

## Amy Herzog

---

**From:** Annie Christensen <anniedc53@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, January 23, 2024 11:11 AM  
**To:** Planning Department.UserGroup  
**Subject:** Fwd: Second NEXT commissioner letter

Some people who received this message don't often get email from anniedc53@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

### **Subject: Follow-up Regarding NEXT Rail Proposal**

I attended the 1-10-23 county commission meeting regarding NEXT's application for a rail yard. Of the people who spoke, all but 2 of those in favor were being paid to be there (most in their jobs representing construction unions). Of those speaking against the rail proposal, all 27 were there as unpaid citizens, who, in various ways, spoke to this as a lousy idea. Many spoke to the human costs personally to their farms, their water quality, and their daily lives.

A few things concern me.

Commissioner Smith asked Mr. Efirm directly about the numerous claims made during the meeting that his company lacks the needed commitments for the raw materials needed to make his product. His reply was that he had "Multiple... Dozens." Has he provided you with the documentation to support his claim? Does NEXT have contracts for the needed feedstocks? My research only revealed the October 31 2023 ITAQ termination of merger with NEXT.

[https://www.sec.gov/Archives/edgar/data/1841586/000121390023081947/ea187560ex99-1\\_industr2.htm](https://www.sec.gov/Archives/edgar/data/1841586/000121390023081947/ea187560ex99-1_industr2.htm)

Mr. Efirm stated to us all that only 10-15% of their feedstock would be vegetable oils. I found an SEC document dated 10-17-2023 that directly contradicts this statement.



Clearly, this recent SEC projection states that soybean oil, corn oil, and other oils will comprise at least 75% for the first many years. Vegetable oils from the midwest and U.S. distillers corn oil would be transported by rail, wouldn't they? There is no logical way for oils to come from the midwest by barge. It becomes evident that the rail yard is an **essential** piece of the plan. It is not, as claimed, a back up plan if the dock or the river are "unavailable."

Please see my point. NEXT has provided you with the facts that their **intention** is to bring massive quantities of oils by rail. 318 cars each way per week. If and only if they can find the feedstock oils, which they have not been able to accomplish so far. If they can't, then they may sell the rail yard to someone who seeks a rail yard adjacent to a deep water port. Either way, we get miles of trains.

How do you know that Next will honor their promised limit of 622 cars per week? NEXT promised the port "ship in ship out," yet clearly their intention is to use the rail. How will you enforce their commitment to limit the number of rail cars?? Nine mile-long trains per week will really impact traffic in Scappoose, St. Helens, and Helen's and Rainier.

NEXT's attorney stated that he does not want you to consider the **consequences** of your actions. The consequences seem clear. Approving this rail application will result in miles of trains through our county, every day, for years.

.  
Attached is the link to the SEC filing. It is interesting to read pages 106-109, especially knowing that two weeks later, ITAQ dissolved.

[https://www.sec.gov/ix?doc=/Archives/edgar/data/1841586/000101376223004565/fs42023a1\\_industtech2.htm#TOC001](https://www.sec.gov/ix?doc=/Archives/edgar/data/1841586/000101376223004565/fs42023a1_industtech2.htm#TOC001)

Thank you.

Annie Christensen  
35234 Hazel Street  
St. Helens, OR 97051

Sent from my iPhone