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MR. HUFFMAN: So good evening. We're going to start here.

Thank you for accommodating the early beginning of this process. I know that it was publicized to begin at 6:30, but clearly the room is full and so thank you for allowing us to begin early. The room is booked until 10:30. There's sign-in sheets that will continue to be outside, so we will continue to go through this process.

FEMALE SPEAKER: Will this be recorded for the people who had been planning to be here at 6:30?

MR. HUFFMAN: This is recorded by audio and by a certified court reporter.

FEMALE SPEAKER: Do you have an overflow room?

MR. HUFFMAN: There is an overflow room right over here where there is no video but there's audio.

So my name is Peter Huffman and I'm the director of the City of Tacoma's Planning and Development Services Department. I want to thank all of you for coming out this evening, a dark and rainy evening. Before I turn it over to the staff person that is assigned to this project from my department, Ian Munce, I just want to make a few comments.

I appreciate all of the interest and passion that is going into this process. I do want to reiterate what Ian
has said publicly: that the purpose of tonight's meeting is
to get comments from the public on the scoping of an
Environmental Impact Statement for the proposed methanol
plant by Northwest Innovations Works down in the Tideflats,
so tonight's meeting is a scoping public comment meeting.
This is not a decision tonight. This is not about the
actual project other than gaining support or comments from
you on issues that should be studied as part of the EIS.

This is one of two meetings. The second meeting
will be held next week -- or next month -- I think it's the
16th of February -- and then the comment period will run
through the 27th.

MR. MUNCE: The 17th, but we've been asked to --

MR. HUFFMAN: The 17th, but we've been asked to extend that, so we're considering that based on tonight's comments.

So, again, appreciate the passion. I appreciate your time this evening taken away from your busy schedules, your families, cetera.

I've been doing land use planning in the City of Tacoma for over 20 years, so I've had and held many public meetings on many issues in land use. You'd be surprised how much interest in land use the citizens of the city of Tacoma have, and I have been resistful and for on many, many issues, and one of the things that I pride myself on as
being not only a resident of Tacoma but also the planning
director for the City of Tacoma and a planner for the last
20-some years is how civil, how open, how objective, how
respectful the citizens of Tacoma are, and I would expect
nothing less than this evening.

This is a process that is going to be going on for
some time. There are, obviously, varying degrees of opinion
about this process, this project, in this room, and one of
the things that, again, I think Tacoma does better than
others cities is Tacoma respects the right for people to
have varying opinions, and so I expect this evening for us
to be respectful. I expect everyone to be open to the
speakers and not necessarily jeer them, praise them, or any
other sort of show of emotion. I think everybody here has
the right to be heard and everybody here has the right to
get their issues on the table so that the City can
incorporate those into the scoping process for the
Environmental Impact Statement for this project.

Now, having said that, if an individual does not
yield their time appropriately or does not act in the
fashion that, again, the citizens of Tacoma always do, they
will be asked to yield their time. If there is an ongoing
issue not only this group or individuals and individuals do
not act accordingly to respect the other speakers or other
individuals in this room, they will be asked to leave. If
this room itself or this whole process this evening does not follow the decorum that we all expect of the citizens of Tacoma as they participate in emotional, passionate, contentious land-use issues, we'll adjourn the meeting.

So I do not want to do any of that. I think it's important, as the planning director for this city, to have all voices heard. I think it's important that you all know that we pride ourselves at the City of Tacoma on fairness and being objective, and I want just everyone to be assured that this process is going to be very transparent, that we're going to follow all state laws; we are going to follow all of the procedures and processes that we are required to do during an Environmental Impact Statement.

So with that, I'm going to turn it over to Ian Munce and Ian Munce is going to talk about specifically what this process is and what it's not and then some particulars about the project.

So thank you again for coming this evening, and we all look forward to having a very passionate conversation this evening and continuing that conversation as we move throughout this process. Thank you.

MR. MUNCE: Thank you, Peter, members of the audience. Again, welcome. My name is Ian Munce. I'm the project manager for this Environmental Impact Statement, and I'm going to apologize and read some remarks because I don't
want to get them wrong. I can't do as well as Peter extemporaneously.

I'm doing this project under Peter's direction. After consultation with other City agencies and permit review agencies, it's going to be Mr. Huffman who will determine the adequacy of the work that we're here to discuss tonight, so we're much very in a staff-driven process. I know people would like this to be other than that, but we're very much in a staff-driven process.

I would like to provide first a little context. It's really on the sheets I put on your chairs this evening.

The Port of Tacoma has leased the property to a private company, Northwest Innovation Works, and they're entitled to submit applications. However, before they can submit applications, the City has a duty to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement to look at all of the impacts, both pro and con, of this project. That document that will take about a year to prepare -- and I'll talk about that some more -- a year to prepare will then be the basic document that will be used by all the reviewing agencies, whether it's the Puget Sound Clear Air Agency or the fire department or other agencies.

So as far as the mechanics this evening, as Peter said, we do have a court reporter here. Gina is here to do that. In a week so or we'll have a transcript of this
evening's hearing. We'll put that on our website. The
convention center folks will also have an audio tape and
I'll have that on a thumb drive and that will be available.

So we're going to open this up really quickly for
three-minute comments. There are lights on the podium.
They will show the three minutes. Please don't do what I'm
doing and talk too fast because court reporters get really
anxious about that -- and I always talk too fast. If you'd
like to spell your name, that would be helpful. We're going
to take people in the order they signed up, alternating
between the lists that we have. We apologize in advance for
mispronunciation of names.

At this point I would usually take procedural
questions, but there's just too many people in the room, so
I encourage you to give me a call or send me an e-mail. I
think many of you in the room know I've already responded to
phone calls and e-mails. I will keeping doing that as far
as the procedure.

So what happens after this evening is, as
Mr. Huffman said, we're going to have another -- we're going
to take all of your comments, the comments we have received
in writing and prepare what's called a Draft Scope of Work.
It's going to be three or four pages long. It's going to
describe all the issues City staff think are important to
put in an environmental document. We're going to put that
on our website, e-mail it to our e-mail list February 9th, come heck or high water, and give you a chance to then submit written comments on that scope of work; and hopefully, from my point of view, the discussion at Meeker Middle School will focus on those specifics: what have we got right, what have we got wrong, what do we need to add? So as Mr. Huffman said, it's a very deliberate process that we're engaged in.

So we've got 130 comments, written comments, as of noon today, and we have comment sheets for those who would like to submit them this evening, both in the room and in the foyer.

I plan on taking a break at about two hours or so for ten minutes and then we'll start again, and then we'll see where we are by 10:30 tonight and we may have to have some contingency plans if we still have people who want to talk.

So we're here to listen to you, and at this point I would ask -- you were going to do --

MS. SCHULTZ: Do you want to introduce me?

MR. MUNCE: Oh, I'm sorry.

Shirley Schultz delegates all the difficult tasks to me and so she's going to do the easier ones.

MS. SCHULTZ: Actually, the way it worked out was Ian said he couldn't read people's handwriting. I can't
read Ian's, so I guess it's all fair.

Again, thank you for coming tonight. As Ian mentioned, we're going to go off the lists that we have and alternate so that both side's points of view are getting heard. We have neutrals too which I couldn't reach.

But out of courtesy and respect, we have Port Commissioner Connie Bacon here this evening and we have invited her to start first. And then following Connie, we will have Ken Campbell and then Lyz Kurnitz-Thurlow.

So, Connie, if you want to go up and get started, there's your podium, and Ian's going to try to run the timer.

MS. BACON: Well, good evening, everybody. My name is Connie Bacon and I am the president of the Port of Tacoma Commission.

Last May, I and the other commissioners approved a lease agreement for the former Kaiser smelter property with Northwest Innovation Works so that Northwest Innovation Works could advance their plans for developing a manufacturing and export facility converting natural gas and water to methanol.

It is the job of commissioners to respond to opportunities that are presented to us that have the perceived potential to have economic benefit, environmental benefit, and the benefit that will create jobs. We took
this action understanding that hundreds of jobs would be created, that the methanol would be used instead of coal as a feedstock for manufacturing a wide variety of consumer goods and that the lease would begin with a feasibility period. And when we approved this lease, we did so with tonight's event in mind. This is not the Port's event, nor a Northwest Innovation Works event. This is largely your event, facilitated by the City of Tacoma staff, and an opportunity for you to express your interests and concerns so that the environmental review process can be accomplished in an open and transparent fashion.

On behalf of the Port Commission, I wish to thank you for being here and being willing to express your thoughts and how you feel about the project. I, like you, will be looking forward to the facts that will be -- that will determine the outcome of this project. Thank you very much.

MR. CAMPBELL: Thank you. My name is Ken Campbell. We're all here tonight -- as Ian said, thank you for the opportunity to speak. We're all here tonight to provide comments that are related to the possible environmental impacts of putting the country's largest methanol refinery here in the city of Tacoma.

I would like the review that's conducted to consider the water that we use, the amount of water that
will be used, and how that water is going to be accounted for, especially given the low water levels we've seen lately.

I'd like the report to consider the power that this plant is going to require and where that power is going to need to come from and at what cost.

I'd like it to consider the effects of an earthquake, that earthquake we hear about almost every day in the news now, and there's a fault right underneath this spot, as I'm sure you know. I would like it to consider what would happen to this area if that should happen, if we should happen to get an earthquake.

Sea level rise is something that's being planned for by other ports, by the U.S. Navy. Studies show that this area where we're going to --

Does that mean one minute left? What does this mean?

MR. MUNCE: I forgot to turn the timer on.

MR. CAMPBELL: Do I start over?

MR. MUNCE: No. You know your time.

MR. CAMPBELL: Okay, all right. It just kind of freaked me out.

The sea level rise, I think that that should be considered -- that's all I'm saying -- that if it's being considered elsewhere, it should be considered here. There
are models that show that this site is in danger given levels of two, three, four, and more feet.

I'd like it to consider -- and I don't know that this is entirely within the scoping of this report -- but the natural gas line that hasn't been built yet. That's the line that's coming from Puyallup to supply this plant -- whether or not this is going to consider that. It does need to consider the fact of how much natural gas is coming in and the impact of fracking, which is how natural gas gets you in the first place. I realize that's not a local environmental impact, but I don't really know that there's such a thing as a local environmental impact.

More than 12 million tons of plastic is dumped in the ocean every year. What effect does this plant -- what part does this plant and plants like it play on that fact?

I think most of us remember the explosion at the Atlas foundry a few years ago, a relatively small explosion compared to what could happen in a situation like this. I'd like the report to consider that.

And, finally, this methanol is going to be used eventually to make plastic, and it's not baby formula; it's not some vitally needed commodity. It's plastic, and we've got more plastic than we know what to do with already, so I would like the Environmental Impact Statement to consider that too.
Thank you very much for your time.

MS. KURNITZ-THURLOW: Good evening. Lyz Kurnitz-Thurlow.

I am neither for nor opposed to this project at this point. Mostly I have questions. Correct me if I'm wrong, but until the SEPA process explores all these issues and the mitigation, we don't know what the effects will be, so I can't make a decision and I think that hasty decisions don't help because then you don't look at everything.

Also, this is not a refinery. It is a conversion plant. We do know that it will use a lot of electricity. If it does not all come from hydropower and other clean sources and coal generation is involved, this would not help the world's problems with greenhouse gases, so we all want to know about that.

Also, would any of the natural gas be fracked -- and I understand that it's always mixed, so some of it is -- because this is causing such huge environmental problems that are growing that it is a major concern to us all.

Thank you.

MR. MARTINEZ: Thank you, and I'll be brief. Good evening and thank you for the opportunity to speak.

For the record, my name is Mark Martinez. I live in the Stewart Heights neighborhood in the fabulous east side of Tacoma. I also am proud to represent the 16 craft
unions and about 6,000 union members, the building construction trades here in Pierce County.

    Like everybody else, we're interested in maintaining Tacoma's waterways, shorelines, air and water supplies, making sure that they remain clean and safe. We are equally concerned about the continued availability of well-paid blue-collar jobs and adequate funding for our schools, public services, infrastructure, all of which are supported by a healthy economy based on a mixture of employment. We urge the City to develop a scoping environmental review consistent with the following process:

    First, the scope of the EIS should be reasonably limited to the effects of the project in Tacoma/Pierce County and the surrounding water bodies and air sheds.

    The Draft EIS should address how construction and operation of the proposed manufacturing facility will not adversely affect the ongoing remediation efforts within Commencement Bay and the Tideflats.

    The DEIS should identify regulatory requirements and industry-designed best practices that ensure the proposed manufacturing facility is engineered, constructed, and operated to the highest safety standards. We in the construction industry understand safety very well and work hard every day to ensure that everybody goes home after every shift every day.
The DEIS should analyze the effects of the proposed manufacturing facility on the area's infrastructure such as roads, rail, electrical and water systems and wastewater treatment.

The DEIS should analyze direct and indirect economic effects of the proposed facility, including jobs created, taxes paid to support services such as fire, EMS, police, as well as school districts and other special-purpose districts.

We are also going to ask that the EIS process is conducted in a timely and fair manner, using analysis based on facts and science, not distortion and hysteria. The Building Trades Council strongly supports the construction and operation of the methanol plant facility in the Port of Tacoma.

Thank you.

MS. NEUGEBAUER-REX: Hello. My name is Joanne and I'll spell the last name: N-e-u-g-e-b-a-u-e-r, hyphen, R-e-x, and I'm used to it being kind of not pronounced right. Thank you for this opportunity to speak.

I live in northeast Tacoma, and I wrote some questions and I will be submitting them later in my comments, in extended comments, but I would like to read them here.

The first question I have that will be part of my
comments: Has there been an analysis on land values? And if there has been, for those of us who live in Tacoma, who paid for it and is it unbiased? I am concerned how this plant, if it goes forward -- and believe me, I do not want this plant built and I will explain more on that -- how does it affect my land value in northeast Tacoma of the home I love?

My second question: What other materials will the olefins be used for? I saw a display out here and I just say this in all respect to our commissioner: A perceived potential benefit doesn't mean it's a safe or a wise one for us. Where are these products going to end up? In our oceans again? Can we recycle them? Are they fully recyclable? Do we need more packaging and waste products generated that aren't necessary and will be static in our environment for years?

I'm very concerned about our oceans. That was number 3.

Number 4: Why are these plants being built in the U.S.? Why can't they be built, with all respect to Mr. -- and let me pronounce it -- Mr. Xi, I believe. Why is it not built in China where the company originates? And I realize they're an LLC here. Why do you want to build in the middle of such a populated area and put people's health at risk?

Number 5: Why wasn't every single resident in the
City of Tacoma sent the SEPA document so they could be informed? The 2014 census of Tacoma was 205,159. Only 1,300 brochures were mailed out. That is a less than one percent notification rate. That is unacceptable. Every citizen in Tacoma should have knowledge of this, and I am asking that you send the rest of those out, please. It's your right -- as a public servant, that's what you can do for us. Please do that.

I don't know how much time I have, but I'm going to keep going.

So number 6: If a catastrophic explosion takes place -- and if any of you haven't Googled "methanol plant explosion," please do it. It is terrifying. It is a hell fire plume of fire, and since methanol has such a low flash point, water even -- I believe it's hard for water to put this out.

(Timer sounds.)

Okay, well, I'm done, but -- and the last one, quickly: I am a cancer survivor. I already had crap put in my body. I do not want to deal with methanol and the terrible consequences that it can have for our health, and I thank you for the time to speak.

MS. SCHULTZ: So next we have Eric Garcia, I believe. Federal Way?

(Recitation of names.)
MR. GARAY: So my last name is spelled G-a-r-a-y.

So mine's pretty objective. I have four main points that I'm curious about and they should be looked at in the EIS very closely.

The first is the plant is going to consume about 3.8 billion gallons of water. The citizens use about 3.5 -- these are all estimated numbers -- annually. Tacoma has a max output -- again, another estimated number -- of about 5.8. Between the two, you need 6.3 [sic] billion gallons, so the water infrastructure is not there. Who's going to pay for that if such a thing goes through, and how are they going to -- where is the rest of the water going to come from? What other cities or areas are we going to be affecting? That's the bottom line for that.

All right, so the other one is the health of the Puget Sound. Since there's very little research done on how methanol might impact an environment, even though some can argue it's safe, some can argue it's not safe, I would like to see how that's disclosed in the impact statement.

Disasters and clean-up: If something, God forbid, should go wrong, who's paying the bill? What plans will be in place? Who's going to be responsible for the clean-up? I mean, that's an enormous amount of planning right there.

Then finally, the pollution to the Puget Sound.

That's our backyard.
So, basically, I'd like to see all of that fully disclosed openly, publicly, easily. If it has to be across four websites -- whatever -- just get the word out so everybody is well informed.

Thank you.

MR. NEWGENT: Thank you for taking testimony today. My name is Lee Newgent. I'm the executive secretary of the Washington State Building Trades. We represent 70,000 union construction workers in Washington state. We are working on a number of energy projects. We're very familiar with the process.

When I come here today, I welcome the idea of the possibilities of what Tacoma can make out of this project. It's important to the future of Tacoma that they have investment in industry. I understand the arguments for and against, and the building trades, we're not here to argue with the environmentalists. We consider ourselves environmentalists as well.

We know that we can hold the contractor, we can hold the company, we can hold their safety standards to a level that's not seen in the rest of the United States because of the vision of what we do in Washington state. It's the manner of how we do everything in Washington state. We're the leader in Washington state in so many different construction practices regarding safety. Our nuclear plant
standards, our hydroelectric dam standards, all those standards are the highest in the United States now, so we're not going to lower our standards to build a project so we can profit from it. That's not what we believe in. We believe in investment in community.

Our members live here too, the members in our audience here today. They live in Pierce County for two reason: First, it's a beautiful place to live. Second, it's more affordable than some other areas.

We went through a major project here years ago with the Tacoma Narrows project: on the water, all kinds of environmental concerns. We walked through that, mitigated the dangers, and had a very successful project. That's what we're talking about.

The bigger issue now facing the Port of Tacoma is maintaining a working port. The Seattle area, King County, is losing their working port. They're losing that. A combined effort with Tacoma and Seattle, we'll be able to compete on the nation's level for ports and working ports. We know how important that is.

We know that this land is already industrial land. This is not land that is virgin and untouched. This is land that was a smelter plant before. This is not a development of a project. It's a redevelopment of something that is not having any use right now, so it's an investment for
commercial property. It's investment in the local infrastructure. It's an investment in school money, infrastructure money, all things that are important to the people who live here.

Again, we can't build this project unless we have strong environmental oversight -- strong environmental oversight. The environmental impact needs to take everything into concern of what is going to happen in Pierce County and our waterways. We maintain that level.

I also want to remind people, my work force, if there's an accident, they're the people that get killed and it's important to us that we maintain safety and environmental standards.

Thank you very much for the testimony.

MS. WALKER: Good evening. My name is Ingrid Walker, W-a-l-k-e-r. Thank you for the opportunity to speak.

I am alarmed that the state and city has proceeded with the methanol plant project largely without public input up to this point, and I hope that the concern that has now been generated on all sides of this issue suggests that potentially we need, after the environmental scope is done, more public conversation about this plant.

My comments are a little broader than the EIS because this is the first chance I've had to share them.
I'm truly saddened that after the clean-up of Tacoma's environment, our city stewards would even consider this industry. These plants produce waste that includes nickel, copper, zinc oxide, carbon dioxide, carbon monoxide, nitrogen oxide, sulfur dioxide, volatile organic compounds and particulate matter, all in hundreds of gallons of wastewater a minute.

I was mere miles from the epicenter of the Loma Prieta earthquake of 1989 that leveled Santa Cruz, California, and tore apart the San Francisco Bay Bridge 95 miles to the north. It pushed homes off their foundations, burst gas lines, started fires and destroyed an entire city in ten seconds, buildings imploding as if by detonation. What a major earthquake can do is unimaginable. And I want you to think about what happened to Japan: They thought they were ready for that earthquake.

To even consider putting a methanol pipeline in this region is irresponsible and potentially deadly. Methanol is flammable in liquid and gas states and is considered highly toxic to humans and animals. It's bad enough that we have freight trains going through Tacoma with toxic loads. We don't need to invite environmental risks of this magnitude. It is foolish and dangerous.

As an American said in (unclear), I am painfully aware of the boom-and-bust cycle of American cities like
Tacoma. I love this city. I love its blue-collar roots, and I don't want to see this become a decision between jobs or the environment. We shouldn't have to make that choice.

The U.S. is moving toward clean industry standard. I hear this is a clean industry. I'm not convinced. Please don't take us backwards. We just cleaned up our waterways. Given our history of industrial pollution, Tacoma should be on the forefront of less-toxic industries. We expect you to lead us in that direction.

Thank you.

(Recitation of names.)

MS. BECKER: Good evening. My name is Bonnie Becker, B-e-c-k-e-r. I am on the board of Citizens for a Healthy Bay. Please note, we have submitted very lengthy written comments that I'm sure you will be reading.

I'd like to thank you for your time and I'd like to ask a single question that comes from our lengthy list of questions, and what I would like to -- what I would like to hear answered through the EIS scoping process is regarding water use. While I understand that the precise amount of water needed to run this plant is still uncertain since we're fairly early in the process, we do know that it will be significant relative to the existing use of water in Tacoma.

I'm sure many people here will be asking about the
human impacts of that water use, but I'm more focused on the
ecological effects of that water use, so I'd like to know
what the effect is of removing this much water from our
rivers in terms of stream flow, in terms of salmon, and I
would specifically like to know how this will be affected by
natural variability, plus the predicted variability due to
climate change. So while there's still quite a bit that's
unknown, I feel like we do have enough of a range to be able
to model out what those effects might look like in terms of
the ecological effects.

I'd like to thank you for holding this hearing.
I'd like to thank everybody for coming out tonight and for
considering our comments later. Thank you.

MR. McClAIN: Good evening. Thanks for having us
here. My name is Chris McClain, M-c-C-l-a-i-n.

The ironworkers are here today to talk about jobs,
and not just any jobs, but living-wage jobs. Bringing
living-wage jobs to this community was the plan when Tacoma
residents of the -- or leaders of the past decided to build
a port and an industrial complex in the same area. It
wasn't so that we could have large lots of extremely
valuable property sitting vacant. It was so that we can
attract a thriving community to Tacoma, and when we protest
business in an industrial area, we essentially are saying
that we are closed for business, that we don't want a
thriveing and diversified community.

We are in an age of transition, and the American people are tried of fossil fuel energies and its pollution. Methanol is a clean-burning energy source, and I know this to be true because the monster truck show last weekend inside the Tacoma Dome, filled with people not wearing gas masks, proves the clean emissions of methanol because that's how those vehicles are powered. I didn't hear anything about a catastrophic explosion endangering the entire audience. I did hear, though, that it was a lot of fun.

As Stephen Hawking recently said about our technological advances, we must recognize the dangers and control them, so let's help Pierce County residents control the dangers of pollution by reducing their commutes, by building a clean-energy plant here in Tacoma.

Several months ago, the ironworkers partnered with Pierce County by offering direct entry into our apprenticeship program upon completion of a one-month pre-apprenticeship. We have brought in over 40 Pierce County residents so far. There is currently a class in training now and there are more to come. We have negotiated living wages, retirement and health care benefits for those people, but right now they aren't working in Tacoma. They're working in Everett at the Boeing facility; they're working in Seattle at the Amazon building; they're working in
Bellevue at Lincoln Square; they're working out of Bangor Naval Base in Silverdale helping to ensure our national safety. We don't create work, but you can. We need you to help us by creating these jobs for these men and women that have been training for them. Tacoma has the opportunity to tell their residents that not only do we want you to live here, we also want you to be able to work here.

Thank you.

MR. COBLE: Hi. My name is Ken Coble, C-o-b-l-e.

I have nothing new to add. Just add me to the list of citizens of Tacoma who are opposed to this being built.

Thank you.

(Recitation of names.)

MS. MALOTT: Hi. My name is Melissa Malott and I'm the executive director of Citizens for a Healthy Bay, an environmental nonprofit organization that represents and engages citizens in the clean-up, restoration and protection of Commencement Bay, its surrounding waters and natural habitat. Thank you for having us here tonight and for talking public comments.

CHB's comments about the scope of the environmental review for this plant falls under four categories: industrial processes, water usage and discharge systems, water and air pollution, and community safety. I'm going to speak to the water usage and discharge issues that most
directly impact the health of the bay and my written
testimony will cover the other issues.

CHB would like to see a broad scope of review
around the plant's potential water use and water discharge
systems. The EIS should evaluate, 1, the specific amount
and quality of water required for each reaction and stage of
the industrial process, the temperature requirements for
this water, and the maximum amount of water required on a
daily basis.

2: The project's water sources, impacts on ground
water supplies, streams and rivers, the ecological impacts
of such water use on the aquatic and terrestrial life near
those water sources and how these impacts may affect other
water customers, wildlife, and minimum in-stream flows in
different seasons and during periods of drought.

3: The demonstrated technology for effectively
recycling cooling water at this facility, the environmental
implications of recycling cooling water in this way,
alternatives that require less water usage and the
environmental impacts of those alternatives.

4: The project's ability to scale back water use
during drought periods, processes at the facility that can
be curtailed under defined drought conditions, Northwest
Innovation's plans or processes for water conservation
during drought and the means that the City has to enforce
5: Whether the project can effectively use water sourced from wastewater treatment plants for some or all stages of the industrial process.

6: The amount of water discharged via the city sewer and wastewater treatment facilities, any direct discharge to waterways, and any stormwater discharge from the site.

Finally, how the plant will manage wastewater and the cost to treat, given different treatment alternatives, including any costs that may be borne by the public.

Thank you again for your time tonight and for taking public comment on the scoping. Please consider the scope of issues that should be evaluated in the EIS for the proposed methanol plant. Doing so will help us keep the bay healthy for citizens of Tacoma and our state and to ensure that our community can thrive today and for generations to come. Thank you.

MR. DeMULLING: Yeah, thank you. Dear committee members, my name is Don DeMulling. My family, including my wife, three adult sons, their wives and my two grandsons live in the Puyallup Valley not far from the Port of Tacoma. I'm also a member of Ironworkers Local 86 which has 2,500 members, 175 of which live in the vicinity of the Port. We all support building this methanol plant and encourage the
community to move forward.

I know methanol is much more environmentally friendly than other energy sources that would be used elsewhere in the world. Who else would you trust to make sure that the best practices are here when building and maintaining an environmentally safe plant?

By moving forward, we create 260 permanent jobs and a thousand construction jobs, with an economic multiplier greater than three for the community. These will be jobs with dignity, which means being able to contribute to the community instead of taking resources away from the community. It means being able to take my family out to dinner at a restaurant, not standing in line at a food bank. It means having medical insurance benefits, not my neighbor's taxes or insurance surcharges paying my medical bills. It means when I'm too old to work and ready to retire, my community isn't paying for that either. Having a job with dignity also means I'm able to contribute to my community.

Please don't let us lose this opportunity. It makes good financial sense to generate money for local businesses and create a long-stemmed tax revenue for our area. Please approve this project.

Thank you for your time. That's Don DeMulling, D-e-M-u-l-l-i-n-g.
MS. MOORE: I am Ellen Moore, citizen of Tacoma and member of the Sustainable Tacoma Commission. My comments tonight are both specific and broad. I could list any number of serious environmental concerns and I do so for the record.

1: The plant would guzzle more than half of Tacoma's clean water supply a day as we head into years of expected drought and we're asked to conserve water.

2: Heavy metals and chemicals like nickel carbonyl will be used to refine the fracked gas into methanol, and I'd like to know how these hazardous chemicals and materials will be stored once spent.

3: The plant will allow China to make more cheap plastics to send back into our oceans and waterways, choking and killing our marine life even more, and China is the number one contributor to plastic in our waterways -- number one. We'd be enabling China to pollute our oceans even more than it already does with cheap methanol-produced plastics.

4: There's significant risks of methane leaks, and I do know the difference between methane and methanol. Methanol is the highly flammable, volatile, toxic material we might be making here; and natural gas, used to make methanol, consists primarily of methane, the most potent greenhouse gas. Methane and methanol are directly linked, and currently LA is dealing with a methane leak of
catastrophic proportions from its natural gas facility.

    So concerned citizens will make their voices known tonight. My unique contribution comes from my perspective as commissioner of the Sustainable Tacoma Commission. Tonight I speak only from my personal perspective and I do not represent the commission.

    STC's role is extremely limited. While it should act as a watch dog for sustainability matters, it has little power and the City rarely, if ever, seeks us out to advise it on environmental matters. Instead, environmental oversight is placed under the Planning and Development Commission, a severe conflict of interest.

    In fact, the City never brought methanol to STC's attention. As a commissioner, I and others found out about the plant on Facebook, which is troubling, given that we were created by the City to advise it on sustainability issues.

    Because I consider a polluting petrochemical plant in the heart of our beautiful city one of our biggest environmental concerns to date, and because I feel as though I can do nothing as a commissioner, I am resigning from STC.

    Mr. Huffman and Mr. Munce, you made the unusual decision tonight to change public comment protocol by forcing us to sign up as for or against the plant and then calling on each side equally, and I'd like to know how many
Tacomans are actually against methanol.

You also framed this debate by having Connie Bacon lead our discussion. This appears to reveal that despite your assurance, that the City does consider this a done deal. Please convince us otherwise.

MS. GOGINS: Thank you for taking public comment tonight. My name is Karen Gogins, G-o-g-i-n-s, and I am commenting on behalf of Citizens for a Healthy Bay to cover the scope of the water and air pollution issues CHB would like to see in the Environmental Impact Statement. I will speak to the scoping issues related to the pollution and community health issues that most directly impact the health of the bay and our community.

The proposed methanol plant project would produce a variety of air and water pollutants, both through construction and ongoing operation, many of which would impact air and water quality. The EIS should include a comprehensive list of these pollutants, as well as predicted amounts of each.

For on-site pollution, the scope of the EIS should include, number 1, the pollutants that would be in the wastewater of this plant, including thermal pollution, the ecological impacts of those pollutants, the project's potential impact on aquatic resources, and how the plant would meet water quality criteria.
Number 2: How the project's pollutants, including methanol, natural gas, and other byproducts, would affect the marine environment and aquatic and terrestrial natural resources.

Number 3: The types, range, and average quantities of air pollutants, including greenhouse gases and fugitive emissions from the project site and pipeline lateral during construction and operation and the project's impacts on air quality in Tacoma and nearby areas.

The types of storage tanks, including safety features that would be used in the project, and the potential risks related to methanol -- the methanol storage strategy and the measures to be used that would prevent and respond to derailments, spills, and other unexpected sources of pollution.

Number 5: The emergency spill protocol, both terrestrial and aquatic, and the clean-up plans for the accidental discharge of methanol, natural gas, and other byproducts.

For off-site pollution, the EIS should evaluate the frequency and mode by which the project's shipments would be transported, the impact of this increased shipping for both the marine environment and air quality, emissions from marine vessels when engaged in active loading and unloading.

And lastly, the impact of the projected population
growth over the 25-year lease period for the project.

Thank you again for your time tonight and for taking public comment on the scoping. Please consider the scope of these issues that should be evaluated in the EIS. Doing so will help keep the bay healthy for the citizens of Tacoma and our state and to ensure that our community can thrive today and for generations to come. Thank you.

MS. SCHULTZ: Willie Stewart? He'll be here in a second. He's in the other room. Well, we can come back to Willie if he shows up from the other room.

Marcy Rodenborn.

MS. RODENBORN: Thank you for taking public comment. I don't have very well-prepared statements, but I have an impact assessment I would really want the commission to do. I only found out about the plant from my wonderful neighbor Ellen Moore. I didn't hear about it.

I am the mother of an 11-year-old. I gave birth to my child in this city. I defend this city to all my hipster friends in Seattle who put it down all the time, and I want to keep it this beautiful, growing, diverse community that it is.

What I specifically want the impact assessment to look at is the effects on children. There are thousands of children. Thousands of children in schools, in daycares and preschools that play outside all the time in the area, so
what's the effect of the air on them?

What's the effect on all the toxins going into the water, any kind of storage, all of it? The pipeline running underneath, if that leaks -- not even if it leaks, but the everyday operations of the plant.

So many of my daughters' friends come over. They have asthma inhalers; they're sick; they're not well. I'm so tired of watching blue-collar communities be forced to deal with adverse environmental impacts of industrial life and I just think it's not fair.

I am also really disappointed by the lack of transparency. I know that's not part of this. I encourage everyone to look at their ballots and vote. We have a recall process. We should use it.

MR. STEWART: Good evening. My name is Willie Stewart and I'm a retired Tacoma public school educator and veteran who served in the Army, stationed at Fort Lewis, and although I'm a great Texan, I've been in this state since 1958.

As an educator, the success of our young people has always been important to me. I serve on a number of boards in our community that support our youth and help them overcome the many challenges they face, to provide them with the necessary tools and skills to graduate from high school and have a plan for their future. In fact, an alternative
school was just named in my honor and they had a graduation
tonight and that's why I'm a few minutes late.

I'm interested in this project because I feel it
has an opportunity to present help to our young people and
lift them out of poverty and the challenges they face today.
We have lost a large number of companies in Tacoma over the
last ten years that have chosen to relocate their
headquarters. This means that there's less money coming
into those organizations that provide school services to
help our young people -- the social services.

I believe this EIS process will lead to the right
decision as far as the safety and environmental concerns,
which are very important and I do agree that they need to be
thoroughly investigated and mitigated if this project goes
forward. I would like to make sure, though, that the EIS
includes the information about how the company will invest
in our community, specifically in ways that help nonprofit
organizations and the youth they serve build a brighter
future here in Tacoma.

Thank you.

(Recitation of names.)

MR. BURNS: Hi. My name is Kit Burns -- that's
B-u-r-n-s -- citizen of Tacoma. I am an architect and I'd
like to speak a little bit just about your scoping statement
and what I'd ask you to look at specifically.
I'm not familiar with methanol plants, but in a letter that I'm going to submit, I'm asking you to go through the United States and do an assessment of methanol plants throughout the United States. I would like to know specifically what plants have been built since 1960, what plants are still in operation, what's the condition and how they're operating, what's their employment.

I'd like to know also what's their input in terms of electricity, their outflow in terms of wastewater, their outflow in terms of chemicals, what's the temperature of the water -- many of the things that the Citizens for a Healthy Bay have asked for.

So as an architect, I used to come across confusing issues, and the best way I found to understand an issue is to do a comparison, just in a broad scope.

I'd also ask, too, that you specifically go and do an analysis of the water, question the temperature, question the chemicals, and that a plant such as this should be able to reuse this water. To put the volume of water into the bay would certainly be harmful.

In my letter, I also include a number of documents from the Tacoma Public water. I've got them listed specifically. It lists their goals for environmental input, their 2006 water conservation plan, their annual reports since 1997, and their TPU 2012 strategic plan. Also,
recently, they just signed an agreement, because they were short on water, with Lake Haven Water District, and so you want to look at that as well.

Finally, I made a couple suggestion on books to read, because I think it's important to be informed. One is called Merchants of Doubt. Another one is called Living Downstream. Another one that is excellent by a professor from the University of Washington is called King of Fish: The Thousand-Year Run of Salmon. He also wrote a book -- David Montgomery wrote a book called Dirt: The Erosion of Civilizations, and all these, I think, will help make an informed review of this process.

So I appreciate the opportunity to speak today. Thank you.

MR. ANTHONY: Thank you very much. My name's Michael Anthony. I'm a boilermaker from Local 502, and I rise in support of the project today.

I think it's very important these days that we take the environment into account and I'm by no means putting jobs ahead of the environment, but I think we can have both. I sincerely believe that we've got the best-trained work force in our union craftsmen in this country that will be found anywhere in the world. I'd much rather we did this ourselves safely and cleanly than to outsource it and have a similar thing done in China where they are far less
concerned with the environment, and I'll leave it at that.

I just think we can have both.

MR. CRESO: My name is Charles Creso. I live in northeast Tacoma, downwind from the plant, and like so many people in this room, I only found out about this plant in the last few weeks. The Port Commission has been an absolute failure at letting people know this was coming up. I'm asking for a moratorium to delay this plant, to gather more public input -- and we need a bigger venue too. You've got too many people outside.

This has the potential for disastrous widespread impact. It demands probing questions on behalf of Tacoma's citizens and safety. This could be a mistake that will haunt Tacoma for years to come. Let's look at key issues.

Jetliners filled with highly volatile jet fuel slammed into the Twin Towers in York and we all witnessed it over and over again on the news. Now imagine a fully fueled jetliner slamming into the largest methanol gas facility in the world between downtown Tacoma and northeast Tacoma: a concussion blast heard up to 20 miles away, Commencement Bay filling with toxic, life-threatening smoke. If there's a temperature inversion when it occurs, dangerous gases could be trapped for days or weeks. If there's fog when it happens, corrosive toxic mists could settle on homes, cars, and be unavoidably taken in through the lungs. Remember the
survivors in New York: life-long health problems and death from toxic fumes. We might as well paint a big red target on the heart of Tacoma. New Orleans is still suffering from their disaster years later. Imagine plastic resins spelling from a ruptured ship Exxon Valdez style. That took years to clean up. As we speak, there's a gas disaster unfolding in the Los Angeles area, people forced from their homes not for a week but for months on end. And we all remember the Bellingham natural gas disaster. These disasters are the norm, not the exception.

Scientists remind us we are overdue for a magnitude 9 mega-earthquake. They are certain that it will happen here again. No structure in the continental United States has been proven to be able to withstand such a high-magnitude earthquake in an actual event of that size.

Imagine roads buckled, fire engines unable to respond to multiple ruptured tanks or pipelines, ships in the process of being loaded with methanol or plastic resins slamming into docks and fires erupting, bridges down. People injured, everyone needing help. We've seen it in San Francisco with much smaller earthquakes.

Imagine that scenario unfolding in Tacoma and all the while the South Sound filling up with smoke, the evacuations local government would have to undertake, the adverse economic and health impacts. This has greater
potential for spewing hazardous toxins into the air than the 
garbage incineration plant that was opposed several years 
back.

And, lastly, this plant will drive up your water, 
your wastewater processing, and your electrical rates. The 
demand is far too high. They're going to have to go out 
into the market. It's going to drive everybody's rates up 
in this room.

MR. NORDSTROM: My name is Eric Nordstrom, spelled 
like the store. I'm the vice president of Boilermakers 
Local 502.

I think we should keep industry here in the United 
States where it can be regulated. I'm a big fan of ecology 
and I think that that's the way to do it: Regulate it here, 
rather than in China where things are less strict.

Thank you.

MS. SCHULTZ: Ken Gibson.

MR. GIBSON: Good evening, and thank you folks for 
holding this hearing tonight.

First off, I just want to express a little bit of 
concern with the size of this meeting. The next meeting 
scheduled for February 17th in northeast Tacoma is largely 
inaccessible by public transit and it's not a large 
location.

Again, my name is Ken Gibson. I'm a citizen of
Tacoma. I've lived here for the last 16 years. My family
has deep roots in Tacoma and Pierce County going back to
1886, so we love this community a lot.

Jobs are key for Tacoma and Pierce County, but not
this way. I have some concerns. They really fall into
three major areas.

First of all, the water: How will water use be
prioritized, how will it be treated, and what will be
allowed into Commencement Bay that we've spent a lot of time
trying to figure out to how to clean up?

Electricity: Where will it come from? Is it clean
electricity? This is one of the arguments here, is that
what we're trying to do is to offset something in China by
doing something over here, but I'm not convinced that we
will make it any cleaner by doing it here.

Safety is my biggest issue that I would like to
have information about through the EIS process. How will
the toxicity be mitigated in all of its forms? What will
the disaster plan be? Who will pay the costs? Who will be
leading it?

One of the things that I'm intimately familiar with
is that there are some real difficulties between
communication in Pierce County emergency management and the
City of Tacoma, and I'm not convinced that when it's in the
City of Tacoma, that there's a good plan at this point.
Finally, please forgive my skepticism, but we can't clean up Hanford after 70 years. How will this be different?

MR. DEXTER: Hi. Can you hear me? My name is Warren Dexter. I'm from the Portland area and I just heard about this. I'm from the flex fuel part of the equation, and I recognize that the methanol world is changing very fast and I wanted to add some facts.

In 2003, China produced roughly 6 million metric tons of methanol. In 2015, they produced nearly 50 million metric tons, so you can see there's a big growth in methanol and that's happened all around the world.

The other situation that's going on here is that we're watching the construction not just of this plant, but of three plants in our region, additional plants in the South that are part of the bay down there -- in the Gulf, rather, and it's very smart; it's very smart. Methanol is a very simple alcohol. It is made from wood. If we took all the wood in the trees and ground it up and brewed it like beer, we'd have methanol. But it's much cheaper to make it from natural gas, and the availability of natural gas through fracking has really brought about a changed scene in the world of methanol production. It's made the cost of methanol today be roughly 90 cents a gallon, even against the lowest prices of unleaded gas today being offered at a
dollar a gallon in the same very rough market.

Methanol is much cleaner burning, and I would urge everybody who's watching this process to also view a movie called "Pump," P-u-m-p, on Netflix. You'll hear just a little bit about what I'm talking about.

I don't believe these products will be used for olefins. I believe that the real goal of this is an energy product, as you've heard it talked about a lot. It's a very, very efficient energy resource. The simplicity of making it here is to take formed natural gas and join it with steam, which does not have to come from potable water, and they will prove that it can come from water from the river or the bay or different places here and they'll find great ways to show you how this is a very smart plant to be built and they will be part of the process of many plants that will be built.

Here's my problem --

MALE SPEAKER: Are they building them in Portland?

MR. DEXTER: They're building three right around --

two of them are in the Portland area.

And believe me, here's my problem and it's a big problem: These are very important strategic resources. We are experiencing a windfall. We've seen the energy markets come to us in many ways that are very important and we're about to capitalize on it. The people that build pipelines
can build good pipelines. They won't leak. If they do leak, they'll know how they leak. This is a modern age, and modern construction is capable of helping us to reap this windfall and use it, and my big problem is that this -- over $6 billion a year worth of methanol, which is my calculation which will come out of this plant -- $6 billion worth of methanol a year makes a $3 billion plant build very inexpensive and I'd like to look at that from the standpoint that this is a very inexpensive place for methanol to be built and this is why the Chinese are interested in coming here. They are very smart to do so.

What I would urge -- I know there's a lot of objection; I understand -- but I would urge that you consider the strategic importance of these resources: our cheap electricity, our cheap availability of water, and our cheap access to methanol -- or to methane gas and to understand this is larger than just a single issue. They hope to divide you into two camps and then will prove that the plant is clean.

MS. SCHULTZ: Thank you. Let's try to keep loud, critical remarks to a minimum, please.

MR. POGUE: Hello, everyone. My name is Lester Pogue, Jr., spelled P-o-g-u-e. I'm a citizen of Tacoma and a member of the Black Collective.

We have concerns about the environmental impact of
this proposed plant and they're being covered very well and there is truly a valid concern about the negative environmental effects the production of methanol will create. That being said, if this proposed plant is constructed after a vote by the citizenry of Tacoma and the EIS statement is presented, keep in mind that the investors can make changes and approve the plant's construction regardless of what the EIS statement finds.

With the revenue created by the proposed construction of this facility, what programs or entities will be enhanced by the financial gains created by the construction of this plant? With all this talk about job creation, will there be an effort to bring more diversity to the building and running of this plant? Each one of us can drive around the Northwest and see the lack of diversity on job sites such as this. I'm a general contractor and a former carpenter's union member and I find it very difficult to see this job staffed with people who look like myself, so I have a lot of concerns about this and I hope that your economic impact statement includes this as well.

Thank you for the opportunity.

(Recitation of names.)

MR. HOEFT: So I'm Bruce Hoeft, and first of all, thank you very much for your patience, Mr. Munce, Ms. Schultz. I appreciate it.
I have the good fortune of living in Tacoma. I'm a retired public high school teacher, science teacher, and in addition to the Sumner School District where I worked, I have worked for the Mayo Clinic, for the World Health Organization, and the U.S. Forest Service. I believe in the value of what science can tell us about the world and I welcome a thorough scoping review of the impacts of the proposed methanol plant.

Yes, we need jobs, but we need ones that will not threaten the health of the people who have those jobs and the people who live nearby. Trust me: My father-in-law, he worked in the Tideflat shipyards in the '40s and '50s. It was a job he needed to provide for his family, but he paid the price. He worked in a cloud of asbestos and cleaning chemicals which impacted his health. He died of cancer, and in the last couple of years of his life, he was in pain all the time. He lived on North 46th and Ferdinand in the shadow of the Asarco stack. The smelter also provided jobs, but it poisoned the land and the water.

My wife grew up thinking that the stack a quarter mile away, with its constant stream of toxic smoke, was where clouds were made. She and her brother played in the dirt where lead and arsenic laced the soil. Neither one of them can smell anything.

There's a health price to be paid for those jobs
and a fiscal price too. While over a hundred million dollars has been spent cleaning up Asarco’s mess, pregnant women in Ruston are still advised by the state to wear respirators when gardening.

Two months ago a front page News Tribune headline read, "Three decades after the Asarco smelter shut down, its toxic legacy surprises Tacoma newcomers." The poisons are still in the soil and we are cleaning up and it still impacts the property values and the likelihood of people investing in our community.

On the Tideflats, the Port of Tacoma has spent many tens of millions of dollars cleaning up the Kaiser smelter site where the methanol refinery would be located. This is real money, part of the price we pay for polluting industries and the jobs they may bring. We need 21st Century job opportunities for Tacoma, ones that don't threaten the health of the workers and residents and don't depress the land values in the heart of our city.

Please conduct as thorough and comprehensive an impact as you possibly can. We need it. Thank you very much.

(Recitation of names.)

MS. SCHULTZ: Jori is running this way. I see her coming.

MS. ADKINS: Okay, I'm going to talk a little bit
about something a little different. There's been great
tings said about the environment and things like that
again the plant. This is about the south downtown, the
Puget Sound Regional Council, and plans and compatibility of
those plans with this project.

The PSRC, which is the Puget Sound Regional
Council, their vision for 2040 says focus growth within
already urbanized areas, encourage use of urban land by
maximizing development potential such as advancing
development that achieves zone density.

The comprehensive plan for the City, it states that
concentrating growth within mixed-use centers, especially
those which strengthen the existing development pattern,
protect single-family neighborhoods and environments and
create attractive urban living and working environments
which encourage walking, bicycling, and use of public
transit, minimum densities ranging from 50 to 80 units per
acre. I'm talking about the downtown Dome District, Brewery
District, and the area of the downtown that is looking right
out at this area where the plant is going to be.

The Dome District, which is where I live, is poised
to be one of the densest districts close in to downtown as
the transit-oriented district of the downtown and region,
which we have all the transit there.

The Brewery District envisions rehab of historic
properties and businesses and developments, including significant new residential housing that supports and compliments UWT. UWT's vision shows expansion as a four-year university with 12,000 to 15,000 full-time equivalent students.

Can we say that this type of industry furthers these plans? Is this development compatible with the plans of these neighborhoods and entities? We are not NIMBYs. This is in our front yard.

Tacoma, whether it is the residential neighborhood of the northeast or the downtown as the densest part of the city, all look out at what could be perceived as a potential doom. How does this affect our property values? How does it encourage developers to come here to build the housing we have planned and advocated so hard for? This impacts our health, economy, economics, esthetics, and our values of a green, walkable city to live in. How can this ever be mitigated? This plant should not be built in such an urban area.

I also want to say that methane is not methanol.

MS. SCHULTZ: Okay, so it is just now about 7:00, which means we have been over an hour and 15 minutes and I think probably people would appreciate a short break, so we're going to take a ten-minute break.

We still have sign-up sheets out front. We are
willing to have other people sign up. We're still running the lists. We have several sheets left to go, and we're going to work with the people who may have missed hearing their names called out in the lobby, so we'll see you at ten after. Thank you.

(A short recess was taken.)

MS. SCHULTZ: Can I have everybody take your seats, please? Can everybody take your seats, please? And for the people in the hallway, there's a couple of things that came up. I know there's some people in the hallway who aren't necessarily being heard, so I have a delightful colleague who's going to shout names out there, so hopefully we can address that issue.

The other concern that's come up is the size of the venue and the opportunity for the people to speak. We are going to try to look at some additional meetings and additional venues in case we don't get through the -- if we don't get through the 160 people we still have left to go, and I do appreciate everyone being cooperative and timely.

I also took another couple of suggestions, which is I'm going to name five names at once, so test your memories, and I'm also going to say where we are on the list so that if you happen to remember where you are, you can say, oh, I'm another 15 people down the line.

Also, I want to remind people that if people have
to bail out at some point, all the most recent updated
information -- and I've asked Ian to do this, so you're hear
it again -- will be on the City website. So when we do find
other meeting spaces, when we set other meetings, when we
publish the comments, when we let you know that the audio
recording is available, that will be on our website. I
would hope that other folks would link to it. If you can't
find it, you can always contact Ian. My contact information
is also on the website. We will help you however we can to
find the information that you need, but we'll do the meeting
announcements and keep those things up to date.

So with those little tidbits out of the way, I had
William Kupinse.

MR. KUPINSE: Hi. My name is Bill Kupinse. I'm an
educator and a parent and I've lived in Tacoma for 13 years.

Chernobyl Nuclear Power plant, Three Mile Island
Nuclear Reactor Number 2, Fukushima Nuclear Power plant, the
Deepwater Horizon oil rig, the RMS Titanic: What do all of
these engineering disasters have in common? When each of
these projects were built, they were described as state of
the art. So when I read the lease agreement that the Port
of Tacoma signed with Northwest Innovation Works and I read
that site safety will be provided through redundant state-
of-the-art systems, I am not convinced. All refineries tell
you they're state of the art, and I'm sure that at the time
they're built they are. Still, every year the National Oceanic & Atmospheric Administration responds to more than a hundred toxic spills in U.S. waters. So even with a state-of-the-art refinery, I worry about carcinogens like benzine, formaldehyde, and sulfur dioxide released into the air.

I worry about the fact that seismologists report that the Pacific Northwest is overdue for an earthquake of 8.0 or greater on the Richter Scale. That's one big enough to form a tsunami, and the refinery would be built right on the Tideflats.

Even if I weren't concerned about these safety issues, I would oppose the construction of the refinery for some basic reasons. One: Diverting a huge portion of our city's fresh water supply at a time of increased concern about water shortages. I just got something in the mail from our local utility thanking us for cutting back on usage. Now the refinery planners say they may use gray water. Unless we've got an enforceable commitment in writing, I don't believe it.

Number 2: The negative impact on the local economy. If the refinery is built, it will signal that Tacoma is once again a dumping ground for dangerous and dirty industries, and a ton of employers that represent our future -- high technology, green energy, health care -- will
look elsewhere.

Then finally, number 3, environmental racism and
classism: One of the things I teach in my environmental
literature class is the long history of environmental racism
and classism in the U.S. Aside from a smattering of upscale
homes around Browns Point, the overall demographic patterns
within the area concerned around the refinery suggest that
the Northwest Innovation Works proposal will repeat this
history.

The Puyallup Indian reservation is alarmingly close
to the site.

The other place in the U.S. that the Chinese
government is siting a methanol refinery is St. James
Parrish, Louisiana, part of an area known as Cancer Alley.
Don't let the refinery proponents sell off our fresh water.
Don't let them kill our growing economy. Don't let them
sell out the health of our community. Don't let them turn
Tacoma into the Cancer Alley of the Northwest. This project
is wrong for Tacoma.

Thank you.

(Recitation of names.)

MR. BUCK: Hello all. My name is Peter Buck,
B-u-c-k, and I'm not what you would say a very good speaker,
but what I would like to say is, yes, this will provide
many, many construction jobs during the construction of the
project, and when the project is done, yes, those
construction jobs will move on to other locations, but it
will also provide many jobs for local citizens. It will
provide jobs on what we know as a working port, the Tacoma
Port.

I don't know how many of you know it or know what
sort of industry is on the Port. Do you know that there's
oil refineries down there? Oh, my gosh, they're going to
explode. They haven't. They don't. They're maintained.
They're old, but they're maintained and they're improved.
We have a paper industry. We have a wood industry. We have
shipping. We have -- there's a water treatment plant for
the City of Tacoma on this port. Do you know -- yeah --

MR. MUNCE: Just talk to me.

MR. BUCK: So, yeah, a wastewater treatment plant.
Yes, it's a wastewater treatment plant.

So, people, think about what we have. We have a
working port. If we let that go away, what does Tacoma have
for industry? We have coffee shops and restaurants. We
have a few industries for high tech. But other than that,
it's small industry. Tacoma is a working town. It is a
blue-collar town, and there are hundreds, there are
thousands of blue-collar workers here who love it and love
it that way.

We aren't Fresno. We aren't Louisiana. We aren't
Cancer Alley. We do things better up here. It will be a cleaner industry than they have down there. Theirs is not -- the industry for the methanol made down there is not through electricity. They use fossil fuels to create the energy to make the methanol. This is an industry which Tacoma can have, should have, and when it is here, it will be done properly and safely.

Also, if you guys -- if everyone in this room is so afraid of the methanol plant, of plastics, I ask you all, place all your plastics up here in front of the podium.

Thank you.

MS. MIKELADZE: My name is Tatyana. I don't do well in the public forum speaking, but I felt it important to come here and express my opinion.

First of all, I would like to say that Washington state has a $600 billion IT industry, and all we could come up with is building a toxic plant that is going to create 200 jobs?

Second, I started to research the investing investors that are behind this project. One company, the board of directors are formed by members of the Chinese Communist party. They are backed by Chinese government. Another investing party, Double Green Bridge, was formed a year ago, so I don't even know who they are, and I think it's the responsibility of parties involved to at least have
a committee on foreign investment, to do an investigation of those investors. We know there were several companies back in China that were not allowed to invest in the United States, so this is a big company that should be investigated.

Numerous studies have been done and there's one by Berkeley University. There are other studies. There is a loss of value in real estate up to 11 percent after plants of such magnitude open, so how are you going to mitigate? That is a big question. I don't want my house value to be lost.

I also have a question about the EPA Superfund that was used to clean the Port of Tacoma. Are there any limitations of building such a plant again on the site?

Those are questions that I have. I did have a lot of questions. I'm going to mail my comments. Yes, thank you.

MR. CARLTON: My name is John Carlton and I'm a Tacoma resident.

First, the refinery would be a huge guzzler of our most valuable natural resource: fresh water. Over ten million gallons per day, every day of the year, primarily from the Green River on a 30-year lease. Note during the summer months, that is roughly a quarter of the Green River's capacity. The potential negative economics to the
river's ecosystem are obvious. This is home for Steelhead, Chinook, Coho, and other salmon, some of which are federally endangered species.

Also, this amount of water is roughly what the whole population of Tacoma already uses. We just went through the worst drought in history. Residents were asked by the City to conserve water. Global warming indicates our fresh water will become even more scare and valuable in the future and now we will be selling it off in enormous quantities to a foreign country to make plastic?

Power: This refinery will use enough electricity to power over 320,000 households, increasing the cost for the residents of Tacoma and force our providers to look for more sources.

Danger: This behemoth refinery will process and store huge amounts of highly flammable methanol and be a mile away from the already approved Puget Sound Energy's liquified natural gas storage facility, and with over 80,000 barrels of crude oil already passing by daily on rail, what we are creating on the Hylebos wetland is a fossil fuel time bomb in the shadow of the most assured -- almost assured eventual earthquake.

The few supporters -- the supporters of this project tout it as being a green energy alternative, but how is using natural gas, a fossil fuel plundered via hydraulic
fracking and then piped thousands of miles to Tacoma, assuredly leaking methane along the way, where it will then be refined via huge amounts of electricity and water, then shipped overseas to be used to manufacture plastic, which will then be shipped back to the States to be sold so cheaply it will be given away and tossed in the streets -- how is this a green alternative?

Yes, China needs to stop using coal for their health and ours, but this refinery of fossil fuels to make plastic is not green. Ask the Sierra Club; ask the Audubon; ask the EPA. Plastic is killing our oceans. The only green aspect of this proposal are the faces of presidents printed on paper for the profits of relatively few at the cost of everyone else.

Pollution: Over a million gallons of chemical wastewater per day will be generated by this facility, with metals like zinc sulfide, copper, and nickel which will be piped to the City's wastewater plant for processing, while formaldehyde, methane, and benzine will be released into our air. Is this not obviously a detriment to our region?

And finally, legacy: What will happen to the property value of our local residents?

Thank you.

(Recitation of names.)

MR. CALLIES: My name is Dennis Callies. That's
C-a-l-l-i-e-s.

I stand here to support the methanol plant, the proposed methanol plant. I represent -- I'm the business manager for the IBEW. That's the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers in the City of Tacoma. I represent 1,300 -- approximately 1,300 members and their families.

We just went through some of the worst economic times of our life. We've got the best construction workers, the best electricians, the best steel workers, the best tradespeople in this room. We are not going to stand by and watch something built unsafe.

We are not opposed to the scoping of this environmental study. We want to know the effects on our community. I live in this community. I have a family in this community, and I will not support something that does not -- or does not make me feel it's going to produce a safe industry or plant for my family. I want my members to go home every night safer than they went to work.

I say that we build this thing here in the United States where you have the best oversight that can be had. Don't build it in China. Let's do build it here where we can take care of it and watch what happens.

And I'm also about jobs. This thing is -- this is about building and producing good, living-wage jobs. It's about -- I heard it earlier spoke about what it will do for
the community. It should put apprenticeships -- apprentices to work, people that we take out of our schools. Not everybody can go to college. These are people that can learn a trade; they can learn a craft that can support them for the rest of their life. They don't have to move somewhere to get a job. I want to have industry here, and I don't want to be a bedroom community for Seattle. I don't want the jobs in this town, my town, to be nothing but -- and there's nothing wrong with somebody that serves coffee or serves in a restaurant or something -- but you need people to be able to go buy the coffee. You need to have people who can afford to go to the dinners. You need to have people that can go to the doctors and build the hospitals and all of those things.

If we don't have industry here, you're going to lose these craftsmen; you're going to lose these people. They're going to have to move somewhere else, and then who is going support this town? Who's going to let it grow? Who's going to pay the money to build the art museum? Who's going to build -- who's going to pay for the arts that we want? I want this city to be nation -- world-wide known for being a place to come and visit, something that stands out, but I've also got to be able to afford to live here, and this plant will produce jobs, produce living-wage jobs.

Thank you.
(Recitation of names.)

MS. PEAPHON: Hi. My name is Valerie Peaphon, P-e-a-p-h-o-n.

I'm here tonight because my future and my family's future depends on it. I live in north Tacoma and I have grave concerns regarding the mega gas and methanol refinery proposed for the Tideflats.

Though I find the idea of local jobs compelling, I ultimately fear the long-term damage and suffering this refinery could have on Tacoma's residents. I know the primary purpose of this meeting is to hear environmental concerns, but we must also realize those environmental concerns can lead to negative economic impacts for this city. Chemical refineries are volatile and dangerous. A leak, spill, fire, or explosion could have devastating effects on our community. Refineries are known to release toxins and cause pollution. How would this refinery affect Tacoma's air and water quality?

Tacoma has seen significant clean-up and revitalization efforts in the past two decades that truly breathed new life into the city. In fact, Tacoma was recently touted as one of the top 12 up-and-coming cities in the U.S., but will it remain an inviting and desirable city if it returns to its polluted past? Or, more likely, will creating a petrochemical corridor in Tacoma lead to an
exodus of the creative and academic classes? Will they all (unclear) elsewhere? Will home values plummet?

China's use of coal is bad, absolutely, but is the proposed use of fracked gas better? No. We need to fight to keep fossil fuels in the ground, not pipe them down from Canada to convert them to methanol here in Tacoma, to then ship to China to make cheap plastic. It is imperative that we all are well-versed in the social, environmental, and health impacts of the petrochemical industry.

I personally do not support the building of a methanol plant in Tacoma. Temporary jobs and tax revenues must come second to the health, safety, and security of Tacoma's residents.

(Recitation of names.)

MR. TIEGER: Good evening. My name is Joe Tieger, T-i-e-g-e-r. I'm a Tacoma resident, and first I'd like to express my sympathy for the staff. I've spent more than a few hours on that side of the table in the course of a 40-year environmental career, the last 20 of which was spent with the enforcement arm of the Environmental Protection Agency in Washington, D.C. Coincidentally, one of my projects was enforcement against Asarco and Grupa Mexico.

Somehow or other, I ended up moving to Tacoma. I ended up moving to Tacoma because in Zillow, the real estate page gave the North End of Tacoma a high walkability score.
and I was tired of driving long distances.

I am vastly overeducated. I have two degrees in biology, one in public administration, and a law degree, and I have become an expert in a lot of arcane little bits of trivia, including the financial assurance provisions of a couple of federal statutes, so let me explain this to you.

The company that's proposing this project is an LLC. To translate that, that is a limited liability corporation. It really doesn't matter that its origins are Chinese, that it's in China. What you need to know is that the people who put the money into the project own stock in the project. They do not own the facility and they do not own the land, because the Port owns the land. Now, that's very important, because under the Superfund Law, the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act and the Oil Pollution Act, the owners of a facility include the land owners.

How does this matter? Well, this is what I've seen numerous times, particularly over the last 15 years: Companies own stock in what used to be subsidiaries. Under the law, owning stock in a company does not convey liability from the stock-owned company -- in this case, Northwest Innovation -- to their parent corporation. So if there is a significant release requiring a costly response, these companies maintain only sufficient funds to operate. All
the rest of their income goes to their parents as dividends from the stock.

So what if we have a catastrophe? And I've been involved in a few catastrophes in one way or another. One of my other activities was a Coast Guard reserve officer. So let's assume worst case -- and by the way, scenarios for EISs are supposed to consider worst case. So you have a very large spill of methanol. It is truly a nasty stuff. You can't breathe it; you can't touch it; you can't drink it. It is bad for you -- along with other hazardous substances. The company will not have the assets to address it. The company will go to bankruptcy court. Environmental claims are unsecured. Therefore, they won't pay. You the taxpayer, the Port as the owner of the property, will be the sole remaining potentially responsible party. You will pay for clean-up.

MS. SCHULTZ: Thank you. So before I move on, I am going to go back and call some names in case we missed people in the hallways, so hang on one second.

(Recitation of names.)

MS. WIEGMAN: I'm here to speak for the seven generations ahead of us and I would like you to think about that impact. I think that the way that our society has gone has gone on far too long and it's a time for a whole paradigm shift, so this continual debate of whether we're
going to build a plant here or build it somewhere else is ridiculous. We have gone on with this plastic in the ocean, pollutions in the air, in our bodies, for far too long. It's time to shift, and we can do it, you know. When are we going to address that in our I -- EIS or whatever the hell it's called? When are we going to address that, that it's just time to figure out a different way. These temporary jobs is all it is, just temporary jobs. But our lives and our future lives and the future lives of our children, we have to figure out a different way to do things. It's not this way.

And I do work down on the Tideflats and I know the history of that Tideflats, and those Tideflats, you know, before any of this industry, there's a different right that exists down there and that is the land of plenty. This used to be a place where people had wars on food, how much food they could give to somebody. That's where we need to go. We need to shift our thinking on this.

I work in those Tideflats and there's no way out; there's no way out. It's bottlenecked already and it's a disaster already. I don't want another bigger disaster put on top of it.

And, of course, everything I just said before, our whole way we're going is a disaster in our society, and our society is crashing anyway and so is our environment, so now
is the time. Why can't we be the innovators of a new
paradigm, a new way to go? Okay, we're great. Tacoma's
awesome. Let's take -- let's be the innovators of a new way
to go.

And I know it's plastic on my button, but it says,
"No methanol refinery," you know, but we've got to figure it
out and get away from it.

MR. WARFIELD: Good evening. I'm Tony Warfield.
I'm a senior manager of the Port of Tacoma's environmental
program, at 1 Sitcum Plaza, 98421.

The Port of Tacoma has spent the last 30 years
cleaning up fallow, contaminated properties and putting them
back into industrial uses, thus providing both significant
environmental improvements and local family-wage jobs.

The Port purchased the abandoned former Kaiser
aluminum smelter site with the express intent to carefully
dismantle the highly contaminated smelter, clean up the
underlying property, and put the site back into productive
use. It has taken ten years and nearly $33 million to bring
the Port's vision to fruition.

Further, the Port has invested roughly $50 million
in the East Blair One Wharf which is part of the proposed
project area. This project brings the two investments
together in an area already zoned for heavy industry and
establish the plants with high electrical and water needs.
The Port is a strong supporter of the project and of the City's SEPA process. The Port believes that an appropriately scoped EIS that is thoughtfully prepared, clearly written, and technically accurate will assuage many of the concerns raised about the project to date and identify appropriate mitigation measures to deal with any significant impacts remaining from the project.

The Port believes the EIS scope should be limited to those impacts that occur within Pierce County, as has been the City's precedent in other reviews. However, should the City choose to consider other impacts upstream from Pierce County, then it must address the project's product and its significant environmental benefits in Asia and North America, including the positive impact of displacing coal as an industrial feedstock.

Further, while the 260 direct high-wage jobs and 1,000 union construction jobs associated with the project have been publicly discussed, it is important for the City to model the total employment effect, including indirect and induced jobs. That will provide a total employment picture.

Another critical component of this analysis will be the impact of the project on city, school district, and state tax revenues. Those must be clearly identified within the EIS.

If you have any questions regarding the Port's
comments, please contact me and I'd be happy to go over
them. Thank you.

(Recitation of names.)

MS. KAREN CROSS: Thank you. My name is Karen
Cross. I represent no organizations here.

I'm a mother. I'm a grandmother. I've called this
beautiful area my home my entire life. I live here, I work
here, I vote here, and I am not for this project.

I've got four words that everyone in this room has
heard and not enjoyed: the aroma of Tacoma. Okay? Our
leaders have done the hard work of moving us out of the EPA
Superfund era, out of the environmental dark ages. Okay?
This is not the vision I want our city to have.

This is the City of Destiny, not the city of
disaster. Tsunami, earthquakes, and volcanos are real in
this area and they're going to have a huge impact on this
proposed action.

I am pro-employment. I'm a union worker in public
transportation and I support jobs. I do not support
toxifying our land. If we have no clean water to drink, if
we have no air that we can breathe, what are a few dollars
and 200 jobs to anyone?

There are billions of dollars right now being
pumped into the area along the Tideflats. Point Ruston is
trying to encourage people that have money to want to live
here. They don't want to look at that. They don't want to breathe that. They don't want to drink that.

In comparison to all of the 200 jobs that are going to be available to work at this point, what about all of the displaced workers in the marina area that are going to be put out?

Now, thank you, and I acquiesce to my beautiful daughter.

MS. GRACE CROSS: So hi. I'm Grace, and most of my points have already been said, but I think they're important enough to say twice.

So, basically, this methanol plant is going to take in at least 2,500 gallons of water per minute and use up 90 percent of that and so it's either going to go into vapor or it's just going to get used up, and we're already basically in a drought and they're telling us to cut back our water, so this is pretty ridiculous.

And then also, methanol is very toxic and highly flammable. It's also not common in the environment and so at high levels, it's not healthy.

And then also, the way that we're going to get it to the methanol plant is through pipelines, and a lot of people are saying that, oh, methanol is great and everything because it doesn't emit as much pollution as coal, but it still emits some and most of the pollution is from pipeline...
bursts, so these will go straight into the dirt and the soil, which will go into the water and the rivers, which will kill all of the animals and salmon and everything that everybody here likes to fish for and eat.

And then also, they say that they have a cover to stop the air pollution, the NIW, but it's never been used on a plant this size, so they don't know if it will actually work.

And also, people are saying that we'll increase the jobs and bring people to the city, but if it explodes because it's so flammable or it gets shut down due to we find out in the long run that it does pollute a lot and it gets shut down, unemployment rates will skyrocket and everybody will be on the streets with no jobs.

So those are my points.

MR. OSBORNE: Hello. My name is Jimmy Osborne. Thank you for taking public comment tonight, and I appreciate the turnout of everybody here. It's really impressive.

I live in Tacoma. I'm a U.S. Army veteran. I'm not overly educated, but I have boxed in Tacoma boxing tournaments. I'm here with daughter tonight because this is an important issue to me.

We have abundant resources. Our resources can have a positive impact on climate change. I believe the EIS
should include information about the impact of methanol versus coal for fuel in China. I think that this plant will be built state of the art. It will be built using the best building practices. Every one of us should be willing to help reduce carbon emissions.

We all choose what we want to perceive and believe. Anything that challenges what we believe can make us feel unsafe. We can't let fear dictate what we do. Let's proceed with a comprehensive EIS that addresses climate change. Let's proceed with a spirit of cooperation that benefits us all.

I work as a negotiator. When I sit down at the negotiating table, my job is the best interests of everybody who's concerned. My job is not to be decisive. My job is not to fear monger. My job is to look at what I already said: the best interests of everyone concerned. I would hope that the EIS would include the best interests of everyone concerned.

And, geez, you guys: We live right next to a big old mountain over there. It's kind of scary.

(Recitation of names.)

MR. MOORE: Yes, my name is Bliss Moore, B-l-i-s-s. The last name Moore, M-o-o-r-e. I'm a long-term resident of -- a long-time resident of Tacoma, actually for some 28 years now, and I live just about a half mile away from the
former Asarco smelter site. I arrived just two years after they shut down the smelter and I worked with the EPA and others on the plant to clean it up, and here we are 30 years later after the shutdown and it finally is -- redevelopment is happening, clean-up and redevelopment. It's taken a long time.

Anyway, I'm also an environmental activist, very active with the Sierra Club and I'm the vice chair of the Pierce County group this year of the Sierra Club, and I can announce tonight that the Sierra Club has formally come out opposed to this methanol plant.

Most of my comments have been well-spoken to this evening and I'm really amazed by some of the comments tonight. They're very, very pertinent. The water issue.

Power usage: Right now, TP, Tacoma Power, could not provide that power, but they will buy it on the spot market at a high price, and, yes, we will pay for it in the long run.

I'm concerned -- I didn't want to go specifically into all the environmental chemical pollutants in detail and the anticipated levels in the effluence and emissions, but I think that's critically important.

The big one that's been spoken to tonight that's the scariest one, I think, is public health and safety impacts. Really, this business about hazards, environmental hazards from explosions, toxic spills from either accidents,
natural disasters, or terrorist activities, now with the approval of the liquified natural gas facility right very near where the methanol plant would be, it's a very scary proposition. If that was to go or a blast would happen, there would be an evacuation area of a two- to three-mile radius and it would be just disastrous for northeast Tacoma, for central Tacoma, and downtown Tacoma, so I just wanted to say that.

I guess I don't have any more time left. Okay, thank you.

MR. EDALGO: I'm James Edalgo. I'm nobody, but I have a bunch of questions here.

Dredging the waterway and drilling in the Tideflats will cause Asarco and other toxic waste to be exposed. You know, they stay buried, but it's a deep-water port. As far as I know, it hasn't been dredged yet. It's a deep-water port for super tankers.

Okay, the other thing: The process will require, during catalytic conversion, 7,200 gallons of fresh water a minute, with 22,000 capacity per day. Where will that fresh water come from? Everybody's saying different things, and the question is, do citizens have the priority over the corporation for that water? Will the officials on both sides sign statements saying that it's Tacoma first and then Tacoma will not have the water rights to sell. It's one
thing to promise it. It's another one to put your signature on it so you can get caught with fraud and go to jail, so I'm interested in how that pans out.

So the power consumed by this plant is supposed to be close to 360,000 homes per day for usage. How will that affect Tacoma Power plant? Prices? How will it affect priority during peak usage? Are we going to get brown-outs while they just keep on plugging away. And the same thing: Will officials sign a statement saying that it's Tacoma first and our prices will not get doubled and will they also sign?

Why is Puget Power coming into our town, Tacoma, when Tacoma Power has previous license to operate in Tacoma? Why are city jobs being, you know, farmed out to someone else?

And the other part of that too -- well, I'm going to go short. I had something here, but talking about these evaporation towers, all right? They're going to put out the same amount as it would be power for 360,000 homes -- and water too. Why not have steam-powered turbine generators instead, several of them running continuously to create power? Turn around, selling that power to other communities and make money, instead of having these towers that do nothing but suck our economy (unclear) through atmospheric water? If you turn it back once -- like a steam engine,
once you have the chemical and you turn it into electrical energy -- or I'm sorry -- vapor energy to make electrical, it turns back into water, so you're reusing the same water you had in the first place. You don't need 7,200 gallons of water. It makes power and all our power bills will go down. I don't understand why you need the cooling towers and mess everything up. I just had to ask that.

Okay, so the other one is -- the other thing is if the City always wants to make power in Tacoma and make money, you know, we have a geographic anomaly called The Narrows. We have two bridges. We could put electrical generators on those and it works 24/7. It doesn't matter if there's a drought. It doesn't matter if there's rain or shine or snow. The top can even freeze and it will still go through to the bottom. We can make electrical generation there.

We can turn around and turn the Tideflats that was going to be used for methanol, we could use that to make a hydrogen plant, which is clean power. There's no carbon imprint because it doesn't use carbon. It uses hydrogen. It turns to water. So, I'm sorry. I guess my time is up, but my point is, it's a renewable source that our own Port could use too.

(Recitation of names.)

MR. HAHN: Are you looking for Andrew Hahn?
MS. SCHULTZ: Yes. Did I go over it real fast?

Come on up. Are you Andrew?

MR. HAHN: Yes.

MS. SCHULTZ: Great.

MR. HAHN: I have only a short statement to make.

Many of my (unclear) statements have been echoed tonight.

I think the importance of our water conservation is very clear, with the ongoing tragedy of Flint, Michigan.

If you want to know what a water shortage would look like or a poisoning of our waters would look like and (unclear), we need to look no further than that.

I also want to address some of the members in this room tonight. I find it interesting that certain members tonight are talking about the need to create American jobs, when the construction of this refinery only creates 260 long-term jobs at the behest of a Chinese company. If we want -- and I'm not really sure what the shirts say; I think to stand strong for all American jobs -- then perhaps we should deplore trading the long-term health of our community for a brief pay-off from the new Chinese employers.

As it has been stated, water is an increasingly sparse resource. Southern California will be dry in ten years and I think we will all see the effects of that. I actually don't want to see a Southern California (unclear). But water will become one of our most valuable economic
resources in that sparsity, and to trade for some short-term methanol economic gain I think would be incredibly unwise in this new world.

And for -- sorry -- I'll finish with this: And for everyone else in this room, I would not place too much weight on these proceedings. While we may be stating our complaints and, like, our problems to this board, the reality is that we will have to organize ourselves in our community. (Inaudible) information. That will be our job until they prove otherwise; and unless we have collective bargaining power, I do not believe that we will have the power to stop the construction of this plant.

Thank you.

(Recitation of names.)

MR. TABARIS: Hello. My name is Jake Tabaris, T-a-b-a-r-i-s. I am a first-year electrical apprentice with IBEW 76.

First of all, I'm not here to argue any scientific facts whatsoever. I'm a craftsman. That's my trade. I'm for Tacoma. All of us are here for Tacoma, and I'm here to hold the corporations and its affiliates accountable to the highest safety standards in the nation. I'm also here to ensure that the materials that are installed are installed by the best-trained work forces in the country, let alone the world.
Thank you.

MS. PANTOJA: Good evening. My name is Wendy Pantoja. I work in the health issues. I'm a part of the (unclear) center.

THE REPORTER: I can't understand you. I'm sorry.

MS. SCHULTZ: Slow down a little bit and maybe get a little closer to the mic.

THE REPORTER: And spell your name, your last name.

MS. PANTOJA: My name is Wendy Pantoja. I'm a part of the residential center assistance and I work in health issues. I would like -- my name is spelled P-a-n-t-o-j-a. Pantoja.

I would like to say this information is for the workers who are here. That's why I'm here too.

Methanol is dangerous (unclear), especially for the effects of its degradation in the human body. That is called forming acids. A portion of the methanol in the body is (unclear) lungs and kidneys, but the rest, if this is spread in all the body, are focused in water (unclear), for example, like the eyes, which specifically works and attacks optic nerves.

Methanol poison is a poison which is very toxic to the central nerves. (Unclear) methanol poison (unclear) some people would be dizziness, headaches, vision distortion, delirium, and confusion. There is no specific
treatment and no antidote. That is really important and (unclear), because they need to take care of your health and the health of the workers and the health of the citizens of Tacoma and the residents of Tacoma. (Unclear) in pregnant woman cause abortions.

Tacoma is known for many issues and pollution and people say Tacoma aroma. Tacoma is (unclear).

I would like to submit some questions.

I would like to know, who will respond in any emergency? Tacoma is a seismic area and I would like to know if the Tacoma city have an emergency plan in any case.

Puget Sound is a salmon area. It's a waterway for the (unclear).

And over everything, I would like to say, we need water for people. That is a human right. All the citizens need to be sure Tacoma will have water priority. That is really important. First is the people and this is a human right and we (unclear).

(Recitation of names.)

MS. NICHOLS: Hello. My name is Laurie Nichols, N-i-c-h-o-l-s.

I've lived in the City of Tacoma for over 30 years with my family. I'd like the following questions addressed in the SEPA process underway at present and in the Environmental Impact Statement document to be completed over
the next many months.

Number 1: This proposed plant estimates that it will use as much fresh water as all of Tacoma uses each day. What will the impact of this astounding water use be on the Green River watershed and local aquifers? How will future water for citizens be guaranteed at stable rates? How will fish and wildlife habitat be protected and preserved?

Number 2: The plant will require approximately 450 megawatts of electricity daily, enough to power three to four hundred thousand homes. It's unclear how this electricity will be purchased and what impact this will have on future Tacoma rates. How can rate stability for Tacoma residents be guaranteed?

Number 3: Northwest Innovation Works estimates the use of 524 million cubic feet of natural gas to create 20,000 metric tons of methanol each day. Methanol, as we know, is a highly explosive gas even at room temperature which burns with a clear invisible flame. In case of earthquake, lahar, tsunami, or accidental explosion, who will pay for the liability beyond the $50 million general liability insurance held by the Chinese? The proposed plant sits squarely on top of an existing earthquake fault and we're overdue for a massive quake.

Number 4: Given that this will be the largest methanol refinery in the world and one of the first of its
type ever built, what precautions will be taken to avoid an accidental explosion which could produce a blast zone encompassing the Port of Tacoma, northeast Tacoma, and parts of downtown Tacoma and Fife?

Number 5: Given the highly explosive nature of this methanol gas, along with the liquified natural gas piped into this refinery, what precautions will be taken to protect residents, developments, first responders, and the heavily trafficked transportation routes near this site?

Number 6: What harmful toxins will be in the estimated 1.44 million gallons of super hot wastewater runoff produced daily and how will this extremely toxic water be cleaned and disposed of before it enters our vulnerable Puget Sound?

Number 7: There are many concerns about its highly toxic gases. How will citizens breathing our already compromised air be protected from these toxins, many of which have been shown to be carcinogenic?

Number 8: I'd like to request the completion of a cumulative impact statement measuring all impacts on the environment and human health for this refinery's complete supply chain.

In closing, Tacoma has worked hard to clean up its image and its environment from the days of Asarco and a Superfund site. I think there are huge economic and
environmental risks in locating the world's largest methanol refinery within the heart of our city. Don't jeopardize the short- and long-term health and safety of our citizens and our environment by siting this refinery in Tacoma.

Thank you.

(Recitation of names.)

MS. LICEAGA: My name is Deanna Liceaga. It's L-i-c-e-a-g-a. I'm a Tacoma resident, and I'm opposed to this proposed methanol plant.

I understand the need to protect and grow our port and add jobs, but the plant is simply shortsighted in a time when foresight and environmental consideration is essential. As it stands, Tacoma is currently poised to become a visionary city, avoiding the mistakes and pitfalls of the past, and it's become a leader for a sustainable Northwest. This plant, quite simply, does not belong in this century. When the water runs low -- and we know from last summer that it will -- it's not going to be the plant that makes sacrifices. It's going to be the citizens of Tacoma.

That's all I have to say. Thank you.

MR. SPAUR: I'm Mark Spaur. My last name is spelled S-p-a-u-r.

Okay, I am a resident. I'm also a registered professional engineer and a chemical engineer. I have done -- I've studied the process flow sheets and the
proposed process for the methanol conversion. I find that this can be done in a very safe manner. It can be done with environmental responsibility.

I believe it's a good use of a brownfield site. In this Environmental Impact Statement, I would like to be addressed the use of the brownfield site and how many different industrial processes we've lost since 1980 that were in the Tideflats. Not only are we missing an aluminum smelter, but we had chlorine and caustic production at a time. We had some other very clean manufacturing uses that are no longer there. I support the redevelopment of this site for a very clean, very productive production of methanol.

Thank you.

(Recitation of names.)

MR. MOYER: Thank you. My name is Bill Moyer. I lead an organization called the Backbone Campaign. We are based on Vashon Island.

We've been engaged in environmental justice fights throughout this area and around the country. I haven't ever seen a proposal that so triggered so many people to say no so quickly as this proposal. I think it's foolish and folly for Tacoma and elected officials of any sort to think that they're going to get away with moving this forward.

I think the scope of this, it's offensive to me
that as a resident of an island that was highly impacted, and our health and our soil and our water impacted by an experiment in the past -- the folly of Tacoma industrialists in the past -- it is now potentially going to become a victim of a future project, and I think that this -- you risk being sued by not just King County and our community and the Backbone Campaign and the rest of it, but all of the Salish Sea for not including us in the shipment of this methanol.

Rue the day, and what I can tell you is that you should pack up and go home now.

MR. HAUN: Thank you very much. My name is Jimmy Haun, and I'm here representing the Northwest Carpenters Union.

Before I start out, a gentleman got up and claimed he was formerly from the carpenters union and claimed that our job sites aren't very diverse. Well, I'd personally take him on a tour of any of our job sites, come to union meetings. We're very, very diverse and we care about diversity so much. We believe in equal pay for equal work. Men and women get the same wages. We're big on that.

Thank you very much for hosting this important meeting where citizens can express their opinions regarding the proposed Tacoma manufacturing marine export facility. I have full confidence the professionals at Northwest
Innovation Works will provide all the required documents and paperwork to the various local, state, and federal agencies so the experts may do their due diligence to ensure the land, water, and air is protected during the construction and operation of this facility.

You know, most everyone in this room tonight is probably wearing some piece of clothing that was manufactured in China, but I'll venture to guess that the men and women of the union construction workers here are probably wearing a lot of clothing made in the U.S.A.

You know, we know the coal power -- excuse me?

MS. SCHULTZ: Please keep your comments --

MR. MOYER: You know, everybody has a right here.

Thank you.

Part of our bylaws say that we will buy U.S.A.-made clothing, so, look, you know, Chinese clothing is made with coal. We need to get rid of that. We've got to find a way. This plant will help change that.

You know, everyone cares about the environment. The professional construction workers here tonight will be respectful of our natural resources if we construct this facility. This beautiful convention center was built by union men and women, and there were environmental impacts. We build wind farms. You know, it takes four years to get a permit for a wind farm in Montana. I've been to those
hearings. Wind farms have environmental impacts too. We know this. We care.

The thing about this is, all of us in this room, we care about the exact same thing. We all care about our future. We must stop outsourcing jobs and bring family-wage jobs back to Tacoma.

The millennials are now the largest generation, recently surpassing the baby boomers. Where are all those millennials going to go to work? You know, there's an apprentice over here. He gets up at 4 a.m. every day. He's a millennial. You know what? We'll take those millennials. We'll put them to work. They'll become apprentices. They'll work shoulder to shoulder with us on these projects.

Tacoma has a golden opportunity to create careers for the next generation. Once you have done your job, we can't wait to do ours. Thank you.

(Recitation of names.)

MS. NEAL: Thank you. My name is Kathlyn Neal, N-e-a-l, and I've already electronically submitted a detailed list of questions for review.

I'm a medical social worker, union member and supporter. I am opposed to the construction of the methanol plant. The last thing in the world we need is more fracking, pollution, and plastics.

Like other Tacoma residents, I'm concerned about
the health and environmental impacts of the methanol plant. Tacoma has a long history of cleaning up after bad decisions are made. We've been coping with the toxic effects of arsenic and other poisonous heavy metals due to the Asarco plant for many, many years. I hope we've learned from our past and are not doomed to repeat it.

Tacoma is a hard-working, modern, art filled, music filled, academically focused, sophisticated rising star of a city that will hopefully continue to attract businesses that exemplify our values. We need to think hard and ask tough questions when it comes to protecting our city and its residents' safety as well as remaining attractive to future business.

What are the impacts of the methanol plant on the air we breathe, the water we drink, our Puget Sound wildlife, not to mention the impact of possible drought on the salmon runs and federally endangered species? What are the effects on our beloved Puget Sound?

Tacoma residents were just asked last summer to limit their water usage by 10 percent due to a water shortage. Will we be asked to limit our usage before the methanol plant is asked to limit their usage? Will we see our utility bills increase?

What are the risks associated with a possible earthquake, spill, or uncontrolled fire should an accident
occur, especially since the methanol plant is built directly over a fault line? It is imperative that the City of Tacoma take public safety seriously and be transparent about the risks to its citizens and environment. Let us learn from our past mistakes, because our great city deserves better.

Thank you.

MS. SCHULTZ: So we'll reconvene at 8:30. That's approximately eight minutes from now, by my clock.

(A short recess was taken.)

MS. SCHULTZ: Thank you, everyone, for your patience. It is really appreciated and I do appreciate everyone's cooperation and I apologize for getting lost on the list. As I had stated before we went on break, I'm going to run through the names of people who may not have heard them, just in case.

(Recitation of names.)

MR. WASSILIE: Good evening. What I wanted to do is introduce myself. My name is Carl Wassilie. My ancestral name is Anlutak. I'm from Alaska from the Yupik Nation.

I'm the president of the Center for Water Advocacy. We've done contract work with the Alaska Inter-Tribal Council with 229 tribes. The Center For Water Advocacy is formerly known as the Center For Tribal Water Advocacy.

I'm sure folks are familiar with the Boldt Decision
here in the state of Washington, and so, you know, by allowing this plant, we could see a precedent set for an international crime zone right here, so, you know, you're looking to be in violation of treaty rights, and so I warn this body to be really conscious of the water-use issue -- and that's not just for drinking water, but it's also for future generations and for the animals that provide for the people of this region.

And, you know, when we're looking at economic impacts, you know, I completely agree with the movement to create jobs for industry as far as it's a just, renewable energy transition that provides for local communities. And so this one, this one has got a really heavy footprint and we feel it in Alaska. We have villages that are actually sinking into the ocean. The amount of energy that's being -- it's not just the production, but the amount of energy in the entire footprint of the planet to -- from the building as well as the entire life of the product and shipping the product and then the production of the product from cradle to grave. We have lots of plastics in our bodies -- in Alaska, the animals are filled with plastics as well -- so these types of projects are just not consistent with the -- with this century.

I completely agree that Tacoma has an opportunity to become a leader in a transition to a renewable energy
economy and to restore -- continue to restore and defend the
waters that are so vital and that provide for the local
economics.

MS. SCHULTZ: I'm going to read through a few more
skipped names and just see if anybody has come back into the
room.

(Recitation of names.)

FEMALE SPEAKER: Well, I'm not actually Melinda
Raybein. She's gorgeous, but I traded spots with her
because I left Seattle at 4:00 this afternoon, got into a
fender-bender in Federal Way, and I'm still here because
this is an important issue.

I wanted to first say what Melinda wanted to say.
She wants to know that in looking at the EIS, that you guys
will look at the methanol plants that already exist, what
the cancer and those kind of diseases were, at what rate
were they prior to the plant and after the plant, that those
are an important issue to look at.

She also wanted to know what kind of discounts are
you giving this company to build this here or to run it.

For me, I wanted to say I totally support my
brothers who are union members about their abilities to
build, their abilities as workers. I think that they're
magnificent and they're fantastic. However, this job has
already been outsourced. It was outsourced from China to
the United States. Welcome to being a Third World nation, U.S.A. This is not where we need to be.

Tacoma is getting on its feet. It's a wonderful town. It's becoming an art place. It's cleaning up. This isn't how we do it.

We've already talked about the water. We've talked about the electricity. We've talked about the air quality. This impacts on the entire Puget Sound and Washington state and our whole country. When people tell you that they can stop these leaks, ask them -- you know, in the pipelines -- ask North Dakota about that and their rivers that were polluted. Ask Montana and their rivers that were polluted. Look around and see what's already happened in our country and how we're tearing our own nation apart.

We have this beautiful, beautiful planet that we've been given, and the Northwest is this incredible place. We cannot allow this to continue unto the 7th generation. It's like super important for us to do, and Tacoma has this opportunity to be an incredible leader. I beg of you to look at all the environmental impacts of this, everything from the water, to the air, to the earth, and the clean-up that you've already done and decide that there are so many other ways to create jobs in Tacoma that we don't sell our souls for a few years of work.

Thank you.
MS. SCHULTZ: So I'm going to go ahead and read names. I'm going to ask people to line up if they're here. When I see a few people, I'll stop and we'll let the next person speak.

(Recitation of names.)

MS. KYER: All right, thank you very much for this opportunity to comment. My name is Krystal Kyer. I am the executive director at Tacoma Audubon Society, the Pierce County Chapter of the National Audubon Society serving Pierce County, and we will be preparing formal written comments before the deadline and submitting those, but I wanted to touch base on a couple things here tonight.

A lot of the issues have already been covered, including issues around the water usage and discharge and the water coming out of the stream and the ecology, so I won't go into that.

I also want to talk about the issues around the emissions from the proposed plant and the air pollutants that would be emitted, both greenhouse gas emissions and toxins. I would like to know what the impacts would be both locally and at the state level to increase of -- increasing the greenhouse gas emissions and how that fits in with (unclear) or carbon issues or whatever comes out this summer; and the toxins, especially the known carcinogens and what those are, the amount of them and the effect on our air
quality.

I live in the Eastside neighborhood of Tacoma. It was a non-attainment area by the EPA just a few years ago, which means that air quality was so poor, it was being regulated and lots of things needed to be done to improve that. What impact will this new proposal have on the air quality in this area in terms of public health?

The other point I want to make is questions I have about what are the cumulative impacts of this project, both the cumulative impacts of the plant itself, construction and operation? Also, to do a life-cycle analysis of the entire proposal, so if this was built, where is the energy coming from, all the way back to the fracked natural gas and the effects on the environment there, to the end product production, to the shipping overseas, to the plastics that are made and then put into the environment and where those end up: an entire life-cycle analysis of this project.

Thank you very much.

(Recitation of names.)

MR. WEBB: Mike Webb, W-e-b-b, and thank you for taking our testimony here.

I've lived in Tacoma 20 years. I'm a retired environmental chemist, and my most important thing to me is the human health impacts and I would like to make sure that particularly the air emissions get considered to the full
extent of knowing if, say, methanol is one of the possible toxicants that would be released, the full knowledge of that toxicity, what that effect would be on the environment, of people who live around the area. I mean, there's a long legacy of this kind of environmental justice problem where, you know, it's the low, the working-class communities around these facilities that take the worst impact.

Methanol: I just did a quick look at the safety data sheet on it. It's classified as a cumulative toxin, which means it does -- the human body does not excrete it as quickly as some other toxins, so with repeated, even small doses, it can accumulate to toxic levels; and, you know, people have spoken to the nerve damage that is recognized at higher concentrations, so what happens to people who are exposed to low concentrations? I would like that addressed in the Environmental Impact Statement. It's very important to me that these lower levels get addressed.

Thank you.

(Recitation of names.)

MS. BRAATEN: Thank you for the opportunity. My name is Carol Sue Braaten. I live in Fife.

I'm very concerned. I majored in agricultural science. I took (unclear). I'm also certified critical and sensitive area trained.

We have three major fault lines that lie in the
Puget Sound area that run -- two that run along from Point Defiance and go -- one goes toward the Puyallup; one goes toward the Foss Waterway. We have a third that runs directly underneath where the plant -- or by the plant. I'm concerned. I want to know what will the impact be with a 6.8, a 7.2, an 8 and a 9. That is my first question.

We also have a history, a long history, of tsunamis in the area. The largest one known that we had that was recent was January 26, 1700, and then we also had the couple that were during the 1940s that they had, and they figure about every 300 and some years and they say we're overdue. This is the emergency management. I want to know how the plant will sustain a tsunami, since I also have requests of public information and I have for the Fife area on a number of buildings and none of them can sustain a tsunami. And in fact, because of the liquefaction area, none of them can sustain a tsunami, a liquefaction, or a lahar, so it's very important that this plant be able to sustain all of those. Liquefaction means that the area turns to liquid during a severe shaking incident. It liquified in the 1940s when my grandfather was down on the waterfront working as a longshoreman, so it's very important -- and a number of people were living down in that area. This is severe. It could take out the whole plant. The Port would explode. It could actually set off part of the fault line. I'm very
concerned about that.

So this would also create -- an explosion could also create something else that's called in the oceanic world a seige -- s-e-i-g-e -- and that's because of the fact that the explosion could cause a landslide fault area along our areas in the Port and that would have incoming water coming in acting like a tsunami.

I am very concerned with all of these.

We also have the major flood area. The whole entire river levy has been decertified since about 2006.

I want to know how that flood area will affect the area.

I want to know about the water intake, and we also are tidal affected twice a day by the tides: the chemicals that can go in and out of the area, the air, and how it will be affected.

There are a number of other critical areas. We're looking at a -- we have a high water table. It's a water aquifer recharge area. The chemicals in that water acquifur recharge area can contaminate wells and that.

They are proposing -- (timer sounds). I was going to say, they're proposing to also take the pipeline through Fife and they are going to condemn people's properties. I want to know the impact it's going to have on the people that they're condemning their properties.

Thank you.
And I'd also like to add two geological survey things. There's hundreds, hundreds of papers from them and they have hundreds of documents, and so that's the Emergency Management and I have their telephone number.

(Recitation of names.)

MS. SCHULTZ: Matt Estrada?

MR. ESTRADA: Hello. Thanks for all your patience. I apologize for comment redundancy.

Also, many people have left, but I used to be a poll worker, and if half of the people who showed up for this thing voted for all our little tiny school bond elections, think about it.

Anyway, I'll try and go through this really quickly here.

Oh, also, it's a mistake to believe that those opposed to this project are against union members or jobs. All right? We have no doubt that -- nobody doubts their competency or the standards here in the States.

So I have been a citizen of Tacoma since 1993, the year the smelter came down. My wife has been in Tacoma since she was five, and my two youngest children were born here.

My fellow citizens of Tacoma and I have all watched the City and the Port reckon with the immense environmental impacts of over a century of industrial use in and around
Commencement Bay and all over Pierce County. Multiple Superfund sites have cost taxpayers money as well as endangered our health. After so much effort to clean up the bay and the surrounding environment, it seems a ridiculous notion to entertain building the proposed methanol plant.

We're concerned about inevitable leakage from the gas pipelines supplying the plant.

We're concerned about the many dangerous air pollutants discharged by the plant.

We're concerned about the potential devastation, however slight or mitigated by safety features, caused by industrial accident or natural disaster.

We're concerned about the million-plus gallons of wastewater that the City of Tacoma will be responsible for processing daily. Additionally, we are concerned about the immense amount of water used to produce methanol in a region that relies heavily on hydroelectric power. We recently went through a difficult drought.

We're concerned about the environmental burden of the immense power usage incurred by plant operation.

Surely the proposed plant will raise Tacoma's profile with manufacturing interests and increase the Port of Tacoma's profile to the world. However, the monetary and environmental costs of building and operating the plant far outweigh the temporary benefit of the construction jobs and
the longer benefit of plant staff jobs.

This plant is only good for corporate interests, but the plant is bad for the citizens of Tacoma. We respectfully ask you listen not to the money interests of those intent on selling our health and environment out for their profit, but to the citizens who rely on you to be responsive to our concerns.

Thank you for your time and your patience.

MR. KIRK: My name is Jordan Kirk.

So the first thing is, Tacoma has been a hub and is becoming more so a hub for art and community, more than it has ever been.

This paper plant that we have, you know, it's going away. Why fill it again with more pollution? We know there's going to be some -- some. Why risk that for, you know, 260 families? And I understand -- I'm not against jobs. I'm not against any of that. My dad is a foreman for a labor union. I am a labor man myself, but 260 families are not worth the lives of over 200,000 citizens in this city alone, period.

To add, I am part of the millennials. We don't need these jobs that are going to cause harm to our society. We need other jobs. Right now, if you go look on Schuster slope, there is a -- there are two crews of millennials right now that are doing -- they are doing restoration work
on that slope, dealing with the arsenic and the lead in the soil. They are out there every day. Rain, sunshine, snow, it does not matter. They are out there. We do not need these jobs that are going to be ruining our health and our families', when we could have more and better. We can have all these. We can have 260 jobs or more by cleaning up the pollution. How about that? Or something else. We don't need something like this. There's too much at risk, and where these -- these jobs can be put elsewhere and more productive.

That's all.

MS. RYAN: My name is Susan Ryan. That's R-y-a-n. I have been a resident of Tacoma since 1992.

I recently heard -- when I heard of this proposed plant was back in August, and I had a friend that was attending a meeting, and I said, "Well, I didn't know anything about this plant." And she goes, "Well, you need to know about it." But I wasn't able to attend that evening because I was attending another meeting on the City's comprehensive plan, so I chose to go to that meeting because that was important as well.

In doing a little reading recently, I found that on May 1, 2014, the Port of Tacoma Commission unanimously approves methanol plant lease. That was nearly two years ago now, so I wonder -- it states everybody -- the governor,
everyone's talking about how this is kind of a win-win and I
guess I -- I'm opposed to the plant, but I guess I question
the wisdom and the judgment of these people. Did they not
feel that the citizens here would find problems with it? I
mean, there's plenty. Everyone in this room has pointed out
so many of the problems that I can't even mention them, but
it's a cumulative list of so many reasons why not that I'm
just astounded that it's come this far and that it's
believed to be such a win-win by some of the people wanting
to bring it here.

As others have said, I truly support the workers
and the union members and I have no doubt they couldn't
deliver a fine-quality product. That's not my concern,
that. My concern is the long-term maintenance, 20 years, 30
years. We've heard about the methane mine, I think it was,
in California that blew, had a leak because there was a part
from 1970 that they couldn't replace so they never replaced
it, from what I read. Yeah, that's just -- that's just
beyond comprehension that you would end up now with where
they are.

I guess I also wonder what tax incentives are maybe
being offered. I mean, has that come up?

There's just so many reasons to oppose this. I
find no reason to support it, despite the many educated and
talented people that have spoken in support of it. Just the
opposition and reasons why not to just seem to outweigh any positive contribution.

Thank you.

MR. CHAVEZ: Good evening. I feel sorry for you guys right now. I wrote a bunch of notes, but you know what? We've heard them all. I cannot make another point more of all the facts, that, you know, all the numbers.

I am a part of the Eastside Neighborhood Council. I just got elected, and the reason why I got up in my neighborhood is because, like everybody says, Tacoma is changing for the good. But, you know, Tacoma is very unique because it is a hard-working community, but the potential of becoming a futurist destiny town, it's beyond recognition that a lot of towns have worked hard to get to.

The bottom line is that what we need is you guys to -- what I really need from you guys, or from the EIS, is for you guys to listen. That's all I ask, because I feel like I got invited to the wedding and then they say, "Does anybody object?" at the party. Seriously, I do.

So, you know, I love the union people because they are awesome people. You know, I support them. I worked for awhile with United Way and they were the most generous bunch. The union people was one of the most generous bunch, you know, but that tunnel vision in looking at the prize and not seeing everything out of the other impacts are, you
know, substantial.

It was brought up that monster trucks use that fuel, but monster trucks don't bring future jobs. They don't bring future -- that 7th generation statement hits my heart, because the reason why I moved to Tacoma is because they got rid of the aroma, seriously, so that decision alone, it was not only environmental, but it was the life line to the city.

I'm just a little worried that who is going to be responsible when that does go wrong. You know, like that gentleman brought up, the environmental guy, is it going to be the Chinese, the City, or the Port or the citizens of Tacoma? So to me, that is the ultimate question. If the boat sinks in our bay, is it the Chinese who's going to pay for the fixing of the fish or are those fish replaced?

So the bottom line is, I need you guys' help. Tacoma's going to be a great city. I see nothing but great for Tacoma, and I hope you believe you can help us with that. Welcome to the wedding.

(Recitation of names.)


I'm here today because I'm concerned for the welfare of our beautiful home, Tacoma, Washington. I'm a first-generation born American, and I'm a junior in
environmental science at U-Dub, Tacoma, as well as a future scientist for our great nation.

I highly disprove building a methanol plant here in Tacoma. Commencement Bay sits on top of a major active fault line, making it extremely vulnerable to seismic activity. Because of the sheer power of earthquakes, it is impossible to create a structurally sound building that is strong enough to withstand nature's worse. We cannot predict the strength of earthquakes, but I will tell you one thing: Do not underestimate the damage and chaos that will eventually take place if you decide to build this plant.

Keep this in mind: My peers and myself will be cleaning up the disaster that your decisions created -- not you, but my cohorts and future generations of Tacoma will be cleaning up that mess.

Thank you.

MR. MERRITT: Good evening. My name is Jim Merritt and I'm a local architect, facilitator, and planner residing at 3201 North Madison in the City of Tacoma.

For 40 years, our community has been working to change the image of Tacoma. The infamous Tacoma aroma is gone. Asarco is now Point Ruston. The Port is one of the premier container cargo ports in the world, and the Foss Waterway is a people place.

The proposed methanol plant may have short-
long-term significant environmental impacts and social
impacts that could be extremely damaging. This methanol
plant should not be in the center of an urban area within a
few miles of more than a million people.

I want to share a story that has been forgotten.
This is not the first time that a new vision -- that our new
vision for Tacoma was almost sidetracked because of the
potential of new jobs in an energy solution that could have
meant substantial sacrifices.

In the 1970s, energy was becoming a huge concern.
A gasohol report was released by the federal Office of
Technology Assessments in 1979. Then in 1986, a proposal
surfaced to convert the closed Carling Brewery plant at
South 21st and Jefferson to a gasohol plant making ethanol.
After much research and discussion, the newly formed Union
Station Historic District Owners Association, along with
other citizens, in the face of strong support from the
elected officials as well as the business community, decided
that we needed to step up against this and we took a
position against the gasohol plant. After considerable
intense public debate, the momentum and support for the
gasohol plant was reversed, and for a number of reasons,
the gasohol plant initiative was abandoned. At the time,
elected officials and the business community felt that this
was a tremendous loss of economic opportunity. However, if
the gasohol plant had been completed, Tacoma would have had
essentially a hard-liquor distillery in the urban center and
the area may have become an industrial backwater zone. In
that case, the Tacoma Union Station restoration to federal
courts, the Washington State History Museum, the Tacoma Art
Museum, the Foss Waterway development, the Chihuly Bridge of
Glass, and the University of Washington, Tacoma, may never
have happened. Where would our city be now?

In the 1960s, Roy Clark recorded a song: Right or
Left at Oak Street. That can relate to Tacoma's current
decision needs: a choice Tacoma will face. So with minor
edits to one of the song's verses, a city must make its
decisions, but it must consider the stakes. For every
city's life is a gamble. It depends on the turns that it
takes.

So let's get refocused on our vision that the
community has been struggling to build for the last four
decades. Say thanks, but no thanks, to the methanol plant.

Thank you.

MS. DARNEILLE: Hi. I'm Jeanne Darneille, state
senator for this area. I'll see if I can add any value to
what have we heard tonight.

I want to say first that I am so impressed. I have
been awed by the speeches tonight. I have no doubt that our
city is in good hands with the leadership that's been shown
tonight, the love for our city that's been shown tonight, and I'm just -- it just chokes me up. It's been great.

    I think we were asked what we want in this process, and I was -- I happen to have been at that May 1, 2014 meeting. It was decidedly a different gathering than tonight and I would like to welcome you to the world of social media. That's why we ran out of room. I was outraged out there to get here a half hour before this started and have no room in the overflow room, have no room in here. So people signed up and I think we see by those that were not able to stay that there -- it wasn't an accommodating process, so I want to offer the experience I've had in the legislature on how to run a big meeting like this where we've had people carrying guns and all kinds of really interesting things in Olympia.

    But what do I want? It's the same thing I wanted on May 14th when I had to call them to find out where the location was of the meeting. It wasn't on the website for the Port of Tacoma. I made it in time to be able to add my name to the end of that list and there were only 17 people that spoke at that hearing -- 17 people, compared with 170 or more tonight on this list. And what I asked for then was some assurances about communication and about openness for a transparent process to unfold.

    It's true the governor wrote a letter endorsing
that project before there was much known about it, and I
think it was disgraceful then; I think it's disgraceful now.

But we've got the chance now to actually hear and
we have learned tonight about things -- even I, after over a
year of study on this, have learned so much tonight.

So I would like to just talk a little bit about
honoring the investments that have been made in the
reparation of the land in the Port of Tacoma and in the
transportation packages. In my 16 years in Olympia, we have
been working for this county, our delegation, both R's and
D's, a very bipartisan approach to try and say yes to the
projects that are needed by the Port, to say yes to the
projects that are needed by the city and county, so just a
brief overview:

In the last three years, we have invested over
$1 billion in transportation projects which we can drive
through on nights like tonight -- (timer sounds) oh, dear
God -- and complain about them.

I want to say that we fought hard for rate payers
when there was a real challenge and the rate payers for
electricity going way up in Tacoma and Vancouver and our two
cities took over the legislature.

We've put over $23 million in the city of Tacoma
for reparation of things like the Asarco site, derelict
vessel removal in the Foss Waterway. And since 2001, we've
given $15 million to the Port for remediation of contaminated soil, ironically the very soil upon which this methanol plant is supposed to be built.

The question was asked, have we ever remediated twice? I asked that of the Department of Ecology today. We have not ever done that.

I will say that I've done enough research about this to say unquestionably that we are not a colony of China. We are the City of Destiny and our destiny is about continuing to improve our city, not place it at more risk. We're not for sale.

Thank you.

MS. SATIACUM: I'd like to say good evening. Good evening to everybody that stayed behind. Good evening to the panel. Good evening, Madam Senator.

You know, my name is Elizabeth Satiacum. I married into the Satiacum family that is well-known for fighting for the water, for the fish, for the rights of the indigenous people in Puget Sound. I stand here to continue that fight to say no to the methanol plant. I stand here fighting to say no to the coal trains. I stand here saying no to the Naval warfare in the Olympic Peninsula and in the 68 national parks that they want to practice at. I stand here to help protect the future for my children, my grandchildren and their grandchildren.
We are people of fishermen. We clam dig. We crab. We honor all animals. We honor Mother Earth. I stand here to fight. I will stand here. I will not go anywhere. I will stand and protect because there has to be alternatives. There has to be alternatives to this methanol plant. There has to be alternatives. There has to be another answer and we have to find it. We have to stand up and say, "Enough is enough," because the planet is all we have.

I stand here and I will fight you. I'll fight you until the last stand. I'll be at the next hearing, I'll be at the next hearing, and I'll be at the next hearing. I will write letters. I will encourage all my family to write letters, because there's no business for the methanol plant in our Tideflats that will kill everything that I stand for.

My name is Elizabeth Satiacum, and I stand here on behalf of my family and my family's family.

MS. MORKEN: My name is Sarah Morken and I live and work here in Tacoma. I'm a health care worker.

The supporters of this project say that because I use plastic, that I should support this project, and I don't remember ever voting in favor of all the things that I need to be made with planned obsolescence so they wear out really quickly and end up in the landfill or in the ocean within a really short time.

The people that are promoting this are climate
change deniers. This is implicit support for fracking of natural gas. We should not be building more fossil fuel infrastructure, and I know the way the environmental scoping process was, you want to look at things that are just right there on the site, but the thing is, our environment, our -- climate change doesn't work that way. Every greenhouse gas that is emitted affects the climate. It doesn't matter where it's located. And right now, there's 2,000 people in southern California that have evacuated their homes and two schools that are closed because of the natural gas industry, because of the methane, which I know we're talking about methanol, but the methanol is made from natural gas.

We need democratically run green public works projects and free retraining for all workers in the fossil fuel industry, because we can have an environment and a planet and jobs for everyone.

Thank you.

(Recitation of names.)

MR. GEORGE: Kenneth George.

So I will approach as a resident of the Tacoma area, and a lot -- anything I could mention has already been stated, so I won't take up too much time as the evening is drawing out and folks are leaving.

I do have professional experience and education, a U-Dub graduate in Tacoma, but I wanted to -- figured I might
as well come -- and I'll submit written comments, but I will come as an approach that it took me a long time to find a job after graduation (unclear) during the economy and I had to leave the Tacoma area in order to find that job, and I just finally got back and I am excited. A new family, a young family, a child of a year and a half and I have one more on the way, so I'm going to be a father to two boys.

That's how I want to approach at least the verbal comments: that I don't want to move after fighting so hard, job interview after job interview to finally get in this area and I don't want to have to say to my family -- because we're a young and scared family -- to leave and I absolutely don't want that to happen. This is where -- I told my wife, this is where we're going to -- when we got married, this is where we're going to live. This is where we're going to grow up. This is where we're going to raise our family.

We're already making those plans.

So during this process, the EIS statements that are going to come out, everyone has already addressed the environmental concerns, the economic concerns, and the benefits of a few jobs. And of course, everyone has already mentioned that we don't -- we're not against the union workers and the workers. We do want more jobs. We especially want a viable port industry to be able to be built up in this area. That's where the foundation of
Tacoma was built and it's going to continue; we want it to continue.

Something needs to be built on this site, and this methanol plant is not going to be it. We're going to fight to make sure that it doesn't happen. And when something is proposed that will be great for Tacoma, we'll fight to make sure that is built and we'll support that. This is one proposal, though, that we're not going to support.

Thank you very much for listening to my comments.

MS. KIMMERLING: So I'm Marilyn Kimmerling. This is Aviva Lemberger and this is Joan Wallis, and we are three of Tacoma's Raging Grannies. Thank you. I'd thought we would lighten the tone a little bit.

But, first, before we do that, we know how serious this issue is, and one thing that I haven't heard mentioned tonight in speaking about the possibility of this plant exploding in the flood plain of Mount Rainier lahar is the position of the Northwest Detention Center with all of those incarcerated people stuck there unable to get out in the event of a catastrophe that of course will affect all of Tacoma, but just think of that.

THE RAGING GRANNIES: So once again, we're the Tacoma Raging Grannies and we'll start with:

Oh, we're a gaggle of grannies, urging you off of your fannies. We're raising our voice. We want a new
choice. No methanol plant.

With the natural gas pipeline extending and methanol production pending, our water they'll use, our air they'll abuse. No methanol plant.

We're sick of this tradition. Feeding spin, that is not fair. Let us join together. Show that you really care.

So join this gaggle of grannies. Get up off of your fannies. We are angry and how. No methanol plant.

We really mean it.

Seriously, you need to listen to the wisdom of grandmothers everywhere.

Come gather round, folks, and lend us a hand.

Demand that your leaders say no to this plan, a methane pipeline to make methanol in the world's largest methanol plant, which we then ship to China in huge super tanks, while we all know the climate is changin'.

Come coal, gas, and oil men. You've poisoned the air and the land and the water as if you don't care for naught but your profits and more than your share. Well, your hour of reckoning's arrivin'. Your in-the-ground assets will have to stay there, for the climate on earth is a-changin'.

Come elected officials, city council, heed the call. Don't pretend you don't know. Don't deny and don't
stall, for your failure to act could well doom us all in a
mountain of cheap plastic crap that'll float in our waters
and clog up your tap, and the climate on earth is a-changin'.

Come mothers and fathers throughout the land. If
you don't step up now, your kids won't understand. How will
they forgive you if you don't lend a hand? If Tacoma for
them is worth savin', they get off of your assets, pull your
head from the sand, for the climate on earth is a-changin'.

Accept nothing less. You will not stand alone.
If Tacoma to you is worth savin', the few jobs it would make
don't equal our fall, for the climate on earth is a-changin'.

We get more time because we've got two people.

MS. SCHULTZ: You've already had more time.
THE RAGING GRANNIES: So China lies over the ocean
and wants a plant in the Tideflats --

MS. SCHULTZ: We do need to move on.
THE RAGING GRANNIES: -- to make methanol to ship
back to them so we can have more plastic crap. Hell, no,
hell, no. We don't need jobs that damn bad. We don't.
Hell no, hell, no. And if they don't build it, we're glad.

Here's why:

They'll use quite a lot of our water, ten million
gallons a day, and then there's the wastewater from it to
get treated and go in the bay. Hell, no, oh, no, we don't
need this plant over here, my dears. Oh, no, hell, no, we
don't want that plant over here.

Remember the stink of Tacoma? A joke it took years
to live down. They add stink to brew so that folks will
know a toxic is bubbling around. Hell, no, oh, no, no
methanol plan should be -- well, hell, no, hell, no, no
methanol refinery here.

    Last verse:

    Did we mention the problem in Cali, the huge
methane leak over there? If we have a leak from the
pipeline, it could easily blow us away.

    Doesn't rhyme.

    Hell, no, oh, no, there's never, no never been
methane leaks. Hell, no, oh, no, we don't need that plant
over here.

We're done. Thank you.

MS. SCHULTZ: Can I still have a show of hands of
who wishes to speak? Why don't we just have the last ten or
so people line up.

(Recitation of names.)

MR. HASSERTT: Billy Hassertt, H-a-s-s-e-r-t-t.

I'd like to say that the claim that this is clean
energy is somewhat disingenuous. It is cleaner than coal,
which is not saying much.

    I have reactive airway disease. It's a relatively
common affliction and it's very problematic if this plant
comes in. I live less than a mile away from where this plant will be. I will have to leave my home. I will have to leave the city that I grew up in. I will have to leave the city that I love.

Now, I went to the Science and Math Institute at Point Defiance. We had classes, had the school groups and informative adventures where we went out into the sea and soil and found ecosystems still reeling from the pain of the Asarco smelter. Our plants, animals, and human beings suffer because of it. Cut open a tree in this area and you will see the burn of that smelter. It was a horrifying ecological catastrophe, a grand mistake that we cannot afford to make again, and that's the best-case scenario.

It's been mentioned earthquakes would kill people if it happens, something seismologists say is relatively imminent.

Even then, return to the best-case scenario:
You're taking water that we need. You're taking almost as much water as we already use. You're taking it during a time where during our summer months we're told to be careful because we're facing drought during those months.

Now you're polluting my neighborhood, the Eastside. Eastside is next door, and we're told that 260 jobs matter more than the health of our minority youth and community.

It will lower our property values.
It will insult already abused populations. This is unequivocal genocide.

Yes, it will make jobs. Money will flow, but it won't be worth the drain on our property value, the drain on our water, our power. And worst-case scenario, the entire area could be leveled. Kill this city instantly is our best-case scenario. Kill it slowly -- no. Kill it instantly is our worst-case scenario, whereas the best-case scenario is just that you're killing it slowly.

Thank you.

MS. BOYLE: Hi. I'm Emily Boyle. I'm probably the very last one because I just decided.

MS. SCHULTZ: Close, but not quite.

MS. BOYLE: I would like the EIS to also include an investigation of the explosions of the Chinese methane plants over the last decade. There have been four this year alone, this year alone.

The thing foremost on my mind is the fact that my family lives within one mile of the hazard zone. It's one thing to build something ugly in someone's back yard. It's a completely other situation if you're trying to build a potential bomb in somebody's backyard. Even the smallest chance of the facility's catastrophic failure is unacceptable. No amount of insurance can cover the potential loss of (unclear) health.
Next let's look at the pollution this plant will create. My children breathe this air. They play in the water along this coast. It would be criminal to allow the pollution to pollute -- to allow that to be polluted to create more plastic trash, to create more pollution.

I live in a community that's been here for over 60 years. Generations of families have stayed on here. Our children safely play in the neighborhood with their friends. Neighbors know each other -- that's my neighbor. We look out for each other. We'll move. They'll move, following the Lorax to greener pastures while you sit there like the Once-Ler, knowing you chose poorly, breathing poor air, watching dead sea life pile up on your shores, waiting for the day it all explodes.

I'm sure there's a myriad of economic issues that would go on my con list, right -- cost of electricity due to the man, water shortages, et cetera -- just like I'm sure there's a couple that would go on your pro list: possible tax revenues, perceived jobs during construction, back-room payoffs. In the end, none of these dirty pieces of paper will ever balance out the real and actual damage that will be done to the community and the environment that surrounds the project.

Let the good union workers build something Tacoma can be proud of instead of something they're going to be
poisoned by.

You don't live in Tacoma. I looked you up. You are going to retire in Anacortes Island, two and a half hours away. Ian Munce, I looked up my --

MALE SPEAKER: Ian, what you are doing up there? Come on, move down to the Tacoma Tideflats. Come on, Ian.

MS. SCHULTZ: All right. We need to stay in order, guys. Come on.

MS. MURRAY: My name is Roxann Murray. There's this little quote that Samuel L. Jackson is known for: "Wake the fuck up."

MR. ROSNER: Madam Chair, members of the audience --

MS. SCHULTZ: What's your name?

MR. ROSNER: Dan Rosner. I'm way down the list. My name is Dan Rosner. I have been in Tacoma 19 years with my family. Grew up in New Jersey. My friends from outside the area thought I was nuts when I moved here. I have watched the revitalization of this great city. It's amazing to see the outpouring of support tonight against this methanol refinery.

I would like to request that the scoping process specifically address the compliance of Tacoma with the growth management legislation. We have been asked as a community to accommodate tens of thousands of new residents
over the coming decades and that would involve increasing the density in the city, an addition of ADUs we're building.

What I'm seeing -- and I've tried to keep an open mind about this in the scoping process as it's presented to the community -- roughly, this methanol refinery would double the water use and double the energy use of Tacoma, so you're basically committing to doubling the resource use of the city, to double the city for just one project, to create 260 jobs. And thinking about this earlier through this process, reading about it in the paper and tonight, it just seems like such a rotten deal for this city and we can do better than that. So I would request that you specifically address the compliance with the growth management legislation, because doubling the water use and the power use, where is it going to come from? It's just mind boggling that this process can proceed so far without notification.

The Port of Tacoma, they are public servants, and as Senator Darneille said, the meeting at which that was decided was not posted for the community to find out. It's outrageous. Our property taxes pay for this. Our tax district money from our property taxes goes to the Port of Tacoma, so I'm confident that this refinery will not be built. The citizens of Tacoma will stop it and something better will rise in its place.
Thank you.

MS. OSTHELLER: Sarah Ostheller. So thank you for the opportunity to speak. I know that this is probably not ideal for you guys either. And my name's Ostheller, O-s-t-h-e-l-l-e-r.

As a student of chemistry and the president of the Environmental Club at Tacoma Community College, I have a lot of environmental concerns about this methanol plant, and I know that the environmental concerns were the focus of the meeting, so I'll start with those and probably some other stuff too.

I would like for -- I would like to see the ETA [sic] to address some of the following issues:

Number 1 is the bioaccumulation of some of the byproducts is something that hasn't been brought up to an extent, and a lot of heavy metals are used as catalysts in the conversion of methane to methanol and I would like a full assay of the bioaccumulation factors that those could be attributed to in the environment.

Number 2 is the effect on TAGRO. I know that TAGRO comes from our waste management and how the water will be treated that it will be going into are a significant environmental factor because it affects the long-reaching parts of the waste management, and I don't know if there's infrastructure when there's that much water.
Sub-point 3 is if we're selling this to China, which it's said out there that we're turning it into olefins and then selling them to China, that's not to be used as energy. That's to be turned into plastic. You don't use olefins in energy, so that's a -- and they use primarily coal, so I know that you're looking at local issues, but the amount of coal that they use in China is a global issue even though it's happening in China.

And sub-point 4 is more of an anecdote: When I started raising the student garden at TCC, we found out that you can't plant vegetables in the ground here. You have to have the ground tested for lead and arsenic because of plants that were here in the past, and I think that that is bad and I think that propagating that would be a horrible mistake which goes back some more to the bioaccumulation assay which I strongly recommend.

The take-home point is I feel like people are profiting off this and that is the strong push for this. Please don't let profit-centric decisions hurt Tacoma and its citizens like it did in Flint, Michigan. That would be a disaster.

And I'd like to go on record saying that I am somewhat disappointed and disgusted in the dealings of this issue. I feel like I'm an active community member. I serve at the Tacoma -- the Green Tacoma Partnership and (unclear)
Partnership, the Friends of the Cedar River Watershed. I feel like I'm active and I didn't find out about this until the other day. I live in Tacoma/University Place.

But there was another meeting tonight about the expansion of the greenhouse in Wright Park at the same time, and I think that it's horrible to try to break the support apart, two meetings at the same time, and, yeah, you should plan better because it's happened more than once.

MS. LEFRENIERE: My name is Bree Lefreniere, L-e-f-r-e-n-i-e-r-e.

I'm going to talk about something that has not been mentioned this evening, which is corruption, c-o-r-r-u-p-t-i-o-n. I have been a citizen of Tacoma since 1989 and I have never felt a need to come to speak at any forum until last week when I heard about this proposed methanol refinery. There's no excuse why you guys had to keep this so secret except that it was corruption. You could have put a little note in our water bill to let us know about this.

When I heard about it, I was shocked, disappointed, confused, upset, and most of all angry. I am angry about it because my elected officials are not representing the best interests of the citizens of Tacoma but rather the interests of China. It's infuriating to think that we've been asked to conserve water while you were over there negotiating a deal to give our water away to China.
The news was piled on top of my previous anger over the total waste of tax payer money spent on the visit of President Xi and the exposure of our innocent children at Lincoln High School to a leader of a country that has absolutely no respect for human life. And before you decide that I don't like foreigners, I'll tell you that as a Peace Corps volunteer, I worked with refugees from Asia for ten years and I foolishly went to Beijing.

Please don't lie to us to make us believe this project is somehow good for us and will provide jobs. While I applaud any attempts at economic development, the costs of this proposal are way too high in human health and the health of our one and only planet, a God-given gift to us. You have no right to give away our precious resources.

I would not support this any more than I would support an economic development project related to drug dealing, human trafficking, the sale of dog meat or human organs or poisonous drywall or poisonous flooring or poisonous dog food or poisonous baby formula. And if you want to check some other ideas, check the China Product Monthly bulletin produced by the United States Consumer Protection and Safety Commission. Come on, guys. Is methanol the best you can come up with?

I suggest that all of you watch the documentary "Death by China," narrated by Martin Sheen, and then see if
you don't feel like total fools for walking right into the Chinese trap.

(Timer sounds.)

Wait a minute. I have a gift. I have a gift. I have a gift I'd like to give to the mayor. This is made in China and it says, "This product contains lead or other chemicals known to cause cancer or birth defects or other reproductive organs." Maybe she can give me her water bottle.

MS. BOWENS: My name is Natalie Bowens.

So I first want to thank you guys for letting me speak. I know people said that, but it's probably not very fun for you guys.

So I live in Tacoma, obviously. I've lived here for eight years. I love and I work here and I love the people here.

So I'm currently -- before, I was from a city in Rancho -- a city called Rancho Cucamonga in California and bad air quality days impacted us in our school system, so we saw a lot of -- we -- my -- sorry. The effects of the pollution in the surrounding areas ended up sitting on our valley, so even though we might not have produced much, it ended up sitting in our area. And me as a kid, I remember not being able to play outside because of the bad air quality days and whatnot.
So, okay, I just wanted to know, like, if you guys would be able to produce, like, some sort of consistent health testing so that the public can be made aware of, like, certain chemicals that will be produced but, like, on a consistent basis, so daily we'd be able see, oh, these levels of this is being poured into our environment and whatnot, and maybe putting it on a forum that everyone has access to, like on television or the news even, so that those who don't have the time, those who work in Seattle or are, like, traveling places who don't have time to, like, research things heavily will be made known of it, of the effects and whatnot.

I also was requesting that you guys would also look up the incidence of cancer and lung disease with the workers in these types of plants, because usually that relates to what the public will see. And although you can't -- maybe you wouldn't be able to create causation -- or prove causation, there's still definitely a connection between those things, and then also the neighboring cities as well. So I want to just say that this is not really researched, obviously, in this magnitude, and this types of the effects in our bodies and the environment aren't either, so just -- I don't know much about it, so I kind of want you guys to inform us or whatever.

And then also, I wanted to know a little bit more
about persistent organic pollutants which could be made or
stabilized in the process, as researching this, there was a
plant in China that made methanol and they did it with
chlorine and it ended up making persistent organic
pollutants which got into the body and those things can be
passed on biologically as well.

MS. JOHNSON: My name is Jody Johnson and I didn't
plan to speak until towards the end. I wrote on a different
list before I decided to speak.

As I said, I didn't plan to speak, but a couple of
things came to mind and I don't know if they were talked
about earlier, but it does seem like the City's talking out
of two sides of its mouth. I just saw an article about how
we're attempting to keep more trees and grow more trees in
the Tacoma area. And as we know, we have the inversion here
and a lot of pollution sits in our lovely town and so we're
growing trees, want to grow more trees and make it more
green. And then we also have the coal trains which have
started to run down by Titlow and along there and the
citizens down there are at risk with trains in their back
yards, literally, so that's on one side and then we've got
the body of water on the other side which is the Tideflats.

I grew up here and I grew up with my mother calling
the Asarco plant -- when I'd come in and say, "Mom, my
throat hurts," because I would swallow sulfur while I was
playing outside, so that and the St. Regis and the meat
plant and different things all helped contribute to the
Tacoma aroma.

I'm married to a Seattlite and it would tic me off
because his father used to call this the armpit of the
state, and I can see that anything like this is going to
contribute to that hard-fought thing we've been stamping out
for years and the fact that we were a Superfund site.
Still, so many people have brought up all the environmental
issues, but I just want to see us take a step back and look
at the different reasons we choose to do things like this.

And I'm a very strong union person. I'm not
employed with a union at this point, but I have been on an
executive board at different points and I'm shocked that the
unions are selling our souls for 250 jobs -- and a thousand
is not anything. It's a drop in the bucket for a few
minutes, and the rest of our life on this planet is based on
what we have left and so these jobs are not going to be
worth what we end up getting for it.

And I also have a few things that -- the whole idea
of us going to -- sending this off to China, it sticks in my
craw too. I don't want to see the products that come back,
because usually they're not worth the effort.

That's all I have to say. Thank you.

MS. SCHULTZ: I'm going to ask anybody else who
wants to speak to line up and then go ahead and give me your name.

MR. SAGER: Thank you. I'm Alex Sager (phonetic).

Jobs were referred to this evening, and I support local labor and local unions whenever possible, but although my family, my ancestors are from this area and I've made my entire adult life in the Northwest, I moved to Tacoma three years ago. I'm a private contractor who moved my business here because I was confident with the choices Tacoma was making and where it wanted to go and what it wanted grow into. I have plans for future business in this area, but if I see Tacoma making choices that I can't agree with and that show that it's choosing to go in a different direction, I may have to as well, so keep that in mind when you're thinking about these 250 jobs: how many you'll be losing to other industries.

What sort of industries do you want here? What sort of growth do you want here? I want to see a strong, thriving community, but I want to see a sustainable one. Look to these sorts of industries in Flint, Michigan, and what the effects have been there. Look at any mining town across America or up and down the East Coast and what happens once those resources are extracted. Once the resources are gone, those jobs are gone as well.

Thank you.
MS. SCHULTZ: Last call for people to line up. We're closing in on 10:00, so we want to make sure that anybody who does want to speak can get in line. Looks like we're good.

MS. OSBORN: My name is Deborah Osborn and my home is here in Tacoma and it's in the proposed blast zone. I wanted to share that with you right away, because I'll be applying for emergency assistance when my house blows down, so you might want to keep me in mind in the future. But when that happens, I want you to know that the medical mile we brag about, as a medical provider I got to tell you something: It isn't big enough to manage the care of the victims of that accident.

In addition to all of the environmental impact and the societal impact, Tacoma can do better. We can do better. We need more than 250 jobs, and the paperwork you better be reading better not have presidents on it.

Thank you.

MR. JORDAN: Hello. Hi. How's it going? My name's Chris Jordan, born in Tacoma, born in the Hilltop. I love this city, and, you know, I'm going to be here until I die.

But one of the things that's really important to me and kind of sad, I think, about tonight was seeing our unions fight for this. What kind of place are we in as an
economy when we have to be spoon-fed jobs from the Chinese government and Chinese investors? I think that it speaks to how much our city has failed in terms of planning and development to strategically develop the kinds of jobs that our workers should be proud to fight for and work in. These aren't jobs they can be proud about, and I think that we need to take that really seriously.

We have a whole -- our entire economy as a state is kind of being lauded as one of top in the country, but we have people who are struggling with addiction now in huge counties across our state because our economics have been failing them and the logging industry is gone and all these, so people are scrambling for jobs like this, I mean, just to build something? That's just, like, really sad to me, so what I want to see as a part of this study is, you know, what are the demographics of people who will be receiving those jobs?

When it comes to the environmental impacts, where are our rivers and streams going to be as a result of these reservoirs being taken into this?

How is this going to impact agriculture? That's something that we need to constantly be looking back to as part of our economy, because within ten miles we have farms, so how is this going to impact them?

How is the change in the -- is it going to effect
change in our water prices? And, really, there needs to be new levels of accountability with our public utilities in general. There's no reason that something like this should even be considered without a public vote, so that's as far as I'm concerned. So, yeah, all the ways that this is going to impact our agriculture and other industries like the person brought up before.

And also, I want to know what's the history of the ethanol refineries within China and why those are gone and how have those impacted the communities and previous places where they have been?

And what is actually -- what is actually the cost benefits, so when it comes to like -- do you guys go -- do you go into -- oh, sorry. How much time do I have?

MS. SCHULTZ: No. Keep on.

MR. JORDAN: Okay. Is it okay for me to ask you a question?

MS. SCHULTZ: We won't -- it's just a comment. Then it will get answered in the EIS.

MR. JORDAN: Okay, probably what I'm wondering is if you're -- because it's an environmental impact study, but does it actually evaluate economic issues?

MS. SCHULTZ: Uh-huh.

MR. JORDAN: It does. Okay, yeah, so I want to see economic projections of, like, what the benefit is of this,
and there's also economists that work with -- (timer sounds). That's me?

MS. SCHULTZ: You can wrap up.

MR. JORDAN: Okay. So there's economists that work with the environmental impacts and they factor the costs of environmental impacts into that, so I'd like to see an economist who has the expertise actually inform me what the costs to the environmental are monetarily and which of those costs are actually possible to -- there's some irreparable damage as a part of this too, so I want to see which kind of damages will be done.

MS. COOLEY: I didn't sign up. My name is Christine Cooley (phonetic). Thanks for letting me speak. Thank you for being here tonight.

I would like to respectfully respect that the SEPA cover some communication processes. So, for example, I myself have been very proud to participate in Tacoma Power's Energy Resources Planning Team and we came up with a plan for what resources Tacoma Power would be using and that was before this new information of doubling the power load and that such. I know a great deal of city resources went into that planning process, to get the community input organized, and I fear that with all of this new information coming from the methanol plant, that all of these grand community processes will be lost, so I would like to know the economic
impact of having to repeat those and also what the City
plans to do with that lost trust of those community
processes going for naught.

So, again, thank you for your time and have a good
day.

MR. CLARK: Before you push my button, would you
identify yourselves and are you -- first of all, who are
you, who are you affiliated with, and are you a decision-
maker on the EIS?

MS. SCHULTZ: So my name is Shirley Schultz, and
I'm a principal planner with the City of Tacoma. I work
with Ian. He's my colleague. He works two cubicles over.
I work for Peter Huffman, and my role here tonight is to
name names. I will assist Ian with the EIS. No, I'm not a
decision-maker. I'm a planner.

THE AUDIENCE: (Inaudible.)

MS. SCHULTZ: Pardon me? I don't -- I don't think
that that's relevant this evening. I don't need to go into
it. If you want to shoot me an e-mail, I can send you my
resume or CV. You know, I'm 22 years into my career and I
have a master's degree and we can go at it from there, but
that's just telling you who I am and why I'm here.

MR. MUNCE: I was going to address that when we
came to the conclusion as far as next steps, because our
assignment after -- I'll do that now, if I may.
So our assignment after tonight is to prepare a Draft Scope of Work for an Environmental Impact Statement and circulate that to those who we have e-mails addresses for and put it on our Web page and we're going to ask you if you think we have captured the issues that you present to us this evening properly. Then we will work to retain an independent environmental consultant to prepare a Draft Environmental Impact Statement which will be several hundred pages, hopefully addressing your issues well. We'll then come back this summer and ask you one-to-one, in settings like this, whether we answered the questions that you asked us, if we answered them well enough or not, and we'll be accountable to you for that work. And then where there are simple gaps that we can address, we will address those. The goal is to have a final impact statement available at the end of the year, and that impact statement will then inform the permit reviews that may follow.

But the basic -- and this is what I talked to the city council about a couple of weeks ago -- the basic structure of the Environmental Impact Statement is to look at the details, make some statements about whether this is the right place for this project or not, and if it could be located here, what conditions would be put on the project.

So that's the structure we're in. The applicant is ready -- the property is zoned industrial. The applicant is
looking to make applications. Before they can make applications, we have this year-long environmental process, and, really, the kick-off for that process is this evening.

MR. CLARK: Thank you. I hate public speaking myself, but let me just say I'm Jim Clark from University Place.

I would like to speak tonight against the plant for several reasons, but I'd first like to ask if there are other city, country, state, or federal officials in the room.

You're a state senator. Thank you for being here.

MS. SCHULTZ: There's a city council member behind you.

MR. MEYER: Don Meyer, Port of Tacoma Commission.

MR. CLARK: Oh, very good.

MR. McCARTHY: Conor McCarthy, Tacoma City Council.

MS. PETRICH: Clare Petrich, Port of Tacoma Commission.

MR. CLARK: Oh, very good. Thank you.

Well, I'm somewhat heartened by that, because I didn't recognize, frankly, any of you, and as I listened to all of the comments, I was beginning to wonder if the wedding hadn't already happened in terms of the agreements to put the plant in place. I did hear in the hallway that Congressman Dicks, retired, is actually lobbying for the
plant. I wish he were here to defend himself.

    I guess I would like to say that we have a history
here in Tacoma of involving, you know, a small group of
local decision-makers approving industrial facilities in an
urban built-up area, like the Tacoma smelter, and their
decision subsequently destroyed the Ruston Tacoma
waterfront, deposited heavy metals and arsenic in Puget
Sound, across the land from Steilacoom to Bainbridge Island,
Federal Way to Gig Harbor, and my property is still
contaminated in University Place. When it came time to pay
for the bill to clean up the mess, the company skipped town
and many properties were left polluted, as they are today.
We don't need a Tianjin -- sorry for the pronunciation --
style chemical plant explosion here in Tacoma in the midst
of our communities.

    And I noted that one of the speakers for the plant
said, "You really ought to see this great film about how
safe it is," but what I've seen is that we've had several
explosions up in Anacortes at that refinery facility.
They're supposed to be state of the art. And I would
encourage you to take a look at the Halifax Nova Scotia
film. It's called, "A Shattered City," and it shows the
effect of -- in this case, it was a benzine TNT explosion
right in the middle of the city and it's devastating.
    I wish I had more confidence in the SEPA process,
but my experience in University Place is it's not as thorough and the decision-making is a little hokey. Quite often in our case, it goes to a hearing or a -- I think it was a hearing examiner who just brushed away all the environmental concerns.

I'm wondering why this is a local city decision-making process or Port of Tacoma decision-making process.

As a resident and property owner in University Place, I can see that this proposed Chinese plant poses health and safety risks across multiple counties, Puget Sound waterways, and threatens water and power supplies. I think it's going to adversely affect my family's personal history -- sorry -- safety, air quality, water availability, power costs, tax and utility bills, and I wish to heck we weren't paying the Port of Tacoma the taxes on our property and subsidizing these multi-billionaire trade partners at the Port of Tacoma.

So I feel I have a strong vested interest in any decision that is being made here at the City and down at the Port -- which I didn't know about, by the way -- and I can see that residents in King, Kitsap, and Pierce Counties also are going to be affected by the decisions on this project, so I think the decision process should be elevated to a higher level: state and federal.

My last comment is I really appreciated the EPA
fellow that, you know, gave us the inside scoop on a limited
liability company. I think the answer to that is part of
the permitting process if this goes ahead -- and I hope it
doesn't -- but we need to demand an upfront escrow account
for loss of life and property.

MS. SCHULTZ: I thank everyone for waiting and for
taking turns and being polite. I very much appreciate that.
You made my job very easy, so thank you.

FEMALE SPEAKER: Good evening. Thank you. I'm
sure we're all tired and I appreciate your time, everybody
who has stayed. I will make this as quick as possible.

I have a huge concern, though, and my concern
started way back in May 2014. Had the information -- maybe
this is out of your scope now and out of your hands -- but
had the information been made available like it was
tonight -- which, honestly, it was mainly social media two
weeks ago -- you probably would have had a different
turnout, and I ask that you look into that. And that is --
is that something that we can go back and look at, at their
processes? And hearing this room full of people all night
tonight voicing their concerns and their house concerns and
their environmental concerns, could we not have had that
opportunity a year and a half ago? Why are we -- I don't
think we would be here tonight. I really think that needs
to be looked at -- I honestly do -- and if that's not you
guys, then tell us who that can look at that. I think it's really important. I mean, you're talking about people's lives. I understand jobs are important and I want the union workers to have a job. I want them to have a safe job.

Have you gone on to YouTube? Because last night I went on to YouTube on methanol refineries blowing up and it's a video that was not probably a minute long and it took over the whole entire refinery and blew up a truck that was in its way that was approaching behind a fuel truck and it exploded. There's no way -- even if you put a fire department there, they're not going to be able to come in time fast enough to take care of that situation. And my understanding, when it's methanol, you cannot just kill it with water. There's other chemicals that you have to put into it, and what are those chemicals as far as risks to us? And what's the risks to the fire fighters? They're fighting an invisible flame, is my understanding. It's on YouTube.

There was a -- when there was just one tanker truck that crashed and it was on fire, they had to have a helicopter tell the firemen where to put the hose and yet the firemen were so close to that tanker that they almost blew up when the tanker blew up and they were literally -- had they been standing where you guys are, they would have been incinerated.

So I ask you, also, have you talked to the
businesses, the big businesses that you've tried so hard to bring into Tacoma to make Tacoma the way it is tonight and today? Have you told them about this methanol refinery? And are you going to? Because that's important, and I promise you, those businesses will not be staying.

Have you guys gotten -- have you done your due diligence to let the people know -- Thea's Landing, all those brand new, beautiful homes and condos -- that you are about to put the world's largest methanol refinery here in Tacoma in their front yard, in their waterway? You think they're going to stay? I ask you to look at that in the consideration of the big businesses.

One really, really important thing and I am done and I didn't hear it tonight: I ask that you look at all the refineries that are in the U.S. I ask you to look at the health conditions of those people there before the refineries were made, and I ask that you now go back and see what their health conditions are now. Is there a higher increase in cancer? Is there a high increase in various different diseases? I think that's important.

And can you look at -- if you decide that this is something that you want to pass, is there somewhere you can put in the scope that you request that the citizens of Tacoma get the chance to vote yes or no? Or Pierce County and King County and Thurston County -- because you know that
it is not just Tacoma that is affected.

I'm done. Thank you so much for your time.

MS. SCHULTZ: We need to -- we need to --

FEMALE SPEAKER: Since I didn't use all my time, I just want to say one thing here.

MS. SCHULTZ: We really need to close down.

FEMALE SPEAKER: The News Tribune, I used to work there and when letters to the editor came in, they said if we got one letter, that represented 400 people. And so just be encouraged: There's probably a similar statistic when you have bodies actually showing up.

MS. SCHULTZ: Again, thank you, everyone, for coming this evening. I'm going to turn things back over to Ian and excuse myself. I'm very appreciative of everyone, so thank you.

MR. MUNCE: So, really, I gave my concluding remarks before. I'll be around for questions afterwards. Watch our website. Watch your e-mail. We'll give you a Draft Scope of Work and we'll get together next month and talk about what a good job we did or didn't do.

Thank you.

(Hearing concluded at 10:15 p.m.)