

## Jennifer and Claudia Catastini

The proposed clean up plan, while following regulations that Dept of Ecology must consider, is not a complete solution.

We believe our community is looking for a real, final solution.

One that is respectful of generations which will follow us and the challenges they will have due to climate changes.

We feel the proposed solution does not truly consider:

#1. An earthquake of magnitude 8-9, which will be followed by a tsunami.

This is NOT a situation of "IF an earthquake occurs".

It is a situation of "WHEN an earthquake occurs."

This is not conjecture.

There is current scientific data showing that a tsunami of significant size and volume will sweep over the area currently proposed as a depot for contaminated materials.

Consider the disaster that will be.

#2. The solution proposes a depot for contaminated materials "200 feet from the shoreline".

It does not stipulate the elevation of this capped soil material.

The capped material certainly will be in reach of a tsunami, which will spread the soil throughout the area.

The capped material will also be at risk when future water levels are significantly elevated, due to continued climate change.

The cap itself has a high probability of being eroded due to water movement, and contaminated soils redispersed.

This is also not an "IF" but a "WHEN", supported by scientific data regarding increased ocean elevation within the next 100 years.

3. Finally, Ennis Creek flows through the site.

If there is a significant change of water volume in the creek due to change in climate, the creek bed itself may wander and change course. This may also affect the capped material.

One can't predict the future wandering course of a stream, unless the stream is contained within a channel; even so --it can overflow the channel.

We are joining the Port Angeles City Council and many, many others in the community who want a complete solution.

This means removal of all contaminated soils from the site.

A real clean up; not a partial one!

Leaving contaminated soils on the site means an almost certain duplication of clean up efforts in the future.

Why do this?

We don't want to kick the can down the road for our children and grandchildren to face.

They will have enormous challenges, if not almost insurmountable ones.

We are in favor of Solution #5.

We strongly urge the Department of Ecology to consider that while a partial solution may appear to

be "less expensive" it is, in fact, a choice that will require future efforts which will cost more.

Please advocate for Solution #5, and insist that Rayonnier clean the site completely!

Jennifer Catastini and Claudia Catastini