

Rayonier Mill Cleanup - Public Comment Meeting
November 8, 2006

Name: *Linda Rotmark*

Representing: *Clallam Economic Development Council*

Written Comment: We need this land for economic development. Just today I met with 2 big companies who are tenants of the Port. We asked them what they would wish for if they could. Their answer was “more land.” They want to expand, to prosper, to develop more jobs for the community.

Name: *Josephine Zuzarte*

Representing: *No affiliation*

Written Comment: If the land is contaminated, why are people allowed to use the path thru the property? Why are there no warning signs of possible contamination? Some months ago there was talk in the papers about warning signs being put up. This appears to have been squashed.

Why is there not a timetable for the cleanup?

Name: *Eloise Kailin, MD*

Representing: *Project the Peninsula's Future*

Written Comment: Please include a follow-up to mortality statistics in the census tracts east side of Port Angeles (in path of plume from Rayonier) for excess rates of death from: a) all cause, b) pulmonary/ influenza, c) cardiovascular. WDOH has stopped publishing detailed cause-of-death and left out even all of Port Angeles in their annual reports –also stopped age-adjusting even earlier than latest.

Name: *Carol Johnson*

Representing: *North Olympic Timber Action Committee*

Oral Comment: My name is Carol Johnson. I'm present as the executive director the North Olympic Timber Action Committee located here in Port Angeles. The Rayonier site is currently zoned heavy industrial and that has been the traditional use for this site. Since 1997 this site has been in various stages of demolition, sampling and cleanup. There are 70 acres of waterfront and uplands, that could be used to create family wage jobs, which are currently sitting idle.

Our community has a demonstrated ability to utilize industrial zoned waterfront property and it is currently at a shortage. We have a need to have more of that available so that we can accommodate future growth in a variety of industries that need industrial zoned property with salt water access.

It seems prudent to complete this process under current rules and complete the clean up on this heavy industrial site so that Rayonier and our community can move on.

Thank you very much.

Name: *Jerry Hauxwell*

Representing: *No affiliation*

Oral Comment: My name is Jerry Hauxwell. I'm representing myself today. I'm coming to express a lot of concern about the rate at which this cleanup is proceeding. I had a discussion with our city manager and we came up with a revenue number that this is costing this community today. I know our friends at the Department of Ecology know this number because we delivered it to them about a year ago. But that number says that for every year that this site is inactive, at least not active to the level which Rayonier had it, this community is losing 100 million dollars of revenue. Now that's not all payroll. That's payroll that goes into the multiplier being used to buy and do business in Port Angeles. That means for every month two hundred and seventy five thousand dollars are being lost. And while we're sitting around here talking tonight something like twenty or thirty thousand dollars have been lost.

Now that's significant money at least to me, maybe not to some folks. My point is, I listen to the discussion tonight and I sense that there is an interest in trying to get more samples, spending more time because we didn't get the contaminated results that we wanted to get and we want to get more.

It seems to me that, I'm a scientist, I always like to see more data. But I know there is a time at which we need to stop and take a critical look at this thing and move forward, get it cleaned up and get it back in action. Thank you.

Name: *Bob Levick*

Representing: *No affiliation*

Oral Comment: Hi, Bob Levick, human race. I haven't read the whole report but what I kept feeling as I read it was it was a little too self-serving. There were too many instances of "Gee, we looked again and we didn't find what was found prior". There were too many of that without any rationale for why the contaminants disappeared. It didn't make good sense that they would disappear.

So what I would at least like to see is an expanded explanation of that. Also I think, and maybe it's in the report and I missed it but if it isn't in the report, an addendum or something should be written to explain the quality assurance or quality control that was used in taking the samples. Like who took the samples? Was Ecology there looking over their shoulder? Was the tribe or was nobody?

Something to give me confidence that the data collection has integrity. Thanks.