**2013 ENVIRONMENTAL SUBSURFACE INVESTIGATION – COMMENTS & QUESTIONS**

1. Note to self – Take particular note of Section 14 – later on.
2. Metals & cPAHs mainly in upper 5 ft. = imported fill, small industrial & commercial activities, fires - ?? = may not be a big cleanup issue.
3. Gasoline @ 7 – 8 ft. in SE area (seems pretty limited extent).
4. TCE & PCE in shallow, deep, & not-determined aquifers – what constitutes the “not-determined” aquifer? (Per Figure 13, it appears to be deeper than the deep aquifer - ??)
5. Page ES-3 – Note to self – regarding a workplan for the South 19th & Fawcett potential source area & possible aquifer connectivity.
6. Page ES-5 – Note to self – consider recommendations here & in Section 13 of main report.
7. Page ES-7 – PDA 1C – s/b Fawcett North? PDA 1B – s/b Tacoma Vacant?
8. Page ES-10 – PDA 1G – Note regarding locations of groundwater contamination.
9. Note to self – Report deals with the PDAs, not necessarily the intermediate parcels, ROWs, etc.
10. Page 9 – Question regarding presence of PCBs & historical uses of PDAs 1A, 1D, & 1F.
11. Page 13 – Note to self – regarding checking what suite of parameters for MNA testing is being contemplated.
12. Page 17 – Question regarding PDA 1G seep being contaminated like the Y Student Center.
13. Page 17 – Question regarding the absence of recessional outwash in PDAs 1 & 2.
14. Page 19 – Question regarding Lawton Clay as a confining layer.
15. Page 21 – Question regarding source of flow in deep aquifer.
16. Confirm – UWT Parking Lot T29 is the former Cragle property?
17. General question – Do we have any histories regarding building fires, esp. PDAs 2B & 2C. Interesting in the context of near surface PAHs & Pb.
18. Note to self – Most of the TCE in soil appears to be in the Qvi. Some TCE in Qvi groundwater, but mostly in advance outwash.
19. There appear to be a lot of heavy metals in the Tioga sump. Any ideas on where they came from, & what is the current status of the sump?
20. Page 38 – Just a note regarding trihalomethanes in Tacoma’s drinking water.
21. Page 39 – Comment regarding VI screening level exceedances.
22. Page 39 – Comment regarding wells to bound the south extent of the plumes.
23. Note to self – Section 10 tables indicate that the highest TCE in the shallow aquifer appears @ 1F-B3 (180), UG-MW25s (290), & UG-MW29s (47). Highest values in deep aquifer appear @ UG-MW18 (PCE @ 12), TCE = UG-MW18 (1200), JP-MW2 (500), & UG-MW6 (700). Last 2 in the vicinity of Cragle, but slightly upgradient. Higher concentrations in deep aquifer than in shallow aquifer = ????s
24. Page 40 – Questions regarding screen elevations & finding the location of a well.
25. Page 41 – Comment regarding Figure annotation.
26. Page 41 – Ditto.
27. Page 41 – Comment regarding well missing from list.
28. Page 42 – Comment regarding Figure annotations for daughter products.
29. Page 48 – Edit question.
30. Page 50 – Comment regarding what’s going on @ 19th & Fawcett.
31. Page 51 – Question regarding possible contribution by Cragle. Also page 52.
32. Page 53 – Noted discussion of MNA – See comment 11, above.
33. Page 54 – Good discussion of AO content. If the AO is missing anything, we can always go back & add or modify things by technical memo, rather than continue drafting the AO & this stage, or doing amendments later.
34. Page 56 – I agree with this discussion – I hope to do an Area Wide Ground Water Investigation Grant with the City, which would further this effort a lot. However, am having to wrestle with the unfortunate reality of our grant fund situation.
35. Page 57 – Having estimated cost ranges in this document is very helpful.
36. Page 58 – Comment regarding a central groundwater treatment system.
37. BIG piece of work – I think this is very helpful in positioning us to move forward with developing additional data to get the area fully characterized & start working toward remedial strategies.