

Greg Enstrom

Ecology did a good job at the July 8th, 2025, Port Angeles presentation. I understand that some attendees do not understand nor like the constraints of existing laws that outline cleanup procedures. And private property rights are also at play in this large project.

I have 2 comments:

1) My primary concern is the proposed site location of the 55,000 cubic yards of contaminated soil that will be capped with 2 feet of topsoil. I find no mapped digital elevation data in the project records that show the consolidated dirty soil location's height above mean sea level. Though Ecology quickly dismissed the many public questions about tsunami risks with suggestions that project climate change analysis would address this, a tsunami is an independent earth movement risk event needing its own analysis. Yes, climate change may raise seawater levels across some selected future time period and augment or enhance a tsunami's potential destructive power. But a tsunami could happen immediately and is not a risk event to be lumped with climate change risks, nor treated as an uncertain distant potential event linked to the uncertainties of climate change.

Elevation data absence aside, tsunami heights classically in the Pacific Northwest are modeled by universities to be particularly destructive in an elevation zone of 15 to 30 feet above sea level. These are only estimations of the height and area extent that might be affected by Geographic Information System mapping which can easily map and delineate the extent of an inundation area 30 feet (or greater) above mean sea level.

I propose you do the spatial analysis, examine the extent of potential tsunami-powered soil movement, and strongly consider removing that soil from the sealevel adjacency you now propose. Leaving the soil onsite pencils out as a cheaper alternative than removing 5500 10-cubic yard loads of soil, but failure to remove that soil leaves a high probability of dispersing all those contaminants you are concerned about across a much larger (and new) project area.

2) Finally, time is of the essence for a number of reasons, including widely expected increases in inflation, and the time risk exposure associated with protracted decision-making. I.e.: your high end project estimated cost of \$28.7 million dollars is in 2019 year dollars. Consumer Price Index application, already today, only 6 years later pushes that figure to ~\$36 million in today's dollars, a 25% increase to the costs you are using in discussions broadly about this project. You estimate 6 to 10 years to project completion and, conservatively, if completion is only 6 years ahead of us at 4% inflation that current \$36 million will become 24% higher, which equals approximately \$45 million in 2031 dollars, or \$50 million in 2035 dollars 10 years out. These figures need to be used in current discussions so as to not underestimate budget needs by both Rayonier and by government.