

## Please Reject NEXT Renewables Application

Ian Capper <iantcapper@gmail.com>

Mon 1/24/2022 12:00 PM

To: Jacyn Normine <Jacyn.Normine@columbiacountyor.gov>; ePermits - Planning <planning@columbiacountyor.gov>; Margaret Magruder <Margaret.Magruder@columbiacountyor.gov>; Henry Heimuller <Henry.Heimuller@columbiacountyor.gov>; Casey Garrett <Casey.Garrett@columbiacountyor.gov>



Dear Commissioners,

My name is Ian Capper and I am a resident at Great Vow Monastery, situated across the street from Port Westward. I am writing to you out of the sincere conviction of my heart, out of love for my gentle friends and neighbors and on behalf of this beloved valley we all call home.

I desperately urge you to consider protecting this ecological area from the dangers of the NEXT energy project and reject the application.

**Below, I have listed the primary environmental and community concerns for you to consider during your vital decision:**

- NEXT's wetland mitigation plan is inadequate, which conflicts with uses in the area. NEXT's wetland mitigation plan will prevent the Beaver Drainage District from controlling flows of water to a significant number of farms that contribute to the character of the area and that provide valuable contributions to the local and state agricultural economy.
- Individuals associated with NEXT have a traceable record of damaging communities with environmental contamination. The Transmissis Columbia Plateau failure and cleanup site in Odessa, WA, raises questions about NEXT's trustworthiness.
- Using this site for a biodiesel fuel plant is a poor decision given that the soils allow for successful agricultural operations and that the area contains ecologically valuable wetlands.
- Proposed use is not water-related or water-dependent and thus, locating the use in the riparian corridor is not permitted. The impacts of the project in wetland and riparian areas are unnecessary and significant.

- The characteristics of the site (successful agricultural operations and sensitive wetland areas) are not suitable for a rail line used to transport fuels on an industrial scale.
- The proposed use will alter the character of the surrounding area in a devastating manner that substantially impairs use of surrounding properties. It will require the implication of long, slow-moving trains which prevent timely harvest and transport of crops, and industrial processes such as a gas flare that could create air, water, noise, and vibrational pollution in the area.
- Potential flaring, leaks/spills, fires, air pollution, water pollution, noise, and vibrations disrupt nearby agricultural operations, ecological functions, and wildlife habitat.
- NEXT has not provided a contingency plan in the event of a massive spill or leaking pipelines—this point from the DLCDC was glossed over during the public hearing.
- Should this project fail (like the biodiesel plant in Odessa), who will be accountable to prevent its opening the door to turn into another fossil fuels export facility, like what happened when the Global Partners terminal failed to make biofuel profitable and quickly turned into a crude oil train terminal in 2013-14?
- NEXT has not provided sufficient evidence that it will uphold its claim to “try” using recycled organic materials and limit vegetable oils “as much as possible” glossing over the fact that 100% of their feedstocks are supplied by the fossil fuel mammoth BP, who holds one of the worst environmental records in the industry directly responsible for our runaway hothouse earth. We have no reason to trust they will not source from new soybean monoculture fields contributing to deforestation, for example, especially considering this vague language and their longstanding partnership with BP.

**Please, for the sake of our local farmers, wildlife, human health, and our pristine valley’s sacred stillness and natural beauty:**

**Reject the application from NEXT Energy.**

Warmly,  
Ian Capper