

**From:** [Winslow, Frank \(ECY\)](#)  
**To:** [Jeff Kaspar](#); [Emerald J Erickson](#)  
**Cc:** [Kim Faust](#); [Marc Boettcher - MainStreet Property Group LLC \(marc@mspgroupllc.com\)](#)  
**Subject:** RE: Rose Hill Cleaners - XN0016 - Ecology Feedback on EMMP  
**Date:** Tuesday, November 28, 2023 11:24:05 AM

---

Hi Jeff,

Please find Ecology's **highlighted** responses below.

Thanks, Frank

---

**From:** Jeff Kaspar <jkaspar@farallonconsulting.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, November 28, 2023 9:39 AM  
**To:** Winslow, Frank (ECY) <fwin461@ECY.WA.GOV>; Emerald J Erickson <eerickson@farallonconsulting.com>  
**Cc:** Kim Faust <kfaust@mspgroupllc.com>; Marc Boettcher - MainStreet Property Group LLC (marc@mspgroupllc.com) <marc@mspgroupllc.com>  
**Subject:** RE: Rose Hill Cleaners - XN0016 - Ecology Feedback on EMMP

Frank,

There are some responses in green below for your use prior to meeting with you for some clarification.

Farallon would also like to schedule a call this week with you to discuss some of these comments further, particularly Comments 3 and 5. Please send over some days/times that work for you and Farallon can set up a Teams meeting.

Thank you



**Jeff Kaspar, LG, LHG**  
Principal Geologist  
**Direct** 425-295-0808, **Cell** 425-417-7238

---

**From:** Winslow, Frank (ECY) <[fwin461@ECY.WA.GOV](mailto:fwin461@ECY.WA.GOV)>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, November 22, 2023 12:55 PM  
**To:** Jeff Kaspar <[jkaspar@farallonconsulting.com](mailto:jkaspar@farallonconsulting.com)>; Emerald J Erickson <[eerickson@farallonconsulting.com](mailto:eerickson@farallonconsulting.com)>  
**Subject:** Rose Hill Cleaners - XN0016 - Ecology Feedback on EMMP

Hi Jeff and Emerald,

A few clarification questions and comments are provided as follows:

1. The EMMP indicated there was a change of approach from the Cleanup Action Plan based on the project schedule delays. The report states:

*The cleanup action approach for soil has been revised slightly from what was presented in the CAP. The Site will be redeveloped and excavated as indicated in the CAP. However, the initial phase of work that will occur in the first quarter of 2023 will target soil containing detectable concentrations of COCs above the laboratory practical quantitation limits (PQLs) followed by documenting the effects on groundwater cleanup.*

Is the change from the CAP that soils with results above PQLs will be removed rather than just soils above the cleanup levels? Please clarify and summarize any changes from the CAP. The soil with COC concentrations exceeding the MTCA cleanup levels will still be removed per the CAP approach. However, additional soil with COCs above the PQLs may also be removed in areas of future development to eliminate the need for dealing with contained-in soil issues. The soil excavation work is now planned for first quarter 2024 with prep work beginning in December 2023. Response acknowledged.

2. The EMMP indicates dewatering discharge will be routed to either City of Kirkland stormwater system or King County sanitary system, whichever is permitted first. The dewatering discharge is anticipated to contain site contaminants as high as 1,100, 200, 250 and 30 µg/L for PCE, TCE, cDCE, and VC, respectively (most recent results from MW-3). Surface water criteria for PCE, TCE, and VC are as low as 2.4, 0.3, and 0.02 µg/L, respectively (see Ecology's CLARC table for details). Our February 16, 2022 NFA Likely letter stated: "Note that any water discharges must be in full compliance with regulatory requirements."

Regardless of permit discharge acceptance criteria, some pretreatment of dewatering discharge (e.g. activated carbon or air stripping) appears to be warranted since dilution alone would not be an acceptable treatment for such discharge that would eventually enter a surface water body. Ecology recognizes that treatment of dewatering discharge can be challenging; however, hopefully the dewatering yield will be relatively low, based on the apparent low hydraulic conductivity of the shallow groundwater system. The groundwater discharge will be filtered for solids and run through granular activated carbon prior to being discharged. It currently appears that the sanitary sewer system is the most expedient discharge approach based on the review timeframes by the agencies issuing the permits. All discharges will be compliant with the permit(s) issued by the appropriate agency. Response acknowledged.

Please note that our February 16, 2022 NFA Likely letter stated: "In addition to monitoring well sampling, sampling of the pit water after completion of the excavation and dewatering work is necessary." Ecology Toxics Cleanup Program (TCP) considers the dewatering to be an integral part of the cleanup action proposed within the CAP, therefore, characterization of the water discharged from the excavation is warranted. The dewatering influent from the excavation areas and the effluent post-treatment will both be sampled periodically so there will be a good understanding of COC concentrations pre-and post-treatment. We just went through a similar situation with another dry cleaner cleanup and multifamily housing development with the same client, so all parties are

well-prepared for repeating the process on this site. Response acknowledged.

3. As mentioned in our February 16, 2022 NFA Likely letter, *“Ecology requests submittal of a confirmation sampling plan, including proposed confirmatory excavation sidewall and base soil sampling locations and groundwater monitoring locations”*. Prior to performing the excavation cleanup work please submit for Ecology’s review and comment a map(s) showing the locations and depths of anticipated confirmation soil sample locations and depths, and groundwater monitoring locations. The conceptual approach to the confirmation soil and groundwater sampling are included in the EMMP text. Farallon can create figures with estimated sampling areas using the lift maps if that is preferred but it will be essentially a lot of performance/confirmation locations along the perimeters and bases of the limits of excavation depicted on the various lift maps that will likely change once digging commences due to conditions in the field. We were not sure how productive putting specific locations would be but are willing to discuss the approach and depiction thereof further if you wish. There is a figure with the proposed monitoring well locations in Appendix A on sheet 3. Please provide feedback on those locations once you review. A draft plan map showing soil confirmation sampling locations and depths is requested to allow Ecology to provide feedback on the overall coverage. It is understood that such as map will be adjusted based on actual results during excavation work. With respect to proposed monitoring well locations, Ecology is requesting a site map showing existing and proposed groundwater sampling locations including showing COC concentrations in groundwater (most recent results at each location). Both of these maps can be provided independent of the EMMP.

4. Following excavation cleanup, please provide within the Cleanup Action Completion Report documentation of the source of clean fill. Sampling data may be warranted for such clean fill if a provenance demonstrating an uncontaminated source is not clear. Ecology recommends analysis of “clean fill” samples to be based on both due diligence information at the source of the fill soil, as well as for site contaminants at the Rosehill Cleaners site. There is currently a plan is to use soil from an unaffected area of the Site where a stormwater retention vault will be constructed and using that materials as backfill to support post-excavation monitoring well installation. This approach is cited in the EMMP. If additional fill is needed, our client has stated that it is acquired from licensed sources that provide clean structural fill so they will be able to document the source of backfill material.

Response acknowledged.

5. Ecology recommends the disposal of any soil removed from the site (both contaminated or uncontaminated ) be at permitted disposal facilities (we do not recommend reuse of any soils at locations that are not permitted disposal facilities). This is because there can be uncertainties with characterization of stockpiled or in situ uncontaminated soils and use at a disposal facility (such as for daily cover) provides for a greater level of protectiveness than unrestricted reuse of soils. The soil being excavated for the cleanup is being removed to a permitted disposal facility. We would like to discuss this issue further since ideally the cleanup will result in an unrestricted NFA. The statement here implies that there would be restrictions post-sale that could impact the parameters of the sale of the property, which is currently under way. The current owner/our client has elected not to develop the property themselves and will now be conducting the cleanup and selling the

property to another developer. If Ecology is going to stipulate this type of limitation in the final NFA letter then we would request some very specific parameters/boundaries that are based on the performance/confirmation soil sampling data collected during the cleanup activities, and the historical soil data. We would like to discuss this further with you. Ecology is not anticipating the need for institutional controls (environmental covenant) unless any contamination remains (in soil or groundwater) at the Site at concentrations above cleanup levels following cleanup. If all soil is cleaned up to below cleanup levels, then no soil restrictions would be needed. However, if groundwater cleanup level exceedances remain, there are several options that Ecology may consider. The first is to defer issue of NFA until groundwater is below cleanup levels at all points of compliance. The second is to record an environmental covenant for groundwater and have continued monitoring requirements following NFA issue. This second scenario would only be applicable if groundwater concentrations are sufficiently low and contamination is not migrating off property. A third option would be for Ecology to look at potential conditional points of compliance. Which scenario is appropriate is hard to assess at this time since they all depend on site specific sampling results for groundwater. Hopefully a case can be made following cleanup that no contamination remains above cleanup levels and an NFA with no institutional controls can be issued. Please note that for remaining groundwater contamination above cleanup levels, in addition to the groundwater pathway, Ecology would need to also compare groundwater results with groundwater vapor intrusion screening levels.

Let me know if you would like to have a Teams call to discuss this further.

6. Ecology is not requesting revision of the EMMP at this time. Please remove the for “Draft for Agency Review” watermark from the EMMP, add appropriate licensing stamp and signature(s), and resubmit a PDF for our file record. Farallon can do this following confirmation following reading through the comments herein. Response acknowledged.

Please let me know if you would like to schedule a Teams call to discuss any of the above.

Thanks, Frank

**Frank P. Winslow, LHG**

WA Expedited VCP Site Manager  
Department of Ecology – Toxics Cleanup Program  
1250 W. Alder Street, Union Gap, WA 98903  
(509) 424-0543 (cell)

[Frank.Winslow@ecy.wa.gov](mailto:Frank.Winslow@ecy.wa.gov)

---

**From:** Winslow, Frank (ECY)

**Sent:** Wednesday, November 22, 2023 10:13 AM

**To:** Jeff Kaspar <[jkaspar@farallonconsulting.com](mailto:jkaspar@farallonconsulting.com)>; Emerald J Erickson <[eerickson@farallonconsulting.com](mailto:eerickson@farallonconsulting.com)>

**Cc:** Kim Faust <[kfaust@mispgrouppllc.com](mailto:kfaust@mispgrouppllc.com)>; Marc Boettcher <[marc@mispgrouppllc.com](mailto:marc@mispgrouppllc.com)>

**Subject:** RE: Rose Hill Project - EVCP No. XN0016

Hi Jeff,

Thank you for submitting this document. Ecology anticipates getting our feedback to Farallon on this document within the next few business days.

Happy Thanksgiving to you as well.

Regards, Frank

**Frank P. Winslow, LHG**

WA Expedited VCP Site Manager  
Department of Ecology – Toxics Cleanup Program  
1250 W. Alder Street, Union Gap, WA 98903  
(509) 424-0543 (cell)

[Frank.Winslow@ecy.wa.gov](mailto:Frank.Winslow@ecy.wa.gov)

---

**From:** Jeff Kaspar <[jkaspar@farallonconsulting.com](mailto:jkaspar@farallonconsulting.com)>

**Sent:** Tuesday, November 21, 2023 5:26 PM

**To:** Winslow, Frank (ECY) <[fwin461@ECY.WA.GOV](mailto:fwin461@ECY.WA.GOV)>; Emerald J Erickson  
<[eerickson@farallonconsulting.com](mailto:eerickson@farallonconsulting.com)>

**Cc:** Kim Faust <[kfaust@mspgroupllc.com](mailto:kfaust@mspgroupllc.com)>; Marc Boettcher <[marc@mspgroupllc.com](mailto:marc@mspgroupllc.com)>

**Subject:** RE: Rose Hill Project - EVCP No. XN0016

Frank,

Emerald is out today and tomorrow so I am batting cleanup and getting the EMMP to you for review. Please let us know if you have any questions or would like to set up a meeting to discuss any elements of the plan.

Thank you





Jeff Kaspar, LG, LHG  
Principal Geologist  
Direct 425-295-0808, Cell 425-417-7238

---

**From:** Winslow, Frank (ECY) <[fwin461@ECY.WA.GOV](mailto:fwin461@ECY.WA.GOV)>  
**Sent:** Friday, November 17, 2023 1:39 PM  
**To:** Emerald J Erickson <[erickson@farallonconsulting.com](mailto:erickson@farallonconsulting.com)>  
**Cc:** Kim Faust <[kfaust@mspgroupllc.com](mailto:kfaust@mspgroupllc.com)>; Marc Boettcher <[marc@mspgroupllc.com](mailto:marc@mspgroupllc.com)>; Jeff Kaspar <[jkaspar@farallonconsulting.com](mailto:jkaspar@farallonconsulting.com)>  
**Subject:** RE: Rose Hill Project - EVCP No. XN0016

Hi Emerald,

Thanks for the update. I should be able to get you email feedback on your EMMP within the timeframe you indicated.

Regards, Frank

**Frank P. Winslow, LHG**

WA Expedited VCP Site Manager  
Department of Ecology – Toxics Cleanup Program  
1250 W. Alder Street, Union Gap, WA 98903  
(509) 424-0543 (cell)

[Frank.Winslow@ecy.wa.gov](mailto:Frank.Winslow@ecy.wa.gov)

---

**From:** Emerald J Erickson <[erickson@farallonconsulting.com](mailto:erickson@farallonconsulting.com)>  
**Sent:** Friday, November 17, 2023 12:15 PM  
**To:** Winslow, Frank (ECY) <[fwin461@ECY.WA.GOV](mailto:fwin461@ECY.WA.GOV)>  
**Cc:** Kim Faust <[kfaust@mspgroupllc.com](mailto:kfaust@mspgroupllc.com)>; Marc Boettcher <[marc@mspgroupllc.com](mailto:marc@mspgroupllc.com)>; Jeff Kaspar <[jkaspar@farallonconsulting.com](mailto:jkaspar@farallonconsulting.com)>  
**Subject:** Rose Hill Project - EVCP No. XN0016

Frank,

I am emailing to give you an update on the status of the Rose Hill project. We are currently now moving forward with cleanup excavation activities and have a plan to start on 12/11. I plan on submitting the EMMP with confirmation soil and groundwater sampling details by Monday next week 11/20, which is about 3 weeks prior to our start day of 12/11. I know this doesn't leave a ton of time for your review and approval of the EMMP. Things have been moving very fast on our end, so please let me know if you foresee any issues with this timing.

Thanks,  
Emerald



**Emerald Erickson-Mulanax, L.G., R.G.**  
**Senior Geologist**

Farallon Consulting

975 5<sup>th</sup> Ave NW

Issaquah, WA 98027

**Phone** 425-466-2271

**Web** [www.farallonconsulting.com](http://www.farallonconsulting.com)

**Email** [eerickson@farallonconsulting.com](mailto:eerickson@farallonconsulting.com)

This correspondence contains confidential or privileged information from Farallon Consulting and may be "Attorney-Client Privileged" and protected as "Work Product." The information contained herein is intended for the use of the individual or party named above. If you are not the intended recipient, note that any copying, distribution, disclosure, or use of the text and/or attached document(s) is strictly prohibited. If you have received this correspondence in error, please notify us immediately. Thank you.