

Marnie,

I focused on Question 8 (page 19-21) and the accompanying text in Appendix 2 as you suggested.

I imagine these two sections were extremely difficult to write, but the authors did an excellent job. In fact, they were very open and honest about the limitations and realities (i.e. local pollution v. global GHG impact). In particular, the text below succinctly addresses the main message of the question posed (Question 8).

“While these potential emissions would contribute to GHG concentrations in the atmosphere, it would be difficult to attribute these particular emissions to a future projected degree of global warming, resulting climate effects, and resulting health effects. What is certain is that if increasing global GHG emissions from human activities continues on a business as usual path, residents in Washington and Cowlitz County will experience far greater harms than if the level of GHG emissions at the global level are dramatically reduced sufficient to arrest the increase in atmospheric GHG concentrations and limit global warming to under 2 degrees Celsius.” (page 54)

Appendix 2 includes useful background on climate change, climate change in Washington, and the usual suspects of health-related outcomes. Regarding the last paragraph on page 52, I suggest reporting global, US and Washington State emissions for the *same* year so the reader can readily assess the relative emissions.

I hope this helps.

Jeff