

Stacia Miller

More transparency is needed along with proactive community engagement on these important human health and environmental concerns. While Ecology has provided access to consultation documents, the State should do more to ensure the information is accessible (i.e. understandable) to the general public. The documents are not user-friendly.

The public consultation should have offered more clarity on:

- what specifically Ecology is wanting to achieve through public comment. Simply stating that public comments are welcome is not a specific objective for what the State is hoping to achieve through public engagement;
- potential impacts to both human and ecological health of the COCs both without and with cleanup actions;
- how Remedial Alternative 4 has been chosen over the other alternatives and what the possible impacts of that choice are (i.e. what is being done and what is not being done);
- information on what the modeling shows for how soil gas will/could impact indoor air quality;
- how the findings at the Grand Street Commons Site relate to adjacent sites. No effort was made to communicate what potential contamination (or not) exists in other areas around this development site;
- how Ecology is working with the City of Seattle and other government partners in supporting development of this site.

Please clarify how Ecology will provide transparency to and engagement with the public as this project proceeds, including but not limited to the following steps: during cleanup, when GSC requests to proceed with re-development, Ecology's subsequent investigations, post action compliance monitoring, environmental covenants, and de-listing.