

Maureen Traxler

I strongly support Alternative 4, requiring Chevron to remove the contamination from the site. Alternative 4 is the only way to eliminate the likelihood that the contamination on the site will spread to Puget Sound and other areas of the watershed. It's possible there may be an acceptable compromise between Alternatives 4 and 6, but Alternative 4 is the only acceptable solution that's been presented. I'm very concerned that, if Alternative 6 is chosen, the contamination will be released in the future due to rising sea levels and weather changes caused by climate change, and by earthquakes.

In addition to containment of contamination, my other major concern is that the Marsh be left in a condition that would allow future restoration of its connection to Puget Sound. The city of Edmonds has clearly expressed its interest in acquiring the property so that it may restore the estuary and contribute to salmon recovery. Chevron and the State of Washington owe it to the community, including the tribes, to do the best cleanup that can be done. The Marsh is currently a wonderful nature site, but it doesn't compare to its condition at the time Chevron acquired the property. Equity considerations also favor Alternative 4. Chevron is responsible for the contamination. The benefits of contaminating the Marsh accrued to Chevron for decades, so it should be required to clean up the site. Ideally, they would leave the site as they found it.

The Feasibility Study should seriously address the environmental hazards, including rising sea levels and other effects of climate change. It must address the interests of the Tribes, and the concerns of other members of the public.

Thank you,
Maureen Traxler