1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7	STATE OF W	ASHINGTON
8	THURSTON COUNT	Y SUPERIOR COURT
9	STATE OF WASHINGTON, DEPARTMENT OF ECOLOGY,	NO.
10	Plaintiff,	
11	v.	CONSENT DECREE
12 13	Mr. and Mrs. Chauncey and Elizabeth Lufkin and	
14	Hytec Inc.	
15	righted file.	
16	Defendants.	
17		
18		
19	TABLE OF	CONTENTS
20		3
21	II. JURISDICTION	4
22	IV. DEFINITIONS	
23	VI. WORK TO BE PERFORMED	
24	VIII. PERFORMANCE	
25	X. SAMPLING, DATA SUBMITTAL	, AND AVAILABILITY14
26	XI. PROGRESS REPORTS XII. RETENTION OF RECORDS	

1	XIII.		NTEREST IN PROPERTY	
	XIV.		F DISPUTES	
2	XV.		F DECREE	
3	XVI. XVII.		SCHEDULET	
3	XVII.		TO SUE	
4	XIX.		PROTECTION	
7	XX.		ON	
5	XXI.		ITH APPLICABLE LAWS	
	XXII.		ION COSTS	
6	XXIII.		ON OF REMEDIAL ACTION	
	XXIV.	PERIODIC REVIE	EW	25
7	XXV.	PUBLIC PARTICI	PATION	25
	XXVI.		ECREE	
8	XXVII.		ST THE STATE	
	XXVIII.		E	
9	XXIX.	WITHDRAWAL (OF CONSENT	27
10		EVIIIDIT A	Cita Diagram	
10		EXHIBIT A. EXHIBIT B.	Site Diagram Cleanup Action Plan/State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA	Δ)
11		LAIIDII D.	Checklist	1)
		EXHIBIT C.	Public Participation Plan	
12				
13				
14				
17				
15				
16				
1.7				
17				
18				
10				
19				
20				
21				
22				
22				
23				
24				
_				
25				
26				
20				
	•			

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

I. INTRODUCTION

A. The mutual objective of the State of Washington, Department of Ecology (Ecology), Chauncey and Elizabeth Lufkin (the Lufkins) and Hytec Inc., (Defendants) under this Decree is to provide for remedial action at a facility where there has been a release or threatened release of hazardous substances. This Decree requires Defendants to perform a remedial action at the Hytec Fiberglass Debris Landfill Site in Olympia, Washington in accordance with the Cleanup Action Plan (CAP) attached as Exhibit B to this Consent Decree.

Ecology has determined that these actions are necessary to protect human health and the environment.

- B. The Complaint in this action is being filed simultaneously with this Decree. An Answer has not been filed, and there has not been a trial on any issue of fact or law in this case. However, the Parties wish to resolve the issues raised by Ecology's Complaint. In addition, the Parties agree that settlement of these matters without litigation is reasonable and in the public interest, and that entry of this Decree is the most appropriate means of resolving these matters.
- C. By signing this Decree, the Parties agree to its entry and agree to be bound by its terms.
- D. By entering into this Decree, the Parties do not intend to discharge non-settling parties from any liability they may have with respect to matters alleged in the Complaint. The Parties retain the right to seek reimbursement, in whole or in part, from any liable persons for sums expended under this Decree.
- E. This Decree shall not be construed as proof of liability or responsibility for any releases of hazardous substances or cost for remedial action nor an admission of any facts; provided, however, that Defendants shall not challenge the authority of the Attorney General and Ecology to enforce this Decree.
- F. The Court is fully advised of the reasons for entry of this Decree, and good cause having been shown:

1	Now, therefore, it is HEREBY ORDERED, ADJUDGED, AND DECREED as follows:
2	II. JURISDICTION
3	A. This Court has jurisdiction over the subject matter and over the Parties pursuant
4	to the Model Toxics Control Act (MTCA), Chapter 70.105D RCW.
5	B. Authority is conferred upon the Washington State Attorney General by RCW
6	70.105D.040(4)(a) to agree to a settlement with any potentially liable person (PLP) if, after
7	public notice and any required hearing, Ecology finds the proposed settlement would lead to a
8	more expeditious cleanup of hazardous substances. RCW 70.105D.040(4)(b) requires that
9	such a settlement be entered as a consent decree issued by a court of competent jurisdiction.
10	C. Ecology has determined that a release or threatened release of hazardous
11	substances has occurred at the Site that is the subject of this Decree.
12	D. Ecology has given notice to Defendants of Ecology's determination that
13	Defendants are PLPs for the Site, as required by RCW 70.105D.020(21) and WAC
14	173-340-500.
15	E. The actions to be taken pursuant to this Decree are necessary to protect public
16	health and the environment.
17	F. This Decree has been subject to public notice and comment.
18	G. Ecology finds that this Decree will lead to a more expeditious cleanup of
19	hazardous substances at the Site in compliance with the cleanup standards established under
20	RCW 70.105D.030(2)(e) and Chapter 173-340 WAC.
21	H. Defendants have agreed to undertake the actions specified in this Decree and
22	consent to the entry of this Decree under MTCA.
23	III. PARTIES BOUND
24	This Decree shall apply to and be binding upon the Parties to this Decree, their
25	successors and assigns. The undersigned representative of each party hereby certifies that he
26	or she is fully authorized to enter into this Decree and to execute and legally bind such party to
•	

1	comply with this Decree. Defendants agree to undertake all actions required by the terms and
2	conditions of this Decree. No change in ownership or corporate status shall alter Defendants
3	responsibility under this Decree. Defendants shall provide a copy of this Decree to all agents,
4	contractors, and subcontractors retained to perform work required by this Decree, and shall
5	ensure that all work undertaken by such agents, contractors, and subcontractors complies with
6	this Decree.
7	IV. DEFINITIONS
8	Unless otherwise specified herein, all definitions in RCW 70.105D.020 and
9	WAC 173-340-200 shall control the meanings of the terms in this Decree.
10	A. <u>Site</u> : The Site is referred to as the Hytec fiberglass debris landfill, and is
11	generally located at 13434 S.W. Halo Kuntux Lane, Olympia, Washington. The Site is more
12	particularly described in the Site Diagram (Exhibit A). The Site constitutes a Facility under
13	RCW 70.105D.020(5).
14	B. <u>Parties</u> : Refers to the State of Washington, Department of Ecology and Mr. and
15	Mrs. Chauncey and Elizabeth Lufkin (Lufkins) and Hytec Inc.
16	C. <u>Defendants</u> : Refers to Mr. and Mrs. Chauncey and Elizabeth Lufkin (Lufkins)
17	and Hytec Inc.
18	D. <u>Consent Decree or Decree</u> : Refers to this Consent Decree and each of the
19	exhibits to this Decree. All exhibits are integral and enforceable parts of this Consent Decree.
20	The terms "Consent Decree" or "Decree" shall include all exhibits to this Consent Decree.
21	E. <u>CAP</u> : Refers to the Cleanup Action Plan developed for this Site and included as
22	Exhibit B to this Consent Decree.
23	F. <u>SEPA Checklist</u> : Refers to the State Environmental Policy Act Checklist
24	prepared for this Site and included with Exhibit B to this Consent Decree.
25	
26	

V. FINDINGS OF FACT

Ecology makes the following findings of fact without any express or implied admissions of such facts by Defendants.

A. The site is generally located at 13434 S.W. Halo Kuntux Lane, Olympia, Washington (Township 16, Range 3 West, Section 9). The general area and investigation locations in and around the Hytec Fiberglass Debris Landfill were surveyed by Butler Surveying, a licensed Washington surveyor located in Chehalis, Washington, in August 2006. All spatial coordinates in the survey are based on the Washington State Plane South Zone. The position of the approximate center of the Hytec Fiberglass Debris Landfill area is: Northing (ft) 579,446; Easting (ft) 998,481. The surface area of the Hytec Fiberglass Debris Landfill covers an area of approximately 1.32 acres (based on the results of test pits, soil borings, and geophysical testing; see Figures 3-1, 3-2, and 3-3 from the RI/FS). The property(s) upon which the site is generally located is bounded to the north and east by residential properties, to the west by 77.3 acres of land owned by the Washington State Department of Natural Resources and to the south by Bordeaux Road. The other side of Bordeaux Road is undeveloped. The nearest town is Littlerock.

- B. Mr. and Mrs. Chauncey Lufkin (the Lufkins) currently own 24 acres located at 13434 S.W. Halo Kuntux Lane, Olympia, Washington (Township 16, Range 3 West, Section 9). Originally, the Lufkins owned a larger 44 acre parcel of property, which they purchased in 1975, that included their current property. This larger 44 acre property, which was eventually subdivided into the current Lufkin property plus 4 residential lots (comprising approximately 5 acres each), was the Hytec Littlerock clean-up site for the purposes of conducting the Remedial Investigation and Feasibility Study.
- C. In 1998, the Lufkins sold two of these parcels to Joseph Monte, who subsequently sold the parcels to Juliane M. Morgan, and Richard E. and Cecile E. Spears. Juliane M. Morgan currently owns the property located at 13405 Halo Kuntux Lane S.W.

FAX (360) 586-6760

1 |

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	١

Olympia, Washington 98512, and has built a home on her land. Richard E. and Cecile E. Spears' parcel is vacant and located at 13333 Halo Kuntux Lane S.W. Olympia, Washington 98512. In 1998, Mr. Pavlicek bought two 5 acres parcels from the Lufkins, located at 13423 Halo Kuntux Lane S.W. Olympia, Washington 98512. Mr. Pavlicek built a house on one parcel and the other parcel is a vacant lot. The parcel the Lufkins retained comprises approximately 24 acres and is located at 13434 S.W. Halo Kuntux Lane in Olympia. This parcel is undeveloped and includes a former gravel pit along Bordeaux Road.

- D. The Pavlicek property has a drinking water well with a depth of 60 feet below ground surface (bgs). The Morgan property has a drinking water well with a depth of 180 feet bgs.
- E. Until 1986, Mr. Lufkin served as President of Hytec, Inc. (Hytec), a fiberglass manufacturing company that manufactured fiberglass bathroom fixtures. Hytec was incorporated in Washington State in 1968.
- F. During the mid-1970s, Hytec generated fiberglass manufacturing waste, including fiberglass trimmings and drums of waste polyester resin. Waste disposal was done by burying the waste on the north-central portion of the original 44-acre property owned by the Lufkins. This disposal was performed under a solid waste dump permit issued to Hytec by the Thurston-Mason Health District in 1976, in accordance with Article IX of the Thurston-Mason Sanitary Code. The localized area of waste burial by Hytec is readily visible from aerial photographs taken during the 1970s.
- G. Philips Industries, Inc., an Ohio corporation, purchased all the outstanding capital stock of Hytec, Inc. from Mr. Lufkin as the principle stockholder in 1986. Hytec is still registered as an active corporation in Washington State.
- H. Access to the Lufkins' property at 13434 S.W. Halo Kuntux Lane was not restricted from at least the late 1970s through the mid 1990s, when a gate was installed. Intermittent dumping of household waste by unknown third parties occurred along the former

access road. During a site walk conducted on April 22, 2004, Ecology staff noted several areas where household wastes had been dumped at the property. The source(s) of this waste or parties who dumped this waste are not known.

- I. A soil gas survey was performed at the site from October 28 to October 30, 1990, by Science Application International Corporation (SAIC), under contract to Ecology. Several organic compounds were detected during the soil gas survey of the property. The maximum organic solvent concentration was of methylene chloride at 1,110 ppbv. Another solvent 1,1-dichloroethylene was detected in five of seven soil gas samples. Benzene, ethylbenzene, toluene, m-xylene and/or o-xylene were detected at 17 of the sample locations. A magnetic survey was performed by SAIC in 1990. This study concluded there may be buried drums or metallic material at various locations at the Site. During this study, several drums were observed on the surface of the ground.
- J. Following the Site Hazard Assessment (SHA) in 1990, the Department of Ecology (Ecology) ranked this site as 3 (1 indicating the highest relative risk and 5 the lowest) under the Washington Ranking Method (Warm). In August 1992, Ecology informed Mr. Chauncey Lufkin the Warm ranking for the site had been reduced to 4. In July 1993, prior to the time anyone resided at or on the Site, the Washington State Department of Health conducted a preliminary assessment of the potential for the Site to affect public health and concluded, at that time, that the Site did not present a significant hazard to public health.
- K. In 2003, Mr. Lufkin hired Paul W. Stemen of Stemen Environmental, Inc. to perform a site investigation. Mr. Stemen submitted a voluntary cleanup application (VCP) on behalf of Mr. Lufkin to Ecology in September 2003.
- L. Mr. Stemen began performing a site investigation by allegedly excavating test pits and collecting soil samples at various locations on the site and groundwater samples from the Pavlicek and Morgan wells. On April 11, 2004, Paul Stemen wrote a letter to Ecology stating he wished to withdraw the VCP application since he no longer represented Mr. Lufkin.

1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
	۱

He also submitted the sampling data he had gathered regarding soil and groundwater at the site. The information Mr. Stemen submitted was in the form of raw data and did not have an accompanying report. Therefore, the locations of soil testing are not clear. The data indicates a concentration of 12 mg/kg of naphthalene had been measured in soil sample D1-L2. The location of D1-L2 is unknown. This value is more than twice the Method A soil cleanup standard for unrestricted land use (5 mg/kg). The groundwater sample from the Morgan well had a concentration of 1.09 µg/l of naphthalene. The Method A cleanup level for naphthalene in groundwater is 160 µg/l. In the Pavlicek well, trichlorofluoromethane was measured to be 2.1 µg/l. There is no Method A cleanup standard for trichlorofluoromethane. Concentrations ranging from 330 to 800 mg/kg of lead were measured in soil samples D1-L1, SLF- 2 and SLF-1 (the sample locations were unspecified). These values are higher than the Method A soil cleanup standard for unrestricted land use (250 mg/kg). In addition to naphthalene, trichlorofluoromethane and lead, a number of volatile organic compounds such as chlorobenzene, ethylbenzene, styrene, benzyl alcohol, 2-methylnapthalene, 1dimethylphthalate, fluorine, methylnaphthalene, phenanthrene, di-n-butylphthalate, fluoranthene, pyrene, benzo (a) anthracene, chrysene, bis (2-ethylhexyl) phthalate, benzo (b) fluoranthene, and metals such as chromium, barium, and lead were detected in soil and groundwater during the preliminary study by Stemen Environmental, Inc. The laboratory analysis was performed by Environmental Services Network. Because no written report accompanied the Stemen Environmental data, it is unknown whether the samples were collected, stored, and transported in accordance with acceptable sample collection and analysis methods. No confirmation of the sampling and analysis protocols was done.

M. Mr. Lufkin resubmitted a request to enter the Site in the VCP. In April 2004, Ecology informed Mr. Lufkin that his second VCP application was not accepted and the site should be investigated and remediated under a formal agreement with Ecology.

24

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

1 ||

- N. In November 2005, Ecology issued Agreed Order No. 2888 for the Defendants to conduct a Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study (RI/FS) for the original 44-acre Hytec Littlerock site. The Defendants submitted a final RI/FS to Ecology on August 1, 2007. Ecology approved the final RI/FS on September 5, 2007.
- O. The investigations conducted during the RI/FS made it clear that the original site included two separate and distinct areas of contamination: The Hytec fiberglass debris landfill and the area comprising the dump for the old logging town of Bordeaux. The determination was made to treat the two areas are separate sites, and to handle cleanup of the two sites independently. The Hytec fiberglass debris landfill is subject to cleanup under this Consent Decree. The Bordeaux dump site is subject to a separate clean-up action under a separate agreed order between Ecology and the Lufkins.
- P. Tables 5-1, 5-2, and 5-3 in Appendix A of the CAP show a summary of the chemicals of concern measured in soil and groundwater at the site.
- Q. This Consent Decree is being issued for the Defendants to implement the CAP attached as Exhibit B.

VI. WORK TO BE PERFORMED

This Decree contains a program designed to protect human health and the environment from the known release, or threatened release, of hazardous substances or contaminants at, on, or from the Site.

A. Based on the final RI/FS, Ecology prepared a draft CAP (attached as Exhibit B) for cleanup of the Hytec fiberglass debris landfill, and chose a preferred clean-up alternative. The CAP requires excavation and removal of soil containing chemicals of concern. The soil cleanup levels for the chemicals of concern at the point of compliance will be the lowest of (1) MTCA Methods A or B for unrestricted land use, or (2) the soil cleanup level generated by equation 747-1 to protect groundwater. Compliance monitoring reports for soil and

1	groundwater, a health and safety plan and a final remedial action report must be prepared and
2	submitted to Ecology as outlined in Appendix B of the CAP.
3	C. Defendants agree not to perform any remedial actions outside the scope of this
4	Decree unless the Parties agree to modify the CAP (Exhibit B) to cover these actions. All
5	work conducted by Defendants under this Decree shall be done in accordance with Chapter
6	173-340 WAC unless otherwise provided herein.
7	VII. DESIGNATED PROJECT COORDINATORS
8 9	The project coordinator for Ecology is:
10	Mohsen Kourehdar, P.E.
11	Ecology's Southwest Regional Office Toxics Cleanup Program
12	300 Desmond Dr.
13	PO Box 47775 Olympia, WA 98504-7775
14	(360) 407-6256 mkou461@ecy.wa.gov
15	
16	The project coordinators for the Defendants are:
17	Tom McKeon, P.E.
18	CALIBRE Systems Inc. 16935 SE 39 th St.
19	Bellevue, WA 98008 (425) 643-4634
20	Tom.McKeon@calibresys.com
21	Michael W. Mayberry
22	Owens Davies, P.S. PO Box 187
23	Olympia, WA 98507
24	(360)943-8320 mmayberry@owensdavies.com
25	Cliff Schmitt
26	Farallon Consulting

26

975 Fifth Ave. NW Issaquah, WA 98027 (425)427-0061 cschmitt@farallonconsulting.com

John J. Houlihan, Jr. Houlihan Law 3401 Evanston Avenue, N. Suite C Seattle, WA 98103 (206) 547-5052 john@houlihan-law.com

Each project coordinator shall be responsible for overseeing the implementation of this Decree. Ecology's project coordinator will be Ecology's designated representative for the Site. To the maximum extent possible, communications between Ecology and Defendants and all documents, including reports, approvals, and other correspondence concerning the activities performed pursuant to the terms and conditions of this Decree, shall be directed through the project coordinators. The project coordinators may designate, in writing, working level staff contacts for all or portions of the implementation of the work to be performed required by this Decree.

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

VIII. PERFORMANCE

All geologic and hydrogeologic work performed pursuant to this Decree shall be under the supervision and direction of a geologist licensed in the State of Washington or under the direct supervision of an engineer registered in the State of Washington, except as otherwise provided for by Chapters 18.220 and 18.43 RCW.

All engineering work performed pursuant to this Decree shall be under the direct supervision of a professional engineer registered in the State of Washington, except as otherwise provided for by RCW 18.43.130.

All construction work performed pursuant to this Decree shall be under the direct supervision of a professional engineer or a qualified technician under the direct supervision of a professional engineer. The professional engineer must be registered in the State of Washington, except as otherwise provided for by RCW 18.43.130.

Any documents submitted containing geologic, hydrologic or engineering work shall be under the seal of an appropriately licensed professional as required by Chapter 18.220 RCW or RCW 18.43.130.

Defendants shall notify Ecology in writing of the identity of any engineer(s) and geologist(s), contractor(s) and subcontractor(s), and others to be used in carrying out the terms of this Decree, in advance of their involvement at the Site.

IX. ACCESS

Ecology or any Ecology authorized representative shall have full authority to enter and freely move about all property at the Site that Defendants either own, control, or have access rights to at all reasonable times for the purposes of, *inter alia*: inspecting records, operation logs, and contracts related to the work being performed pursuant to this Decree; reviewing Defendants' progress in carrying out the terms of this Decree; conducting such tests or collecting such samples as Ecology may deem necessary; using a camera, sound recording, or other documentary type equipment to record work done pursuant to this Decree; and verifying the data submitted to Ecology by Defendants. Defendants shall make all reasonable efforts to secure access rights for those properties within the Site not owned or controlled by Defendants where remedial activities or investigations will be performed pursuant to this Decree. Ecology or any Ecology authorized representative shall give reasonable notice before entering any Site property owned or controlled by Defendants unless an emergency prevents such notice. All Parties who access the Site pursuant to this Section shall comply with any applicable Health and Safety Plan(s). Ecology employees and their representatives shall not be required to sign any liability release or waiver as a condition of Site property access.

X. SAMPLING, DATA SUBMITTAL, AND AVAILABILITY

With respect to the implementation of this Decree, Defendants shall make the results of all sampling, laboratory reports, and/or test results generated by it or on its behalf available to Ecology. Pursuant to WAC 173-340-840(5), all sampling data shall be submitted to Ecology in both printed and electronic formats in accordance with Section XI (Progress Reports), Ecology's Toxics Cleanup Program Policy 840 (Data Submittal Requirements), and/or any subsequent procedures specified by Ecology for data submittal.

If requested by Ecology, Defendants shall allow Ecology and/or its authorized representative to take split or duplicate samples of any samples collected by Defendants pursuant to the implementation of this Decree. Defendants shall notify Ecology seven (7) days in advance of any sample collection or work activity at the Site. Ecology shall, upon request, allow Defendants and/or their authorized representatives to take split or duplicate samples of any samples collected by Ecology pursuant to the implementation of this Decree, provided that doing so does not interfere with Ecology's sampling. Without limitation on Ecology's rights under Section IX (Access), Ecology shall notify Defendants three (3) days prior to any sample collection activity unless an emergency prevents such notice.

In accordance with WAC 173-340-830(2)(a), all hazardous substance analyses shall be conducted by a laboratory accredited under Chapter 173-50 WAC for the specific analyses to be conducted, unless otherwise approved by Ecology.

XI. PROGRESS REPORTS

Every two (2) months, Defendants shall submit to Ecology written Progress Reports that describe the actions taken during the previous two (2) months to implement the requirements of this Decree. The Progress Reports shall include the following:

- A. A list of on-site activities that have taken place during the months;
- B. Detailed description of any deviations from required tasks not otherwise documented in project plans or amendment requests;

1 |

- C. Description of all deviations from the CAP (Exhibit B) during the current months and any planned deviations in the upcoming months;
- D. For any deviations in schedule, a plan for recovering lost time and maintaining compliance with the schedule;
- E. All raw data (including laboratory analyses) received by Defendants during the past month and an identification of the source of the sample; and
- F. A list of deliverables for the upcoming two (2) months if different from the schedule.

All Progress Reports shall be submitted by the tenth (10th) day of the month in which they are due after the effective date of this Decree. Unless otherwise specified, Progress Reports and any other documents submitted pursuant to this Decree shall be sent by certified mail, return receipt requested, to Ecology's project coordinator.

XII. RETENTION OF RECORDS

During the pendency of this Decree, and for ten (10) years from the date this Decree is no longer in effect as provided in Section XXVI (Duration of Decree), Defendants shall preserve all records, reports, documents, and underlying data in their possession relevant to the implementation of this Decree and shall insert a similar record retention requirement into all contracts with project contractors and subcontractors. Upon request of Ecology, Defendants shall make all records available to Ecology and allow access for review within a reasonable time.

XIII. TRANSFER OF INTEREST IN PROPERTY

No voluntary conveyance or relinquishment of title, easement, leasehold, or other interest in any portion of the Site shall be consummated by Defendants without provision for continued operation and maintenance of any containment system, treatment system, and/or monitoring system installed or implemented pursuant to this Decree.

Prior to a Defendant's transfer of any interest in all or any portion of the Site, and during the effective period of this Decree, that Defendant shall provide a copy of this Decree to any prospective purchaser, lessee, transferee, assignee, or other successor in said interest; and, at least thirty (30) days prior to any transfer, that Defendant shall notify Ecology of said transfer. Upon Defendants' transfer of any interest, Defendants shall restrict uses and activities to those consistent with this Consent Decree and notify all transferees of the restrictions on the use of the property.

XIV. RESOLUTION OF DISPUTES

- A. In the event a dispute arises as to an approval, disapproval, proposed change, or other decision or action by Ecology's project coordinator, or an itemized billing statement under Section XXII (Remedial Action Costs), the Parties shall utilize the dispute resolution procedure set forth below.
 - 1. Upon receipt of Ecology's project coordinator's written decision, or the itemized billing statement, Defendants have fourteen (14) days within which to notify Ecology's project coordinator in writing of any objection to the decision or itemized statement.
 - 2. The Parties' project coordinators shall then confer in an effort to resolve the dispute. If the project coordinators cannot resolve the dispute within fourteen (14) days, Ecology's project coordinator shall issue a written decision.
 - 3. Defendants may then request regional management review of the decision. This request shall be submitted in writing to the Southwest Region Toxics Cleanup Program Section Manager within seven (7) days of receipt of Ecology's project coordinator's written decision.
 - 4. Ecology's Regional Section Manager shall conduct a review of the dispute and shall endeavor to issue a written decision regarding the dispute within thirty (30) days of Defendants' request for review.

- 5. If Defendants find Ecology's Regional Section Manager's decision unacceptable, Defendants may then request final management review of the decision. This request shall be submitted in writing to the Toxics Cleanup Program Manager within seven (7) days of receipt of the Regional Section Manager's decision.
- 6. Ecology's Toxics Cleanup Program Manager shall conduct a review of the dispute and shall endeavor to issue a written decision regarding the dispute within thirty (30) days of Defendants' request for review of the Regional Section Manager's decision. The Toxics Cleanup Program Manager's decision shall be Ecology's final decision on the disputed matter.
- B. If Ecology's final written decision is unacceptable to Defendants, Defendants have the right to submit the dispute to the Court for resolution. The Parties agree that one judge should retain jurisdiction over this case and shall, as necessary, resolve any dispute arising under this Decree. In the event Defendants present an issue to the Court for review, the Court shall review the action or decision of Ecology on the basis of whether such action or decision was arbitrary and capricious and render a decision based on such standard of review.
- C. The Parties agree to only utilize the dispute resolution process in good faith and agree to expedite, to the extent possible, the dispute resolution process whenever it is used. Where either party utilizes the dispute resolution process in bad faith or for purposes of delay, the other party may seek sanctions.
- D. Implementation of these dispute resolution procedures shall not provide a basis for delay of any activities required in this Decree, unless Ecology agrees in writing to a schedule extension or the Court so orders.

XV. AMENDMENT OF DECREE

The project coordinators may agree to minor changes to the work to be performed without formally amending this Decree. Minor changes will be documented in writing by Ecology.

1 |

Substantial changes to the work to be performed shall require formal amendment of this Decree. This Decree may only be formally amended by a written stipulation among the Parties that is entered by the Court, or by order of the Court. Such amendment shall become effective upon entry by the Court. Agreement to amend the Decree shall not be unreasonably withheld by any party.

Defendants shall submit a written request for amendment to Ecology for approval. Ecology shall indicate its approval or disapproval in writing and in a timely manner after the written request for amendment is received. If the amendment to the Decree is a substantial change, Ecology will provide public notice and opportunity for comment. Reasons for the disapproval of a proposed amendment to the Decree shall be stated in writing. If Ecology does not agree to a proposed amendment, the disagreement may be addressed through the dispute resolution procedures described in Section XIV (Resolution of Disputes).

XVI. EXTENSION OF SCHEDULE

- A. An extension of schedule shall be granted only when a request for an extension is submitted in a timely fashion, generally at least thirty (30) days prior to expiration of the deadline for which the extension is requested, and good cause exists for granting the extension. All extensions shall be requested in writing. The request shall specify:
 - 1. The deadline that is sought to be extended;
 - 2. The length of the extension sought;
 - 3. The reason(s) for the extension; and
 - 4. Any related deadline or schedule that would be affected if the extension were granted.
- B. The burden shall be on Defendants to demonstrate to the satisfaction of Ecology that the request for such extension has been submitted in a timely fashion and that good cause exists for granting the extension. Good cause may include, but may not be limited to:

- 1. Circumstances beyond the reasonable control and despite the due diligence of Defendants including delays caused by unrelated third parties or Ecology, such as (but not limited to) delays by Ecology in reviewing, approving, or modifying documents submitted by Defendants;
- 2. Acts of God, including fire, flood, blizzard, extreme temperatures, storm, or other unavoidable casualty; or
 - 3. Endangerment as described in Section XVII (Endangerment).

However, neither increased costs of performance of the terms of this Decree nor changed economic circumstances shall be considered circumstances beyond the reasonable control of Defendants.

- C. Ecology shall act upon any written request for extension in a timely fashion. Ecology shall give Defendants written notification of any extensions granted pursuant to this Decree. A requested extension shall not be effective until approved by Ecology or, if required, by the Court. Unless the extension is a substantial change, it shall not be necessary to amend this Decree pursuant to Section XV (Amendment of Decree) when a schedule extension is granted.
- D. An extension shall only be granted for such period of time as Ecology determines is reasonable under the circumstances. Ecology may grant schedule extensions exceeding ninety (90) days only as a result of:
 - 1. Delays in the issuance of a necessary permit which was applied for in a timely manner;
 - Other circumstances deemed exceptional or extraordinary by Ecology; or
 - 3. Endangerment as described in Section XVII (Endangerment).

XVII. ENDANGERMENT

In the event Ecology determines that any activity being performed at the Site is creating or has the potential to create a danger to human health or the environment, Ecology may direct Defendants to cease such activities for such period of time as it deems necessary to abate the danger. Defendants shall immediately comply with such direction.

In the event Defendants determine that any activity being performed at the Site is creating or has the potential to create a danger to human health or the environment, Defendants may cease such activities. Defendants shall notify Ecology's project coordinator as soon as possible, but no later than twenty-four (24) hours after making such determination or ceasing such activities. Upon Ecology's direction, Defendants shall provide Ecology with documentation of the basis for the determination or cessation of such activities. If Ecology disagrees with Defendants' cessation of activities, it may direct Defendants to resume such activities.

If Ecology concurs with or orders a work stoppage pursuant to this Section, Defendants' obligations with respect to the ceased activities shall be suspended until Ecology determines the danger is abated, and the time for performance of such activities, as well as the time for any other work dependent upon such activities, shall be extended, in accordance with Section XVI (Extension of Schedule), for such period of time as Ecology determines is reasonable under the circumstances.

Nothing in this Decree shall limit the authority of Ecology, its employees, agents, or contractors to take or require appropriate action in the event of an emergency.

XVIII. COVENANT NOT TO SUE

A. Covenant Not to Sue: In consideration of Defendants' compliance with the terms and conditions of this Decree, Ecology covenants not to institute legal or administrative actions against Defendants regarding the release or threatened release of hazardous substances covered by this Decree.

FAX (360) 586-6760

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

1 ||

This Decree covers only the Site specifically identified in the Site Diagram (Exhibit A) and those hazardous substances that Ecology knows are located at the Site as of the date of entry of this Decree. This Decree does not cover any other hazardous substance or area. Ecology retains all of its authority relative to any substance or area not covered by this Decree.

This Covenant Not to Sue shall have no applicability whatsoever to:

- 1. Criminal liability;
- 2. Liability for damages to natural resources; and
- 3. Any Ecology action, including cost recovery, against PLPs not a party to this Decree.

If factors not known at the time of entry of the settlement agreement are discovered and present a previously unknown threat to human health or the environment, the Court shall amend this Covenant Not to Sue.

- B. Reopeners: Ecology specifically reserves the right to institute legal or administrative action against Defendants to require them to perform additional remedial actions at the Site and to pursue appropriate cost recovery, pursuant to RCW 70.105D.050 under the following circumstances:
 - 1. Upon Defendants' failure to meet the requirements of this Decree, including, but not limited to, failure of the remedial action to meet the cleanup standards identified in the Cleanup Action Plan (CAP) (Exhibit B);
 - 2. Upon Ecology's determination that remedial action beyond the terms of this Decree is necessary to abate an imminent and substantial endangerment to human health or the environment;
 - 3. Upon the availability of new information regarding factors previously unknown to Ecology, including the nature or quantity of hazardous substances at the Site, and Ecology's determination, in light of this information, that further remedial action is necessary at the Site to protect human health or the environment; or

1 |

- 4. Upon Ecology's determination that additional remedial actions are necessary to achieve cleanup standards within the reasonable restoration time frame set forth in the CAP.
- C. Except in the case of an emergency, prior to instituting legal or administrative action against Defendants pursuant to this Section, Ecology shall provide Defendants with fifteen (15) calendar days notice of such action.

XIX. CONTRIBUTION PROTECTION

With regard to claims for contribution against Defendants, the Parties agree that Defendants are entitled to protection against claims for contribution for matters addressed in this Decree as provided by RCW 70.105D.040(4)(d).

XX. INDEMNIFICATION

Defendants agree to indemnify and save and hold the State of Washington, its employees, and agents harmless from any and all claims or causes of action for death or injuries to persons or for loss or damage to property to the extent arising from or on account of acts or omissions of Defendants, its officers, employees, agents, or contractors in entering into and implementing this Decree. However, Defendants shall not indemnify the State of Washington nor save nor hold its employees and agents harmless from any claims or causes of action to the extent arising out of the negligent acts or omissions of the State of Washington, or the employees or agents of the State, in entering into or implementing this Decree.

XXI. COMPLIANCE WITH APPLICABLE LAWS

A. All actions carried out by Defendants pursuant to this Decree shall be done in accordance with all applicable federal, state, and local requirements, including requirements to obtain necessary permits, except as provided in RCW 70.105D.090. The permits or other federal, state or local requirements that the agency has determined are applicable and that are known at the time of entry of this Decree have been identified in the CAP.

B. Pursuant to RCW 70.105D.090(1), Defendants are exempt from the procedural requirements of Chapters 70.94, 70.95, 70.105, 77.55, 90.48, and 90.58 RCW and of any laws requiring or authorizing local government permits or approvals. However, Defendants shall comply with the substantive requirements of such permits or approvals. The exempt permits or approvals and the applicable substantive requirements of those permits or approvals, as they are known at the time of entry of this Decree, have been identified in Exhibit B.

Defendants have a continuing obligation to determine whether additional permits or approvals addressed in RCW 70.105D.090(1) would otherwise be required for the remedial action under this Decree. In the event either Ecology or Defendants determine that additional permits or approvals addressed in RCW 70.105D.090(1) would otherwise be required for the remedial action under this Decree, it shall promptly notify the other party of this determination. Ecology shall determine whether Ecology or Defendants shall be responsible to contact the appropriate state and/or local agencies. If Ecology so requires, Defendants shall promptly consult with the appropriate state and/or local agencies and provide Ecology with written documentation from those agencies of the substantive requirements those agencies believe are applicable to the remedial action. Ecology shall make the final determination on the additional substantive requirements that must be met by Defendants and on how Defendants must meet those requirements. Ecology shall inform Defendants in writing of these requirements. Once established by Ecology, the additional requirements shall be enforceable requirements of this Decree. Defendants shall not begin or continue the remedial action potentially subject to the additional requirements until Ecology makes its final determination.

C. Pursuant to RCW 70.105D.090(2), in the event Ecology determines that the exemption from complying with the procedural requirements of the laws referenced in RCW 70.105D.090(1) would result in the loss of approval from a federal agency that is necessary for the State to administer any federal law, the exemption shall not apply and Defendants shall

comply with both the procedural and substantive requirements of the laws referenced in RCW 70.105D.090(1), including any requirements to obtain permits.

XXII. REMEDIAL ACTION COSTS

Defendants shall pay to Ecology costs incurred by Ecology pursuant to this Decree and consistent with WAC 173-340-550(2). These costs shall include work performed by Ecology or its contractors for, or on, the Site under Chapter 70.105D RCW, including remedial actions and Decree preparation, negotiation, oversight and administration. These costs shall include work performed both prior to and subsequent to the entry of this Decree. Ecology's costs shall include costs of direct activities and support costs of direct activities as defined in WAC 173-340-550(2). Defendants shall pay the required amount within ninety (90) days of receiving from Ecology an itemized statement of costs that includes a summary of costs incurred, an identification of involved staff, and the amount of time spent by involved staff members on the project. A general statement of work performed will be provided upon request. Itemized statements shall be prepared quarterly. Pursuant to WAC 173-340-550(4), failure to pay Ecology's costs within ninety (90) days of receipt of the itemized statement of costs will result in interest charges at the rate of twelve percent (12%) per annum, compounded monthly.

Pursuant to RCW 70.105D.055, Ecology has authority to recover unreimbursed remedial action costs by filing a lien against real property subject to the remedial actions.

XXIII. IMPLEMENTATION OF REMEDIAL ACTION

If Ecology determines that Defendants have failed without good cause to implement the remedial action, in whole or in part, Ecology may, after notice to Defendants, perform any or all portions of the remedial action that remain incomplete. If Ecology performs all or portions of the remedial action because of Defendants' failure to comply with their obligations under this Decree, Defendants shall reimburse Ecology for the costs of doing such work in accordance with Section XXII (Remedial Action Costs), provided that Defendants are not

obligated under this Section to reimburse Ecology for costs incurred for work inconsistent with or beyond the scope of this Decree.

Except where necessary to abate an emergency situation, Defendants shall not perform any remedial actions at the Site outside those remedial actions required by this Decree, unless Ecology concurs, in writing, with such additional remedial actions pursuant to Section XV (Amendment of Decree).

XXIV. PERIODIC REVIEW

As remedial action, including groundwater monitoring, continues at the Site, the Parties agree to review the progress of remedial action at the Site, and to review the data accumulated as a result of monitoring the Site as often as is necessary and appropriate under the circumstances. At least every five (5) years after the initiation of cleanup action at the Site the Parties shall meet to discuss the status of the Site and the need, if any, for further remedial action at the Site. At least ninety (90) days prior to each periodic review, Defendants shall submit a report to Ecology that documents whether human health and the environment are being protected based on the factors set forth in WAC 173-340-420(4). Ecology reserves the right to require further remedial action at the Site under appropriate circumstances. This provision shall remain in effect for the duration of this Decree.

XXV. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

A Public Participation Plan (Exhibit C) is required for this Site. Ecology shall review any existing Public Participation Plan to determine its continued appropriateness and whether it requires amendment.

Ecology shall maintain the responsibility for public participation at the Site. However, Defendants shall cooperate with Ecology, and shall:

A. If agreed to by Ecology, develop appropriate mailing list, prepare drafts of public notices and fact sheets at important stages of the remedial action, such as the submission of work plans, remedial investigation/feasibility study reports, cleanup action plans, and

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

1 |

2

3

engineering design reports. As appropriate, Ecology will edit, finalize, and distribute such fact sheets and prepare and distribute public notices of Ecology's presentations and meetings.

- B. Notify Ecology's project coordinator prior to the preparation of all press releases and fact sheets, and before major meetings with the interested public and local governments. Likewise, Ecology shall notify Defendants prior to the issuance of all press releases and fact sheets, and before major meetings with the interested public and local governments. For all press releases, fact sheets, meetings, and other outreach efforts by Defendants that do not receive prior Ecology approval, Defendants shall clearly indicate to their audience that the press release, fact sheet, meeting, or other outreach effort was not sponsored or endorsed by Ecology.
- C. When requested by Ecology, participate in public presentations on the progress of the remedial action at the Site. Participation may be through attendance at public meetings to assist in answering questions, or as a presenter.
- D. When requested by Ecology, arrange and/or continue information repositories at the following locations:
 - 1. Tumwater Timberline Library 7023 New Market Street Tumwater, WA 98501 (360) 695-1566
 - Ecology's Southwest Regional Office 300 Desmond Drive PO Box 47775 Olympia, WA 98504-7775 (360) 407-6365

At a minimum, copies of all public notices, fact sheets, and press releases; all quality assured monitoring data; remedial actions plans and reports, supplemental remedial planning documents, and all other similar documents relating to performance of the remedial action required by this Decree shall be promptly placed in these repositories.

FAX (360) 586-6760

XXVI. DURATION OF DECREE

The remedial program required pursuant to this Decree shall be maintained and continued until Defendants have received written notification from Ecology that the requirements of this Decree have been satisfactorily completed. This Decree shall remain in effect until dismissed by the Court. When dismissed, Section XVIII (Covenant Not to Sue) and Section XIX (Contribution Protection) shall survive.

XXVII. CLAIMS AGAINST THE STATE

Defendants hereby agree that they will not seek to recover any costs accrued in implementing the remedial action required by this Decree from the State of Washington or any of its agencies; and further, that Defendants will make no claim against the State Toxics Control Account or any local Toxics Control Account for any costs incurred in implementing this Decree. Except as provided above, however, Defendants expressly reserve their right to seek to recover any costs incurred in implementing this Decree from any other PLP. This Section does not limit or address funding that may be provided under Chapter 173-322 WAC.

XXVIII. EFFECTIVE DATE

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

XXIX. WITHDRAWAL OF CONSENT

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.

1 |

1	STATE OF WASHINGTON DEPARTMENT OF ECOLOGY	ROBERT M. McKENNA
2	DELAKTIVIENT OF ECOLOGY	Attorney General
345	Jim Pendowski Program Manager Toxics Cleanup Program (360) 407 - 7177	Katharine G. Shirey WSBA # 35736 Assistant Attorney General (360) 586-6769
6	Date:	Date:
7		
8		
9		
10	HYTEC, INC.	CHAUNCEY AND ELIZABETH LUFKIN
11	/Sh (
12	George S. Mappoyliou Vice President : Secretory	
13		
14	Date: 5/11/10	Date:
15		
16		
17	ENTERED this day of	20
18		
19		
20		JUDGE Thurston County Superior Court
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
1		

1	STATE OF WASHINGTON	ROBERT M. McKENNA
2	DEPARTMENT OF ECOLOGY	Attorney General
3	Janes al	Vallain G. Xun
4.	Jim Pendowski	Katharine G. Shirey WSBA # 35736
	Program Manager Toxics Cleanup Program	Assistant Attorney General (360) 586-6769
5	(360) 407 - 7177	α /./
6	Date: 8410	Date: 8/18/10
7		
8		
9		
10	HYTEC, INC.	CHAUNCEY AND ELIZABETH LUFKIN
11		4 Charces Kerkins
12		Elinbert Lifking
13		curavem signin
İ		Elizabeth Futkin
14	Date:	Date: May 19, 2010
15		
16	A . 10. A	
17	ENTERED this 20th day of At	<u>1gust</u> 20 <u>10</u> .
18		CAROL MURPHY
19		
20		JUDGE Thurston County Superior Court
21		
22	·	
)2		
23	•	
24		
25		
6		
11		