

Voluntary Cleanup Program

Washington State Department of Ecology Toxics Cleanup Program

TERRESTRIAL ECOLOGICAL EVALUATION FORM

Under the Model Toxics Control Act (MTCA), a terrestrial ecological evaluation is necessary if hazardous substances are released into the soils at a Site. In the event of such a release, you must take one of the following three actions as part of your investigation and cleanup of the Site:

- 1. Document an exclusion from further evaluation using the criteria in WAC 173-340-7491.
- 2. Conduct a simplified evaluation as set forth in WAC 173-340-7492.
- 3. Conduct a site-specific evaluation as set forth in WAC 173-340-7493.

When requesting a written opinion under the Voluntary Cleanup Program (VCP), you must complete this form and submit it to the Department of Ecology (Ecology). The form documents the type and results of your evaluation.

Completion of this form is not sufficient to document your evaluation. You still need to document your analysis and the basis for your conclusion in your cleanup plan or report.

If you have questions about how to conduct a terrestrial ecological evaluation, please contact the Ecology site manager assigned to your Site. For additional guidance, please refer to www.ecy.wa.gov/programs/tcp/policies/terrestrial/TEEHome.htm.

Step 1: IDENTIFY HAZARDOUS WASTE SITE		
Please identify below the hazardous waste site for which you are documenting an evaluation		
Facility/Site Name: Former Wolfkill Site		
Facility/Site Address: 205 West Fir Street, Mount Vernon, Washington 98273		
Facility/Site No: 4755451	VCP Project No.: NW 2353	

Step 2: IDENTIFY EVALUATOR						
Please identify below the person who conducted the evaluation and their contact information.						
Name: Meg Strong				Title: Senior Geologist		
Organization: AMEC Environment & Infrastructure, Inc						
Mailing address: 11810 North Creek Parkway N						
City: Bothell			te: WA	Zip code: 98011		
Phone: 425 368 1000	Fax: 425 368 1001		E-mail: meg.strong@amec.com			

В.	Simp	olifie	ed eval	uation.	
1.	Does	the	Site q	ualify for a simplified evaluation?	
		\boxtimes	Yes	If you answered "YES," then answer Question 2 below.	
		□ Unl	No or known	If you answered "NO" or "UNKNOWN," then skip to Step 3C of this form.	
2.	Did y	ou (condu	ct a simplified evaluation?	
		\boxtimes	Yes	If you answered "YES," then answer Question 3 below.	
			No	If you answered "NO," then skip to Step 3C of this form.	
3.	Was	furt	her ev	aluation necessary?	
			Yes	If you answered "YES," then answer Question 4 below.	
		\boxtimes	No	If you answered "NO," then answer Question 5 below.	
4.	If fu	rthe	r evalu	ation was necessary, what did you do?	
				ed the concentrations listed in Table 749-2 as cleanup levels. If so, then skip to ep 4 of this form.	
			Со	nducted a site-specific evaluation. If so, then skip to Step 3C of this form.	
5.	5. If no further evaluation was necessary, what was the reason? Check all that apply. Then skip to Step 4 of this form.				
	Ехро	osur	e Anal	ysis: WAC 173-340-7492(2)(a)	
		\boxtimes	Are	ea of soil contamination at the Site is not more than 350 square feet.	
		\boxtimes	Cu	rrent or planned land use makes wildlife exposure unlikely. Used Table 749-1.	
	Pathway Analysis: WAC 173-340-7492(2)(b)		rsis: WAC 173-340-7492(2)(b)		
		\boxtimes	No	potential exposure pathways from soil contamination to ecological receptors.	
	Contaminant Analysis: WAC 173-340-7492(2)(c)		nalysis: WAC 173-340-7492(2)(c)		
		\boxtimes	No co	o contaminant listed in Table 749-2 is, or will be, present in the upper 15 feet at ncentrations that exceed the values listed in Table 749-2.	
] alt lis	o contaminant listed in Table 749-2 is, or will be, present in the upper 6 feet (or ternative depth if approved by Ecology) at concentrations that exceed the values sted in Table 749-2, and institutional controls are used to manage remaining ontamination.	
] cc	o contaminant listed in Table 749-2 is, or will be, present in the upper 15 feet at encentrations likely to be toxic or have the potential to bioaccumulate as determined sing Ecology-approved bioassays.	
] al [.] th	o contaminant listed in Table 749-2 is, or will be, present in the upper 6 feet (or ternative depth if approved by Ecology) at concentrations likely to be toxic or have e potential to bioaccumulate as determined using Ecology-approved bioassays, and stitutional controls are used to manage remaining contamination.	

C.	the problem, as	evaluation. A site-specific evaluation process consists of two parts: (1) formulating and (2) selecting the methods for addressing the identified problem. Both steps ation with and approval by Ecology. See WAC 173-340-7493(1)(c).
1.	Was there a p	roblem? See WAC 173-340-7493(2).
	☐ Yes	If you answered "YES," then answer Question 2 below.
	☐ No	If you answered " NO ," then identify the reason here and then skip to Question 5 below:
		No issues were identified during the problem formulation step.
		While issues were identified, those issues were addressed by the cleanup actions for protecting human health.
2.	What did you	do to resolve the problem? See WAC 173-340-7493(3).
		sed the concentrations listed in Table 749-3 as cleanup levels. <i>If so, then skip to uestion 5 below.</i>
		sed one or more of the methods listed in WAC 173-340-7493(3) to evaluate and ddress the identified problem. <i>If so, then answer Questions 3 and 4 below.</i>
3.	If you conduc	ted further site-specific evaluations, what methods did you use? apply. See WAC 173-340-7493(3).
	☐ Li	terature surveys.
	□ s	oil bioassays.
	□ W	/ildlife exposure model.
	□ В	iomarkers.
	☐ S	ite-specific field studies.
	□ v	/eight of evidence.
		ther methods approved by Ecology. If so, please specify:
4	. What was the	result of those evaluations?
	⊠ C	confirmed there was no problem.
		confirmed there was a problem and established site-specific cleanup levels.
5	. Have you alr problem reso	eady obtained Ecology's approval of both your problem formulation and blution steps?
	☐ Yes	If so, please identify the Ecology staff who approved those steps:
	⊠ No	

MTCA Cleanup Regulation

173-340-900

Table 749-1 Simplified Terrestrial Ecological Evaluation – Exposure Analysis Procedure under WAC 173-340-7492(2)(a)(ii).^a

Estimate the area of contiguous (connected) undevelo		
land on the site or within 500 feet of any area of the		
to the nearest 1/2 acre (1/4 acre if the area is less than	1 U.5	
acre). "Undeveloped land" means land that is not co	vered	
by existing buildings, roads, paved areas or other bar	riers	
that will prevent wildlife from feeding on plants, ear	th-	
worms, insects or other food in or on the soil.		
1) From the table below, find the number of		
points corresponding to the area and enter this		
number in the box to the right.		
Area (acres) Points		
0.25 or less 4		
0.25 01 1635		
i	_	
1.0 6	+	
1.5 7	1	
2.0 8		
2.5 9		
3.0 10	•	
3.5 11		
4.0 or more 12		
2) Is this an industrial or commercial property?		
See WAC 173-340-7490(3)(c).	3	
If yes, enter a score of 3 in the box to the right. If		
no, enter a score of 1.		
3) Enter a score in the box to the right for the		
habitat quality of the site, using the rating system	3	
shown below ^b . (High = 1, Intermediate = 2,		
Low = 3)		
4) Is the undeveloped land likely to attract	2	
wildlife? If yes, enter a score of 1 in the box to		
the right. If no, enter a score of 2. See footnote c.		
5) Are there any of the following soil		
contaminants present:		
Chlorinated dioxins/furans, PCB mixtures, DDT,		
DDE, DDD, aldrin, chlordane, dieldrin,	١,	
endosulfan, endrin, heptachlor, benzene	1 (
hexachloride, toxaphene, hexachlorobenzene,	•	
pentachlorophenol, pentachlorobenzene? If yes,		
enter a score of 1 in the box to the right. If no,		
enter a score of 4.		
6) Add the numbers in the boxes on lines 2		
through 5 and enter this number in the box to the	1 a	
right. If this number is larger than the number in		
the box on line 1, the simplified terrestrial	1	

ecological evaluation may be ended under WAC

Footnotes:

a It is expected that this habitat evaluation will be undertaken by an experienced field biologist. If this is not the case, enter a conservative score (1) for questions 3 and 4.

b Habitat rating system. Rate the quality of the habitat as high, intermediate or low based on your professional judgment as a field biologist. The following are suggested factors to consider in making this evaluation:

Low: Early successional vegetative stands; vegetation predominantly noxious, nonnative, exotic plant species or weeds. Areas severely disturbed by human activity, including intensively cultivated croplands. Areas isolated from other habitat used by wildlife.

High: Area is ecologically significant for one or more of the following reasons: Late-successional native plant communities present; relatively high species diversity; used by an uncommon or rare species; priority habitat (as defined by the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife); part of a larger area of habitat where size or fragmentation may be important for the retention of some species.

Intermediate: Area does not rate as either high or low.

c Indicate "yes" if the area attracts wildlife or is likely to do so.

Examples: Birds frequently visit the area to feed; evidence of high use by mammals (tracks, scat, etc.); habitat "island" in an industrial area; unusual features of an area that make it important for feeding animals; heavy use during seasonal migrations.

977 therefore the simplified terrestrial ecological evaluation is ended. Mothers.

173-340-7492 (2)(a)(ii).