

ENTERED

Steve Pullen
Project Manager
Triassic Park Dump
HWB-NMED
Santa Fe, NM

September 21, 2001

Reviewed 9/21/01
SR.

Dear Steve,

In viewing the administrative record, I came across the fax from Ken Schultz dated 7/19/01 claiming the "need for Triassic Park **now**". After reviewing the article which was faxed to you, I can not help but be amused at the overt and heavy-handed attempt at influencing the process with an article which clearly indicates the need for greater funding and resources being placed in the coffers of the Environment Department, not the "need" of a dump.

Illegal dumping will not be curbed nor discouraged by GMI's proposed super-dump. People who are looking to cheat and dump illegally will always look to do so. That is why the article demonstrates the "need" for greater funding to be given to the Environment Department. I trust the Department sees through this charade and utilizes whatever propaganda value lies within this article to its own benefit by requesting greater funding so that it can better do its job.

Also, I can find no update on the business plan which allegedly never existed. You had previously indicated the applicant's intent to provide an "updated" business plan. What I find curious is, if there was no business plan in the first place, why update it? If there was once a business plan, where is the original and, indeed, where is the updated version? This is a very disturbing issue.

Another question I have is why has the NMED changed its tune in regards to supplying Spanish versions of the fact sheet? Not that long ago, you told me that counsel for the Department believed that a public notice in Spanish was the only material required to be printed in Spanish. Now I see that the position of the Department has changed. Is this a shift in policy, or just a shifty policy?

Also, for your information, I would like to submit a study by the University of New Mexico concerning the negative impacts of sites like this on surrounding property values. Previously, GMI claimed to have contacted two similar, privately-owned dumps in different parts of the country to ask if they had noticed any negative impacts on property values in their areas. First of all, asking other dumps about the negative impacts they have had on their neighbors could hardly be considered asking the question of a neutral party. Secondly, the data included in the study indicates that GMI's answer was not well researched nor was it entirely truthful. Personally, I would consider that response to be very much like a lot of other things associated with this process: of questionable integrity.

If you could be so kind as to respond to the issues raised in this and my previous correspondence, I'd be much obliged. You know how to reach me.

Very truly yours,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'VIC', with a stylized flourish extending to the right.

Victor Blair