

Ben Rall

The proposed variances would:

Allow four regional dischargers a 20-year pass to dump as much as five times the legal limit for pollution into your river. One pollution discharger has applied for a 10 year variance.

Enable those dischargers to avoid established pollution limits which protect your health and the health of our fish.

Ignore the purpose of the Clean Water Act by letting polluters propose how many toxins they would like to dump into your river.

Ignore the intention of the Clean Water Act to eliminate all water pollution by 1987.

Do ask the WDOE for a clean up plan that holds all polluters responsible - a "Total Maximum Daily (pollution) Load". This kind of plan will pin pollution dischargers to pollution limits for the entire river.

Do ask WDOE to put polluters on 10 year compliance schedules to clean their pollution up.

Specifically, the review of the documents reveals issues that Ecology needs to address:

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement does not explore the impacts of stalling the timelines to meet state pollution standards.

The draft Environmental Impact Statement needs to address a "no discharge" alternative - explore the impacts of getting all pollution out of the Spokane River.

More actions are needed to reduce and remove PCB toxins from waste water needs to be inside the "Pollution Minimization Plans". These PMPs are a part of the variance applications. Many of the current plans are vague or do not go far enough.

Increase the reporting and accountability inside the variances. Every discharger should be mandated to finding and reporting-on the latest, developing technology to destroy toxics in their pollution discharge.