

RESPONSIVENESS SUMMARY

Agreed Order 18201 and Public Participation Plan Georgia-Pacific Consumer Operations LLC

Public comment period: February 25 – April 23, 2021

This document addresses questions and comments received by the Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology) during the public comment period for the Georgia-Pacific Consumer Operations LLC (GP Camas) draft Agreed Order 18201 and the accompanying Public Participation Plan.

We published notice of an opportunity to comment in the Camas-Washougal Post-Record and distributed the notice to additional interested parties. In the notice, we invited public review of the documents and provided a 34-day public comment period. Ecology received 18 requests for a public meeting/hearing. In response to the requests Ecology, held an online hearing on April 20, 2021 and extended the comment period until April 23, 2021. Due to COVID-19, Ecology was unable to hold an in-person event.

We received 57 comments from individuals and organizations during the comment period. Ecology carefully reviewed all the comments received. Ecology received many comments which voiced similar/common concerns. Ecology has provided responses to these common concerns in a single location at the beginning of this responsiveness summary under the heading “Ecology Responses to Common Comments and Concerns.” Comments received and Ecology response are included in this responsiveness summary under the heading “Public Comments Received.” Submitted comments appear in *italicized* text, followed by Ecology’s response in regular text.

Changes were made to the Agreed Order and Public Participation Plan, where necessary. The changes are described in the response to the appropriate comment. A copy of the final Agreed Order and Public Participation Plan, including this Responsiveness Summary will be sent to all interested parties upon issuance and posted on the Ecology website at <https://apps.ecology.wa.gov/gsp/Sitepage.aspx?csid=15156>.

ECOLOGY RESPONSE TO COMMON COMMENTS AND CONCERNS

Future Zoning

Washington's Model Toxics Control Act states that "[c]lean up standards and cleanup actions selected [...] shall be established that protect human health and the environment for current and potential future site and resource use." Potential future site use is determined through multiple factors including the zoning of the property. Ecology has no role in establishing what the future land use of the site will be. Decisions regarding zoning and future land use are established by the owner of the site and the local land use planning authority (City of Camas). If future land use other than industrial is established by the owner and/or the city, then Ecology will include that in the evaluation of cleanup levels for the site in subsequent steps. Agreed Order 18201 establishes a framework for the remedial investigation of the GP Camas site and while the property is currently zoned for industrial use, the data gathered for the remedial investigation will be of sufficient quality to support evaluation of other land use scenarios should they be proposed. No changes have been made with regards to future land use discussions.

Community Advisory Group

Ecology is committed to transparency and to ensuring active public participation in the MTCA cleanup process. Ecology believes that it is important for communities to be actively and effectively engaged in the MTCA cleanup process. Ecology's goal is to provide documents for public review on our website as soon as possible to allow ample time for review. We will also take into account the amount of documentation associated with a regulatory action when determining the timeframe for our public comment opportunities. Additional information is provided in the second to last paragraph of this response.

A number of commenters expressed an interest in forming a community advisory group for the cleanup project. Some communities have found it useful to form such groups to serve as a forum for local residents and leaders to discuss issues and concerns related to cleanup projects. The group would function as a forum for more efficient exchange of information between Ecology and the community. It should be noted that a citizen advisory committee is not a decision-making body; Ecology is the regulatory authority responsible for final decisions at the MTCA cleanup site.

While Ecology does not have the resources to organize, manage and staff such a group, we are always willing to engage with local government or community forums to provide information and answer questions about projects and the cleanup process.

It should be noted that the lack of a community advisory group does not prohibit/preclude a citizen or community from actively participating in the MTCA cleanup process for the site. The MTCA process establishes formal community participation points throughout the cleanup timeline and Ecology will periodically hold 30-day minimum public comment periods to solicit input from citizens, the community and stakeholders at these key/predetermined points.

Additionally, community participation in the MTCA cleanup process is not limited to these predetermined public participation points (formal minimum 30-day public comment periods); the public is always welcome to ask questions, request documents for review, and provide informal input at any point in the MTCA cleanup process. Questions, comments, and concerns regarding the cleanup at GP Camas can be sent to Shingo Yamazaki at shingo.yamazaki@ecy.wa.gov.

A brief discussion regarding community group meetings and Ecology's willingness provide updates to and receive input from a community advisory group (if formed) has been included in the Public Participation Plan.

Responsibility for Cleanup

Ecology received many comments requesting that the site be fully cleaned up and that GP Camas must be held responsible for that clean up. GP Camas has been identified as a potentially liable person (PLP) with respect to the Model Toxics Control Act (MTCA). A key principle of MTCA is that those responsible for the contamination pay for the cleanup. In accordance with WAC 173-340-510, it is the responsibility of each and every liable person to conduct remedial action so that sites are expeditiously cleaned up.

The proposed Agreed Order is the first step in the cleanup process and requires the GP Camas to conduct a remedial investigation to identify areas of potential contamination at the site and submit a remedial investigation report. The report will be made available for public review and comment.

Public Hearing

Ecology received multiple requests for a public hearing on this proposed Agreed Order and Public Participation Plan. On March 18th, Ecology announced that a public hearing would be held on April 20th and extended the public comment period to April 23rd. Comments received by Ecology which were only requests for the public hearing are not included in the comments below.

It is noted that all hearing requesters and commenters have been added to the "interested parties" distribution list for the GP cleanup and will receive future notifications regarding public participation opportunities on Ecology actions at the site.

PUBLIC COMMENTS RECEIVED

Comment #1, from Dennis Connelly

I am concerned about once clean up starts that the ground surrounding the River may leak hazardous chemicals into the river and environment especially during heavy rains. Lot of employees in the past were not trained in dealing with hazardous chemicals and may have disposed of them improperly.

Response to Comment #1

Agreed Order 18201 establishes a framework for the remedial investigation of the GP Camas site. One of the first steps in planning a remedial investigation is establishing a conceptual site model. This is a tool that helps us think about how contamination might move in the environment and impact nearby groundwater, surface water, and air. This is an important tool in planning where and how we sample. If we find contamination that poses an immediate threat to human health or the environment, then Ecology will propose an interim action to address the contamination as soon as possible. The conceptual site model will be updated as we step through the cleanup process. This information will be used to protect human health and the environment and reduce/prevent exposure. For example, the remedial investigation may identify areas where cleanup needs to occur sooner rather than later as an interim action to ensure the concern mentioned in the comment doesn't occur. The conceptual site model will also help determine the best management practices that need to be employed during cleanup activities to ensure that the expressed concern does not occur.

Comment #2, from Brian Locke

As much work that has been put into the advancement of the Camas-Washougal communities, it would an absolute shame and embarrassment for the papermill to abandon this community at the very end. The mill made this community possible and the only appropriate way to close out its relationship with the community it built is to take responsibility for what it's leaving behind

Response to Comment #2

At this point in time, GP Camas has told Ecology that they have no plans on selling/shutting down operations at the Camas site. However, even if the facility were to completely close in the future, Ecology has formerly identified GP Camas as a potentially liable person (PLP) with respect to the Model Toxics Control Act (MTCA).

Please see the Ecology provided response regarding "Cleanup Responsibility" in the "Ecology Response to Common Comments and Concerns" section at the beginning of this Responsiveness Summary document for additional information.

Comment #3, from James Koch

Public hearing is the only possibility here.

As well as the company "cleaning up their own messes and making sure there is no contamination in surrounding lands and waters!"

Not to just donate and have us clean up the mess. They can pay, and Camas can calm down on all the revenue chasing! Quit selling the local lands over sea companies as well!

Response to Comment #3

Please see the Ecology provided responses regarding "Public Hearing" and "Cleanup Responsibility" in the "Ecology Response to Common Comments and Concerns" section at the beginning of this Responsiveness Summary document for additional information.

Comment #4, from Anonymous

I have a friend who lives in Longview and they let me know that Ecology and the PLPs on the cleanup of the Millennium/Reynolds Metals site held regular public meetings outside of comment periods to inform the public and local officials about how things were progressing on the cleanup site. Please 1) add these types of events to the public participation plan as something that will happen at the Georgia Pacific Camas mill cleanup, 2) make draft documents such as sampling and analysis plans and work plans available to the public for review and discussion at these events before they are finalized, and 3) make all final documents and correspondence that include decisions made on what happens in all the steps cleanup process available on Ecology's webpage for this site. The Camas community wants to know, understand, and have a change to be heard when it comes to the future of this site. Thank you.

Response to Comment #4

I reviewed the Public Participation Plan for the *Former Reynolds Metals Aluminum Smelter*. Similar language has been incorporated into the GP Camas Public Participation Plan. Please refer to the general "Community Advisory Group" response in the "Ecology Response to Common Comments and Concerns" section at the beginning of this Responsiveness Summary document for more information about public participation opportunities throughout the cleanup process.

Information regarding draft document and sampling analysis plans may be requested at any time and documents will be posted on our website as soon as practicable. Additionally, Shingo Yamazaki can be contacted if there are additional questions, comments, concerns regarding cleanup activities at the site.

Information regarding the site, including cleanup documents are available to the public at <https://apps.ecology.wa.gov/gsp/Sitepage.aspx?csid=15156>.

Comment #5, from James Hutchison

The mill's effluent system, particularly the settling pond areas on Lady Island, should be encompassed within cleanup plans or studies of the Camas paper mill site.

Response to Comment #5

MTCA defines a site as “any site or area where a hazardous substance has been deposited, stored, disposed of, or placed or otherwise come to be located.” The site will include areas on the facility proper and where contamination has “come to be located” via the operations of the site, which will include the operations on Lady Island.

Comment #6, from Carrie Schulstad

I would like to be informed and involved with this discussion so the clean up proceedings lead to the best future use of this property in relation to the historic downtown and the community as a whole. I would like to be notified of public hearings on this order and process. Thank you.

Response to Comment #6

Please see the Ecology provided response regarding “Public Hearing” in the “Ecology Response to Common Comments and Concerns” section at the beginning of this Responsiveness Summary document for additional information.

Comment #7, from Rick Marshall

Dear Dept of Ecology,

I'm a private developer in Camas and we focus on small in-fill residential projects. The fate of the mill is probably the biggest thing to impact downtown Camas since the City was founded.

I please ask for a Public Hearing and Extension of Public Comment for the Draft Order and Public Participation Plan for the Camas Mill cleanup.

Any cleanup of the Mill should really consider the most likely reuse of that property and it is likely to be mixed use. Our community will fight vigorously for access to the waterfront and most successful repurposes of old waterfront industrial sites typically include public access to the water. The redevelopment of the Mill property could be a huge economic benefit to our community that also provides additional public amenities for our region.

Please conduct a robust public engagement process. It is important that the public is confident that the process was thorough and transparent in order to successfully repurpose the property.

Thanks!

Rick Marshall

Response to Comment #7

Please see the Ecology provided responses regarding “Future Zoning”, “Community Advisory Group” and “Public Hearing” in the “Ecology Response to Common Comments and Concerns” section at the beginning of this Responsiveness Summary document.

Comment #8, from Robert Orr

Please allow concerned Camas citizens to participate in a Camas Mill cleanup public hearing.

We are a historic downtown & our mill cleanup will impact our community greatly!

Please hold a public hearing.

Respectfully submitted,

Robert Orr

Response to Comment #8

Ecology held a public meeting/hearing on April 20, 2021.

Comment #9, from Lawrence D. Minson

I'm very concerned that the old mill has not been cleaned up to heavy industry standards and request a public hearing re same.

I'm also asking for an extension of time for public comment.

Lawrence D Minson

Response to Comment #9

Agreed Order 18201 requires the investigation of the GP Camas site for contamination. The Agreed Order is a preliminary step in the MTCA process towards cleaning up the site. A full MTCA cleanup of the site has not yet occurred.

The public comment period was extended until April 23, 2021.

Comment #10, from Aaron Boedeker

Hello as a member of the community I am well aware of the disregard to the ecological impact of literally burying waste at the Camas Georgia pacific mill location. I've heard numerous people from my family to retired workers tell about the waste buried at the site. After hearing about how Georgia pacific company sold off their property to the city and let them deal with the contamination. I can only see the writing on the wall when I look at the Camas location. Please don't let this become our reality.

Aaron Boedeker local 5 President

Response to Comment #10

Please see the Ecology provided response regarding “Cleanup Responsibility” in the “Ecology Response to Common Comments and Concerns” section at the beginning of this Responsiveness Summary document for additional information.

The proposed Agreed Order is the first step in the cleanup process and requires the facility to conduct a remedial investigation to identify areas of potential contamination at the site and submit a remedial investigation report. The report will be made available for public review and comment.

Comment #11, from Janice Macarthur

Please make sure this is totally cleaned up. Unfortunately GP is famous for not doing a proper job. There is contaminated ground everywhere under mill property. This is fir the safety of the public.

Thank you.

Response to Comment #11

Please see the Ecology provided response regarding “Cleanup Responsibility” in the “Ecology Response to Common Comments and Concerns” section at the beginning of this Responsiveness Summary document for additional information.

Comment #12, from Joan Brueckner

Camas mill is an important part of Camas history and economy. It is very important to clean it up correctly to post-industrial standards. If the mill is not cleaned up properly, historic downtown Camas, the environment and the economy of Camas will be adversely affected. Instead of being a community where people want to live, Camas will become a town where people want to leave. Please have a public hearing so the residents of Camas can express their concerns. The date and time of the public hearing should be publicized weeks in advance of the hearing.

Sincerely,

Joan Brueckner

Response to Comment #12

Please see the Ecology provided responses regarding “Future Zoning” and “Public Hearing” in the “Ecology Response to Common Comments and Concerns” section at the beginning of this Responsiveness Summary document.

Comment #13, from Anonymous

You made profits in our community and cut corners to increase those profits. You cannot leave our town with damaged lands after you've determined you can make more money elsewhere. There is a place for profits, but it can't be at the cost of the ecosystem of our community

Response to Comment #13

Please see the Ecology provided response regarding “Cleanup Responsibility” in the “Ecology Response to Common Comments and Concerns” section at the beginning of this Responsiveness Summary document.

Comment #14, from Kimberly Tice

I am writing to request a Public Hearing regarding the clean up of the Camas Mill. The mill has been important to Camas' history and economy, but now it is time to clean it up correctly to post-industrial standards, hopefully so these sites can be used for something besides heavy industry.

Our city and its citizens need to have a seat at the table to ensure these sites are cleaned up properly so they can be used to ensure a bright future for Camas and its residents.

Thank you,

Kimberly Tice

Response to Comment #14

Please see the Ecology provided responses regarding “Future Zoning” and “Public Hearing” in the “Ecology Response to Common Comments and Concerns” section at the beginning of this Responsiveness Summary document.

Comment #15, from Richard C High

Hello,

I would like to ask that we do continue discussion on the Camas Mill clean up and to what extent and zoning. I realize there may be many reasons that are best for all as to the extent of final zoning, but having enjoyed Camas for over 40 years I feel there should be strong consideration for what a visionary clean up and possible public/private partnership could develop in that area. Perhaps even something on the order of the Vancouver waterfront as a true draw for the city core.

At the very least I believe it warrants a public hearing to further the dialogue and talk through the potentials.

Sincerely,

Richard C High

Response to Comment #15

Please see the Ecology provided responses regarding “Future Zoning” and “Public Hearing” in the “Ecology Response to Common Comments and Concerns” section at the beginning of this Responsiveness Summary document.

Comment #16, from Rob P Herman

I would like to request that the citizens of Camas be given the chance to participate in a public hearing regarding the Order to clean-up our historic Camas mill. Our beautiful small town, and economy, were built around that mill - former smells and all - and we want to know that any clean-up being completed is done correctly and to post-industrial standards.

Thank you for your attention to this important matter.

Rob P. Herman - author, proud Camas resident

"Naked in the Middle of a Tornado:

The True Story of One Family's Unbelievable Fight Against Polycystic Kidney Disease (PKD)"

Available NOW at Smile.Amazon.com! Just search: Naked in the Middle \$\$\$ ALL PROCEEDS

GO TO KIDNEY RESEARCH. \$\$\$

Response to Comment #16

Please see the Ecology provided responses regarding “Future Zoning” and “Public Hearing” in the “Ecology Response to Common Comments and Concerns” section at the beginning of this Responsiveness Summary document.

Comment #17, from Jessica Obradovic

I request, demand a public hearing regarding the clean up of the Camas Paper mill. My father worked there for 45 years and recently retired. Three weeks ago we learned he is dying from

Mesothelioma -a cancer that can show up 40 years later. It is directly contracted from exposure to asbestos. The mill was demolishing their relic furnaces alongside their workers without properly protecting them or informing them of the risk. Let's NOT let this ruin our home town again. Let's NOT allow a preventable cancer rob one more family of the time they deserve to be together.

Response to Comment #17

Please see the Ecology provided responses regarding “Cleanup Responsibility” and “Public Hearing” in the “Ecology Response to Common Comments and Concerns” section at the beginning of this Responsiveness Summary document.

Comment #18, from Randal Friedman

Angela — You are listed as the Public Involvement Coordinator for the Camas Mill Clean-Up Order, DE 18201, which includes the Public Participation Plan. You sent out a letter to “Interested Party” on February 25th seeking comment on these documents. While I did not receive such a letter, I have seen one and started a conversation about it.

There is some confusion about how a request for public hearing is made. Under "How can I comment", there’s a web-address specific to this Order which leads to a form to submit comments.

It is a long and random email address so I hope people can find it.

The next paragraph of your letter conflicts as you describe the process for granting of a public hearing and public comment extension. For this comment you seem to call it a “request” that should be mailed or emailed directly to you.

So which is it?

The City of Camas exists because of the mill. Its economic engine built the City. The City’s future, and certainly that of our Historic Downtown, depends on how that property is cleaned, as necessary, for its post-industrial future. It’s that simple.

I’m sure there will be well more than 10 requestors but I do think they should have clarity on where to send them.

I copied my City Councilor so she can have accurate information if her constituents ask.

I copied Carolyn Mercury. Carolyn is Board President Co-Chair off the Downtown Camas Association. In this capacity, she interacts and can represent our diverse Historic Downtown community. If she didn’t get a “Dear Interested Party” letter she should have and should be part of the ongoing mailing list. I would like to make sure she has the correct address.

I also request to be on the mailing list.

I have a long professional background as a retired Navy-civilian in the clean up of closed military bases covering thousands of acres in California, including one federal Superfund site within the City of San Francisco. Many of these bases were responsible for a community growing up around them. I would like to talk to you about how we handled public involvement for such major sites.

We recognized they were more than a number.

Please provide as soon as possible as people will be wanting to know the correct way to request this hearing.

Please consider this a formal request for Public Hearing meaning there are only 9 more to go.

I might add I was surprised by this ten person requirement. Is it in Washington statute? I was also surprised Ecology wouldn't start this process with a public hearing on this order. That's what the Navy always did.

Thanks.

Randal Friedman

Response to Comment #18

Comment noted. Ecology held a public meeting/hearing on April 20, 2021. All commenters have been added to the "interested parties" distribution list for the GP cleanup and will receive future notifications regarding public participation opportunities on Ecology actions at the site.

The requirement for 10 or more requests for a public meeting is established in rule [see WAC 173-340-600(5)].

Comment #19, from Darlene Shanfald

Your AO and PP documents read well.

I have two questions and one comment.

Question 1: Do you have a ballpark time when the RI Work Plan process will begin?

There is a timeline for the rest of the steps, but not when GP is expected to start this work.

Question 2: Has any of this pollution spread across the border into the State of OR?

Comment: "...we will hold one [public meeting] if 10 or more people request it, and this may cause us to extend a public comment period so the meeting occurs during it."

Ecology and GP should offer at least one, if not more, public meeting(s); even virtually – which could attract a larger audience. The public should not have to request it.

Response to Comment #19

- 1) A draft RI Work Plan is due 120 calendar days following the effective date of the Agreed Order. The RI Work Plan development will likely start soon after the effective date of the Agreed Order. The completion of RI field work is required within 12 months of completion of the final SAP, QAPP, and HASP. There is no date specified regarding when the RI work must start but it must be completed within 12 months.
- 2) Ecology does not believe contamination has spread across the state border into Oregon. The results of the RI will be used to develop a conceptual site model to understand where contamination is located and how it travels through the environment.
- 3) The requirement for ten requestors is written into Washington Administrative Code [WAC 173-340-600(5)].

Comment #20, from Paul Anderson

The Camas Mill is the heart of the City and Downtown and its proper clean-up is vital for the City's future. It is the communities hope that the current use and zoning of heavy industry will be changed to mixed-use- hence the current plan is deficient. I'd like to request a public hearing before this is approved.

The current zoning of Heavy Industry is not the appropriate bench mark for clean-up and mixed-use should be used instead. To support this, Ecology should create an Advisory Group including representatives from the City, Port, organizations like DCA, and public members. The Advisory Group should have access to review and comment on key milestones like the sampling plan.

Thank you for your time and I look forward to hearing from you

Best

Paul

Response to Comment #20

Please see the Ecology provided responses regarding “Future Zoning”, “Community Advisory Group” and “Public Hearing” in the “Ecology Response to Common Comments and Concerns” section at the beginning of this Responsiveness Summary document.

Comment #21, from Shelley Collins

I am new to Camas and live close to paper mill the noise is horrible but I am more concerned about the water and the smoke that comes out of it.

Shelley Collins

Response to Comment #21

This public comment period and agency action are concerning the cleanup of the GP site.

Water and air emissions are regulated under the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) and Title V permitting programs respectively to ensure protection of human health and the environment. Ha Tran (ha.tran@ecy.wa.gov) is the Ecology facility manager who can be contacted with any additional questions or concerns that relate to water discharges from the facility. The Southwest Clean Air Agency (SWCAA) is responsible for regulating the air emissions from the facility.

Comment #22, from Steve Young

I support the concept of a community advisory group to participate in the proposed Georgia-Pacific Model Toxics Cleanup in Camas, Washington.

The advantages of such a group include the following: facilitates project transparency, helps identify potential subsurface contaminants not listed in the current spill log and their likely locations, and provides a forum for public discussion of cleanup endpoints consistent with future property uses. Thanks for the opportunity to comment.

Response to Comment #22

Please see the Ecology provided response regarding “Community Advisory Group” in the “Ecology Response to Common Comments and Concerns” section at the beginning of this Responsiveness Summary document.

Comment #23, from Doug Quinn

The cleanup of the Georgia Pacific mill site is a key juncture in our community's future. The citizens of Camas should be allowed input via a public hearing.

There are community concerns around the clean-up level noted in the Agreed Order adversely affecting future uses that could be allowed on the site. Commercial use of the site should be considered through the development of a site Master Plan. A concept development plan will inform the clean-up work and help establish target levels of remediation in specific areas based on future uses.

Of further concern, is the proximity of the City's drinking water wells along the bank of the Washougal River, located immediately upstream from the site. These wells draw water from a shallow aquifer and may be at risk. With increased testing requirements for persistent drinking water contaminants, down to parts per trillion for per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances (PFAS), the Agreed Order must demonstrate that this clean-up ensures protection of that critical public resource.

I am requesting that a Public Hearing be provided to allow testimony from residents of the community, and that the clean-up standard be raised from the lowest level Industrial to Commercial.

Response to Comment #23

Please see the Ecology provided responses regarding “Future Zoning” and “Public Hearing” in the “Ecology Response to Common Comments and Concerns” section at the beginning of this Responsiveness Summary document.

Agreed Order 18201 established the framework for performing a remedial investigation of the site. The remedial investigation will provide the data that is necessary to identify the nature and extent of contamination. This will help develop a conceptual site model which will identify all the pathways of exposure, including the potential for drinking water contamination. A remedial investigation report will be prepared that the public will be allowed to review and provide comments on.

Comment #24, from Kristen Wallway

Georgia-Pacific must be responsible to fully clean up the Camas site, well beyond 'heavy industrial' standards. This land is precious waterfront for the city of Camas and should be left, clean, for its citizens for future use. Companies should be held liable to clean up after themselves. Please require it!

Response to Comment #24

Please see the Ecology provided responses regarding “Future Zoning” and “Cleanup Responsibility” in the “Ecology Response to Common Comments and Concerns” section at the beginning of this Responsiveness Summary document.

Comment #25, from Nan Henriksen

I am Nan Henriksen, lifelong citizen of Camas and former Camas Mayor.

On March 15th I made the following comments to the Camas City Council meeting:

"Almost 40 years ago the Camas City Council and I worked together and took bold action to change our City's vision of itself and tried to ensure long term fiscal viability, focusing on an excellent quality of life for future generations of Camasonians.

Now you have a similar opportunity to alter our City's vision and destiny. Even though the mill property is currently zoned Heavy Industrial, I would be surprised if the City's future vision for that property is for more heavy industrial. If we have a vision for aesthetically pleasing and vibrant mixed use with waterfront access for all in the future, we must ensure NOW that required cleanup of the mill site is adequate and safe for mixed use and not just good enough for more heavy industrial usage. I will do all I can to make sure we keep our options open for a 21st century vision."

Now I'm asking the Department of Ecology to make their Draft Agreed Order and Draft Public Participation Plan more inclusive and fair to the current and future generations of Camas citizens.

We need to have an Advisory Group including representatives from the City, Port, Downtown Camas Association and other qualified individuals and groups affected by this Plan. This group should have access to review and comment on key milestones like the sampling plan. Making all the agreements and plans and not having public input until the end of the process may well doom us to a 19th century vision for Camas.

If we have a vision for aesthetically pleasing and vibrant mixed use with waterfront access for all in the future, we must ensure now that required cleanup of the mill site is adequate and safe for mixed use and not just good enough for more heavy industrial usage. Please help us keep our options open for a 21st century vision.

Nan A Henriksen

Response to Comment #25

Please see the Ecology provided responses regarding “Future Zoning” and “Community Advisory Group” in the “Ecology Response to Common Comments and Concerns” section at the beginning of this Responsiveness Summary document.

Comment #26, from Anonymous

Too many cooks spoil the broth. I believe the addition of a citizen’s advisory committee would do just that in this case. The Department of Ecology is more than up to the task of ensuring that the appropriate clean up is done to the level required some day in the future when it is needed. When is that someday? One year, five years, ten years? At this point no one knows but as a lifelong resident of Camas my hope is that it is a far into the future as possible. Especially if it delays the dreams of those who picture high density housing, condos and a developed riverfront. Progress is not turning Camas into Lake Oswego East.

And to what level? The cleanup should be done to how the property is zoned. For those who want it done to a higher degree, for mixed use, put that on the shoulders of the developers who stand to make money hand over fist through the further gentrification of Camas.

Again, when the time comes simply let the Department of Ecology do its job.

Response to Comment #26

Please see the Ecology provided responses regarding “Future Zoning” and “Community Advisory Group” in the “Ecology Response to Common Comments and Concerns” section at the beginning of this Responsiveness Summary document.

Comment #27, from Paul Anderson

Dear Ecology,

This clean up is critical for the future of Camas. The key points I would like addressed are:

1)Clean up standards- future land use cannot be limited to a paper mill- the clean up standard must be MIXED USE- to allow for the citizens of the area to be safe from 130 years of toxic land use.

2) The public and the City must have a role in over sight of the planning and clean up- This is an advisory committee made up of local land and business owners and the elected officials of Camas.

3)There must be transparency. Currently internal decisions are private under this draft Order. Untila 30-day review period at the end. Even for our city government. This must be altered.

thank you

Paul Anderson

Response to Comment #27

Please see the Ecology provided responses regarding “Future Zoning” and “Community Advisory Group” in the “Ecology Response to Common Comments and Concerns” section at the beginning of this Responsiveness Summary document.

Ecology provides multiple formal public participation points throughout the process. These participation points include 30-day minimum public comment periods. There are multiple such points included in the timeline established by this Agreed Order. In addition, the public is welcome to ask questions, request documents, and provide input at any time during the process.

Comment #28, from Mark Nickerson

What can Camas expect should the mill shutdown the last machine? Length of time and cost? Does the state have any influence on what becomes of the land? Are there any lessons to be learned from other paper mill closures ...Boise Cascade in Vancouver or Kimberly Clark in Everett?

Response to Comment #28

The Agreed Order establishes a structure for the remedial investigation of the site. This is the initial step in the MTCA cleanup process. Length of time and cost are current unknowns.

Ecology does not have a say in future land use of the site. Those decisions are made by the owner (GP Camas) and the responsible local government authority. Please see the Ecology provided response regarding “Future Zoning” in the “Ecology Response to Common Comments and Concerns” section at the beginning of this Responsiveness Summary document for more information.

Ecology has experience with ongoing and historic cleanups of pulp and paper mills. Those cleanups will help inform and provide guidance on this current process. A review of historic cleanup activities will be performed internally as part of the remedial investigation process.

Comment #29, from Jean Avery

Thank you for the informative meeting on April 20. I support a thorough clean-up of this site. I often visit Camas for its beautiful parks, quaint downtown, and (yes) its peaceful cemetery. Please ensure that this site will be fully decontaminated so as to provide pleasant and safe surroundings for generations to come.

Response to Comment #29

Comment noted.

Comment #30, from Randal Friedman

Angela – Thanks for scheduling the Public Hearing so quickly. I look forward on April 20th to an informative session and the ability of our community to provide feedback.

Monday night I gave a public comment to the Camas City Council. My comment provided an update to the draft Order and Public Participation Plan. Given concerns with the current proposal, I suggested the City join the Port in supporting an Advisory Committee and the City having a “seat at the table.” A number of the

Councilors later in the meeting expressed support for both the Advisory Committee and the seat at the table.

This was not a formal action by the City.

With these expressions of support from both the Port and Camas, I developed the attached addition to Task 5 of the Public Participation Plan. It would create an Advisory Committee with appropriate support and responsibilities. The draft language amending Task 5 is attached.

While my request only, it is one based on my professional experience in the cleanup of complex sites for reuse. Its model is what the US Navy and other military services have been using since 1990. I’m specifically referring to Restoration Advisory Boards (RAB). RABS continue to provide the means for communities to participate in the important task of environmental cleanup at military installations, especially those that have closed.

In a 1994 joint document for implementation of RABs, USEPA states: “RABs bring together people who reflect the diverse interests within the local community, enabling the early and continued flow of information between the affected community, DoD and environmental oversight agencies. DoD is creating RABs to ensure that all stakeholders have a voice and can actively participate in a timely and thorough manner in the review of restoration documents. RAB community members will provide advice as individuals to the decision-makers on restoration issues. It is a forum to be used for the expression and careful consideration of diverse points of view. “

See <https://www.epa.gov/fedfac/restoration-advisory-board-rab-implementation-guidelines#community>

The RAB example is illustrative and provided with the hope of starting a discussion, hopefully at the upcoming Public Hearing.

I think appropriate content for the upcoming Public Hearing also includes Ecology and GP making a public presentation on this Agreed Order, the cleanup process, and discussing this request for an Advisory Committee.

To show one example of how this cleanup is fundamental to Camas’ future, I was on a ZOOM meeting this week to discuss the ongoing Camas Housing Study. Sarah Fox, a senior planner for Camas, mentioned only 10% of the City’s land was zoned multi-family. She said that was part of the problem in meeting Washington State housing mandates.

I commented this is an example of why this Order needs to change.

The hundreds of acres of mill property remain limited and zoned for Heavy Industry and can't be included in this Housing Study. With mill property "off-limits", the City has to look for other places to rezone and intensify. Those tend to be outside the downtown core. Development outside the downtown core could make Camas lose its walkability, likability, and a transit friendly future.

Once again, the mill's cleanup is central to this, and the very future of how Camas grows to accommodate State housing affordability requirements.

The mill's cleanup is central to the City's next century, period.

The cleanup of the Camas Mill should not leave the City with only heavy industrial options. There should be community involvement throughout the process prior to these decisions being made.

Again, this is my proposal and I infer no review by any other party.

I welcome discussion.

Randal Friedman

TASK 5. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

The Camas Mill is the heart of and Camas and its Historic Downtown. Its cleanup is vital for the City's future. There has been a request for creation of an Advisory Committee to ensure the current and future plans of Camas are considered, and the cleanup is done consistent with the mill property serving as Camas' heart. These Committees are used in other complex cleanups. For example, in 1994 Implementation Guidelines were published by the US Department of Defense and US Environmental Protection Agency calling for creating Restoration Advisory Boards for cleanup of military installations.

Ecology agrees an Advisory Committee for this complex cleanup, given post-industrial use considerations, would provide needed review and consensus on a Final Remedial Investigation and Interim Actions as required in this Order.

Recognizing the role of local agencies in this process, Ecology leaves the decision on creation of an Advisory Committee to the local agencies with authorities over the mill property, the City of Camas and the Port of Camas/Washougal.

Upon support from City of Camas and/or the Port of Camas/Washougal, including their willingness to participate; GP shall assist Ecology in the formation and administration of a Camas Mill Cleanup Advisory Committee (CMCAC). GP shall submit a proposal and work plan for the standup and support for CMCAC within 45 days of the Agreed Order.

The CMCAC should include a diverse representation of the Camas/Washougal area and at minimum shall include representatives from the City, Port, and community-based organizations like the Downtown Camas Association and the Camas/Washougal Chamber of Commerce. It should include public members appointed by the City of Camas and the Port.

In the event an organization is granted a Public Participation Grant for this site, that organization shall be represented on the CMCAC and considered for a leadership role.

For purposes of this Order, the term “Agency Review” includes the opportunity for the CMCAC, if formed, to review and comment.

For purposes of this Order, CMCAC review includes key subtasks and milestones documents, like the sampling plan, before they form the basis a draft Remedial Investigation and its specific public review requirements.

Ecology will coordinate document review and provide reasonable time constraints to assure timelines of the Order are met. At Ecology’s discretion, requests for additional time by the CMCAC shall be considered within the framework allowed to Ecology for document review.

The City of Camas and Port of Camas/Washougal shall have 15 days to review the CMCAC proposal from GP and suggest Ecology consider needed changes to accommodate reasonable community needs.

Upon approval by Ecology, GP shall assist in the CMCAC holding its first meeting within 30 days of approval.

After review by the CMCAC, if formed, GP shall support Ecology in presenting the Public Review Draft RI Report and SEPA evaluations at one public meeting or hearing. The GP will assist Ecology with presentations at any additional meetings or hearings that might be necessary for SEPA compliance or as part of the Public Participation Plan.

After the public comment periods are completed, GP shall prepare an Agency Review Draft Responsiveness Summary that addresses public comments. GP shall prepare two (2) copies of the Agency Review Draft Responsiveness Summary and submit them to Ecology for review and approval, including one electronic copy each in Word (.docx) and Adobe (.pdf) formats.

After addressing Ecology’s comments and after Ecology approval, GP shall prepare five (5) copies of the Final Responsiveness Summary and submit them to Ecology for distribution, including one electronic copy each in Word (.docx) and Adobe (.pdf) formats.

Response to Comment #30

Please see the Ecology provided responses regarding “Future Zoning” and “Community Advisory Group” in the “Ecology Response to Common Comments and Concerns” section at the beginning of this Responsiveness Summary document.

Comment #31, from Randal Friedman

Angela — The concern with a cleanup process reflective of our community’s needs continues to grow. The Columbian did an editorial recognizing the importance of

this cleanup and our City’s future. Here’s the link.

<https://www.columbian.com/news/2021/apr/12/in-our-view-camas-must-prepare-should-paper-mill-close/>

I have continued to review the Draft Agreed Order and draft Public Participation Plan and offer some additional requests and a refinement of my prior request for an Advisory Committee.

I must emphasize that these comments are mine alone. I'm thrilled our community will soon have its chance to voice their personal concerns and stories, but I am not speaking for them except as we collectively deserve a chance to make our case for a better Agreed Order and have meaningful participation in the long-term process.

FUTURE LAND USE IDENTIFICATION. I note with interest the requirement for the Remedial Investigation to consider "future land use." Certainly, given the value of this property, and past examples in our State; future land use cannot be limited to a paper mill as suggested by Georgia Pacific in the Post-Record. You've already heard differently from the CEO of our Port. The Columbian has joined the Post-Record in editorials beating this drum.

This shows additional need for the Advisory Committee amendment I submitted for inclusion in the Final Public Participation Plan.

Our community deserves a seat at the table when discussions turn to future land use, as required in the order. That is fundamental to the entire subsequent cleanup process.

REQUEST FOR PUBLICLY REVIEWED RESPONSE DOCUMENT. When public comments close on the 23rd, what happens to these comments?

Is the public presentation, and subsequent hearing on the 20th, considered equivalent to a "draft document" and therefore triggers the requirement for a "published response"? Per the draft Public Participation Plan Formal 30-day comment periods allow interested members of the public to comment on draft documents, legal agreements, and proposed cleanup actions...

Following a comment period, we publish all the input we received and respond to significant comments and questions.

If the comments result in significant changes to the cleanup documents, then the documents will be revised and re-issued for public review. If the comments do not result in significant changes, then they become final. (emphasis added)

If this does fall under the requirements for a draft document, is that published response completed before the Order is signed by Mr. DeMay?

If available before signing the order on behalf of the State of Washington, can the public have at least a week to review a draft published response document prior to the Order being signed?

As a resident of Camas, and the State of Washington; I request the hearing and public comment period on the Camas Mill be considered part of a draft document process with its follow-up public response. Further, I request that I, and the elected officials who represent me copied on this email, have a chance to review a draft published response document. Given the many people likely to attend this virtual hearing, this will assure the State of Washington heard their concerns, and how they are reflected in the response.

OUR COMMUNITY SEEKS A SIGNIFICANT CHANGE. Giving the community a seat at the table, while perhaps obvious, is requesting a significant change. When the State of Washington makes a decision whether or not to include this Advisory Committee, within the governing cleanup order for the Camas Mill, our community deserves a chance to respond before it is signed on our behalf. Signed before our direct regulatory authority is taken away.

If this is not considered a draft document, and there will be no public response document with the opportunity for public review, I would request to know sooner rather than later.

Our community is only asking for what they would get if the mill were a military base. Will the State of Washington treat us below that standard?

I hope not.

LET'S NOT FORGET THE COLUMBIA RIVER AND OUR CITY'S HISTORY. The Post-Record article mentions past involvement of the Columbia Riverkeeper.

They sent a technical comment letter in 2015 concerning the Mill's NPDES permit. The letter identifies the mill as a significant pollution concern, and recognized the close connection between pollution sources on the mill property and the Columbia River. I've attached it. <https://www.columbiariverkeeper.org/sites/default/files/2015/06/2015.6.16-Columbia-Riverkeeper-Comments-on-Camas-GP-Mill-NPDES-Permit-Renewal.pdf>

The article made me realize, in my hurriedness to comply with state legal requirements for a hearing, I had left something out. Let me explain.

The mill property has been the economic heart of Camas before its incorporation as a City. The future of this property largely determines if Camas's historic downtown declines with its mill shuttered, with business and new residents shifting up the hill to the exploding 192nd St Corridor in Vancouver.

See <https://www.columbian.com/news/2021/apr/11/vancouvers-192nd-corridor-reimagined/> We hope, on the other hand, this historic mill evolves into a new multi-use employment center taking advantage of its incredible location, schools, and business climate.

Concern for this community's well-being was my immediate motivation, and one shared by many. You've heard and read passionate comments of how this cleanup must honor this City's vision, started when the first paper mill was built, and now at cross-roads.

While fully respecting the value of the remaining paper line, and the jobs it creates, the reality for this community is once the package boiler is installed, and the old boiler decommissioned; there will be at least 10 equivalent city blocks of decommissioned buildings on our City's historic downtown district's border. That's only considering land north of an extension of 4th Avenue.

Nothing in what I have suggested, or in a proposal for an Advisory Committee, conflicts with the long-term continued operation of the remaining paper line.

It recognizes that hundreds of acres of prime land directly adjacent to our downtown can be reimaged and planned consistent with those operations, if it is remediated from past contamination.

OUR PORT IS READY. Our Port has shown how it can manage shoreline property for manufacturing jobs, mixed-use development, and high standards of resource management, and public recreation all at once. I'm proud we have a public agency which actively recognizes the need to retain and develop manufacturing where humans work compatibly with the environment. Their recent plan, which involved environmental cleanup of a lumber mill, also provides for outstanding public connection to our river.

Continued mill operations can co-exist with future development. The remaining paper line is less than 60 yards from existing downtown businesses and the two have and remain compatible. Once again, nothing suggested implies otherwise.

It is exciting to see our Port ready to roll up its sleeves and get to work on implementing this Order through an Advisory Committee and the Interim Action process. I hope they get the chance.

ADVISORY COMMITTEE ADDITION. The Advisory Committee proposal I requested had an oversight. It should have had included the Columbia Riverkeeper as a stakeholder. I worked with their equivalents while the civilian representative to California for the US Navy and they were part of the process. Disclosure, I am one of their 8,000 members and supporters.

As important as this Order and cleanup is to the City and Camas and beyond, it is equally important to a stakeholder like the Columbia Riverkeeper. This property represents two miles of shoreline, not including islands like Lady Island. The opportunities, both for new recreational sites and restoring past contamination is without equal. It is important for ongoing efforts for the Columbia's protection in a world of coming climate change.

I included Riverkeeper's Executive Director on this email. They might find creation of an Advisory Committee a reasonable and necessary addition to the Public Participation Plan.

THE CONCEPTUAL SITE MODEL. The draft Order requires a "Conceptual Site Model" detailing how contamination may interact with the Columbia River. The expertise an NGO like the Columbia Riverkeeper could bring to the table, if they were so interested, is substantial.

I've attached a revised submittal for the Public Participation Plan. Please consider this my current request.

Beyond any individual stakeholder, this is an example of how a properly set-up and managed Advisory Committee has great potential to avoid future conflicts.

I trust everyone on this email agrees we should strive for an outcome that avoids conflict and delays where everyone loses. Everyone benefits from avoiding shuttered buildings on a property that keep deteriorating. I saw that sadness on all too many closed military bases in California.

OTHER STATE POLICY CONSIDERATIONS SUPPORT AN ADVISORY COMMITTEE. Potential reuse of significant portions of the mill could satisfy and implement other State of Washington goals for climate change, affordable housing, promotion of infill development and reduction of Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT). It could also provide new conservation opportunities for the Columbia River.

Absent this opportunity for concentrated development, demand will shift to areas lacking downtown's access, utilities, and opportunities for sustainable infill development.

All the more reasons to bring people together through an Advisory Committee. Within this Committee's DNA is to identify and resolve clean up issues while it is easier to do so. It accomplishes this by identifying and respecting all interests in this area. This includes the greater interests of the State of Washington, championed nationally by our recently reelected Governor, on the necessity to incorporate climate change into every state action.

THE BASICS: EQUAL STANDING. I wanted to share some comment I made to the Camas City Council last week.

If you happen to live in Oak Harbor, the busy Naval Air Station Whidbey Island has a Restoration Advisory Board with the community's seat at their table.

Puget Sound Naval Shipyard, 14,000 employees strong, had a community board until 2008. Remarkable when you consider these boards started in the early 90's. Massive Joint Base Lewis-McChord asked the community if they wanted a Board. The community decided not to.

They all had the choice. So should we. Even for ongoing operations. There's no "pass" for paper mills, whether active or largely shuttered. Just like there's no pass for the largest, and quite active military bases in our State.

The State of Washington should not give my community less standing than it would get from an active installation of the United States Navy, or other branch of our Armed Forces.

I have to believe my Governor would agree.

THERE MUST BE TRANSPARENCY. I did this for 32 years starting with true Superfund sites. There are so many incremental decisions that shape and focus a complex cleanup investigation. They start with the first meeting after this order is signed. These decisions include what, and to what extent, areas are investigated. Then, more meetings on how they are investigated. Still more meetings about sample results, and if more sampling is needed. More decisions decide what appropriate interim actions the state requires, if any. These are but a few examples.

These internal decisions are private under this draft Order. Until a 30-day review period at the end. Even for our city government.

This is wrong on so many different levels, the most significant of which is the demonstrated ability for an Advisory Committee process to work.

Thank you, Angela. I look forward to the Hearing on the 20th and an answer to the questions raised in this submittal.

Randal Friedman

TASK 5. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

The Camas Mill is the heart of and Camas and its Historic Downtown. Its cleanup is vital for the City's future. There has been a request for creation of an Advisory Committee to ensure the current and future plans of Camas are considered, and the cleanup is done consistent with the mill property serving as Camas' heart. These Committees are used in other complex cleanups. For example, in 1994 Implementation Guidelines were published by the US Department of Defense and US Environmental Protection Agency calling for creating Restoration Advisory Boards for cleanup of military installations.

Ecology agrees an Advisory Committee for this complex cleanup, given post-industrial use considerations, would provide needed review and consensus on a Final Remedial Investigation and Interim Actions as required in this Order.

Recognizing the role of local agencies in this process, Ecology leaves the decision on creation of an Advisory Committee to the local agencies with authorities over the mill property, the City of Camas and the Port of Camas/Washougal.

Upon support from City of Camas and/or the Port of Camas/Washougal, including their willingness to participate; GP shall assist Ecology in the formation and administration of a Camas Mill Cleanup Advisory Committee (CMCAC). GP shall submit a proposal and work plan for the standup and support for CMCAC within 45 days of the Agreed Order,

The CMCAC should include a diverse representation of the Camas/Washougal area and at minimum shall include representatives from the City, Port, community-based organizations like the Downtown Camas Association and the Camas/Washougal Chamber of Commerce, and the Columbia Riverkeeper and other Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) DOE may find appropriate. It should include public members appointed by the City of Camas and the Port.

In the event an organization is granted a Public Participation Grant for this site, that organization shall be represented on the CMCAC and considered for a leadership role.

For purposes of this Order, the term "Agency Review" includes the opportunity for the CMCAC, if formed, to review and comment.

For purposes of this Order, CMCAC review includes key subtasks and milestones documents, like the sampling plan, before they form the basis a draft Remedial Investigation and its specific public review requirements.

Ecology will coordinate document review and provide reasonable time constraints to assure timelines of the Order are met. At Ecology's discretion, requests for additional time by the CMCAC shall be considered within the framework allowed to Ecology for document review.

The City of Camas and Port of Camas/Washougal shall have 15 days to review the CMCAC proposal from GP and suggest Ecology consider needed changes to accommodate reasonable community needs.

Upon approval by Ecology, GP shall assist in the CMCAC holding its first meeting within 30 days of approval.

After review by the CMCAC, if formed, GP shall support Ecology in presenting the Public Review Draft RI Report and SEPA evaluations at one public meeting or hearing. The GP will assist Ecology with presentations at any additional meetings or hearings that might be necessary for SEPA compliance or as part of the Public Participation Plan.

After the public comment periods are completed, GP shall prepare an Agency Review Draft Responsiveness Summary that addresses public comments. GP shall prepare two (2) copies of The Agency Review Draft Responsiveness Summary and submit them to Ecology for review and approval, including one electronic copy each in Word (.docx) and Adobe (.pdf) formats.

After addressing Ecology's comments and after Ecology approval, GP shall prepare five (5) copies of the Final Responsiveness Summary and submit them to Ecology for distribution, including one electronic copy each in Word (.docx) and Adobe (.pdf) formats.

Response to Comment #31

Following a review of comments received during the initial public comment period, Ecology may make edits to draft documents in response to those comments. If edits are significant, then additional public participation (public comment period) regarding the updated draft documents would occur. If the edits are minor in nature, then draft documents would be finalized without additional public comment. For Agreed Order 18201 and associated Public Participation Plan, no significant changes were made and therefore no additional public comment period is being held.

Interested parties including the Columbia Riverkeepers were notified of this action and the opportunity to participate in the public comment period.

Please see the Ecology provided response regarding "Future Zoning" and "Community Advisory Group" in the "Ecology Response to Common Comments and Concerns" section at the beginning of this Responsiveness Summary document.

Comment #32, from Don Chaney

I have been a Camas resident since 1973 and a current member of the Camas City Council.

As a disclaimer, these comments are not authorized to represent the Camas City administration nor are these comments authorized to represent a consensus of the city council.

These comments represent my personal perspective as well as an interested number of constituent citizens who have inspired me to represent this issue as their representative.

The 'Camas Mill' is a prominent part of our city history and that inspired Camas' formation as a town and later a city.

It has produced paper products, broadly distributed for many uses over many decades. It has provided jobs at a living wage for generations. The existence of this mill sustained the city's economic viability from the time it was established. I was employed by Crown Zellerbach mill in the mid 1960s and am therefore somewhat familiar with the complex and broad layout of this facility. I have great respect for the warm history, perspective and value it brings to our community identity, even today.

My comments are intended to be forward looking, to the time when the operation ceases and the land will likely reclaimed. Eventually, for other uses as might be prescribed by future planning and zoning by city officials when that time comes.

It is my understanding that GP is currently deconstructing the CRD building and associated adjacent structures and property NW Ash and Drake Streets, in preparation for sale. We can envision that sometime in the future, portions of, if not all of the remainder of this mill will follow a similar course.

I believe this process serves as an opportunity to assess and prepare for the future.

Regardless, if decommissioning occurs in 5 years or 75 years, it would be a disservice and 'missed opportunity' not to be proactive in assuring a safe and, if necessary, decontaminated environment on and around this property.

I strongly encourage that this process involve the community by establishing an advisory committee to provide public over-site and input to this process. I further encourage that this assessment process uses standards envisioning and applicable to mixed use/residential land zoning.

Respectfully,

*Don Chaney
Camas City Council
Member 'At Large'*

Response to Comment #32

Please see the Ecology provided responses regarding “Future Zoning” and “Community Advisory Group” in the “Ecology Response to Common Comments and Concerns” section at the beginning of this Responsiveness Summary document.

Comment #33, from Bonnie Carter

Thank you so much to you and your team for holding the public meeting with the questions and answers portion on Tuesday for the proposed GP clean-up. As a member of the Camas City

Council, the city has enjoyed a long, collaborative history with mill owners over the decades and foresee this relationship continuing.

As mill operations potentially change in the future, it would be desirable to ensure the land is cleaned up and ready for future mixed-used zoning options which are more stringent than the current heavy industrial zoning.

Again, I appreciate the opportunity to provide comments and look forward to this public process.

*Thank you,
Bonnie Carter
Council Member*

Response to Comment #33

Please see the Ecology provided response regarding “Future Zoning” in the “Ecology Response to Common Comments and Concerns” section at the beginning of this Responsiveness Summary document.

Comment #34, from Steve Hogan

As an elected city council member for the city of Camas, I would like to give my thoughts on the appropriate level of cleanup for the Georgia Pacific mill property if it should ever discontinue paper making or other industrial use on this site. By the way, as a city we do not want the paper making to be discontinued. We hope that the enterprise continues on for years to come.

I am not giving an opinion for the city administration nor the other members of the Camas City Council. My statements reflect the concerns that have been made directly to me by my constituents within the city of Camas.

For any property that is actually being cleaned up, my constituents and I agree that a level of clean up that would meet a "mixed use" of both residential and commercial would be the appropriate level of cleanup for the Georgia Pacific property in Camas.

I will try to be on the meeting tonight. If I am unable to attend, could you enter these comments into your records? Thank you.

*Steve Hogan
Camas City Council*

Response to Comment #34

Please see the Ecology provided response regarding “Future Zoning” in the “Ecology Response to Common Comments and Concerns” section at the beginning of this Responsiveness Summary document.

Comment #35, from Ellen Burton

Thank you for hosting the public hearing for the Dept. of Ecology | GP Cleanup order. I plan to attend and comment at the hearing this evening, April 20. Could you please enter these comments into the public record?

As a council member for the city of Camas and 20 year resident, I'm speaking on behalf of myself and my constituents, not the council.

The Camas-Washougal community and the city of Camas have benefited from over a century of economic activity and partnership with the GP paper mill under various owners. We want this beneficial partnership to continue today and in the future.

Nevertheless, when the mill is no longer a viable enterprise we want to guarantee the Dept. of Ecology, GP and the community have proactively partnered to position us well for the next chapter.

This chapter is mixed used of both commercial and residential where all community members can enjoy the property, not heavy industrial. Please involve the community, establish an advisory committee and cleanup the site to the standards of mixed use.

Thank you for taking my comments. Ellen Burton, Camas City Council member and resident.

Response to Comment #35

Please see the Ecology provided responses regarding “Future Zoning” and “Community Advisory Group” in the “Ecology Response to Common Comments and Concerns” section at the beginning of this Responsiveness Summary document.

Comment #36, from John Firkins

Paper Mill Environmental Hazard – Dioxins

Bleached pulp mills produce Dioxins as a byproduct of their pulp bleaching process. While there are many related byproduct chemicals, the term "Dioxin" usually focuses on one of the worst environmental hazards of this class of toxic byproducts, 2,3,7,8-Tetrachlorodibenzo-p-Dioxin.

The Camas mill is no exception, and after many years of producing bleached wood pulp, is likely to have areas where the ground or riverbed sediments are contaminated with "Dioxin."

Because the GP Camas will no longer produce bleached wood pulp, the issue is not dioxins in the bleach plant effluents or byproducts. The issue is dioxins in soil or sediments, which will preclude any use of all or part of the mill site for uses that maximize the value of the site to the city of Camas. If the city of Camas has to do a cleanup of dioxins on or in any part of the mill site, now or in the future, the costs will likely exceed the value of the end use(s) being considered.

The current proposed limit of 1.31 mg./day for dioxin is basically meaningless, because the mill no longer bleaches wood pulp. The issue is contamination of all, or part, the site with dioxins, which will preclude its use for most possible land uses, especially those of highest value to the community

Georgia Pacific and the Washington DOE must develop a plan to assess and propose cleanup of any measurable/detectable amount of dioxins anywhere on the Camas Mill Site. Doing anything less would be a major disservice to Camas, and be a prohibitively costly legacy for the community of city.

*John L. Firkins, Ph.D., Chemistry
Camas Resident
April 18, 2021*

Response to Comment #36

Agreed Order 18201 establishes the framework for the remedial investigation of the GP Camas site. This remedial investigation will combine a historical review of the site with analytical data to establish an understanding of the contamination at the site. Given the past bleach plant operations at the site, dioxin and furan contamination will be investigated and assessed. Future Ecology actions will include dioxin and furan cleanup as appropriate.

Comment #37, from Randal Friedman

*Questions concerning Draft Agreed Order and Public Participation Plan
Thank you.*

- 1. Does this order require any public involvement beyond a 30 day public comment period upon publishing of the draft Remedial Investigation several years down the road? If not, and the community requests more comment periods for interim steps, e.g. the ability to comment on study design, is there a guarantee those will be granted?*
- 2. What is a typical size of a Remedial Investigation in terms of pages (or shelf space for us old-timers?) When you consider it includes the sampling plan, results for soil borings and water samples, not to mention a conceptual site study for a major property on two rivers, it will be significant.*
- 3. If public review is limited to 30, or even 45 days, is this time reasonable and adequate to find problems given this will be new material at the commencement of public comment?*
- 4. Is it all realistic to think Ecology will go back and do a revision to the study including supplemental sampling, borings, wells, etc. based on a different perspective on the sites relationship with the City of Camas and the Columbia River, or on the site's future? If not, is this an adequate public review opportunity?*
- 5. The mill property has been the economic heart of Camas since its incorporation. Will you be considering future land use beyond a paper mill/heavy industry in determining that interim actions are required, and what the scope of the remedial investigation is?*
- 6. Will you consider other goals of our Governor and Department of Ecology concerning new development that speaks to consideration of the greater potential of this property to provide for growth with a smaller carbon footprint than other alternatives?*

Specifically, the use of the property for residential mixed-use development as a way to meet regional housing requirements in a manner that minimizes the carbon footprint of regional growth occurring in areas lacking existing services and auto-dependent?

7. The draft order appears to exempt the City of Camas from the actual issuance of permits, e.g. for demolition of structures done for the cleanup. Is this the case? I understand substantive requirements must be met, but will the City of Camas no longer have the authority to issue key permits?

8. If this property were a military installation, there would be an Advisory Committee should the community be interested. Will you amend the Public Participation Plan to create one as requested? Recognizing the broad regional impacts, will you also include non-governmental and tribal organizations if they are interested?

9. If created, will Ecology insure GP is responsible for performing work this committee requests, subject to Ecology's concurrence, including providing access to documents and work products?

10. Will there be a response document publicly released before this order is signed, and if so will the public have at least a week to review that document to ensure our comments and questions were correctly entered, and evaluate the responses.

Response to Comment #37

1. Agreed Order 18201 establishes formal comment periods for the draft RI Report and for draft Interim Action Work Plans. These formal comment periods do not preclude the public from requesting information or providing comments/input at any time during the MTCA cleanup process. Information can be requested from Shingo Yamazaki at shingo.yamazaki@ecy.wa.gov. Additional information is included in the Ecology provided response regarding “Community Advisory Group” in the “Ecology Response to Common Comments and Concerns” section at the beginning of this Responsiveness Summary document.
2. We do not know the amount of documentation/pages the Remedial Investigation Report for GP Camas would contain. A typical Remedial Investigation Report when printed would comprise about 2-3 binders.
3. For complicated actions, Ecology will extend public comment periods to allow for additional time for review.
4. Agreed Order 18201 establishes the framework for the remedial investigation of the site. Ecology’s goal is to evaluate the site for contamination regardless of the future use determination. Ecology does not expect a change in future use to change the remedial investigation in any substantive fashion. Additionally, Ecology is not precluded from requiring additional remedial investigations, as needed.
5. Future use is an important consideration when developing cleanup standards for a site. GP has stated to Ecology that they have no intention of selling the site or ceasing operations. If the future use of the site changes, then the cleanup levels will be adjusted accordingly.

6. Ecology does not establish zoning and future use and has no regulatory authority to do so. Please see the Ecology provided response regarding “Future Zoning” in the “Ecology Response to Common Comments and Concerns” section at the beginning of this Responsiveness Summary document for additional information.
7. The language in question from Section VIII. N. (Compliance with Applicable Laws) of the Agreed Order does not exempt the City of Camas from issuing permits. Rather, the language provides that GP may be exempt from the obligation to obtain local government permits for remedial investigation/action work that is required by the Agreed Order. If a permit exemption is used, Ecology will work with the local government to document the substantive requirements that must be met. The permit exemption only applies to remedial action work being conducted under the Order. For example, if the environmental remedial investigation/action is being done in conjunction with a development project, the permit exemption should only be used for work related to the remedial investigation/action and not be applied to any work related to the development.

This exemption is intended to prevent the delay of remedial actions resulting from obtaining local government permits. However, there may be instances where invoking this permit exemption may delay a cleanup. Such an instance could be if Ecology lacks the knowledge or expertise of a local government (e.g., the City of Camas) to identify a permit’s substantive procedural requirements and how establish methods for implementing these requirements. Thus, Ecology retains the option of asking GP to apply for permits from local governments.

8. Ecology will not create or lead a community-based advisory group but is more than willing to participate, provide information to, and accept input from such a group, if formed. Please see the Ecology provided response regarding “Community Advisory Group” in the “Ecology Response to Common Comments and Concerns” section at the beginning of this Responsiveness Summary document.
9. A community-based advisory group is advisory in nature. It establishes a focal point for communication between Ecology and the community. GP holds no responsibility/obligations to a community-based advisory group.
10. No review/comment period is provided for the public to review and provide input on the responsiveness summary.

Comment #38, from Diana Gordon

The mill is such an important part of the history of Camas that it is hard to imagine it ever leaving town. We all have friends or family who have worked there and I don't know anyone who hasn't driven through the car wash.

If the mill were to leave, however, the future use of the site would be relevant to the quality of life in our area and a thorough cleanup would be important. Because some toxic substances are used in the paper-making process, I am concerned that some may have escaped into the soil over the years.

A flood event like the increasingly common 100 year flood or water level rise due to climate change could possibly carry some of the pollution into the rivers nearby. They could possibly harm the Columbia and extend down to the Columbia River Estuary. Chemicals might affect wildlife.

Insects and their larvae - important food sources for many fish species. - can be affected. The alluvial soil under the mill would be especially vulnerable to liquefaction in the case of an earthquake thus allowing chemicals to reach the water.

I am sure that, in the unlikely event the mill left Camas, we would all have many questions about the condition of the site and many people would want to participate in hearings about it. Certainly a thorough examination of possible contamination would be top of mind for many of us living anywhere near the Columbia River.

Please help us insure a vibrant future for Camas by having robust public involvement and a complete site clean-up and decontamination process if our historical mill closes.

Thank you,

Diana Gordon

Response to Comment #38

Agreed Order 18201 establishes a framework for the remedial investigation of the GP Camas site. This will help establish a conceptual site model to understand where contamination is located and how it travels through the environment. This information will be used to protect human health and the environment and reduce/prevent exposure. For example, the remedial investigation may identify areas where clean up needs to occur sooner rather than later as an interim action to ensure the concern mentioned in the comment doesn't occur. The conceptual site model will also help determine the best management practices that need to be employed during cleanup activities to ensure that the expressed concern does not occur.

Comment #39, from Cal Stone

Thank you Washington State Department of Ecology and Georgia-Pacific for undertaking the clean-up the Camas paper mill site. Since the mill has been in operation for over 135 years, with more than half of the mill's lifespan having operated with little to no consideration for environmental impacts, no doubt this will be a significant undertaking.

With respect to the Remedial Investigation, it is my hope that the full extent of contamination accrued since the mill's inception be determined both on the mill property proper, as well as affected areas away from the site. Knowing what is, and is not, contaminated, is the first step toward improving the environment of which many people live and depend. Taking extensive action now, while seemingly expensive, will positively affect future generations to come. Delaying action will only become more burdensome as time goes by, and could even become unmanageable if not cleaned-up in the near term.

Please make every effort to support the cleanest possible environment such that the site can support any potential future use.

*Sincerely,
Cal Stone
Camas, WA*

Response to Comment #39

Comment noted. Agreed Order 18201 establishes a framework for the remedial investigation of the GP Camas site. This will help establish a conceptual site model to understand where contamination is located and how it travels through the environment. This information will be used to protect human health and the environment and reduce/prevent exposure. The facility will be required to generate a report with the results of their investigation and that report will be made available for public review and comment.

Comment #40, from Rick Marshall

Thank you, Department of Ecology for holding this public hearing. I'm a local real estate investor, and I thought it might be helpful to share a few observations regarding local land values.

The Camas mill site is a very attractive property located in one of the few truly walkable areas of Clark County. And much of the reason for downtown Camas and surrounding neighborhoods being walkable and desirable for multiple uses is because of the mill. The mill was the economic engine that kept downtown Camas viable, even after the interstate freeway system went in. The mill has provided much of the open space trails and park system that surrounds this area, including our lakes, Crown Park, Mill Ditch, Benton Park, and the city steps.

And the mill, and its employment created a more diverse and interesting housing stock. It would be great if the mill can figure out a way to continue profitable operations and its current site. I think the mill brings great diversity and stability to our local economy.

But if the mill chooses to move operations, then it's unlikely that this property will see its greatest value as heavy industry. The city could easily extend its classic downtown grid structure into this area. And my guess is that G-P already understands the potential value of their infill walkable properties, or they wouldn't be making the large investment in the lab property cleanup currently underway.

Let's face it. Heavy industry does not need a world class view of the Columbia River and Mount Hood. And waterfront locations are more of a liability than an asset, given the move away from water-based shipping and with current concerns about water quality and fish preservation.

This site is a site developer's dream and as long, but as long as it can be cleaned up properly and to the public satisfaction. And the public part is key to maximizing value.

Conducting a robust and transparent scoping and cleanup process is important to win the trust of the public. Just satisfying a state agency and state regulations is not going to be enough to realize the full value of this property. The skeptical public will lower the value of the property as investors will be hesitant if they perceive the risk of any future public opposition.

Seems to me that everyone wins under a scenario of thorough public involvement. G-P should be able to maximize the value of their truly unique property and the public can help move along redevelopment and hopefully gain even more public amenities.

Thanks again for holding this public hearing. I think it is step in the right direction. Thanks.

Response to Comment #40

Please see the Ecology provided responses regarding “Future Zoning”, “Community Advisory Group” and “Public Hearing” in the “Ecology Response to Common Comments and Concerns” section at the beginning of this Responsiveness Summary document.

Comment #41, from Ellen Burton

Good evening. Thank you very much for holding this hearing. We really appreciate it, that you're taking the time, all of you, to come and speak with us in the Camas-Washougal area.

My name is Ellen Burton. I'm a Camas City Council member and a 20 year resident. Tonight, I'm speaking on behalf of myself and my constituents not the council. My contact information is eburton@cityofcamas.us.

The Camas-Washougal community, and the city of Camas have benefited from over a century of economic activity and partnership with the G-P mill under various owners. As my neighbor Rick Marshall just stated, we want this beneficial partnership to continue today and in the future.

Nevertheless, when the mill is no longer a viable enterprise we want to guarantee the Department of Ecology, G-P, and the community have proactively partnered to position us well for the next chapter. This chapter is mixed use of both commercial and residential, where all community members can enjoy the property, not heavy industrial. Please involve the community, as you are tonight, establish an advisory committee, and clean up the site to the standards of this use.

Thank you very much for taking my comments.

Ellen Burton, Camas City Council member and resident

Response to Comment #41

Please see the Ecology provided responses regarding “Future Zoning” and “Community Advisory Group” in the “Ecology Response to Common Comments and Concerns” section at the beginning of this Responsiveness Summary document.

Comment #42, from David Ripp

Thank you, very much. I just want to say thanks to Ecology for holding this public meeting.

I feel very fortunate to have gone through a similar process when we cleaned up the mill site on our property. And was fortunate to receive an integrated planning grant, so we had a very robust public process to what was going on on the property, to clean up the property, but also what the highest and best use for the future of the property was. So, I thank you for allowing for the Port of Camas-Washougal to comment during this presentation.

The port supports the Georgia-Pacific's longstanding history in Camas, the economic benefits that they brought to our community, what they currently bring, and their future operational contributions.

The port has always had a strong interest in the future of the Georgia-Pacific mill site. We feel sometimes in the future, sometime in the future, the mill will be closed and its next chapter will begin, most likely away from its heavy industrial zoning to the redevelopment into commercial retail and mixed use. The timing of all of this is unknown, but developing a future plan will only benefit our community.

The port is eager to work in partnership with the city and the mill to lay out a future vision and foundation for this site, which everyone will be proud of when the mill does decide to close their doors.

Also, the port supports the creation of the public advisory committee, participation committee, and would definitely be a part of that and would like to be a part of that during the cleanup and interaction process. This also includes reviewing the interim documents such as sampling plan and design of the cleanup standards.

So, if that is the case, we'll definitely want to make that point that we would be eager to be a part of that committee Thank you so much and have a good evening.

And as it was also stated, my name is David Ripp. I'm the CEO for the Port of Camas-Washougal and my email addresses david@portcw.com.

Thank you.

Response to Comment #42

Please see the Ecology provided responses regarding “Future Zoning” and “Community Advisory Group” in the “Ecology Response to Common Comments and Concerns” section at the beginning of this Responsiveness Summary document.

Comment #43, from Don Steinke

Hello, my name is Don Steinke. My email address is crvanwash@gmail.com. I taught science for nine years at Camas high school beginning in 1968.

The EPA may have been created because of this paper mill. Denis Hayes was the chief organizer for the first Earth Day fifty-one years ago this week. He's from Camas. As a result of that Earth Day, President Nixon created the EPA, and shortly after that Governor Dan Evans created the Department of Ecology which is conducting this hearing.

Denis Hayes changed the world. I assume that the pollution from this paper mill made him conscious of the need for regulations. I can assume that Denis Hayes would say use your full authority to make this site as clean as possible. Make it safe for frog and salmon eggs. One part per billion of petrochemical products causes defamations in salmon.

Did anyone notify the Cowlitz Nation? Did anyone notify the Columbia River Intertribal Fish Commission of this hearing? Their member tribes ceded this land to the settlers in a federal treaty around 1855, but retained the right to hunt, fish, and gather foods, both on and off the reservation.

That means they should also be able to eat as much salmon as they would like without being concerned with persistent, bioaccumulative toxins. It also means that salmon should be able to reach spawning habitat, without barriers.

Cities around America are reconnecting people with their waterfront, from Bellingham, to Austin, Texas, to Oregon City, and to both Vancouvers.

This company should pay for all the liabilities they accepted when they bought this property. And while cleaning this up, do the same at the paper mill site at Port Gamble on the Kitsap Peninsula and say no to the Kalama Methanol plant.

Thanks for conducting this hearing

Response to Comment #43

Ecology reached out to interested stakeholders including tribes during this process.

Please see the Ecology provided response regarding “Cleanup Responsibility” in the “Ecology Response to Common Comments and Concerns” section at the beginning of this Responsiveness Summary document for additional information.

Comment #44, from Alona Steinke

Good evening. My name is Alona Steinke. Don and I live in Clark County within the Camas school district. I am a retired R.N.

I'm urging Ecology to insist on the highest level of cleanup. Pulp and paper industries release wastewater that contains complex organic and inorganic pollutants. This site is contaminated by petroleum hydrocarbons from diesel, gasoline, and oil. These include volatile organic compounds, including toluene, benzene, ethyl benzene, and xylene. There are also heavy metals and persistent organic pollutants. These are toxic and health harming. Benzene is carcinogenic. It can cause leukemia and also it affects the immune system.

Toluene effects the nervous system, even after only a short term exposure. Xylene depresses the central nervous system. Heavy metals include lead, mercury, barium, and cadmium. Persistent organic pollutants are chemicals of global concern due to their potential for long range transport, persistence in the environment, the ability to bio magnify and bio accumulate in ecosystems, as well as their significant negative effects on human health and the environment.

All of this pollution is harmful to humans, fish, and aquatic plants. There is so much potential for this great property. It can become a source of pleasure and pride for our community. Don't settle for minimal cleanup. Please go beyond industrial standards and make this site safe for public access.

Thank you for letting us comment.

Response to Comment #44

Comment noted. Agreed Order 18201 establishes a framework for the remedial investigation of the GP Camas site. This will help establish a conceptual site model to understand where contamination is located and how it travels through the environment. This information will be used to protect human health and the environment and reduce/prevent exposure.

Please see the Ecology provided response regarding “Future Zoning” in the “Ecology Response to Common Comments and Concerns” section at the beginning of this Responsiveness Summary document.

Comment #45, from Randal Friedman

I'm a retired civilian for the United States Navy. For 32 years, I was the public face of the Navy and military before California's legislative and executive branches. I want to emphasize four simple words.

There must be transparency.

I worked on environmental or mediation of large closing military installations, including federal Superfund sites. There are so many incremental decisions that shape and focus a complex cleanup investigation. They start with the first meeting after this order is signed. These decisions include what, and to what extent, areas are investigated. Then more meetings on how they are investigated. Still more meetings about sample results and if more sampling is needed. More decisions decide what appropriate interim actions the state requires, if any. These are but a few examples.

These internal decisions are private under this draft order until a 30 day review period at the end, even for our city government. This is wrong on so many different levels, the most significant of which is the demonstrated ability for an advisory committee process to work. Our community and appropriate, non-governmental and tribal organizations deserve a seat at the table. I thought I heard said if the community creates one, Ecology will honor it and allow its participation. I would like confirmation of this, and its inclusion in the public participation plan.

Thank you.

Response to Comment #45

Comment noted. Please see the Ecology provided response regarding “Community Advisory Group” in the “Ecology Response to Common Comments and Concerns” section at the beginning of this Responsiveness Summary document.

Comment #46, from John Firkins

Hi, everybody I made a couple comments earlier in the meeting, but I thought I would like to read a short write up on it.

John Firkins. I have spent about 30 years or more of my career with the pulp and paper industry, working for Weyerhaeuser, International Paper, Hammermill, and Boise Cascade, and I'm pretty familiar with the issue of chlorine-free bleaching. So, I just want to comment. I'll just read my short statement here.

Bleached pulp mills produce dioxins as a byproduct of their pulp bleaching process. While there are many related byproduct chemicals, the term dioxin usually focuses on one of the worst environmental hazards of this class of toxic byproducts, 2,3,7,8-tetrachlorodibenzo-p-dioxin.

The Camas mill is no exception, and after many years of producing bleached wood pulp, is likely to have areas where the ground or riverbed sediments are contaminated with "dioxin."

Because the G-P Camas will no longer produce bleached wood pulp, the issue is not dioxins in the bleach plant effluents or byproducts. The issue is dioxins in soil or sediments, which will preclude any use of all or part of the mill site for uses that maximize the value of the site to the city of Camas. If the city of Camas has to do a cleanup of dioxins of any part of the mill site, now or in the future, the costs will likely exceed the value of the end use of land being considered.

The current proposed limit of 1.31 mg/day limit for dioxin is basically meaningless, because the mill no longer produces bleached wood pulp, so it's not using chlorine. The issue is contamination of all, or part, the site with dioxins, which will preclude its use for most possible land uses, especially those of highest value to the community.

Georgia-Pacific and the Washington DOE must develop a plan to assess and propose cleanup of any measurable or detectable amount of dioxins anywhere on the Camas mill site. Doing anything less would be a major disservice and prohibitively costly legacy for the community of Camas.

Thank you.

Response to Comment #46

Agreed Order 18201 establishes the framework for the remedial investigation of the GP Camas site. This remedial investigation will combine a historical review of the site with analytical data to establish an understanding of the contamination at the site.

Given the past bleach plant operations at the site, dioxin and furan contamination will be investigated and assessed. Future Ecology actions will include dioxin and furan cleanup as appropriate.

Comment #47, from Amanda Martinez

Calling on behalf of the [...] community that is a long standing residential community sitting above the paper mill, behind the mill on the east end. My property is unique in that it butts up against the mill. And I would just like to include in the public comments that a direct, complete, community advisory council be formed and inclusive of all those individuals that would be affected by any action on the mill.

Thank you.

Response to Comment #47

Please see the Ecology provided response regarding “Community Advisory Group” in the “Ecology Response to Common Comments and Concerns” section at the beginning of this Responsiveness Summary document.

Comment #48, from Downtown Camas Association

With so many unknowns in a site of this age, I request a public hearing to inform citizens on these complex matters. The Camas Mill is an integral part of the city's history and its future. It has long played a major role in the success of the community as a property owner, business operator and employer. As operations are reduced, these properties have the opportunity to play a new role. As a community, we must be able to understand the possibilities and perhaps restrictions for these future uses to determine what will be the best, highest use. Thank you

Response to Comment #48

Please see the Ecology provided responses regarding “Future Zoning” and “Public Hearing” in the “Ecology Response to Common Comments and Concerns” section at the beginning of this Responsiveness Summary document.

Comment #49, from Port of Camas-Washougal

Good evening, Department of Ecology and everybody else here too, obviously Camas and each county region has some very interested citizens in this whole project. So that's really nice to see such a good turnout. Thanks, also for the presentation. I found that really informative, so we really appreciate you taking the time to bring that to us. And thanks also for taking time to take my comments.

So, my name is Cassie Marshall, and I'm a long time resident of Camas and a commissioner at the port of Camas-Washougal. My contact information is cassie@portcw.com.

It was lucky for me to be able to follow immediately behind David Ripp, our port CEO. I wanted to kind of echo some of the comments that David had made already.

Dave, originally way back in mid-March, sent a letter to Ecology as our port CEO. And he, in that letter, detailed the port's support of the creation of an advisory committee to provide public input into the full Camas smell cleanup, and the as well as the interim action process that you guys described so well tonight. In this letter, he also stated the port's intent to be an active participant in this process.

The port's had recent experience in significant public engagement process, which was used to shape the future of the local waterfront development. The importance of transparency and public involvement in planning for Camas's future can't be underestimated. Especially when both the economic and the environmental health of our entire region will be impacted by decisions made during this progress.

I'll keep my comments really short, but I wanted to take advantage of this opportunity to give full support to the comments that David made in his letter and just previously in those comments and also just reiterate the port's commitment to partnering with Ecology, the City of Camas, and Georgia Pacific in this work that's so crucial to the future of our area.

Thank you very much.

Response to Comment #49

Comment noted. Please see the Ecology provided responses regarding “Future Zoning” and “Community Advisory Group” in the “Ecology Response to Common Comments and Concerns” section at the beginning of this Responsiveness Summary document.

Comment #50, from Port of Camas-Washougal

Good evening. My name is Larry Keister. Contact information is larryk@portcw.com and I'm a commissioner at the Port of Camas-Washougal.

The [...] mill is a viable business in east Clark County, providing jobs and economic benefits. At such times the property does become available for the development, it must meet the level of mixed use of both residential and commercial.

The port supports the creation of an advisory committee and the port will assist on this advisory committee, when we are asked.

Thank you.

Response to Comment #50

Please see the Ecology provided response regarding “Community Advisory Group” in the “Ecology Response to Common Comments and Concerns” section at the beginning of this Responsiveness Summary document.

Comment #51, from Port of Camas-Washougal

Good evening. My name is John Spencer. I am a commissioner with the Port of Camas-Washougal, and a 40 year resident of this area. My email is john@portcw.com.

Simply like to express my support for Dave Ripp comments, as well as Ellen Burton's actually, and note that with my comments, you have a unanimous agreements among the port commission for Dave comments.

Thanks.

Response to Comment #51

Comment noted.

Comment #52, from Downtown Camas Association

Thank you so much for hosting this hearing. It's so important. My name is Carrie Schulstad, director@downtowncamas.com is my email.

I'm the Executive Director of the Downtown Camas Association and have been a Camas resident for 23 years. Adequate cleanup is important for our public health, quality of life, and economic stability. It's important to ensure the site is prepared for future use that best suits the needs of our Camas community, and also what will provide the most robust and healthy connections between the current historic downtown and the mill areas that are right across the street. They're right next door.

The DCA would like a seat at the table in an advisory committee to be fully informed and have the opportunity to give our input. We're also prepared to help with public education through all of our channels.

Thank you.

Response to Comment #52

Comment noted. Please see the Ecology provided response regarding “Community Advisory Group” in the “Ecology Response to Common Comments and Concerns” section at the beginning of this Responsiveness Summary document.