John Huffstetler

Concerning the Port Angeles Rayonier Mill interim action plan, the document states in Tables 5-4 through 5-6 (pages 78-80) that alternatives SL-5, G-3, and S-5 scored highest by your own objective criteria. Only when costs are considered does the plan change to SL-3, G-1, and S-2. On interim action plan page 41 it states, "MTCA requires Ecology to select the most permanent alternative whose incremental cost is not disproportionate to the incremental benefit it would achieve compared to the lower cost alternatives." While I do not dispute the projected costs, I do not believe that all benefits have adequately been considered. There is no consideration of the following benefits: long-term benefits, projected profits from restored land and marine use, cultural benefit to the Lower Elwha Klallam Tribe, and many more. Even if some of these benefits were adequately considered, the highest scoring alternatives would rise to their rightful prominence. In short, the choice is not the best versus the most cost-effective. We are choosing less cost-effective options, because the benefits are being downplayed. Alternative SL-5, G-3, and S-5 not only have the highest benefits to my community, but over time the thoroughness of these cleanups will prove to be invaluable investments in the life, culture, and profits of Port Angeles. Please do not sacrifice our long-term benefits for short term cost considerations!