

From: jimskadan@comcast.net
To: [Forkeutis, Kristen \(ECY\)](#)
Subject: Point Edwards Unocal Review
Date: Wednesday, November 13, 2024 4:26:38 PM

External Email

Dear Ms Forkeutis,

I have read the "Comments to the Revised Draft Feasibility Study 2024" prepared by our Point Edwards Unocal Review Committee and approved by our Point Edwards board of directors, and I am concerned about the fact that Chevron is proposing to allow toxic waste to remain on the Unocal site. This will complicate development of a salmon recovery estuary.

I am presenting the following questions and comments about how this decision was reached.

1. Why was the Memorandum of Understanding between the City of Edmonds and WSDOT not mentioned to show our concerns and plans?
2. Why was the fact that the state legislature gave the City of Edmonds a right of first refusal to purchase the Unocal site not used to show our concerns?
3. Why was the fact there has been **significant** support for a salmon recovery estuary not commented upon in the Feasibility study or Addendum.
4. Why does Ecology say that the future use of the Unocal site is as an ecological habitat?
5. Why does Ecology say that they support salmon restoration but will not say that one planned use of the Unocal site is as a salmon estuary?
6. Why does Ecology say that they do not want to dictate the use of the Unocal site when the issue is not whether Ecology supports that use (salmon recovery) but whether the Feasibility study should consider a salmon recovery estuary as a potential future use for the site?
7. In the 2017 Feasibility study what percentage weight was given to public concerns?
8. In the 2017 Feasibility Study what weight was given to Tribal concerns?
9. What objectives were set for public concerns and Tribal rights and interests?
10. Why is there no documentation on what invitations were sent to the tribes and their responses?
11. What tribal engagement plan was developed for the Unocal site and why is it not listed in the feasibility study?
12. Why was there no consideration that in order to meet the goals of salmon recovery, perhaps not all of the newly identified locations of toxic waste need be excavated?

The courts and legislature have adopted a public policy through court orders and budgets mandating that barriers imposed by culverts be rebuilt so that salmon resources can be enhanced. This may cost the taxpayers **billions** of dollars. Why should the DCA weigh costs in a manner that allows Chevron to avoid a few million dollars in cost (well under 11.427 million dollars) that would create a path through the Unocal site for salmon?

Thank you for your attention to my concerns,
Jim Skadan
Point Edwards