

**Wyckoff Eagle Harbor  
Department of Ecology Generational Remedy Evaluation  
Steering Committee Meeting Summary – March 8, 2010**

**AGENDA**

- Welcome, Meeting Purpose and Agenda Overview
- Alternatives Report
  - \* Descriptions of the Alternatives
  - \* Comparison of the Alternatives
  - \* Report Review Schedule
- Preparations for March 24 Community Meeting
  - \* Community Meeting Plan
  - \* Publicity
  - \* Presentation Content and Participants
  - \* Action Items for Meeting and Material Preparation
- 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    | EnvirolIssues                          |

## 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.

### Alternatives Report

The alternatives report is currently being prepared by Floyd|Snider and Aspect Consulting. As report sections are prepared they are being submitted to Ecology for review.

Erin Breckel walked the steering committee through the draft section of the report that provides the descriptions of the three generational remedy alternatives. The three generational remedy alternatives include:

- Alternative 1 - In-situ thermal treatment alternative. This alternative would heat in place all contaminated soil and groundwater within the Former Process Area in order to mobilize and remove subsurface contamination.
- Alternative 2 - Excavation and ex-situ thermal treatment alternative. This alternative would excavate all contaminated soil within the Former Process Area and treat it on-site using heat to destroy the contaminants. Treated soils would be placed back into the excavated area.
- Alternative 3 with Treatment Options A and B - Shallow excavation and ex-situ thermal treatment with in-situ thermal treatment or stabilization at depth alternative. This alternative would excavate and thermally treat shallow contaminated soils on-site. Below the excavated area, the deeper contaminated soils would be treated in place using either in-situ thermal treatment, similar to the first alternative listed above, or by immobilizing the contamination through mixing of contaminated soils with cement and binding agents.

The three alternatives were described in detail, including each alternative's components, site restoration following remedy implementation, uncertainties, schedule, and potential community impacts. Costs for the three alternatives were not presented as these are still being developed.

Input received from the steering committee members on the alternative descriptions are summarized below:

- For Alternative 1 that requires a significant amount of electrical energy, the alternative assumes that energy can be obtained from the grid. It was asked what an on-site plant that could generate 2 megawatts (MW) of energy might look like. It was also suggested the high power usage be listed as a potential community impact for this alternative.
- For Alternative 1 and Alternative 3, Treatment Option A, include a short discussion on what site restoration work could occur while the site was cooling down following thermal treatment.

- For Alternatives 2 and 3 that include excavation and ex-situ thermal treatment, it would be good to clarify that excavation work will only occur during normal working hours. It would be good to double check that the timeframe given for excavation under the schedule for this alternative reflects the timeframe for day time excavation work and does not assume 24 hour operations. It is assumed that the thermal desorption units would be treating excavated soil 24 hours a day, 7 days a week.
- Other community impacts that should be listed under the alternatives includes:
  - \* Visual impacts of excavation work occurring at the site for Alternatives 2 and 3.
  - \* Traffic from trucking in cement required for soil stabilization work in Alternative 3, Treatment Option B.
- The community impacts discussion for Alternative 3 should be separated out into two sections, one for Treatment Option A and one for Treatment Option B.
- A figure that depicts site restoration elements following remedy implementation at the site would be helpful. Also, include in the text that site restoration is occurring to prepare the site for use as a park.

Erin next presented the format for comparison matrix table that would be filled in to compare the generational remedy alternatives. This table would be included in the section of the report that described the three generational remedy alternatives. The steering committee was asked to provide their thoughts on the categories that were used for the comparison. In general, everyone agreed with the categories listed, which included: site restoration, long-term requirements, schedule, cost, community impacts, uncertainties, risk reduction, and implementability and construction risks. The idea was also raised of using this same matrix format in the section of the report which compares the EPA containment remedy to a generational remedy (Chapter 5).

Additional input received from the steering committee regarding the alternatives report in general included the following:

- The time span for the containment remedy to be operated and maintained is a question that many of the steering committee members are hearing from the community. The community wants to know how long the creosote will be in the subsurface at the site if allowed to naturally degrade. It would be good to do a rough order-of-magnitude estimate of the containment remedy timeframe based on the creosote mass depletion over time. This will help the community get a sense of the long term commitment that is required.
- A diagram of the EPA containment remedy should be included in the report.
- Include a short discussion on the use of bioremediation to cleanup the site contamination.
- Include a reference in the text to the Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs) that were prepared following the last community meeting.

There was a brief discussion of the alternatives report review schedule. Currently, the plan is to provide a draft of the report to the steering committee to review by April 9. This would give the steering committee members time to review the material prior to the next steering committee

meeting to be held on April 19. This initial draft would not include the executive summary or the conclusions section of the report, as these sections of the report would be prepared later in the month of April. The steering committee would receive these last sections in late April to review. The steering committee members accepted this proposed schedule.

### **Preparations for March 24 Community Meeting**

Pat Serie reviewed the meeting plan for the March 24 community meeting. This upcoming community meeting is modeled largely on the last community meeting that was held by Ecology in January (in conjunction with the Expert Panel Workshop); however, the March meeting allows for more time for the community to ask questions and provide input regarding the generational remedy alternatives.

Pat discussed the range of tools that would be used to notify the community about the meeting, which included the following:

- Postcards and e-postcards
- Display ads
- Local access cable
- Posters
- Project web page
- Twitter
- Ecology blog
- Online announcements
- Media relations

The meeting will occur between 5:30 and 9 pm. Based on input from the steering committee, the following meeting agenda was agreed upon:

- 5:30 to 6:30 – Open house (stations set up to learn about the generational remedy alternatives and to ask questions)
- 6:30 to 7:30 – Presentation
  - \* 15 minutes -- Welcome and overview
  - \* 5 minutes – Agenda review and introductions
  - \* 10 minutes – Background on City role, Pritchard Park process, and tribal perspectives
  - \* 30 minutes – Presentation on the generational remedy alternatives and EPA's containment remedy
- 7:30 to 8:15 – Group question and answer period
- 8:15 to 9:00 – Open house (stations set up to learn about the generational remedy alternatives and to ask questions)

Tim Nord will give the welcome and overview portion,, Libby Hudson will speak to the City's role, Perry Barrett will present the material on Pritchard Park, Merle Hayes will give a brief statement regarding tribal perspectives, and Kate Snider will describe the alternatives. These

individuals will work directly with Pat in getting her the materials they plan to present in the PowerPoint presentation.

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

- It should be made clear to the community that this is still work in progress and that we are informing them of our progress to date. This is not a formal public review, but an opportunity to share with the community three possible viable alternatives that could be implemented at the site. This is also an opportunity to get input from the community as the process moves forward.
- Emphasize the fact that is a Superfund site located within the community.
- Clarify why Ecology is conducting this generational remedy evaluation in the welcome and overview portion of the presentation. There is a perception by some in the community that Ecology is leading the site cleanup. It is important to present a brief history of the site for those who are not familiar with it.
- In the presentation of the generational remedy alternatives there will be a short discussion on potential community concerns with these alternatives. The community should be asked for their input on these concerns to make sure these are complete.
- It would be helpful to generate a list of potential questions that might be received from the community and think through the answers to those questions prior to the meeting. The group was asked to send Pat any questions they thought the community might ask. Additionally, it would be good to cover questions that arose during the last community meeting. Potential topics that may come up include:
  - \* Power availability for the alternatives
  - \* Traffic and noise
- There should be a brief discussion on what Ecology's next steps are following this evaluation process. Inform the community that Ecology plans to have further discussions with EPA on the direction of the site following this evaluation process. These discussions with EPA will be based on information that was gathered during the evaluation process and on input that is received from the community.
- If a generational remedy alternative moves forward toward implementation it will require additional evaluation and analysis. There would be opportunities for further public input into the process during the evaluation.

### **Next Steps**

The April 19 Steering Committee meeting has been cancelled. This meeting will be rescheduled in late May, with the date and location still to be determined.