

## Al Snapp

I have attended two public meetings in which Dept. of Ecology personnel have explained the current state of planning for the Unocal clean-up of the property adjacent to the Edmonds Marsh. I believe the proper course of action would be to consider some additional information and perspectives and to reject choosing clean-up alternative 6 and to require a clean-up plan closer to Alternative 4. I don't think that the importance of the polluted property as a wildlife sanctuary adjacent property has been properly weighted so far. Nor has the historic evolution of the property from time honored indigenous resource to commercial property to prospective key component of the restoration of a vital environmental and cultural resource

At it's most basic formulation the state owes the citizens to require Unocal or Chevron, the current industrial owner to conform to a basic tenet which is they made the mess by polluting the land and its many natural strengths and they rightfully should not just partially clean it up but should restore it to close to the natural state.

At a time and place when salmon runs and other natural treasures have been threatened, Ecology is presented with an opportunity to use the authority of the state on behalf of its citizens to right the imbalance and by doing so support and partially achieve progress toward restoring lost natural treasures.

Without a clean soil to sufficient depth and deeper than alternative 4 requires, there will not be a viable route through the property for the much needed estuary restoration so that the creeks feeding the Marsh have a clear and open channel to re-connect the Mary and the upper creek regions with Puget Sound.

So as a citizen of Edmonds and the State of Washington I call on our Ecology administrators to do take the right course and require a complete clean-up of the pollution to the Unocal property adjacent to the Edmonds Marsh. Either adopt Alternative 4 and require complete clean-up or develop an alternative that essentially achieves the complete clean-up of a preponderance of the property to allow for the creation of a safe to marine wildlife channel to restore the estuary.

If Ecology needs to negotiate with Unocal or Chevron and insist on this more complete clean-up the threat of legal action should not be a deterrent. If the issue comes before a legal adjudication I believe the preponderance of necessary justification for the more complete clean-up exists.

Finally it did not seem from the presentations from Ecology that public sentiment has been weighed clearly or sufficiently. I hope the public comments now submitted will lead necessarily to better inclusion of that element and a result in line with what I am advocating.

Thank you for all the work that has gone into finding the right way forward with this project.