

Includes Cleanup Action Plan
(Exhibit C)

IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON
FOR PIERCE COUNTY

STATE OF WASHINGTON,
DEPARTMENT OF ECOLOGY,

Plaintiff,

v.

PORT OF TACOMA,

Defendant.

No. ~~93-2-08684-4~~
93-2-08693-3
ORDER ENTERING
CONSENT DECREE

Having reviewed the Consent Decree signed by the parties to this matter, the Joint Motion for Entry of the Consent Decree, the Affidavit of Jo Messex Casey, and the file herein, it is hereby

ORDERED AND ADJUDGED that the Consent Decree in this matter is ENTERED and that the Court shall retain jurisdiction over the Consent Decree to enforce its terms.

Signed this 27 day of August, 1993.

Superior Court Judge
[Signature]

U4:tacoma.ord

FILED
IN COUNTY CLERK'S OFFICE

AUG 27 1993

PIERCE COUNTY/ WASHINGTON
TED RUTT COUNTY CLERK
BY _____ DEPUTY

IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON
FOR PIERCE COUNTY

STATE OF WASHINGTON
DEPARTMENT OF ECOLOGY,

v.

PORT OF TACOMA

~~83-2-08684-4~~
No. 93-2-08693-3

CONSENT DECREE

Table of Contents

	<u>Page</u>
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. JURISDICTION	3
III. PARTIES BOUND	4
IV. DEFINITIONS	4
V. STATEMENT OF FACTS	5
VI. WORK TO BE PERFORMED	8
VII. DESIGNATED PROJECT COORDINATORS	10
VIII. PERFORMANCE	11
IX. ACCESS	11
X. SAMPLING, DATA REPORTING, AND AVAILABILITY	12
XI. PROGRESS REPORTS	13
XII. RETENTION OF RECORDS	14
XIII. TRANSFER OF INTEREST IN PROPERTY	14
XIV. RESOLUTION OF DISPUTES	15
XV. AMENDMENT OF CONSENT DECREE	16
XVI. EXTENSION OF SCHEDULE	17
XVII. ENDANGERMENT	19
XVIII. OTHER ACTIONS	20
XIX. INDEMNIFICATION	22
XX. COMPLIANCE WITH APPLICABLE LAWS	22
XXI. REMEDIAL AND INVESTIGATIVE COSTS	23
XXII. IMPLEMENTATION OF REMEDIAL ACTION	24
XXIII. FIVE YEAR REVIEW	24
XXIV. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION	25
XXV. DURATION OF DECREE	26
XXVI. CLAIMS AGAINST THE STATE	26

1	XXVII.	COVENANT NOT TO SUE	27
	XXVIII.	CONTRIBUTION PROTECTION	29
2	XXIX.	EFFECTIVE DATE	29
	XXX.	PUBLIC NOTICE AND WITHDRAWAL OF CONSENT	29
3		Exhibit A - Site Diagram	
		Exhibit B - Legal Description	
4		Exhibit C - Cleanup Action Plan	
		Exhibit D - Scope of Work	
5		Exhibit E - Restrictive Covenant	
6		Exhibit F - Map and Legal Description of Buffer Area	
		and excerpt of Sitcum Waterway Federal	
		Consent Decree	
7			
8			
9			
10			
11			
12			
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			

1 I. INTRODUCTION

2 A. In entering into this Consent Decree (Decree), the
3 mutual objective of the Washington State Department of Ecology
4 (Ecology) and The Port of Tacoma (Defendant) is to provide for
5 remedial action at property located at 1602 Marine View Drive,
6 Tacoma, WA (the "Site") where there has been a release or
7 threatened release of hazardous substances. (Exhibits A and B)

8 This Decree requires the Defendant to undertake the following
9 remedial action(s) which are discussed in more detail in Section
10 VI:

- 11 (1) The Defendant shall perform the remedial actions
12 specified in detail in the Cleanup Action Plan
13 (Exhibit C) and the Scope of Work (Exhibit D). These
14 exhibits are incorporated by reference and are
15 integral and enforceable parts of this Decree.
- 16 (2) Record with the property deed the attached Declaration
17 of Restrictive Covenant (Exhibit E) limiting the Site
18 to industrial uses and ensuring that future
19 development is consistent with the strength and
20 permeability limitations of the Site.

21 Ecology has determined that these actions are necessary to
22 protect public health and the environment.

23 B. The Complaint in this action is being filed
24 simultaneously with this Decree. An answer has not been filed,
25 and there has not been a trial on any issue of fact or law in
26 this case. However, the parties wish to resolve the issues

1 raised by Ecology's complaint. By entering into this Decree,
2 the Defendant neither admits nor denies liability under federal
3 or state law. In addition, the parties agree that settlement of
4 these matters without litigation is reasonable and in the public
5 interest and that entry of this Decree is the most appropriate
6 means of resolving these matters.

7 C. In signing this Decree, the Defendant agrees to its
8 entry and agrees to be bound by its terms.

9 D. By entering into this Decree, the parties do not
10 intend to discharge nonsettling parties from any liability they
11 may have with respect to matters alleged in the complaint. The
12 parties retain the right to seek reimbursement, in whole or in
13 part, from any liable persons for sums expended under this
14 Decree.

15 E. This Decree shall not be construed as proof of
16 liability or responsibility for any releases of hazardous
17 substances or cost for remedial action nor an admission of any
18 facts; provided, however, that the Defendant shall not challenge
19 the jurisdiction of Ecology in any proceeding to enforce this
20 Decree.

21 F. The Court is fully advised of the reasons for entry of
22 this Decree, and good cause having been shown: IT IS HEREBY
23 ORDERED, ADJUDGED, AND DECREED AS FOLLOWS:
24
25
26

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
0
1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
0
1
2
3
4
5
6

2
3
4

5
6
7
8
9
0
1

12
13
14
15
16
17

18
19
20
21
22

23
24
25

1 F. Defendant has agreed to undertake the actions
2 specified in this Decree and consents to the entry of this
3 Decree under the MTCA.

4 III. PARTIES BOUND

5 This Decree shall apply to and be binding upon the
6 signatories to this Decree (parties), their successors and
7 assigns. The undersigned representative of each party hereby
8 certifies that he or she is fully authorized to enter into this
9 Decree and to execute and legally bind such party to comply with
10 the Decree. Defendant agrees to undertake all actions required
11 by the terms and conditions of this Decree and not to contest
12 state jurisdiction regarding this Decree. No change in
13 ownership or corporate status shall alter the responsibility of
14 the Defendant under this Decree. Defendant shall provide a copy
15 of this Decree to all agents, contractors and subcontractors
16 retained to perform work required by this Decree and shall
17 ensure that all work undertaken by such contractors and
18 subcontractors will be in compliance with this Decree.

19 IV. DEFINITIONS

20 Except for as specified herein, all definitions in WAC 173-340-
21 200 apply to the terms in this Decree.

22 A. Site: The Site, previously known as the Wasser &
23 Winters site, is located at 1602 Marine View Drive in Tacoma,
24 Washington. The Port of Tacoma owns approximately 13.54 acres,
25 of which approximately 11.4 upland acres is "the Site" subject
26 to this Decree. The Site is further described in Exhibit A, a

1 detailed site diagram, and Exhibit B, a legal description,
2 attached and hereby incorporated as part of this Decree.

3 B. Parties: Refers to the Washington State Department of
4 Ecology and the Port of Tacoma.

5 C. Defendant: Refers to the Port of Tacoma.

6 D. Consent Decree or Decree: Refers to this Consent
7 Decree and each of the exhibits to the Decree. All exhibits are
8 integral and enforceable parts of this Consent Decree. The
9 terms "Consent Decree" or "Decree" shall include all exhibits to
10 the Consent Decree.

11 V. STATEMENT OF FACTS

12 Ecology makes the following finding of facts without any
13 express or implied admissions by Defendant.

14 1. Wasser & Winters Company leased the property for log
15 storage and sorting from June 1, 1972 through November 1984.
16 The property is currently not leased.

17 2. Slag, a product of the ore smelting process produced
18 at the ASARCO smelting facility in Tacoma (Ruston), Washington,
19 was placed on the Site as ballast in the 1970s and early 1980s.

20 3. Ecology conducted a surface water investigation at the
21 Site between November 1983 and June 1984. The study found
22 elevated levels of several metals in surface water runoff from
23 the Site which discharged to the Hylebos Waterway. Metals
24 included arsenic, copper, lead, and zinc which were found at
25 concentrations as high as 21,600, 10,160, 5,900, and 11,930 ppb,
26 respectively. Federal and state marine acute ambient water

1 quality criteria for arsenic, copper, lead and zinc are 69, 3,
2 140, and 95 ppb, respectively. The study concluded that the
3 elevated levels of arsenic, copper, lead and zinc in runoff from
4 the log sort yards studied were from the slag present on the
5 yards. (Norton, D. and Johnson, A. 1985. Completion Report on
6 WOIS Project 1 for the Commencement Bay Nearshore/Tideflats
7 Remedial Investigation; Assessment of Log Sort Yards as Sources
8 of Metals to Commencement Bay Waterways. Washington Department
9 of Ecology Memorandum, Olympia, Washington.)

10 4. In March, 1987 Ecology issued a Consent Order under,
11 ch. 90.48 RCW, to the Port to perform a preliminary Site
12 Characterization and Focused Feasibility Study to further
13 investigate the occurrences and potential control of metals in
14 Site stormwater runoff. The Port's contractor, Sweet-Edwards &
15 Associates, Inc., reported that surface water runoff contained
16 elevated concentrations of arsenic, copper, lead and zinc.

17 5. On October 7, 1991, Ecology issued an Agreed Order
18 under ch. 70.105D RCW to complete a Remedial
19 Investigation/Feasibility Study (RI/FS). The Port's contractor
20 for the RI/FS, Kennedy/Jenks Consultants, Inc., reported that
21 surface soil samples taken from 39 locations across the Site
22 contained concentrations of arsenic, copper, lead, and zinc of
23 up to 3,250 mg/kg, 3,270 mg/kg, 1,870 mg/kg, and 3,340 mg/kg,
24 respectively. The MTCA Method A Industrial soil standards for
25 arsenic and lead are 200 mg/kg, and 1000 mg/kg, respectively.
26 Sampling of 30 soil borings indicated that samples taken from 2

1 feet below ground surface generally contain 1 to 3 orders of
2 magnitude lower metals concentrations than the corresponding
3 ground surface soil samples; in no case did any of the samples
4 from deeper than 2.5 feet exceed 20 mg/kg arsenic (MTCA Method A
5 Residential Soil Cleanup Standard). Based on the investigatory
6 work conducted during the RI/FS process, it is estimated that
7 there are approximately 18,500 cubic yards of mixed soil, bark,
8 woodwaste, and slag above the Method A Industrial Cleanup
9 Standards for arsenic (200 mg/kg) present at the Site.

10 6. Three rounds of groundwater samples were taken from
11 eleven monitoring wells during the RI process. Concentrations
12 of metals were generally low and do not indicate that
13 groundwater has been a significant pathway of contaminant
14 migration.

15 7. Monitoring of surface water runoff conducted during
16 the RI in 1992 indicates levels of arsenic, copper, lead, and
17 zinc of up to 340, 282, 52, and 695, ug/l, respectively, were
18 detected in stormwater discharge leaving the Site.

19 8. The Site is located within the boundaries of the
20 federal Commencement Bay Nearshore/Tideflats (CB/NT) Superfund
21 Site, and has been identified as a source of contamination to
22 the Head of Hylebos Problem Area.

23 9. The Port of Tacoma has negotiated a proposed federal
24 consent decree (Federal Decree) for the Commencement Bay
25 Nearshore/Tideflats Superfund Site; Sitcum Waterway Problem
26 Area. This Federal Decree is also signed by the State of

1 Washington in its capacity as a natural resource trustee. The
2 Federal Decree settles the Natural Resource Damage (NRD)
3 liability for all land owned, operated, or managed by the Port,
4 including the site subject to this Decree. The NRD settlement
5 requires the Port to place institutional controls upon the site
6 subject to this Consent Decree (see Exhibit F-7).

7 10. Petroleum hydrocarbons have been identified on a
8 limited area in the southern portion of the Site. Defendant is
9 addressing these issues as an independent cleanup action.

10 VI. WORK TO BE PERFORMED

11 This Decree contains a program designed to protect public
12 health, welfare and the environment from the known release, or
13 threatened release, of hazardous substances or contaminants at,
14 on, or from the Site.

15 A. The Defendant shall perform the remedial actions
16 specified in detail in the Cleanup Action Plan (Exhibit C) and
17 the Scope of Work (Exhibit D). These exhibits are incorporated
18 by reference and are integral and enforceable parts of this
19 Decree. A summary of the work program to be performed is as
20 follows:

- 21 (1) Prepare the subgrade at the Site by grading, importing
22 fill, and consolidating and pulverizing bark and
23 woodwaste material present.
- 24 (2) Cap the Site with asphaltic concrete according to the
25 plans specified in the Ecology-approved Remedial
26 Design Report.

- 1 (3) Install a storm water collection system as described
2 in the Ecology-approved Remedial Design Report.
- 3 (4) Inspect and maintain the cap and storm water
4 collection system in accordance with the Ecology-
5 approved Operation and Maintenance Plan.
- 6 (5) Monitor surface water and groundwater and conduct soil
7 verification sampling in accordance with the Ecology-
8 approved Monitoring Plan.
- 9 (6) Defendant agrees not to perform any remedial actions
10 outside the scope of this decree except those
11 described in Section V, ¶ 10, unless the parties agree
12 to amend the scope of work to cover these actions.
13 All work conducted under this decree shall be done in
14 accordance with ch. 173-340 WAC unless otherwise
15 provided herein.
- 16 (7) Within 20 days of completion of paving, the Defendant
17 shall record a restrictive covenant (Exhibit E) in the
18 title records to that portion of the property
19 underlying the Site over which Defendant holds fee
20 title. The restrictive covenant shall limit the Site
21 to industrial uses, excepting that portion which is to
22 be set aside for a buffer area pursuant to the Consent
23 Decree reference in V.9 above, and ensure that future
24 development is consistent with the strength and
25 permeability limitations of the Site. The Defendant
26 shall forward a filed copy of the restrictive covenant

1 to Ecology within 10 days of receiving a filed copy
2 from the Pierce County Auditor.

3 VII. DESIGNATED PROJECT COORDINATORS

4 The project coordinator for Ecology is:

5 Garin Schrieve
6 7272 Cleanwater Lane, LU-11
Olympia, Washington 98504-6811

7 The project coordinator for the Defendant is:

8 Suzanne Dudziak
9 Port of Tacoma
P. O. Box 1837
10 Tacoma, WA 98401-1837

11 Each project coordinator shall be responsible for
12 overseeing the implementation of this Decree. The Ecology
13 project coordinator will be Ecology's designated representative
14 at the Site. To the maximum extent possible, communications
15 between Ecology and the Defendant and all documents, including
16 reports, approvals, and other correspondence concerning the
17 activities performed pursuant to the terms and conditions of
18 this Decree, shall be directed through the project coordinator.
19 The project coordinators may designate, in writing, working
20 level staff contacts for all or portions of the implementation
21 of the remedial work required by this Decree. The project
22 coordinators may agree to minor modifications to the work to be
23 performed without formal amendments to this Decree. Minor
24 modifications will be documented in writing by Ecology.

25 Any party may change its respective project coordinator.
26 Written notification shall be given to the other parties at
least ten (10) calendar days prior to the change.

1 VIII. PERFORMANCE

2 All work performed pursuant to this Decree shall be under
3 the direction and supervision, as necessary, of a professional
4 engineer or hydrogeologist, or equivalent, with experience and
5 expertise in hazardous waste site investigation and cleanup.

6 Any construction work must be under the supervision of a
7 professional engineer. Defendant shall notify Ecology in
8 writing as to the identity of such engineer(s) or
9 hydrogeologist(s), or others and of any contractors and
10 subcontractors to be used in carrying out the terms of this
11 Decree, in advance of their involvement at the Site.

12 IX. ACCESS

13 Ecology or any Ecology authorized representatives shall
14 have the authority to enter and freely move about all property
15 at the Site at all reasonable times for the purposes of, inter
16 alia: inspecting records, operation logs, and contracts related
17 to the work being performed pursuant to this Decree; reviewing
18 Defendant's progress in carrying out the terms of this Decree;
19 conducting such tests or collecting such samples as Ecology may
20 deem necessary; using a camera, sound recording, or other
21 documentary type equipment to record work done pursuant to this
22 Decree; and verifying the data submitted to Ecology by the
23 Defendant. Upon request, Ecology shall split any samples taken
24 during an inspection unless the Defendant fails to make
25 available a representative for the purpose of splitting samples.

26

1 All parties with access to the Site pursuant to this paragraph
2 shall comply with approved health and safety plans.

3 X. SAMPLING, DATA REPORTING, AND AVAILABILITY

4 With respect to the implementation of this Decree,
5 Defendant shall make the results of all sampling, laboratory
6 reports, and/or test results generated by it, or on its behalf
7 available to Ecology and shall submit these results in
8 accordance with Section XI of this Decree.

9 If requested by Ecology, Defendant shall allow split or
10 duplicate samples to be taken by Ecology and/or its authorized
11 representatives of any samples collected by Defendant pursuant
12 to the implementation of this Decree. Unless otherwise agreed
13 to by the parties, Defendant shall notify Ecology seven (7)
14 calendar days in advance of any sample collection or work
15 activity at the Site. Ecology shall, upon request, allow split
16 or duplicate samples to be taken by Defendant or authorized
17 representatives of any samples collected by Ecology pursuant to
18 the implementation of this Decree provided it does not interfere
19 with the Department's sampling. Without limitation on Ecology's
20 rights under Section IX, Ecology shall endeavor to notify
21 Defendant prior to any sample collection activity.

22
23
24
25
26

1 XI. PROGRESS REPORTS

2 Defendant shall submit to Ecology written monthly progress
3 reports until construction is complete. The progress reports
4 shall describe the actions taken during the previous month to
5 implement the requirements of this Decree. The progress report
6 shall include the following:

7 A. A list of on-site activities related to this Decree
8 that have taken place during the month;

9 B. Detailed description of any deviations from required
10 tasks not otherwise documented in project plans or amendment
11 requests;

12 C. Description of all deviations from the schedule
13 (Exhibit D) during the current month and any planned deviations
14 in the upcoming months;

15 D. For any deviations in schedule, a plan for recovering
16 lost time and maintaining compliance with the schedule;

17 E. All raw data (including laboratory analysis) received
18 by the Defendant during the past month and an identification of
19 the source of the sample; and

20 F. A list of deliverables for the upcoming month if
21 different from the schedule.

22 All progress reports shall be submitted by the tenth day of
23 the month in which they are due after the effective date of this
24 Decree. Unless otherwise specified, progress reports and any
25 other documents submitted pursuant to this Decree shall be sent
26

1 by certified mail, return receipt requested, to Ecology's
2 project coordinator.

3 XII. RETENTION OF RECORDS

4 Defendant shall preserve, during the pendency of this
5 Decree and for ten (10) years from the date this Decree is no
6 longer in effect as provided in Section XXV, all records,
7 reports, documents, and underlying data in its possession
8 relevant to the implementation of this Decree and shall insert
9 in contracts with project contractors and subcontractors a
10 similar record retention requirement. Upon request of Ecology,
11 Defendant shall make all non-archived records available to
12 Ecology and allow access for review. All archived records shall
13 be made available to Ecology within a reasonable period of time.

14 XIII. TRANSFER OF INTEREST IN PROPERTY

15 No voluntary or involuntary conveyance or relinquishment of
16 title, easement, leasehold, or other interest in any portion of
17 the Site not previously described in this Consent Decree shall
18 be consummated without provision for continued operation and
19 maintenance of any containment system, stormwater collection
20 system, and monitoring system installed or implemented pursuant
21 to this Decree.

22 Prior to transfer of any legal or equitable interest in all
23 or any portion of the property not previously described in this
24 Consent Decree, and during the effective period of this Decree,
25 Defendant shall serve a copy of this Decree upon any prospective
26 purchaser, lessee, transferee, assignee, or other successor in

1 interest of the property; and, at least twenty (20) days prior
2 to any transfer, Defendant shall notify Ecology of said
3 contemplated transfer.

4 XIV. RESOLUTION OF DISPUTES

5 A. In the event a dispute arises as to an approval,
6 disapproval, proposed modification or other decision or action
7 by Ecology's project coordinator, the parties shall utilize the
8 dispute resolution procedure set forth below.

9 (1) Upon receipt of the Ecology project coordinator's
10 decision, the Defendant shall have fourteen (14) calendar days
11 within which to notify Ecology's project coordinator of its
12 objection to the decision.

13 (2) The parties' project coordinators shall then confer in
14 an effort to resolve the dispute. If the project coordinators
15 cannot resolve the dispute within fourteen (14) calendar days,
16 Ecology's project coordinator shall issue a written decision.

17 (3) Defendant may then request Ecology management review
18 of the decision. This request shall be submitted in writing to
19 the Toxics Cleanup Program Manager within seven (7) calendar
20 days of receipt of Ecology's project coordinator's decision.

21 (4) Ecology's Toxics Cleanup Program Manager shall conduct
22 a review of the dispute and shall issue a written decision
23 regarding the dispute within thirty (30) calendar days of the
24 Defendant's request for review. The Program Manager's decision
25 shall be Ecology's final decision on the disputed matter.
26

1 B. If Ecology's final written decision is unacceptable to
2 Defendant, Defendant has the right to submit the dispute to the
3 Court for resolution within thirty (30) calendar days of receipt
4 of Ecology's decision. The parties agree that one judge should
5 retain jurisdiction over this case and shall, as necessary,
6 resolve any dispute arising under this Decree. In the event
7 Defendant presents an issue to the Court for review, the Court
8 shall review the action or decision of Ecology on the basis of
9 whether such action or decision was arbitrary and capricious and
10 render a decision based on such standard of review.

11 C. The parties agree to only utilize the dispute
12 resolution process in good faith and agree to expedite, to the
13 extent possible, the dispute resolution process whenever it is
14 used. Where either party utilizes the dispute resolution
15 process in bad faith or for purposes of delay, the other party
16 may seek sanctions.

17 Implementation of these dispute resolution procedures shall
18 not provide a basis for delay of any activities required in this
19 Decree, unless Ecology agrees in writing to a schedule extension
20 or the Court so orders.

21 XV. AMENDMENT OF CONSENT DECREE

22 This Decree may only be amended by a written stipulation
23 among the parties to this Decree that is entered by the Court or
24 by order of the Court. Such amendment shall become effective
25 upon entry by the Court. Agreement to amend shall not be
26 unreasonably withheld by any party to the Decree.

1 Defendant shall submit any request for an amendment to
2 Ecology for approval. Ecology shall indicate its approval or
3 disapproval in a timely manner after the request for amendment
4 is received. If the amendment to the Decree is substantial,
5 Ecology will provide public notice and opportunity for comment.
6 Reasons for the disapproval shall be stated in writing. If
7 Ecology does not agree to any proposed amendment, the
8 disagreement may be addressed through the dispute resolution
9 procedures described in Section XIV of this Decree.

10 XVI. EXTENSION OF SCHEDULE

11 A. An extension of schedule shall be granted only when a
12 request for an extension is submitted in a timely fashion,
13 generally at least 30 days prior to expiration of the deadline
14 for which the extension is requested, and good cause exists for
15 granting the extension. All extensions shall be requested in
16 writing. The request shall specify the reason(s) the extension
17 is needed.

18 An extension shall only be granted for such period of time
19 as Ecology determines is reasonable under the circumstances. A
20 requested extension shall not be effective until approved by
21 Ecology or the Court. Ecology shall act upon any written
22 request for extension in a timely fashion. It shall not be
23 necessary to formally amend this Decree pursuant to Section XV
24 when a schedule extension is granted.

25 B. The burden shall be on the Defendant to demonstrate to
26 the satisfaction of Ecology that the request for such extension

1 has been submitted in a timely fashion and that good cause
2 exists for granting the extension. Good cause includes, but is
3 not limited to, the following:

- 4 (1) Circumstances beyond the reasonable control and
5 despite the due diligence of Defendant including
6 delays caused by unrelated third parties or Ecology,
7 such as (but not limited to) delays by Ecology in
8 reviewing, approving, or modifying documents submitted
9 by Defendant; or
- 10 (2) Acts of God, including fire, flood, blizzard, extreme
11 temperatures, storm, or other unavoidable casualty; or
- 12 (3) Endangerment as described in Section XVII.
- 13 (4) Agreement by both parties to the extension.

14 However, neither increased costs of performance of the
15 terms of the Decree nor changed economic circumstances shall be
16 considered circumstances beyond the reasonable control of
17 Defendant.

18 C. Ecology may extend the schedule for a period not to
19 exceed ninety (90) days, except where a longer extension is
20 needed as a result of:

- 21 (1) Delays in the issuance of a necessary permit which was
22 applied for in a timely manner; or
 - 23 (2) Other circumstances deemed exceptional or
24 extraordinary by Ecology; or
 - 25 (3) Endangerment as described in Section XVI.
- 26

1 Ecology shall give Defendant written notification in a
2 timely fashion of any extensions granted pursuant to this
3 Decree.

4 XVII. ENDANGERMENT

5 In the event Ecology determines that activities
6 implementing or in noncompliance with this Decree, or any other
7 circumstances or activities, are creating or have the potential
8 to create a danger to the health or welfare of the people on the
9 Site or in the surrounding area or to the environment, Ecology
10 may order Defendant to stop further implementation of this
11 Decree for such period of time as needed to abate the danger or
12 may petition the Court for an order as appropriate. During any
13 stoppage of work under this section, the obligations of
14 Defendant with respect to the work under this Decree which is
15 ordered to be stopped shall be suspended and the time periods
16 for performance of that work, as well as the time period for any
17 other work dependent upon the work which is stopped, shall be
18 extended, pursuant to Section XVI of this Decree, for such
19 period of time as Ecology determines is reasonable under the
20 circumstances.

21 In the event Defendant determines that activities
22 undertaken in furtherance of this Decree or any other
23 circumstances or activities are creating an endangerment to the
24 people on the Site or in the surrounding area or to the
25 environment, Defendant may stop implementation of this Decree
26 for such period of time necessary for Ecology to evaluate the

1 situation and determine whether Defendant should proceed with
2 implementation of the Decree or whether the work stoppage should
3 be continued until the danger is abated. Defendant shall notify
4 Ecology's project coordinator as soon as possible, but no later
5 than twenty-four (24) hours after such stoppage of work, and
6 thereafter provide Ecology with documentation of the basis for
7 the work stoppage. If Ecology disagrees with the Defendant's
8 determination, it may order Defendant to resume implementation
9 of this Decree. If Ecology concurs with the work stoppage, the
10 Defendant's obligations shall be suspended and the time period
11 for performance of that work, as well as the time period for any
12 other work dependent upon the work which was stopped, shall be
13 extended, pursuant to Section XVI of this Decree, for such
14 period of time as Ecology determines is reasonable under the
15 circumstances. Any disagreements pursuant to the clause shall
16 be resolved through the dispute resolution procedures in Section
17 XIV.

18 XVIII. OTHER ACTIONS

19 Ecology reserves its rights to institute remedial action(s)
20 at the Site and subsequently pursue cost recovery, and Ecology
21 reserves its rights to issue orders and/or penalties or take any
22 other enforcement action pursuant to available statutory
23 authority under the following circumstances:

- 24 (1) Where Defendant fails, after notice, to comply with
25 any requirement of this Decree;
26

- 1 (2) In the event or upon the discovery of a release or
2 threatened release not addressed by this Decree;
3 (3) Upon Ecology's determination that action beyond the
4 terms of this Decree is necessary to abate an
5 emergency situation which threatens public health or
6 welfare or the environment; or
7 (4) Upon the occurrence or discovery of a situation beyond
8 the scope of this Decree as to which Ecology would be
9 empowered to perform any remedial action or to issue
10 an order and/or penalty, or to take any other
11 enforcement action. This Decree is limited in scope
12 to the geographic site described in Exhibit A and
13 Exhibit B and to those contaminants which Ecology
14 knows to be at the Site when this Decree is entered.

15 The Port of Tacoma has negotiated a proposed federal
16 consent decree (Federal Decree) for the Commencement Bay
17 Nearshore/Tideflats Superfund site, Sitcum Waterway Problem
18 Area. This Federal Decree is also signed by the State of
19 Washington in its capacity as a natural resource trustee. The
20 Federal Decree settles the Natural Resource Damage (NRD)
21 liability for all land owned, operated, or managed by the Port,
22 including the site subject to this Decree. The NRD settlement
23 requires the Port to place institutional controls upon the site
24 subject to this Consent Decree (see Exhibit F, p. 7). In the
25 event the federal Consent Decree is not entered by the U.S.
26 District Court, Ecology reserves all rights regarding the injury

1 to, destruction of, or loss of natural resources resulting from
2 the release or threatened release of hazardous substances from
3 the Wasser-Winters Site.

4 Ecology reserves the right to take any enforcement action
5 whatsoever, including a cost recovery action, against
6 potentially liable persons not party to this Decree.

7 XIX. INDEMNIFICATION

8 To the extent permitted by law, Defendant agrees to
9 indemnify and save and hold the State of Washington, its
10 employees, and agents harmless from any and all claims or causes
11 of action for death or injuries to persons or for loss or damage
12 to property arising from or on account of acts or omissions of
13 Defendant, its officers, employees, agents, or contractors in
14 entering into and implementing this Decree. However, the
15 Defendant shall not indemnify the State of Washington nor save
16 nor hold its employees and agents harmless from any claims or
17 causes of action arising out of the negligent acts or omissions
18 of the State of Washington, or the employees or agents of the
19 State, in implementing the activities pursuant to this Decree.

20 XX. COMPLIANCE WITH APPLICABLE LAWS

21 All actions carried out by Defendant pursuant to this
22 Decree shall be done in accordance with all applicable federal,
23 state, and local requirements, including requirements to obtain
24 necessary permits.

25

26

1 XXI. REMEDIAL AND INVESTIGATIVE COSTS

2 The Defendant agrees to pay costs incurred by Ecology in
3 the amount of \$5,798.53 for oversight and remedial action
4 performed prior to October 7, 1991.

5 The Defendant agrees to pay costs incurred by Ecology
6 pursuant to this Decree. These costs shall include work
7 performed by Ecology, the Department of Health, or Ecology's
8 contractors under Chapter 70.105D RCW both prior to and
9 subsequent to the issuance of this Decree for investigations,
10 remedial actions, and Decree preparation, negotiations,
11 oversight and administration. Ecology costs shall include costs
12 of direct activities; e.g., employee salary, travel costs,
13 laboratory costs, contractor fees, and employee benefit
14 packages; and indirect costs of direct activities. The
15 Defendant agrees to pay the required amount within ninety (90)
16 days of receiving from Ecology an itemized statement of costs
17 that includes a summary of costs incurred, an identification of
18 involved staff, and the amount of time spent by involved staff
19 members on the project. A general statement of work performed
20 and itemized statements will be provided by Ecology and shall be
21 prepared quarterly. Failure to pay Ecology's costs within
22 ninety (90) days of receipt of the itemized statement will
23 result in interest charges.

24 Nothing in this section shall preclude Ecology or other
25 federal, state or local governmental entities from seeking to
26

1 recover other costs incurred by such entities for which
2 Defendant is liable.

3 XXII. IMPLEMENTATION OF REMEDIAL ACTION

4 If Ecology determines that Defendant has failed without
5 good cause to implement the remedial action, Ecology may, after
6 notice to Defendant, perform any or all portions of the remedial
7 action that remain incomplete. If Ecology performs all or
8 portions of the remedial action because of the Defendant's
9 failure to comply with its obligations under this Decree,
10 Defendant shall reimburse Ecology for the costs of doing such
11 work in accordance with Section XXI, provided that Defendant is
12 not obligated under this section to reimburse Ecology for costs
13 incurred for work inconsistent with or beyond the scope of this
14 Decree.

15 XXIII. FIVE YEAR REVIEW

16 As remedial action, including ground water monitoring,
17 continues at the Site, the parties agree to review the progress
18 of remedial action at the Site, and to review the data
19 accumulated as a result of Site monitoring as often as is
20 necessary and appropriate under the circumstances. At least
21 every five years the parties shall meet to discuss the status of
22 the Site and the need, if any, of further remedial action at the
23 Site. Ecology reserves the right to require further remedial
24 action at the Site under appropriate circumstances. This
25 provision shall remain in effect for the duration of the Decree.

26

1

2

5

8

11

17

21

1 sediment, and air monitoring data; remedial actions plans;
2 supplemental remedial planning documents; and all other similar
3 documents relating to performance of the remedial action
4 required by this Decree shall be promptly placed in these
5 repositories.

6 XXV. DURATION OF DECREE

7 This Decree shall remain in effect and the remedial program
8 described in the Decree shall be maintained and continued until
9 the Defendant has received written notification from Ecology
10 that the requirements of this Decree have been satisfactorily
11 completed.

12 After the Defendant concludes that Tasks 1 through 7 of
13 Exhibit D of the remedial action have been performed, the
14 Defendant may submit a written report to Ecology stating that
15 the remedial action associated with Tasks 1 through 7 of Exhibit
16 D have been completed in accordance with the requirements of
17 this Decree and request that Ecology issue a written
18 acknowledgement. If Ecology concurs that Tasks 1 through 7 of
19 Exhibit D have been adequately completed, Ecology shall issue a
20 written acknowledgement. Such letter may only issue at the
21 point in time when the only remaining actions required under
22 this Decree are associated with operation and maintenance of the
23 cap, stormwater system, and completion of long-term monitoring.

24 XXVI. CLAIMS AGAINST THE STATE

25 Defendant hereby agrees that it will not seek to recover
26 any costs accrued in implementing the remedial action required

1 by this Decree from the State of Washington or any of its
2 agencies; and further, that the Defendant will make no claim
3 against the State Toxics Control Account or any Local Toxics
4 Control Account for any costs incurred in implementing this
5 Decree. Except as provided above, however, Defendant expressly
6 reserves the right to seek to recover any costs incurred in
7 implementing this Decree from any other potentially liable
8 person.

9 XXVII. COVENANT NOT TO SUE

10 In consideration of Defendants' compliance with the terms
11 and conditions of this Decree, the State covenants not to insti-
12 tute legal or administrative actions against Defendants regard-
13 ing contamination covered by this Decree. Compliance with this
14 Decree shall stand in lieu of any and all administrative, legal,
15 and equitable remedies and enforcement actions available to the
16 State against Defendants for the release or threatened release
17 of hazardous substances covered by the terms of this Decree.

18 This covenant is strictly limited in its application to the
19 Site specifically defined in Exhibit A and to those hazardous
20 substances which Ecology knows to be located at the Site as of
21 the entry of this Decree. This covenant is not applicable to
22 any other hazardous substance or area and the State retains all
23 of its authority relative to such substances and areas.

24 A. Reopeners: Notwithstanding the covenant given above,
25 Ecology reserves the right to institute legal or administrative
26 actions against Defendants seeking to require them to perform

1 additional response actions at the site, and to pursue
2 appropriate cost recovery in accordance with provisions set out
3 in RCW 70.105D.050, under the following circumstances:

4 (1) If Defendants fail to meet the requirements of this
5 Decree, including, but not limited to, failure of the remedial
6 action to meet the cleanup standards identified in the Cleanup
7 Action Plan (Exhibit C).

8 (2) Upon Ecology's determination that action beyond the
9 terms of this Decree is necessary to abate an imminent and
10 substantial endangerment to public health or welfare or the
11 environment.

12 (3) In the event new information becomes available
13 regarding factors previously unknown to Ecology, including the
14 nature or quantity of hazardous substances at the Site, and
15 Ecology determines, in light of this information, that further
16 remedial action is necessary at the Site to protect human health
17 or the environment, and Defendants, after notice, fail to take
18 the necessary action within a reasonable time.

19 B. Applicability. The Covenant Not to Sue set forth
20 above shall have no applicability whatsoever to:

- 21 1. Criminal liability;
- 22 2. Liability for damages to natural resources;
- 23 3. Any Ecology action against potentially liable
24 persons not a party to this Decree, including
25 cost recovery.
26

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

XXVIII. CONTRIBUTION PROTECTION

Defendants shall not be liable for claims for contribution regarding matters addressed in this Consent Decree, pursuant to RCW 70.105D.040(4)(d).

XXIX. EFFECTIVE DATE

This Decree is effective upon the date it is entered by the Court.

XXX. PUBLIC NOTICE AND WITHDRAWAL OF CONSENT

This Decree has been the subject of public notice and comment under RCW 70.105D.040(4)(a). As a result of this process, Ecology has found that this Decree will lead to a more expeditious cleanup of hazardous substances at the Site.

If the Court withholds or withdraws its consent to this Decree, it shall be null and void at the option of any party and the accompanying Complaint shall be dismissed without costs and without prejudice. In such an event, no party shall be bound by the requirements of this Decree.

Carol L. Fleskes 8/3/93 Jo Messex Casey 8/24/93
CAROL FLESKES Date JO MESSEX CASEY Date
Program Manager WSBA #19161
Toxics Cleanup Program Assistant Attorney General
For Port of Tacoma

Jack G. Fahlstedt
Authorized Representative Date
Port of Tacoma

DATED this 27 day of August, 1993.

FILED
IN COUNTY CLERK'S OFFICE
JUDGE
Pierce County Superior Court
AUG 27 1993

14:consent.red

PIERCE COUNTY HAS JUDICIAL CLERK
TED RUIT COUNTY CLERK
BY _____ DEPUTY

ATTORNEY GENERAL OF WASHINGTON
Ecology Division
PO Box 40117
Olympia, WA 98504-0117
FAX (206) 438-7743

EXHIBIT A
SITE DIAGRAM

LEGAL DESCRIPTION FOR UPLAND AREA

PARCEL 47

PORT OF TACOMA

Commencing at the Southeast corner of the Northeast Quarter of the Southeast Quarter of Section 36, Township 21 North, Range 3 East, Willamette Meridian; thence North $89^{\circ}26'40''$ West along the South line of said Northeast Quarter of the Southeast Quarter, 230.31 feet to the Westerly right-of-way line of Marine View Drive and the Point of Beginning; thence North $1^{\circ}57'22''$ West along said right-of-way line, 137.65 feet; thence North $70^{\circ}45'35''$ West, 526.00 feet; thence South $42^{\circ}53'25''$ West 503.14 feet; thence South $48^{\circ}31'08''$ East 962.23 feet to a curve to the left in a Northerly direction having a radius of 904.93 feet; said curve being the Westerly right-of-way line of Marine View Drive; thence along said curve an arc length of 514.98 feet; thence Northerly along said Westerly right-of-way line North $1^{\circ}57'22''$ West, 196.79 feet to the Point of Beginning.

Containing 496,393 sq. ft. or 11.40 acres more or less.

EXHIBIT C

**CLEANUP ACTION PLAN
WASSER & WINTERS LOG SORT YARD**

June 1993

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.0	INTRODUCTION	1
2.0	SITE DESCRIPTION	1
2.1	Commencement Bay Superfund Site Considerations	2
3.0	SITE CHARACTERIZATION	3
3.1	Surface Water Quality	4
3.2	Ground Water Quality	4
3.3	Soil Quality	6
4.0	CLEANUP STANDARDS	7
5.0	SUMMARY OF REMEDIAL ALTERNATIVES	9
6.0	SELECTED CLEANUP ACTION	11
6.1	Detailed Description of the Selected Cleanup Action	12
6.2	Points of Compliance/Compliance Monitoring	13
7.0	JUSTIFICATIONS/DETERMINATIONS	14
7.1	Protection of Human Health and the Environment	15
7.2	Compliance with Cleanup Standards	15
7.3	Compliance with Applicable or Relevant and Appropriate Requirements (ARARs)	16
7.4	Compliance Monitoring	17
7.5	Short-Term Effectiveness	18
7.6	Long-Term Effectiveness	18
7.7	Reduction in Toxicity, Mobility, or Volume	19
7.8	Implementability/Technical Feasibility	19
7.9	Cost	20
7.10	Elimination of Other Alternatives	20
8.0	STATE AND COMMUNITY ACCEPTANCE	21
9.0	CLEANUP ACTION REQUIREMENTS	21
10.0	SCHEDULE FOR IMPLEMENTATION/UPCOMING ACTIVITIES	22
	REFERENCES	23

1.0 INTRODUCTION

This draft cleanup action plan (CAP) is provided to describe the proposed remedial action for the Wasser-Winters log sort yard site (hereafter referred to as "the Site") located on the southern tip of the head of Hylebos Waterway turning basin in Tacoma, Washington (Exhibits A & B). It has been prepared to satisfy the requirements of the Model Toxics Control Act (MTCA). The purposes of this CAP are to: 1) describe the Site, including a summary of its history and extent of contamination as presented in the Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study (RI/FS); 2) identify the site-specific cleanup standards; 3) summarize the remedial alternatives presented in the FS; and 4) identify and describe the selected alternative for Site remediation.

Thorough descriptions of the Site and the remedial alternatives set forth are found in the RI/FS (Kennedy-Jenks, 1993) for the Site. The RI/FS was performed pursuant to Agreed Order No. DE 91-S248.

2.0 SITE DESCRIPTION

The Site, previously known as the Wasser & Winter site, is located at 1602 Marine View Drive in Tacoma, Washington. The Port of Tacoma owns approximately 13.54 acres, of which approximately 11.4 upland acres is "the Site" subject to this Decree (Exhibits A & B). The Site is situated on the head of the Hylebos Waterway in Commencement Bay. Wasser & Winters Company leased the property, also for log storage and sorting from June 1, 1972 through November 1984. During yard operations logs were trucked into the sort yard, weighed, and unloaded into scaling bays. After scaling, the logs are stacked on log decks designated for a specific grade and size of log.

The natural soils and dredged fill material at the Site are fine-grained silt and silty sand which are unstable under heavy loads, particularly during wet weather. Therefore, operation of the Site as a log sort yard required the use of ballast material to support the heavy machinery and log inventory on the

site. In addition to other rock and gravel material, slag from the ASARCO smelter in Tacoma was used to ballast portions of the site in the 1970s and early 1980s.

During normal log sort yard operations, wood waste (principally bark) is produced by loading, unloading and movement of logs within the yard. This wood waste accumulates on top of the natural soil, dredged fill material, and ballast. As a result of heavy vehicular traffic, wood wastes have been mixed with surficial soils and slag ballast.

In the early 1980s, the Department of Ecology (Ecology) initiated preliminary investigations of water and sediment quality in Commencement Bay and its tributaries, including the Hylebos Waterway. Surface water samples collected by Ecology at the Site and other similar log sort yards in the Commencement Bay area were found to contain elevated concentrations of metals. Ecology believes that the metals are leached out of the slag by the acidic conditions attributed to biological decomposition products of the wood waste. The mechanical grinding of the slag by heavy vehicular traffic pulverized it and created smaller particles which increased the surface area of the slag available to leach metals.

2.1 Commencement Bay Superfund Site Considerations

In 1983, the Commencement Bay area was identified as a federal Superfund site. Hylebos Waterway marine sediments were found to be contaminated with metals (Tetra Tech, 1985, 1988). The Record of Decision for the Commencement Bay Nearshore/Tideflats Superfund site issued in 1989 (USEPA, 1989) identifies the Wasser & Winters Site as a source of problem chemicals (arsenic, copper, zinc, lead) to the Head of Hylebos Waterway problem area.

3.0 SITE CHARACTERIZATION

In February 1985, Ecology issued a report entitled, "Assessment of Log Sort Yards as Metals Sources to Commencement Bay Waterways, November 1983 - June 1984" (Norton and Johnson, 1985). This report contained storm water runoff data for numerous log sort yards, including the Wasser & Winters Site. In 1986 and 1987, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's contractor Ecology and Environment, Inc. (EEI) conducted an inspection of the site (EEI, 1987). The inspection involved the installation and sampling of four groundwater monitoring wells on the site.

In March 1987 the Port entered into a Consent Order with Ecology to perform a preliminary Site Characterization and Focused Feasibility Study with the goal of evaluating potential interim measures that could mitigate the release of metals in site stormwater runoff. This study was conducted by the Port's contractor, Sweet-Edwards & Associates, and consisted of surface water monitoring, excavation and sampling of 13 backhoe pits, and installation of three groundwater monitoring wells (Sweet-Edwards, 1987).

On October 7, 1991, Ecology issued an Agreed Order to complete a RI/FS. The mutual objectives of the Agreed Order were to provide a framework for the investigation of the extent of metals contamination at the site and the evaluation of alternatives available to provide a permanent site remedy in accordance with the Model Toxics Control Act. The RI/FS was submitted to Ecology in March 1993.

Specific findings of the investigative work conducted at the Site include the following:

3.1 Surface Water Quality

Surface water occurs on-site as a result of precipitation and discharges off-site to Hylebos Creek and Hylebos Waterway via overland flow and ditches. Stormwater samples collected by Ecology in 1983 and 1984 contained concentrations of arsenic, copper, lead, and zinc up to 21,600, 10,160, 5,900, and 11,930 ug/l (ppb), respectively. Further investigation in 1987 by the Port's contractor Sweet-Edwards showed elevated levels of arsenic, copper, lead and zinc discharging from the site in storm water. Stormwater sampling conducted during the RI showed lower concentrations of metals in water discharging from the site, yet concentrations were consistently above marine chronic criteria. Maximum concentrations measured in surface water on-site and the marine chronic and acute water quality criteria are shown for comparison in Table 1. Based on the results of the environmental investigations conducted at the Site, it appears that surface water runoff is the primary pathway by which metals are transported from the Site.

3.2 Ground Water Quality

Site hydrogeology is characterized by two distinct zones of saturation: an unconfined Dredge Fill unit consisting of poorly graded sand and gravel, and the confined Middle Sand unit consisting of fine- to medium-grained sand. These two water-bearing zones are separated by an upper aquitard consisting of clayey silt approximately 5 to 6 feet thick (Kennedy-Jenks, 1993). Saturation conditions in the Dredge Fill unit appear to be discontinuous; where observed, saturated conditions were typically encountered at approximately 7 feet below ground surface (bgs). The Dredge fill appears to be recharged from infiltration of surface water that ponds on the surface of the site. The Middle Sand unit appears to be tidally influenced, and discharges to the Hylebos Waterway. The ground water at the Site is not a current or potential

future source of drinking water due to tidal influence and the water's natural salinity.

Three rounds of groundwater samples were taken from eleven monitoring wells during the RI process. Four of the wells sampled the Dredge Fill unit, with the remainder sampling the Middle Sand unit. The ranges in concentrations of dissolved arsenic, copper, lead, and zinc from these wells and the Marine Chronic Water Quality Criteria are shown in Table 1. Arsenic exceeded the Marine Chronic criterion in two samples collected from one monitoring well in the Dredge Fill; these samples were below the Marine Acute criterion. The majority of samples were below the detection limit of 1 ug/l. Arsenic was detected in only two of 21 samples from the Middle Sand unit at very low levels (< 4 ug/l). While most copper concentrations measured exceed the Marine Chronic and Acute criteria, they are generally low and do not indicate an impact on the site groundwater has taken place. It is Ecology's opinion that the groundwater has not been a significant pathway for migration of the contaminants resultant from the slag present on the Site.

Table 1. Measured Levels of Contaminants of Concern at the Wasser-Winters Site and Marine Ambient Water Quality Criteria

Contaminant	Surface Water Maximum Measured ^(a) ug/l	Ground Water Range Measured/Avg. ^(b) ug/l	Marine Acute ^(c) ug/l	Marine Chronic ^(c) ug/l
arsenic	21,600	<1 to 57 / 1	69	36
copper	10,160	<2 to 10 / 3	2.9	2.9
lead	5,900	<1 to 2 / 1	220	8.5
zinc	11,930	<4 to 57 / 10	95	86

Key: (a) Total metals
(b) Dissolved metals
(c) U.S. EPA Water Quality Criteria

3.3 Soil Quality

Most of the surface of the Site is covered by areas of bark, other wood debris, gravel, and slag. The bark is often mixed with sand and silt, and ranges in thicknesses from 0.5 to 2.0 feet. Estimates of the percentage of slag on the surface of the Site were made at approximately 1,000 locations across the site during the RI process. The majority of slag identified during this mapping ranged in size from 0.25 to 8 inches in the greatest dimension. Smaller particles were observed, but were difficult to identify.

Based on the results of the surface slag mapping, 39 surface soil samples were collected. The maximum detected concentrations of the metals of concern were arsenic - 3,250 mg/kg, copper - 3,270 mg/kg, lead - 1,870 mg/kg, and zinc - 3,340 mg/kg. These maximum concentrations were found in two samples taken from the center of the site.

Subsurface soil samples were taken at 30 locations across the site at a depth of 2 feet below ground surface. The maximum detected concentrations in subsurface materials were arsenic - 759 mg/kg, copper - 799 mg/kg, lead - 513 mg/kg, and zinc - 1,050 mg/kg. These maximum values all occurred within the same sample. In general, concentrations of these metals at the 2-foot depth were 1 to 3 orders of magnitude less than those detected at the surface at the corresponding location. In no case did any of the samples from deeper than 2.5 feet exceed 20 mg/kg of arsenic (MTCA Method A Residential Cleanup Standard).

Moderate levels of petroleum hydrocarbon contamination from an underground diesel storage tank and a previous equipment maintenance facility have been identified in a small portion of the site located in the southern corner. The tank was removed by GeoEngineers, Inc. in 1990. The extent of petroleum contamination was determined in studies conducted by GeoEngineers

(GeoEngineers, 1990) and Pacific Environmental Group, Inc. (Pacific Environmental, 1991). Based on these studies it appears that soils contaminated with petroleum hydrocarbons do not contain elevated levels of the metals of concern at the site. The Port of Tacoma and other PLPs are conducting an independent cleanup action on this petroleum contamination. The contaminated soils will be excavated and removed from the site for treatment or disposal prior to conducting the cleanup action of the metals/slag contaminated soils.

4.0 CLEANUP STANDARDS

Cleanup standards were developed for this Site based on Chapter 173-340 WAC. The use of Method A industrial soil cleanup standards per WAC 173-340-745 is justified for the following reasons: the Site cleanup may be defined as a routine cleanup per WAC 173-340-130; the Site is located in a heavy industrial area, adjacent to other industrial properties; the site is zoned for industrial use; and, deed restrictions will limit the use of the Site to industrial activities in the future.

Soil cleanup levels have been determined for arsenic and lead. Copper and zinc were evaluated and determined not to be present on-site at concentrations which would present a human health (direct contact) hazard. Ground water cleanup standards were set for arsenic, copper, lead, and zinc. The cleanup standards for soil and ground water are presented in Table 2.

Table 2. Cleanup Standards

Site Cleanup Standards			
Contaminant	Ground Water (ug/l) ^{(a) (f)}	Soil (mg/kg) ^(d)	Surface Water ^(e)
Arsenic	36	200 ^(e)	*
Copper	2.9 (10 ^(b))		*
Lead	8.5 (10 ^(b))	1000 ^(e)	*
Zinc	86		*

- Key: (a) State and Federal Water Quality Criteria - Marine Chronic Criteria
- (b) Practical Quantification Limit (PQL). Ecology recognizes that the PQL may be higher than the cleanup standard for a given parameter. In these cases, the cleanup standard may be considered to be attained if the parameter is undetected at the PQL and the conditions outlined in WAC 173-340-707 are met.
- (c) MTCA Method A Cleanup Levels - Industrial Soil per WAC 173-340-745
- (d) Soil cleanup standards are not based on 100 X ground water cleanup level due to the low ground water concentrations (below cleanup standards) of the compounds listed below.
- (e) No surface water cleanup standards have been set for this site since the proposed remedial action should eliminate surface water as a contaminant pathway; however, surface water will be monitored for the same parameters as ground water, as indicated by the symbol *, to ensure the efficacy of the cleanup. These data will be compared to state and federal marine chronic water quality criteria to determine whether an individual NPDES permit and/or additional cleanup is required.

- (f) Natural background values may be substituted as cleanup objectives by Ecology if the requirements of WAC 173-340-708 (11) are satisfied.

In addition to protection of human health from the direct contact exposure pathway, contaminant concentrations remaining in soil after the cleanup is completed must also support maintenance of acceptable water quality (see standards in Table 2).

The aquifer underlying the Site cannot be used for drinking water due to salinity. However, the Site is immediately adjacent to the Hylebos Waterway and ground water present on-site discharges to this waterway. Therefore, ground water discharge must be of a quality which will maintain acceptable sediment and water column quality. Hylebos Waterway sediment cleanup objectives are set forth in the Commencement Bay Nearshore/Tideflats Record of Decision (USEPA, 1989). It is expected that discharge of ground water contaminant concentrations below marine chronic ambient water quality criteria will result in sediment and surface water concentrations at or below acceptable levels as discussed above. Therefore, ground water standards for this Site are the state and federal marine chronic ambient water quality criteria.

The points of compliance and compliance monitoring requirements are discussed in section 6.2.

5.0 SUMMARY OF REMEDIAL ALTERNATIVES

The MTCA requires at a minimum that all cleanup actions protect human health and the environment, comply with cleanup standards, comply with applicable state and federal laws, and provide for compliance monitoring. In addition, all cleanup actions must consider implementation time, cost effectiveness,

permanent solutions, and resource recovery technologies to the maximum extent practicable.

A number of potential remediation alternatives were screened in the FS process to select the most effective, implementable, and cost-effective alternatives for more detailed evaluation. Six alternatives for remediating potential human health and environmental risks associated with slag deposits and contaminated soil were chosen for detailed evaluation in the FS.

The following is a brief description of each of the alternatives:

Alternative 1 No action. Semiannual groundwater and surface water monitoring.

Alternative 2 The site would be graded to direct surface water to collection and treatment system. Collected water would be treated by sedimentation/neutralization/reverse osmosis/ion exchange. Groundwater monitoring.

Alternative 3 Soils exceeding the cleanup standards would be excavated and disposed of off-site in a permitted hazardous waste landfill. Excavated areas would be backfilled with clean soil. Would include regrading of site surface and stormwater collection and monitoring. Groundwater monitoring.

Alternative 4 Soil/slag would be capped with asphaltic concrete meeting permeability and strength requirements. Surface water

runoff from the capped area would be collected and conveyed to a point of discharge along the Hylebos Waterway. A vegetated buffer of approximately 100 feet in width would be maintained along the Hylebos Creek; contaminated soils from this buffer area would be excavated and placed in the area to be capped. Groundwater monitoring.

Alternative 5 Contaminated soils would be excavated and encapsulated in a flexible membrane liner at a depth of approximately 2 feet below ground surface. An asphaltic concrete cap would be placed over the site. Surface water would be collected and a vegetated buffer would be constructed as in Alternative 4. Groundwater monitoring.

Alternative 6 Contaminated materials would be solidified by mixing with cement. Solidified materials would be capped with asphalt after appropriate subgrade preparation. Groundwater monitoring.

6.0 SELECTED CLEANUP ACTION

While several of the alternatives examined in the FS should positively impact the quality of surface water runoff, ground water, and soil conditions on the site, it is Ecology's opinion that Alternative 4, previously outlined and described in detail below, will provide the greatest protection for human health and the environment.

On-site containment, rather than waste treatment, was selected as the cleanup action because literature review and bench scale studies for similar sites have not demonstrated the existence of a feasible treatment system (biological or chemical) for this waste type.

6.1 Detailed Description of the Selected Cleanup Action

The alternative selected involves capping of the Site with asphalt. The cap system will serve to isolate contaminated materials from surface water, prevent infiltration through contaminated soils, and eliminate the potential for worker exposure to the contaminated material. While the actual cap design will be determined as part of the remedial design, the cap is expected to consist of a suitable layer of base course rock and gravel overlain by an asphaltic concrete layer of appropriate thickness, strength, and low permeability characteristics. Seams and edges of the cap will be engineered to reduce effective permeability and potential for cracking of the cap.

A vegetated buffer strip approximately 100 feet in width will be constructed along the Hylebos Creek bank will be maintained in accordance with City of Tacoma's Stream Corridor Development permit requirements. Soils in this buffer area exceeding the cleanup standards will be excavated, backfilled with clean material, and placed in the area to be capped.

As part of the cap subgrade preparations, surficial soils containing large amounts of bark and wood debris will be excavated from existing locations and consolidated in the center of the area to be capped. A mechanical pulverization and mixing process will be used to improve the subgrade characteristics of these materials by reducing their size and adding material more suitable for pavement support. The cap thickness in this central area would be increased to account for the increased organic content of the subgrade. This preparation will help to ensure future cap stability and

integrity by reducing the potential for settlement cracking. The requirements of the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System and State Waste Discharge Baseline General Permit for Storm Water Discharges Associated with Industrial Activities will be met during the construction of the cleanup action.

A stormwater collection system will be included in the cleanup action. This system is expected to consist of a series of catch basins and drain lines leading to a single point of discharge to the Hylebos Waterway. The purpose of this system is to efficiently drain the surface of the cap to prevent the occurrence of standing water on the cap and the associated potential for leakage.

A key component of the selected cleanup action is an ongoing schedule of inspection and maintenance of the cap. An Operation and Maintenance Plan will be prepared as part of the remedial design phase. This plan will specify regular and frequent cap inspections and maintenance to ensure that the cap is functioning as intended. This plan will also address the regular maintenance and operation of the storm water collection system.

Institutional controls prohibiting the disruption of the cap system without Ecology approval will be placed on the site. Since industrial soil cleanup standards will be used, a restrictive covenant limiting site use to industrial activities will be placed on the property deed. Future industrial uses of the site will only be permitted if it can be shown that the cap is of suitable strength to support the proposed activities.

6.2 Points of Compliance/Compliance Monitoring

Given that Ecology's proposed cleanup alternative involves containment of hazardous substances on-site, requirements of WAC 173-340-740(6)(d) must be

met including carrying out a compliance monitoring program to ensure the long-term integrity of the containment system, and other requirements for containment technologies in WAC 173-340-360(8) are met.

Groundwater will be monitored by wells located on the perimeter of the cap system; these wells shall represent the points of compliance for ground water cleanup standards. All wells will sample the uppermost aquifer system. Specific well placements, designs, and monitoring methodologies will be developed during the remedial design phase.

Monitoring of storm water runoff for the metals of concern will be conducted at the post-remediation point of surface water discharge to the Hylebos Waterway. If surface water runoff occurs from areas left uncapped, it will be monitored to assess the effectiveness of the cleanup action.

Any site soils remaining outside the containment system must comply with soil cleanup standards. A Performance Monitoring Sampling Plan describing the sampling design and analytical methodologies that will be used to ensure that soils remaining outside the containment facility meet the cleanup standards will be prepared during the remedial design phase.

7.0 JUSTIFICATIONS/DETERMINATIONS

The MTCA requires that any alternative selected for site remediation must, as a minimum, meet four threshold requirements as follows: protect human health and the environment; comply with cleanup standards; comply with applicable state and federal laws; and, provide for compliance monitoring.

7.1 Protection of Human Health and the Environment

The risks identified during the RI/FS process are: 1) potential human health impacts from ingestion and inhalation of on-site wood waste and soil/slag deposits which contain elevated concentrations of metals; 2) potential water quality impacts in the Hylebos Waterway and Hylebos Creek attributable to surface water runoff or ground water discharge containing elevated concentrations of metals; and, 3) potential impacts to marine sediments.

The selected cleanup action eliminates the human health risks from ingestion and inhalation of metals in the slag/soil mixture by capping of the wood waste, contaminated soil, and slag deposits. The metal concentration in surface water runoff attributable to these soils/wastes will be minimized by preventing surface water contact with the soil/slag.

As noted in Section 2.1 above, Ecology believes that the site is a source, along with other sources, of metals to the Hylebos Waterway sediments. Conditions in the Hylebos Waterway sediments will be addressed in other activities pursuant to the Commencement Bay Nearshore/Tideflats Record of Decision. The selected cleanup action for the Wasser-Winters site will minimize the possibility of metals migration from the site soils to the Hylebos Waterway.

7.2 Compliance with Cleanup Standards

The selected alternative is designed to comply with the remedial action objectives listed in Section 5.0 above.

7.3 Compliance with Applicable or Relevant and Appropriate Requirements
(ARARs)

This evaluation criterion is used to determine the degree to which the selected cleanup action complies with federal and state standards and regulations. The following ARARs apply to the site:

STATE LAWS AND REGULATIONS

-
- a. Model Toxics Control Act Cleanup Regulation, Chapter 173-340 WAC
 - b. Hazardous Waste Cleanup - Model Toxics Control Act, Chapter 70.105D RCW
 - c. State Environmental Policy Act, Chapter 197-11 WAC
 - d. Minimum Standards for Construction and Maintenance of Water Wells, Chapter 173-160 WAC
 - e. Water Pollution Control, Chapter 90.48 RCW
 - f. NPDES Permit Program, Chapter 173-220 WAC
 - g. Water Quality Standards for Surface Waters of the State of Washington, Chapter 173-201A WAC
 - h. Dangerous Waste Regulations, Chapter 173-303 WAC
 - i. Washington Clean Air Act, Chapter 70.94 RCW
 - j. Washington Industrial Safety and Health Act (WISHA)

FEDERAL LAWS AND REGULATIONS

- l. Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA)
- m. Occupational Safety and Health Act (OSHA), 29 CFR subpart 1910.120
- n. Federal Water Pollution Control Act of 1972 (Clean Water Act)
- o. Water Quality Act of 1987:
 - 1) Section 308. Establishes water quality criteria for toxic pollutants.
 - 2) Section 402. Establishes the NPDES permit process for discharges to surface water bodies.

The selected cleanup action achieves all ARARs listed above. Other ARARs such as shoreline management regulations, and air quality regulations will be complied with as an integral part of the remedial design and implementation steps.

7.4 Compliance Monitoring

Compliance monitoring as specified in WAC 173-340-410 will be provided to determine compliance with the cleanup standards listed in Section 5.0. Surface and ground water will be monitored to evaluate compliance with cleanup standards. A compliance monitoring plan will be prepared and submitted to Ecology for approval as part of the remedial design phase.

7.5 Short-Term Effectiveness

Short-term effectiveness considers how each alternative would impact the human health and the environment during the implementation (construction) phase and prior to attainment of cleanup standards.

The implementation of the proposed cleanup action involves various earthmoving activities. The earth work has a potential to impact the community from exposure to airborne dust. This potential impact will be mitigated through use of control measures such as watering to reduce dust generation. The earth work may increase mobility of soil particles in surface water runoff. Mitigation of this potential sediment discharge will involve using sediment barriers and performing remedial activities during the dry season.

Capping should result in immediate improvements in the quality of storm water runoff. The cap should effectively isolate contaminated materials from surface water runoff. Capping should eliminate the human health concerns associated with ingestion of contaminated material.

7.6 Long-Term Effectiveness

Long-term effectiveness is evaluated in terms of the magnitude of residual risk and the adequacy and reliability of the cleanup action.

Implementation of the selected alternative will prevent contact between precipitation/surface water runoff and contaminated soil/slag materials. Long-term reliability will be dependent on maintenance of the engineering controls and continued monitoring since residuals will remain on site. There is a high degree of confidence that the isolation and containment measures will be effective in controlling mobility of metals when coupled with appropriate long-term operation, maintenance and monitoring to remedy any

potential damage to the cap system due to settlement, erosion, or other causes. The selected alternative provides, in addition to monitoring, periodic routine inspections and maintenance of the cap system to ensure its integrity and effectiveness. Institutional controls, including restrictive covenants, will limit the use of the site to industrial uses for the long-term.

7.7 Reduction of Toxicity, Mobility, or Volume

This evaluation criterion addresses the statutory preference for selecting remedial actions that employ treatment technologies that permanently and significantly reduce toxicity, mobility, and volume of the hazardous substances present. As stated in section 6.0 above, physical or chemical treatment was not chosen as the preferred cleanup alternative because the existence of a feasible treatment system for this waste is not known.

The human health and environmental risks identified at the Site are a direct result of on-site slag deposits containing metals. The implementation of this alternative will not use treatment technologies to reduce toxicity, mobility, or volume of the contamination present on the site. The cleanup action will eliminate the contact of storm water with contaminated soil/slag through the use of a physical barrier (cap system), thereby limiting the mobility of contaminants.

7.8 Implementability/Technical Feasibility

This alternative employs conventional technologies and, therefore, should be readily implemented. Capping has been performed at other log sort yards in the Tacoma area. Maintenance requirements for the cap system should not pose any technical difficulties.

7.9 Cost

The relative costs of the alternatives determined in the FS are given in Table 3.

Table 3. Remedial Alternative Cost Comparison

ALTERNATIVE		COST ⁽¹⁾
Alternative 1.	No Action	553,000
Alternative 2.	Grading/surface water collection/water treatment	NA ⁽²⁾
Alternative 3.	Excavation/off-site landfilling	3,593,000 - 4,321,00
Alternative 4.	Asphalt capping/stormwater collection	2,543,000
Alternative 5.	Excavation and encapsulation at depth/asphalt capping	3,935,000
Alternative 6.	Solidification/asphalt capping	2,611,000

(1) 30-year present worth cost using 5 percent discount rate

(2) Not applicable. Alternative 2 did not meet the preliminary threshold evaluation criteria described in the Feasibility Study, therefore a cost analysis was not performed.

7.10 Elimination of Other Alternatives

Alternatives 1 and 2 have not been chosen because human health and the environment are not adequately protected by these alternatives. Alternative 3 was not chosen due to excessive costs without a corresponding increase in protectiveness. Solidification and asphalt capping (Alternative 6) was not chosen due to the poor strength and subgrade properties expected from the

solidified soil/slag/woodwaste mixture. Alternative 5 was not chosen because it offers little benefit in protection for a substantial increase in cost when compared to Alternative 4.

8.0 STATE AND COMMUNITY ACCEPTANCE

State and community acceptance will be evaluated based on the comments received during the public comment period. Based on the information gathered from the public, Ecology will modify the draft CAP to arrive at a final CAP.

9.0 CLEANUP ACTION REQUIREMENTS

The cleanup action as selected is designed to accomplish the following requirements:

1. Protect human health and the environment.
2. Comply with cleanup standards per WAC 173-340-700 through 760.
3. Comply with applicable state and federal laws per WAC 173-340-710.
4. Provide compliance monitoring per WAC 173-340-410.
5. Use permanent solutions to the maximum extent practicable per WAC 173-340-360(4), (5), (7), and (8).
6. Provide a reasonable restoration timeframe per WAC 173-340-360(6).
7. Consider public concerns, if any, raised during public comment on the draft cleanup action plan per WAC 173-340-360(10) through (13).

10.0 SCHEDULE FOR IMPLEMENTATION/UPCOMING ACTIVITIES

Ecology will begin negotiations on a Consent Decree per MTCA with the Port of Tacoma to cover the remedial design, remedial construction, and all other work phases. The time line for implementation of all project phases will be defined in the Consent Decree. Full public participation, including a 30-day public comment period and public meeting, will accompany the MTCA Consent Decree.
