

Linda Nutter

I am a 40-year resident of Port Angeles, and, obviously, during those 40 years, Rayonier has been in the state of operation, shutting, down, having a Consent Decree, some interaction with the City of Port Angeles, etc. Yet, so very little has been accomplished to remove an extreme toxic area.

Choice 5 is the correct choice, whereas Choice 3 is only postponing complete cleanup while leaving a toxic waste pile with no direction of what is to happen in the future with the toxic matter other than Rayonier is to "monitor" every 5 years. Obviously and logically, 2 feet of covering is not adequate whether due to placement of being directly on the Juan de Fuca shoreline or possible burrowing animals, people climbing, cutting or going under the fence, earthquakes, etc. The recent highest recorded earthquake in Russia demonstrated the extreme possibility of an earthquake and/or tsunami along with West Coast, and Port Angeles is in the danger zone.

If the inadequate choice of #3 is chosen, then at some future date, a permanent disposal of the toxic pile will have to be completed. Why handle toxic material twice when once will complete the proves.

With Ecology stating that trucking would be bad, trucking moved a great deal to the site over the years including toxic materials via truck. Saying that trucking is not a choice is an invalid argument. Physical items arrived at the site generally by trucking and left by trucking. Saying the trucking is dangerous to everyone that drives and lives on the disposal route is in danger is ludicrous. Having a toxic "dump" on the shoreline exposes everyone living in Port Angeles and those traveling through the town. That is extremely dangerous because the "pile" goes on year after year after year, and between each 5-year inspections of the pile, who knows what is leaching, or off gassing, or being moved around by burrowing animals (now dead and eaten by other animals who ingest the toxic dead animal and then die themselves, and around and around it goes), etc.

Another point is the state's salmon restoration project to replace the current fish barrier culverts. A short distance just upstream from Rayonier's property, Washington's DOT is currently installing a friendly fish passageway for salmon. Why have a new and improved passageway when the salmon are negatively affected by the creosote pilings that are not being removed plus not having an estuary and salt marsh to acclimate to/from salt water. Ennis Creek's flow into the Strait has been paved over. Why not have Rayonier's part of Ennis Creek be re-established with an estuary and salt marsh with this cleanup? Or is DOT's new salmon passageway way on Ennis Creek just a waste of Washington taxpayer's money that will not help save salmon or other fish.

Just as a reminder or refresher, an average marine piling contains about 61 gallons of creosote. Creosote contains over 300 different chemicals. All pilings should be removed to a safe and permanent location; and when the non-fish and removal time coincide, can it be possible to have more than 1 removal crew working simultaneously? I have no knowledge if this is possible because of the movement of the soil while removing a pile plus if anything else is simultaneously affected.

I heard a person ask if Rayonier could afford the cleanup. First of all, does or does not the splitting the company into 2 corporations eliminate the responsibility of 1 of the 2 Rayonier organizations? As you know, splitting can have 1 company have more capital than the other; thus, is Rayonier saying they do not have sufficient capital because only 1 company was financially evaluated.

Really?

In the selection of either option 3 or option 5, it appears that the financial numbers have been elevated for option 5 while option 3 has been slightly modified. Option 5 is a permanent and best solution over option 3, which is: "kick the can down the road and come up with an answer in the future while letting Port Angeles live with a toxic dump during that time." DO THE CLEANUP CORRECTLY THE FIRST TIME IS THE OBVIOUS AND CORRECT CHOICE. OPTION 5!