

Wyckoff Eagle Harbor
Department of Ecology Generational Remedy Evaluation
Steering Committee Meeting Summary - February 1, 2010

AGENDA

- Welcome, Meeting Purpose and Agenda Overview
- Communications with Experts and Community since the Workshop
 - * Community input
 - * Frequently asked questions and responses
 - * Expert wrap up
- Alternatives Report Outline
 - * Overview and proposed outline
 - * Inclusion of cost-benefit analysis and philosophy for what is being compared
 - * Inclusion of new chapter or attachment regarding existing risk and concerns with containment only
- Recommended Alternatives to Document and Cost
 - * Three Alternatives proposed by the Ecology Team
- Input from EPA on the East Beach
- Approach for March 24 Community Meeting
 - * Publicity
 - * Content
- Wrap-up and Next Steps

STEERING COMMITTEE ATTENDEES

Tim Nord	Washington State Department of Ecology
Perry Barrett	Bainbridge Island Parks
Rich Brooks	Suquamish Tribe
Libby Hudson	City of Bainbridge Island
Janet Knox	Association of Bainbridge Communities
Frank Stowell	Citizen at Large

ADDITIONAL ATTENDEES

Dawn Hooper	Washington State Department of Ecology
Kate Snider	Floyd Snider
Erin Breckel	Floyd Snider
Pat Serie	EnviroIssues
Lori Herman	Aspect Consulting
Jeremy Porter	Aspect Consulting
Howard Orlean	U.S. EPA

MEETING SUMMARY

This meeting summary was prepared by Kate Snider and Erin Breckel. It is based on notes taken during the meeting to document the discussion.

Communications with Experts and Community since the Workshop

The communications discussion began by gathering input from the steering committee members on what they had been hearing from the community over the past couple of weeks regarding the Expert Panel Workshop.

- Steering committee members liked the news article on the workshop that was prepared by the Kitsap Sun. Dawn Hooper stated that she would e-mail this article to the group. There was some disappointment that the Bainbridge Island Review only provided an editorial on the workshop and not a news article.
- The steering committee was pleased with the great turnout at the community meeting. In general, it seemed that community members were impressed with the quality of the experts and the meeting. The community seemed to get a real sense that this process was different from EPA's past approach and that this might actually go somewhere. There is respect for Ecology for taking on this evaluation.
- There have been a lot of questions regarding the implementation of bioremediation at the site. Use of bioremediation at the site is addressed in the Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs) and responses that were prepared by EnviroIssues.
- The community also continues to have lingering questions regarding the thermal pilot study and on creosote health issues and impacts. It was discussed that there are multiple ways that these questions can be addressed to help the community gain a better understanding, such as:
 - * Include these questions in the FAQs document
 - * Discuss these questions at the March community meeting
 - * Discuss these questions briefly in the Alternatives Report

- Janet Knox has been in contact with members from the Bainbridge Island Energy Challenge committee to ask them about realistic suggestions for power sources for the generational remedy alternatives. There was also a recent letter in the Bainbridge Island Review regarding energy use at Wyckoff. This letter will be distributed via e-mail to the group.
- Libby Hudson is continuing to work to find a point person on the City Council for this evaluation effort.
- Perry Barrett has discussed the workshop with the Park Board. The board has deep interest in the evaluation and is appreciative of the effort. They would like to see the site cleaned up irrespective of how long it takes to do it.
- Rich Brooks briefed tribal management, who were pleased with the current steps being taken. The tribal management is very interested in what the next steps will be once the alternatives report is completed. They know a generational remedy will cost a lot of money and wonder if there will be the political will to move forward.

Pat Serie provided a summary of the status of the FAQs document.

- The version of the FAQs document provided at this meeting was edited slightly from the version that was distributed to the steering committee members the following week.
- Steering committee members were asked to provide any comments they had on the FAQs document by the end of the day as the FAQs document will be posted on the project website shortly. The community meeting summary, for the community meeting held on January 13th, will also be posted on the website at this time.
- The FAQs document is intended to be a living document. As questions arise from the community it should be easy to continue to add them to this document.

Kate Snider mentioned that e-mails were received from the expert panelists following the workshop that provided their thoughts on what they would recommend as the remedial approach for the site to meet Ecology's goals. These e-mails were distributed to the steering committee members last week. The e-mails show that there is breadth and diversity in the recommended approaches suggested by the expert panelists. These e-mails will provide additional information, in addition to what was received from the expert panelists during the workshop, to consider as we move forward in the evaluation process. At this point, the expert panelists are essentially done with their work, but are available for specific requests if needed. The expert panelists are interested in staying updated on the evaluation progress.

Alternatives Report Outline

Kate Snider went over the attached Preliminary Report Outline that was prepared by the Ecology Team in detail. Key points of the outline, along with input and suggestions brought up by the steering committee during the discussion of the outline are summarized below.

- Steering committee members wanted to understand how this alternatives document would differ from a typical feasibility study.

- * It was thought that this document, along with the expert panel workshop summary, would be more similar to a weighty technical memo or a white paper than to a feasibility study.
- * The document would almost be a mini feasibility study as it would involve many of the elements of a more formal feasibility study. The document would also provide a good starting point for a formal feasibility study.
- * There will be the ability to mix and match components of the remedies based on the document that will be prepared.
- * One of the goals of the document is provide a quick outcome that is useful to Ecology, EPA, the community, for moving forward and making decisions about how to proceed.
- The alternatives evaluated in this document are at a “working” conceptual level of detail only and this will be emphasized in the report.
- The document will not include a technology review, documenting what technologies are available and why or why not those technologies are brought forward. The document will just hone in on the three alternatives proposed by the Ecology Team. Technology screening is addressed more in the workshop summary.
- For the executive summary, it was suggested that this be a more user friendly piece that could be read by multiple audiences. It was also suggested that at the community meeting a one page fact sheet be prepared for the public.
- For the section of the report that discusses existing site conditions, EPA’s containment proposal, site end use, key site uncertainties, and Ecology concerns, the following points were made:
 - * This existing site conditions section will refer back to the Wyckoff Site Summary document.
 - * The site end use section will refer back to the Park’s Department webpage with information for future design of Pritchard Park.
 - * It was suggested that there be a short summary added to the section on Ecology’s concerns with the site over generational time that discusses the issues and health impacts of creosote.
 - * A brief section on why EPA’s thermal pilot study did not work should also be mentioned with reference to the Site Summary document and the Corps Assessment report on the Pilot Study.
- For the section of the report that discusses assumptions regarding EPA’s containment alternative, the following points were made:
 - * The assumptions made in the report will include the Ecology Team’s assumptions for what EPA’s containment remedy will ultimately include based on what we know at this point in time. The assumptions will be based on information pulled out of EPA documents.
 - * It is assumed that EPA’s containment remedy will ultimately include an enhanced containment wall, extended side walls on the southern edges of the existing

sheet pile wall, a surface cap, a complete upgrade of the well system, and pumping and treatment of groundwater. Howard Orlean said that EPA estimated that it would take \$25 million to finish this work. Previously, it was estimated to cost \$30 to \$35 million. Howard Orlean has a CH2M Hill report that documents what work is still to be completed for the containment remedy and the costs which he will send to Tim Nord.

- * This section of the report is important for doing the cost-benefit evaluation later in the document. It will provide the basis for comparison to a generational remedy approach.
- * There was a question on long term operation and maintenance (O&M) costing and what timeframe would be used. Hundreds of years or an in perpetuity timeframe will be used.
- * Uncertainties with regard to EPA's containment remedy will be discussed in this section.
- * Howard Orlean noted that the uncertainty should be added that unless an agreement is reached between EPA and Ecology on the site than work at the site will stop as of January 2011.
- For the section of the report that discusses the three generational remedy alternatives, the following points were made:
 - * For the discussion of the development process and expert involvement, it was suggested that there be a summary of the expert panelists selection process included. This section should show that the expert panel was drawn from a broad range of expertise. Community involvement should also be briefly discussed here with reference to both community meeting summaries.
 - * For the descriptions of the alternatives, potential uncertainties of each of the alternatives should be included.
 - * The comparison of the generational remedy alternatives will include a large matrix.
 - * For the conclusion of this section, it was discussed that it is important to call out that a generational remedy alternative can be implemented on this site and in fact there are more than one alternative that would work. This is an important statement for the community to hear. This message should also be reiterated in the executive summary.
- For the cost benefit evaluation section of the report, this will be a comparison of a generational remedy approach with EPA's containment remedy. It will not be a cost benefit comparison of the three generational remedy alternatives.
- For the recommended approach forward section, the following points were made:
 - * This section will not put forward a preferred generational remedy alternative. It will make clear that there are multiple ways to implement a generational remedy, but that it still needs to be determined what the optimal way to do it is. It should be clear to the community that they are still a stakeholder in the next steps.

- * The conclusion on key information gaps will list technical items that would be good to have completed for gaining additional information about the alternatives and the site. These items will not be completed prior to the release of this report in April.
- * Preparation of this section will come after the March community meeting. However, there will be talking points around this section to discuss at this community meeting.

Recommended Alternatives to Document and Cost

Kate Snider noted that when the generational remedy project was started, it was unclear if there were any generational alternatives available for the Wyckoff site to meet Ecology's generational remedy objectives, but the workshop has now shown that there are several potential options for moving forward. Three alternatives were recommended by the Ecology Team to document and cost in the alternatives report based on an Ecology Team meeting that was held the previous week. The attached Draft Proposed Remedial Alternatives to Document and Cost document was reviewed by Kate Snider. Key points and input brought up during the discussion of these alternatives are summarized below.

- As the second and third alternatives listed are developed in more detail, there will need to be more thinking about what permanent containment features may be necessary for these two alternatives.
- An alternative that included full stabilization of site soils was not included; however, the Ecology Team felt that Alternative 3b would bring forward the concept of stabilization.
- The Ecology Team thinks that all three of the alternatives would not require any long-term hydraulic control.
- Bioremediation could potentially be considered as a polishing step for the alternatives.
- Now that the alternatives have been selected, the Ecology Team will begin preparation of this alternatives report. The Ecology Team may be reaching out to the expert panelists here and there for assistance, but the expert panelists will not be playing a major effort in the report preparation.
- The time line for a draft of the document for steering committee review will likely be in the first half of April. During the next steering committee meeting on March 8, most of the material for the document will be in progress and will be discussed with the steering committee. It may be beneficial during this March meeting to work on what the comparative matrix in the document will look like.

Input from EPA on the East Beach

Howard Orlean was asked what EPA was planning for remediation of the East Beach. He said that he would be meeting with CH2M Hill in a few weeks to discuss the status of this area. Howard made the point that contaminated sediment (below 10 cm), free product, and

groundwater in the East Beach area, outside of the sheet pile wall, were considered to be part of OUs 2 and 4. This surprised the Ecology and Steering Committee members and it raised significant concern as previous EPA documents and discussions led to a contrary understanding. Howard will review the ROD and work with CH2M Hill to clarify the plan forward for the East Beach, and will communicate with Tim Nord.

Approach for March 24 Community Meeting

The purpose of the March 24 community meeting will be to gather community input on the alternatives moving forward and the cost-benefit analysis. It will provide the community with more comparative information regarding the generational remedy alternatives and EPA's containment remedy. It will not be a review of the draft report on the alternatives and it is not a formal comment meeting.

Pat Serie led the discussion with the steering committee on publicity for the community meeting. The following suggestions were made:

- Place information on the Ecology Generational Remedy Website
- Send out an e-mail notice to the project list serve
- Place posters around the community
- Place a display ad in the local media
- Place meeting date on the Bainbridge Islander's calendar
- Hold the meeting at IslandWood again
- Send a tweet to the generational remedy Twitter followers with the meeting date
- Place notices in the ferry terminal and on the ferry
- Hold sessions on ferries for commuters to ask representatives questions during their commute (have ferry make announcement)
- Place notice on local access cable
- Place a community insert in the local school newsletter
- Attend a Land Trust Board Meeting
- Contact the Weed Warriors group that have a presence at Pritchard Park and add them to the list serve.
- Place flyers at Pritchard Park

Pat Serie proposed a format for the community meeting which included the following:

- Open house from 5:30 to 6:30 pm.
- Presentation (approximately a half an hour) and group question and answer session (approximately 1 hour or until questions run out) from 6:30 to 8 pm.

- Open house (additional mingling) from 8 to 9 pm.

Input and suggestions on the format for the community meeting from the group included the following:

- Since one of the purposes of the meeting it to look for input on community inputs, the formal presentation should spend more time on how the alternatives would be implemented.
- For the presentation, there should be a brief piece on site end use by Perry and Libby. This should cover what the goals and themes were in the acquisition of the property (restoration of the land, restitution of human dignity) and what the future vision is for Pritchard Park. A brief overview of what is included in the 50 acres of the park should also be briefly discussed.
- The presentation should include a virtual tour of the site, including future design plans for Pritchard Park.
- The presentation should also contain more information about what the problem is at the site.
- It was also suggested that a tribal fisheries liaison/tribal elder give a short talk as part of the presentation at the community meeting.
- For the group question and answer session, it was suggested that we include topics that Ecology Team would specifically like feedback on from the community.

Pat will provide a community meeting plan to the steering committee prior to the next steering committee meeting. Further details for the community meeting will be discussion at the next meeting.

Libby Hudson will get Ecology on the schedule for the next City Council Workshop following the community meeting, so that the City Council can be briefed on the progress.

Wrap-up

The next Steering Committee meeting will be held on March 8 at the Bainbridge Island City Council Chambers from 10 am to 3 pm.

Attachments

- Handout: Preliminary Report Outline as of 1/29/10
- Handout: Proposed Remedial Alternatives to Document and Cost – Draft for Discussion, 1/29/10

**Preliminary Report Outline
Wyckoff Generational Remedy Evaluation
as of 1/29/10**

1. Executive Summary
2. Introduction – Generational Remedy Evaluation Overview
3. Site conditions, EPA containment proposal, Site End Use, Key Site Uncertainties, Ecology concerns
4. Assumptions re: EPA containment alternative (description, construction techniques, end results, schedule, resources, order of magnitude cost range) – Long term O&M and replacement assumptions and cost estimate
5. Generational Remedy Alternatives
 - a. Development process – expert involvement - overview of alternatives
 - b. Alternative 1 description (including description of construction techniques, end results, level of certainty, schedule, resources, order of magnitude capital cost range, O&M requirements and associated cost range)
 - c. Alternative 2 description
 - d. Alternative 3 description
 - e. Comparison of Generational Remedy Alternatives: what they accomplish, construction effort, predictability, time, power, cost, community issues
 - f. Conclusions regarding ability to meet Generational Remedy objectives
6. Cost-Benefit Evaluation
 - a. Compares the EPA containment remedy with its O&M to the Generational Remedy approach
7. Recommended Approach forward
 - a. Further evaluate responsibilities and funding for Generational Remedy
 - b. Fill key information gaps and hone in on Generational Remedy preferred alternative

Wyckoff Generational Remedy Evaluation Proposed Remedial Alternatives to Document and Cost DRAFT FOR DISCUSSION – 1/29/10

Below are the Ecology Team's recommendations for three remedial alternatives to document and cost in the Generational Remedy Evaluation Report.

These alternatives are put forward for discussion with the Steering Committee. We have chosen these alternatives to span the range of alternatives and technologies discussed in the Expert Workshop. All alternatives meet the Generational Remedy objectives and site end use objectives, including allowing the shoreline to be cut down to a natural beach profile if desired.

1. Full in-situ thermal treatment of the site (steam and electrical).
2. Full excavation of the site with ex-situ thermal treatment, and replacement of the treated soils back into the excavation.
3. Excavation of soil to 20-30 feet, with ex-situ thermal treatment, and replacement of the treated soils back into the excavation. Evaluation of two options for deeper soils:
 - a. In-situ thermal treatment
 - b. Stabilization

Permanent enhanced containment may be included for the last two alternatives and would include the following components:

- Upgradient barrier wall
- New perimeter wall
- Aquitard sealing
- Low permeability cap