**From:** HarborComments <HarborComments@epa.gov>
**Sent:** Wednesday, September 07, 2016 3:56 PM
**To:** PortlandHarbor
**Subject:** FW: Clean Up Portland Harbor
**Attachments:** 349040749530277375.pdf

---

**From:** (b) (6)
**Sent:** Tuesday, September 06, 2016 11:59 PM
**To:** HarborComments <HarborComments@epa.gov>
**Subject:** Re: Clean Up Portland Harbor

## Clean Up Portland Harbor

| | |
|---|---|
| Letter | Dr. Ms. McCarthy, The proposed cleanup of the Portland Harbor is a big win for industry and a bad deal for the public. EPA's cleanup proposal tackles just 8% of a site area that is 100% toxic. A more aggressive plan is needed to prevent even more harm to human health and the environment. On behalf of all people who rely on the river for food, recreation, employment and culture, I urge the EPA to implement a plan that: Moves quickly and sustainably reduces contaminants causing harm to Willamette and Columbia River resources. Includes ongoing monitoring and cleanup upriver and downriver from the site. Contributes to healthy fish that are safe to eat for all people. Holds polluters accountable for creating a safer Portland Harbor. These elements get us closer to the plan our communities deserve. And I deserve a clean, safe Portland Harbor. *Submitted during the comment period between June 9, 2016 to August 8, 2016 regarding the EPA's Portland Harbor Feasibility Study and Proposed Plan. |
| First Name | (b) (6) |
| Last Name | (b) (6) |

| | |
|---|---|
| E-mail | (b) (6) |
| Upload your own letter (.pdf, .doc or .docx, 1 MB limit) | Portland Harbor Superfund Plan comments 2016-09.docx |

September 6, 2016

To: Environmental Protection Agency Administrator Gina McCarthy
Re: Portland Harbor Superfund

Dear Ms. McCarthy,

I have been engaged in watershed restoration for over 16 years in Portland. EPA's current proposed alternative for the Portland Harbor Superfund cleanup undermines the watershed restoration and public health investments made by numerous government agencies, nonprofit organizations, and private landowners by treating the Willamette as a holding tank for a legacy of contamination, one that the current proposed alternative would leave for future generations to deal with. After 16 years of study on one of the most toxic and complex Superfund sites in the nation, I request that the public comment period be extended to carefully consider the ramifications of the proposed plan, and adequately consult with the communities directly affected by it. If the public comment period cannot be extended, then I strongly urge EPA to adopt Alternative G with the most stringent cleanup standards. We cannot settle for using capping technologies that have been shown to fail at other sites.

As a mother and a recreationalist who has lived, played and worked on or near the water my whole life, it is really important to me to raise my child in a similar way and pass on family traditions. He greatly enjoys fishing and swimming -- however, I currently do not feel comfortable allowing him to swim in the Willamette or eat fish that is caught in the river closest to our home. Similarly, it is critical that EPA avoid violating treaty rights to subsistence fishing, and other cultural practices including use of riparian plants that bioaccumulate toxic sediments, held by the Yakama, Grand Ronde, Warm Springs and other regional tribal nations. Additionally, I urge EPA and the city of Portland to consider responsibility under Title VI (Civil Rights Act) to communities of color who use the area near the Portland Harbor for fishing and would continue to bear the brunt of exposure to contamination.

Please take the responsible first step by extending the public comment period on this decision making process.

Best,
(b) (6)
SW Portland