

Rick Miller

My family and I have lived in Edmonds since 1981, and previously, my wife and I lived in north Seattle. We enjoyed the natural habitat of the Edmonds Marsh area for years before moving to Edmonds, and again once we lived in Edmonds with our children. The marsh was a key factor in our decision to live in Edmonds.

Furthermore, while I served in the U.S. Coast Guard in the 1970's, enforcing the federal "Boldt Decision" on Puget Sound fisheries allocations, I realized how critical preservation of our fisheries are to the existence and future of our local Native American tribes.

To preserve our fisheries in Puget Sound, it is imperative that Chevron clean up, rather than cover up, the remaining pollutants at the Unocal Site. As a corporation, Chevron generated many millions, if not billions, of dollars in revenue from the products processed through this site. Chevron must therefore be held responsible to pay for a complete cleanup of the site, the cost of which would be minor compared to the revenue that they site generated.

The Revised Draft Feasibility Study 2024 is not acceptable in considering all the issues that need to be addressed to ensure a proper and complete cleanup. And Alternative #6, with no excavation to remove pollutants, is completely unacceptable. Some key questions that must be addressed are:

1. 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?
2. Why does Ecology say that they do not want to dictate the use of the Unocal cite 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?
3. What objectives were set for public concerns and Tribal rights and interests?
4. Why is there no documentation on what invitations were sent to the tribes and their responses?
5. What tribal engagement plan was developed for the Unocal site and why is it not listed in the feasibility study?
6. 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?