

Melissa Malott – I'm Executive Director for Citizens for a Healthy Bay (CHB). Thank you so much for holding this public hearing. Will be submitting extensive written comments but I just wanted to speak tonight. For 26 years, CHB has represented the voice of the public and the cleanup restoration and protection of Commencement Bay. We've been involved in advancing every major superfund contamination site in Commencement Bay. With over a quarter century of experience behind us, we are extremely disappointed and concerned with this feasibility study. None of the remedial alternatives presented in the study provides for anywhere close to a full cleanup of the site. They're not even considering it. None of the cleanup alternatives presented even look at the removal of contaminants under the Hylebos. It seems like Occi chemist are throwing up their hands saying they dumped too much pollution to be able to cheaply clean it up, so they should get to do something minimal and walk away. This is not acceptable for our community or our waters. Before I discuss our comments, I want to highlight that it is extremely important for the public to understand some of the key facts about the site.

First, below Occidental Chemical site, there are 100's of 1000's of pounds of toxic organic compounds in the soil and groundwater. These contaminants go hundreds of feet down and spread under the Hylebos waterway and possibly Commencement Bay. While Occidental studies do not indicate they release toxins into the Hylebos, there is minimal information on whether they enter Commencement Bay. These contaminants are toxic to aquatic species should they enter the water.

Second, groundwater under Occidental site is contaminated with sodium hydroxide. This has raised the ph levels so high that it has actually dissolved the minerals in the soil. When the groundwater is pumped out of the ground and the ph is turned into something that's like jello, toxic jello.

Finally, Occidental Chemical is proposing that because their contamination is so vast, and cannot be 100% cleaned up. They should not be required to cleanup as much contamination as possible. Basically, Occidental discounts the removal of tens of thousands of toxic pounds of contaminants because it will not have an impact on the total amount of what's there. They're basically saying, we must have so much that it does not make sense to do as much as possible. This is not a valid argument when dealing with environmental pollution.

I want to point out one, *(I know that I'm close to my time)* I just want to point out one thing, that's a problem with the feasibility study. The cost analysis in the feasibility study provides a misleading look at the remedial alternatives. Any remediation this big and complex is going to have several different components to the cleanup. And what the feasibility study should be doing is finding the best combination of components for as comprehensive a cleanup as possible. Instead, this feasible looks at what could be, what would be components of a

complete remedy, separately. Calls each one an alternative and compares them against each other. So, shallow alternatives like, M3 through M6, which could be some of the components of a complete remedy are unfairly and confusing alternative, they should be combined.