

Georgina Armstrong

I understand that Washington state does not expect the clean-up of the Unocal site to extend to a new landowner's future restoration plans, but why shouldn't Chevron, as the parent company of Unocal, be held accountable for restoring the site to its original condition? Judging by the reaction of those who attended the Dept. of Ecology's September 16th presentation, that's exactly what the Edmonds community wants.

Is it really surprising to learn that the residents of Edmonds support Ecology requiring that all contaminants be removed, as opposed to leaving as many as 22 contaminated spots covered up and needing to be checked regularly in the future to ensure they remain harmless? Why would the state go easy on a company that has polluted the site, and while destroying the original estuary, no less; an estuary the community favors restoring? Chevron should be held accountable not just for a complete clean-up of the site, but also for estuarial restoration. They made the mess, all the while profiting from its operations, so they should clean it up and restore it to its original condition.