

## Liz Marshall

I am hugely in favor of attempts to remediate brownfields. It boggles my mind however that people are converting contaminated acreage, whether GPWest or other of the 12 sites of Bellingham Bay, to public parks, residences, and business complexes. I don't even see the logic or safety in storing export logs on contaminated ground and shipping contaminant residue overseas. Why is altering the creek and bay, building concrete complexes, and inviting the public to tread on the shoreline considered beneficial to the public good while restoring habitat for trees, birds, invertebrates, fish and marine mammals is not? Nature gives life to people, not the other way around.

Doing construction projects and building public parks on a brownfield site where the feasibility for cleanup isn't even done yet is playing Russian roulette.

Contaminants in the soil and groundwater, and vapor have been posing risk to cleanup activities, construction projects, and shipping activity (and probably to surrounding neighborhoods as well). Moreover, all this takes place at and under a major railway constantly carrying huge quantities of hazardous materials. These risks will continue. For all the years that cleanup and redevelopment (and railway) activities continue, the resultant air pollution also continues.

I guess building housing in or around redeveloped brownfields is intended to be altruistic, even though the sites are contaminated, in flood zones, in tsunami zones, and subject to sea level rise and train disasters. It could also be interpreted as political maneuvering. Building facilities to supposedly attract jobs is also an illogical premise since the town doesn't have enough affordable housing.

Even when choosing the most cost-effective Alternative presented, the costs are extremely high. I believe that maintaining the value of the cleanup investment once it is accomplished would best be ensured by restoring such sites to their natural purposes, such as estuaries, trees and critters. This would boost tourism for a number of reasons (tourists could stay in hotels, not backyards) and avoid the comparatively more astronomical costs associated with damage from pollution, as well as earthquakes and other catastrophic emergencies.

While the task at hand is to comment on the Preferred Cleanup Alternative for the Chlor-Alkali Area, I am emphasizing general related concerns since the decisions to impact the shoreline with more building seem to be ordained.