Sam Grello

I am writing this comment as a citizen who lives and works in Port Angeles. I regularly walk or kayak to work downtown from the 9/11 Memorial park. I have attended the public meetings about this cleanup that were hosted by Ecology and by the City of Port Angeles. I am in favor of a full removal of contaminated materials (Option 5) over the consolidation and capping of materials onsite (Option 3). I would ask the Department of Ecology to revisit the pricing estimates for Cleanup options 3 and 5.

The removal of the creosote pilings is not in this cleanup plan. I want the creosote pilings to be addressed in an adopted cleanup plan.

In the City presentation with the consultant group (Integral Consulting) the City hired, Ms. Ott mentioned that new contaminants had been found on site over the past thirty or so years. They were found not because new polluting had been done but because new science had been done and we now recognized new "bad" chemicals. What other undiscovered contaminants may be newly classified in the next 30 years of monitoring (if option 3 is selected)? Will a whole new process have to be undertaken at that point to clean up the newly discovered contaminants that were not accounted for in the current cleanup plan? Is this possibility accounted for when considering Option 3 as cheaper than Option 5?
Thank you for considering to re-evaluate your decision. In a time when democracy is under assault by big business it is you the government employee who still has discretionary power to hold powerful companies accountable for their actions. Thank you for your service and I hope you sleep well at night.