FILED

17 NOV 06 AM 9:46

KING COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT CLERK E-FILED

1 CASE NUMBER: 17-2-28787-3 KNT 2 3 4 5 6 STATE OF WASHINGTON 7 KING COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT 8 STATE OF WASHINGTON, 9 DEPARTMENT OF ECOLOGY, NO. 17-2-28787-3 KNT Plaintiff, 10 CONSENT DECREE 11 ν. PALMER COKING COAL COMPANY. 12 LLP: WEYERHAEUSER NR COMPANY: BNSF RAILWAY 13 COMPANY: PACCAR INC: and **BROWNING-FERRIS INDUSTRIES OF** 14 ILLINOIS, INC., 15 Defendants. 16 17 18 TABLE OF CONTENTS 19 I. JURISDICTION4 II. 20 III. PARTIES BOUND5 DEFINITIONS5 IV. 21 FINDINGS OF FACTS......6 V. WORK TO BE PERFORMED.....11 VI. 22 VII. VIII. 23 IX. SAMPLING, DATA SUBMITTAL, AND AVAILABILITY......17 Χ. 24 XI. RETENTION OF RECORDS9 XII. TRANSFER OF INTEREST IN PROPERTY20 25 XIII. XIV. 26 AMENDMENT OF DECREE......22 XV.

1	XVI.		CHEDULE22	!
	XVII.	ENDANGERMENT		
2	XVIII.		TO SUE25	
	XIX.		PROTECTION26	
3	XX.		ICTIONS27	
	XXI.	FINANCIAL ASSU	RANCES28	;
4	XXII.	INDEMNIFICATIO	N29)
	XXIII.	COMPLIANCE WI'	TH APPLICABLE LAWS29)
5	XXIV.	REMEDIAL ACTIO	ON COSTS30)
	XXV.	IMPLEMENTATIO	N OF REMEDIAL ACTION31	
6	XXVI.	PERIODIC REVIEW	<i>W</i> 32	
	XXVII.	PUBLIC PARTICIP	ATION32	
7	XXVIII.	DURATION OF DE	CCREE34	
i	XXIX.	CLAIMS AGAINST	THE STATE34	
8	XXX.	EFFECTIVE DATE	34	
	XXXI.	WITHDRAWAL OF	F CONSENT34	
9				
	EX	KHIBIT A	Site Diagram	
10	EX	KHIBIT B	Cleanup Action Plan	
		KHIBIT C	Schedule	
11	EX	KHIBIT D	Introduction to Parts A, B, and C	
l			Part A – Compliance Monitoring Plan	
12			Part B – Operation and Maintenance Plan	
			Part C – Contingent Groundwater Extraction and Treatment	
13		**********	System Plan	
		CHIBITS E-1 & E-2	Environmental (Restrictive) Covenants	
14	EX	CHIBIT F	Applicable & Potentially Applicable Permits & Requirements	
, ,				
15				
16				
16				
17				
1/				
18				
10				
19				
1				
20				
20				
21				
- 1				
22				
[
23				
24				
25				
-				
26				

I. INTRODUCTION

- A. The mutual objective of the State of Washington, Department of Ecology (Ecology) and Palmer Coking Coal Company, LLP; the Weyerhaeuser NR Company; BNSF Railway Company; PACCAR Inc; and Browning-Ferris Industries of Illinois, Inc.. (collectively, 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 undertake the following remedial actions, as described in detail in the Cleanup Action Plan (CAP) (Exhibit B):
 - 1. Backfill a portion of the trenches as required for capping.
 - 2. Allow the backfill to consolidate.
 - 3. Place a low-permeability soil cap over the backfill of the trenches (areas 7, 8, and 9), including grading and surface water management.
 - 4. Maintain the soil cap until residual hazardous substance concentrations no longer exceed cleanup or remediation levels under the Model Toxics Control Act (MTCA) resulting from either (1) the application of new remediation technologies currently unavailable or (2) other circumstances or conditions that affect residual concentrations such that they no longer pose a risk to human health or the environment.
 - 5. Implement and maintain institutional controls, groundwater monitoring and any instituted contingency plan.
- B. Ecology has determined that these actions are necessary to protect human health and the environment.
- C. 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.

1	D.	By signing this Decree, the Parties agree to its entry and agree to be bound by
2	its terms.	
3	E.	By entering into this Decree, the Parties do not intend to discharge non-settling
4	parties from	any liability they may have with respect to matters alleged in the Complaint. The
5	Parties retain	the right to seek reimbursement, in whole or in part, from any liable persons for
6	sums expend	ed under this Decree.
7	F.	This Decree shall not be construed as proof of liability or responsibility for any
8	releases of h	azardous substances or cost for remedial action nor an admission of any facts;
9	provided, ho	wever, that Defendants shall not challenge the authority of the Attorney General
10	and Ecology	to enforce this Decree.
11	G.	The Court is fully advised of the reasons for entry of this Decree, and good
12	cause having	been shown:
13	Now,	therefore, it is HEREBY ORDERED, ADJUDGED, AND DECREED as follows:
14		II. JURISDICTION
15	A.	This Court has jurisdiction over the subject matter and over the Parties pursuant
16	to the Model	Toxics Control Act (MTCA), RCW 70.105D.
17	В.	Authority is conferred upon the Washington State Attorney General by
18	RCW 70.105	D.040(4)(a) to agree to a settlement with any potentially liable person (PLP) if
19	after public r	notice and any required hearing, Ecology finds the proposed settlement would lead
20	to a more ex	peditious cleanup of hazardous substances. RCW 70.105D.040(4)(b) requires that
21	such a settle	ment be entered as a consent decree issued by a court of competent jurisdiction.
22	C.	Ecology has determined that a release or threatened release of hazardous
23	substances h	as occurred at the Site that is the subject of this Decree.
24	D.	Ecology has given notice to Defendants of Ecology's determination that

WAC 173-340-500.

25

26

Defendants are PLPs for the Site, as required by RCW 70.105D.020(26) and

24

25

26

- The actions to be taken pursuant to this Decree are necessary to protect public E. health and the environment.
 - F. This Decree has been subject to public notice and comment.
- G. Ecology finds that this Decree will lead to a more expeditious cleanup of hazardous substances at the Site in compliance with the cleanup standards established under RCW 70.105D.030(2)(e) and WAC 173-340.
- Defendants have agreed to undertake the actions specified in this Decree and H. consent to the entry of this Decree under MTCA.

III. PARTIES BOUND

This Decree shall apply to and be binding upon the Parties to this Decree, their successors and assigns. The undersigned representative of each Party hereby certifies that he or she is fully authorized to enter into this Decree and to execute and legally bind such Party to comply with this Decree. Defendants agree to undertake all actions required by the terms and conditions of this Decree. No change in ownership or corporate status shall alter Defendants' responsibility under this Decree. Defendants shall provide a copy of this Decree to all agents, contractors, and subcontractors retained to perform the Work required by this Decree, and shall ensure that all work undertaken by such agents, contractors, and subcontractors complies with this Decree.

IV. **DEFINITIONS**

Unless otherwise specified herein, all definitions in RCW 70.105D.020 and WAC 173-340-200 shall control the meanings of the terms in this Decree.

Site: The Site is referred to as the Landsburg Mine Site, and is generally located A. approximately 1.5 miles northwest of Ravensdale, Washington, in a rural area of southeast King County. The Site is more particularly described in the Site Diagram (Exhibit A). For purposes of the Covenant Not to Sue (Section XVIII), Contribution Protection (Section XIX), and Land Use Restrictions (Section XX) only, the Site shall include the Groundwater and

2	under RCW 70.105D.020(8).
3	B. Groundwater and Portal Protection Area: The Groundwater and Portal
4	Protection Area is the area in which institutional controls will be implemented to prevent
5	withdrawal of groundwater for purposes other than remediation, and to prevent access to the
6	north and south portals.
7	C. <u>Defendants</u> : Refers to Palmer Coking Coal Company, LLP; the Weyerhaeuser
8	NR Company; BNSF Railway Company; PACCAR Inc; and Browning-Ferris Industries of
9	Illinois, Inc
10	D. <u>Parties</u> : Refers to Ecology and Defendants.
11	E. <u>Potentially Liable Persons (PLPs)</u> : Refers collectively to Defendants and TOC
12	Holdings Co.
13	F. Consent Decree or Decree: Refers to this Consent Decree and each of the
14	exhibits to this Decree. All exhibits are integral and enforceable parts of this Consent Decree.
15	The terms "Consent Decree" or "Decree" shall include all exhibits to this Consent Decree.
16	G. Work or Work to Be Performed: Refers to work described in Section VI.
17	V. FINDINGS OF FACT
18	Ecology makes the following findings of fact without any express or implied
19	admissions of such facts by Defendants.
20	A. The Site consists of portions of a former underground coal mine located
21	approximately 1.5 miles northwest of Ravensdale in a rural area of southeast King County,
22	Washington. The Site is situated directly south and east of SE Summit-Landsburg Road, and
23	north of SE Kent-Kangley Road.
24	B. The Site is located within Sections 24 and 25, Township 22 North, Range 6
25	East, W.M. King County, Washington. The Site is more particularly defined in Exhibit A of
26	this Consent Decree (Site Diagram).

1 || Portal Protection Area as depicted in Exhibit A to this Decree. The Site constitutes a Facility

- C. The Site occupies a parcel of land owned or formerly owned by Palmer Coking Coal Company, LLP (PCC) and by Plum Creek Timber Company, L.P., the predecessor in interest to the Weyerhaeuser NR Company. BNSF Railway Company also formerly owned property within the Site. These parties are "owners" as defined by RCW 70.105D.020(22) and are therefore liable under RCW 70.105D.040.
- D. PACCAR Inc; Browning-Ferris Industries of Illinois, Inc.; and TOC Holdings Co. are liable parties for generating and/or transporting hazardous substances disposed of at the facility. RCW 70.105D.040(1).
- E. PCC and several other coal companies previously operated a number of underground coal mines, now collectively called the Landsburg Mine. The various mines consisted of several coal seams known as the Frasier seam (furthest west), the Landsburg seam (furthest east), and the Rogers seam (middle coal seam). The Frasier seam was mined intermittently from the late 1800s to the mid-1940s. PCC's mining of the Landsburg seam began in the late 1930s and continued until 1959. The Rogers seam was mined from 1959 until 1975.
- F. Based on factors currently known to Ecology, the Site is located in the subsidence trenches within the Rogers seam. The Rogers seam is located approximately 800 feet southeast of the Frasier seam and approximately 600 feet west of the Landsburg seam. The mined section of the Rogers seam has a near vertical dip and consists of coal and interbedded shale approximately 16 feet wide. The mined section is about a mile in length. Mining occurred at depths up to 750 feet below the ground surface. Extraction was accomplished by causing the coal seam to cave into mine workings (locally called "booming") from which the coal was hauled to the surface. As a result of this caving, a number of subsidence trenches developed on the land surface above the mine workings. The dimensions of the trenches vary from about 60 to 100 feet in width, between 20 to 60 feet in depth, and about ¾ mile in length. The trenches are not continuous along the whole length of the Rogers seam, but are comprised

1 l

of a series of separate subsided trench segments. Each trench segment is separated by a wall of intact rock and coal (called a pillar wall).

- G. Based on available information, these trenches were used in the late 1960s to the late 1970s for disposal of various industrial waste materials, construction materials, and land-clearing debris. Materials were disposed of in the northern portion of the trenches from the access road shown in Figure 4 of the CAP, attached as Exhibit B. Industrial wastes were contained in drums or dumped directly from tanker trucks. Based on invoice and dumping records from PCC, an estimated 4,500 drums of waste and about 200,000 gallons of oily wastewater and sludge were disposed of in the trenches. Available documented interviews with waste haulers and truck drivers indicate that wastes included paint wastes, solvents, metal sludges, and oily water and sludge (Ecology 1990). It is expected that many of the drums were only partially full. Disposal of land clearing debris continued until the early 1980s after which all disposal activities ceased.
- H. Today the Site and most of the immediate surrounding area is used for forestry. Apart from the Site, developments in the immediate surrounding area include a junior high school, King County-owned open space lands, and approximately 130 rural residential dwellings. The school is located about 0.65 miles northwest of the Site. The nearest residences are located approximately 800 feet southwest of the Site. Drinking water for area residences is supplied by groundwater, either through private wells or small community water supply systems. Domestic sewage disposal throughout the immediate surrounding area is provided by residential septic systems.
- I. The Site is situated between two surface water bodies (rivers/streams): Rock Creek to the south and Cedar River to the north. An infiltration gallery adjacent to Rock Creek, referred to as the Clark Springs facility, has been used by the City of Kent since 1957 as a supplement to its municipal water sources. The facility is located adjacent to Kent-Kangley Road and approximately 4,100 feet west-southwest of the Site's south portal.

1 |

- J. A number of gravel roads access the Site from public thoroughfares, and trails run parallel to the east and west sides of the trenches. The primary access road to the Site begins near the intersection of SE 252nd Street and SE Summit-Landsburg Road and follows along the northern portion of the mine trenches. The Site is also accessible from SE Kent-Kangley Road and from SE 256th Street. Currently the Site is secured by a fence and locked gates, which encloses the northern portion of the trenches. Locked gates secure the Site at all of the access road entrances, and the portion of the trenches where waste disposal occurred is currently enclosed by a six-foot-tall chain link security fence. Dense vegetation covers the Site. Electrical transmission lines and a Bonneville Power Administration easement cross the southern portion of the Site in an east-west direction.
- K. Several preliminary environmental investigations were performed at the Site. These have included a limited soil gas survey, sampling of area private wells, sampling of surface water emanating from mine portals, and limited sampling of ponded surface water, drum contents, and soils for a site hazard assessment. These investigations have detected hazardous substances contained in drums, adjacent soils, and ponded surface water within the trenches. Hazardous substances were not detected, however, in adjacent private or public water supply wells, mine portal groundwater discharge, or soil gases.
- L. In 1991 Ecology designated the Site a high priority for cleanup. In late 1991, at Ecology's request, four of the Defendants or their predecessors implemented an Expedited Response Action (ERA) involving the removal of the most accessible drums from the trenches and construction of a fence to restrict access to the Site. The ERA involved the removal of over one hundred 55-gallon drums.
- M. In 1993, following implementation of the ERA, Ecology and the Defendants or their predecessors negotiated and entered into Agreed Order No. DE 983TC-N273, which directed the Defendants or their predecessors to conduct a Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study (RI/FS) to evaluate the need for remedial action. The Agreed Order was amended in

25

26

2

3

4

1995 and again in 2005. On September 5, 2013, Ecology advised the PLPs that they had completed all actions required under the Agreed Order.

The scope of work for the RI was outlined in the Landsburg Phase I Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study (RI/FS) Work Plan (Golder 1992), which was incorporated by reference into the Agreed Order. The RI/FS, which consisted of a comprehensive investigation of the Site's environmental conditions and evaluation of potential remedial alternatives for Site cleanup, was conducted by the Defendants or their predecessors over the period of mid-1993 to early-1996. The 1996 RI/FS report describes contamination at the Site as follows: within the PCBs, bis-(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate, methylene lead, trenches, chromium, trichloroethylene (TCE) and total petroleum hydrocarbons (TPH) exceeded applicable MTCA cleanup standards in an area confined to the northern portion of the trenches where waste disposal is thought to have occurred in the past. Soil testing confirmed that contamination was not identified outside the northern portion of the trenches. Apart from soils located within the subsidence trenches in the area of known prior waste disposal activities, soil, groundwater, and surface water media in the Site do not exhibit concentrations of chemical constituents above naturally occurring background levels.

N. Interim groundwater monitoring of Site compliance wells started in 1994 and continues to the present. There have been no detections of contaminants that are attributable to contamination by waste materials during any of the interim groundwater monitoring events. Furthermore, the analytical results from the interim groundwater monitoring events over the years indicate no significant changes in groundwater conditions from those observed during the RI. The primary parameters detected in groundwater samples are metals that are naturally occurring. The method reporting limits and method detection limits for all analytes are at or below acceptable concentrations under the MTCA, with the exception of some metals which have a natural background level that is in excess of MTCA cleanup levels due to the geochemical conditions of the groundwater within the coal mine.

- O. Ecology provided all stakeholders an opportunity to participate in its evaluation of the remedial alternatives proposed in the 1996 RI/FS report, in full compliance with applicable MTCA criteria. Stakeholders commented on the preferred remedial alternative in the RI/FS. Ecology took all stakeholders' comments into consideration and concluded that the preferred remedial alternative identified in the RI/FS report and more fully described in the CAP (Exhibit B) is the most appropriate remedial alternative to address hazardous substances at the Site and protect human health and the environment in the areas surrounding the Site.
- P. Ecology published a draft Consent Decree and a draft Cleanup Action Plan for public review and comment in October 2013. During the 60-day public comment period, Ecology held a public meeting and received oral and written comments from residents, area councils, and local government. Between 2014 and 2016 Ecology also coordinated with the Washington State Department of Health in its preparation of a health consultation for the Site, which was completed in November 2016. Based on the public comments and on the health consultation, Ecology revised the CAP (Exhibit B) to enhance its protectiveness of human health and the environment.

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. The Defendants shall perform the work specified in detail in the CAP (Exhibit B) and the Schedule (Exhibit C). The remedy selected for the Site is to place a low-permeability soil cap over backfilled soils in the northern portion of the trenches. That portion of the trenches would be backfilled to approximate grade before capping. The most economical local source of suitable fill will be used; the selection of the source(s) of backfill for the trenches will be made during final design. The permeability of the capping soil shall be no

higher than 10⁻⁶ cm/sec, thereby meeting the Minimum Functional Standard specifications in WAC 173-304.

The CAP is attached to this Consent Decree as Exhibit B and describes the work to be performed in more detail and outlines the anticipated schedule for completion of the construction phase. The work to be performed under the CAP generally includes:

- Backfill a portion of the trenches (areas 7, 8, and 9) as required for capping.
- Allow the backfill to consolidate.
- Place a low-permeability soil cap over the backfill of the trenches (areas 7, 8, and 9), including grading and surface water management.
- Maintain the cap until residual hazardous substance concentrations no longer exceed cleanup or remediation levels under MTCA as described in the CAP resulting from either (1) the application of new remediation technologies currently unavailable or (2) other circumstances or conditions that affect residual concentrations such that they no longer pose a risk to human health or the environment.
- Implement and maintain institutional controls, groundwater monitoring, and any instituted contingency plan.

1. <u>Low-Permeability Soil Cap</u>

- a. The area that will be capped (areas 7, 8, and 9) is shown on Figure 15 of the CAP. This delineation is based on the areas of documented and suspected waste disposal identified in the RI/FS report. The cap will extend slightly beyond the trenches on both sides to provide anchor zones and "overhang." Fill material may extend into area 6 if necessary and as appropriate to provide a buttress to the narrow pillar wall separating areas 6 and 7.
- b. Surface water runoff from the cap will be collected in drainage ditches and directed away from the cap. The cap will be sloped to optimize stability and

encourage rainwater runoff so as to minimize rainwater infiltration to the maximum extent possible.

- c. The cap design is shown as Option B on Figure 14 of the CAP and will include a top layer of vegetated soil to promote evapotranspiration and decrease the potential for erosion. No moisture conditioning is expected, and this soil will not be compacted, in order to provide a loose medium for establishing the vegetative cover. To establish vegetation, the topsoil will be seeded with grasses suitable for the local climate. The low-permeability soil cap will consist of 24 inches of compacted low-permeability soil beneath 6 inches of vegetated topsoil. The suitability of potential sources of cap material, in terms of both quality and quantity, will be identified in the engineering design report. Final haul road location and source material specifications will also be detailed in the engineering design report.
- d. Installation of the cap will be performed using standard earth-moving equipment. Construction quality assurance will primarily consist of verifying the soil cap meets the permeability specification, as well as verifying cap thickness and grading. Any settling after cap installation shall be repaired by filling, compacting, and regrading in the same manner as in initial installation. The thickness of the cap will provide long-term protection against erosion. The planted vegetative cover will be moved as needed.

2. <u>Institutional Controls</u>

a. Deed restrictions compliant with RCW 64.70 will be instituted as provided in Section XX (Land Use Restrictions) of this Decree to ensure that indefinite Site use restrictions remain in force regardless of the property owner, and to notify any prospective purchasers of the Site that there is the presence of subsurface waste. Site use restrictions will prohibit using the Site for purposes incompatible with a waste disposal site. For the selected remedy, these restrictions will prohibit penetrating the

cap and any Site use that could damage the cap or significantly reduce its effectiveness. Groundwater use restrictions will be employed, as provided in Section XX of this Decree, to prevent exposure to groundwater near the Site and within and near the compliance boundary shown in Figure 11 of the CAP.

b. A locked fence surrounds areas of the Site (see Figure 4 of the CAP), and warning signs shall be posted to provide notice of the presence of a waste site to trespassers and recreational visitors.

3. Ongoing Monitoring & Maintenance

- a. Compliance monitoring will be conducted as specified in the Compliance Monitoring Plan, attached as Exhibit D, Part A, and in accordance with WAC 173-340-410. Compliance monitoring consists of protection monitoring, performance monitoring, and confirmational monitoring.
- b. The CAP also requires ongoing Operations and Maintenance (O&M) for completion of the remedial action, in accordance with WAC 173-340-400(4)(c). The O&M plan is attached to this Consent Decree as Exhibit D, Part B.

4. Contingency Plan

The Contingent Groundwater Extraction and Treatment System Plan (Exhibit D, Part C) will be implemented in the event that concentrations of mine waste contaminants at compliance monitoring wells exceed remediation levels established in the Compliance Monitoring Plan (Exhibit D, Part A). This contingency plan details the circumstances under which the groundwater extraction and treatment system for the Site must be installed and operated. If required, the contingent groundwater extraction and treatment system's purpose will be to contain, treat, and safely dispose of impacted groundwater in a timely manner to prevent migration beyond the conditional compliance boundary for groundwater.

1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	١
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

- B. In order to implement the CAP, Defendants will prepare and submit for Ecology's review and approval all documents necessary to conduct the final cleanup action. All deliverables identified in the CAP (Exhibit B) and Schedule (Exhibit C), once approved by Ecology, are hereby incorporated by reference and become an integral and enforceable part of this Decree.
- C. If there is an inconsistency between the Decree and any of the exhibits to the Decree regarding the work to be performed, the terms and conditions of the exhibits shall apply. If there is an inconsistency between the CAP and any of the other exhibits to the Decree, the terms and conditions of the CAP shall apply.
- D. Except in cases of emergency or where required by law, Defendants agree not to perform any remedial actions at the Site outside the scope of this Decree unless the Parties agree to modify the CAP to cover these actions. In the event of an emergency, where actions are taken as required by law, Defendants must notify Ecology in writing of the event and response actions planned or taken as soon as practical but no later than within 24 hours of the discovery of the event. All work conducted by Defendants under this Decree shall be done in accordance with WAC 173-340 unless otherwise provided herein.

VII. DESIGNATED PROJECT COORDINATORS

The project coordinator for Ecology is:

Jerome Cruz, Site Manager Northwest Regional Office Toxics Cleanup Program 3190 160th Avenue SE Bellevue, WA 98008 425-649-7094 jerome.cruz@ecy.wa.gov

24

25

26

The project coordinator for Defendants is:

Gary Zimmerman Golder Associates Inc. 18300 NE Union Hill Road, Suite 200 Redmond, WA 98052-3333 425-883-0777 425-882-5498 (fax) gzimmerman@golder.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 of the Parties 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 or hydrogeologist licensed by the State of Washington or under the direct supervision of an engineer registered by the State of Washington, except as otherwise provided for by RCW 18.220 and 18.43.

All engineering work performed pursuant to this Decree shall be under the direct supervision of a professional engineer registered by 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

25

26

1

2

3

4

a professional engineer. The professional engineer must be registered by 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 RCW 18.220 or RCW 18.43.130.

Defendants shall notify Ecology in writing of the identity of any supervising 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 Defendants' project coordinator 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 Defendants or on their 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 its authorized representative 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 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 WAC 173-50 for the specific analyses to be conducted, unless otherwise approved by Ecology.

XI. PROGRESS REPORTS

During the construction phase of the work to be performed described in Section VI (Work to Be Performed) of this Decree, Defendants shall submit to Ecology written monthly Progress Reports that describe the actions taken during the previous month to implement the requirements of this Decree. After completion of the construction phase of the work to be performed described in Section VI of this Decree, the frequency of Defendants' submittal of

Progress Reports shall be in compliance with Exhibit D, Part A (Compliance Monitoring Plan) attached to this Decree. The Progress Reports shall include the following:

- A. A list of on-site activities that have taken place during the month.
- B. Detailed description of any deviations from required tasks not otherwise documented in project plans or amendment requests.
- C. Description of all deviations from the Schedule (Exhibit C) during the current month and any planned deviations in the upcoming month.
- D. For any deviations in schedule, a plan for recovering lost time and maintaining compliance with the schedule.
- E. All validated data (including laboratory analyses) received by Defendants during the past month and an identification of the source of the sample.
 - F. A list of deliverables for the upcoming month 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 XXVIII (Duration of Decree), Defendants shall preserve at least one (1) copy of records, final 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. The record retention requirements for contractors and subcontractors shall be satisfied by the retention of at least one (1) copy of the last draft or final version of any record, document, or report prepared by such contractor(s) or subcontractor(s). Any records, reports, or documents retained in accordance with this section shall be retained in either hard copy or electronic form. Upon

request of Ecology, Defendants shall make all non-privileged 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 Defendants' transfer of any interest in all or any portion of the Site, and during the duration of this Decree as provided in Section XXVIII (Duration of Decree), Defendants 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, Defendants shall notify Ecology of said transfer. Upon 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. Additionally, notwithstanding any sale, transfer, assignment, hypothecation, or other disposition of any interest in all or any portion of the Site, during the duration of this Decree as provided in Section XXVIII, Defendants shall retain a right to access all or any portion of the Site, at all reasonable times, sufficient to enable such Defendants to effectively comply with the requirements of this Consent Decree.

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 XXIV (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 their 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 Northwest 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 or the Regional Section Manager's delegatee 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 described in Section VI (Work to Be Performed) without formally amending this Decree. Minor changes will be documented in writing by Ecology and one (1) copy shall be provided to each Defendant.

Substantial changes to the work to be performed described in Section VI 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

1 |

A.

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.
 - 2. Other circumstances deemed exceptional or extraordinary by Ecology.
 - 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. This covenant shall be effective on the date this Decree is entered by the Court.

This Decree covers only the Site, as defined in Section IV.A, and those hazardous substances, as described in the RI/FS, subsequent supplemental investigations, and CAP, that Ecology knows or suspects 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.
- 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, Ecology may petition the Court to 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 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.
- 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 thirty (30) 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). The matters addressed in this Decree are all remedial actions taken or to be taken and all remedial costs, including Ecology's oversight costs, incurred or to be incurred by Ecology or any other person with respect to the Site, as defined in Section IV.A and with respect to those hazardous substances, as described in the

RI/FS, subsequent supplemental investigations, and CAP, that Ecology knows or suspects are located at the Site as of the date of entry of this Decree.

XX. LAND USE RESTRICTIONS

In consultation with Ecology, Defendants will prepare an Environmental (Restrictive) Covenant substantially in the form of Exhibit E-1 and consistent with WAC 173-340-440 and RCW 64.70. After approval by Ecology, Defendants shall record the Environmental (Restrictive) Covenant with the office of the King County Auditor within ten (10) days of Ecology's written approval of the As-Built Drawings for the low-permeability soil cap. The Environmental (Restrictive) Covenant shall restrict future activities and uses of the Site as agreed to by Ecology and Defendants and shall include the following:

- A legal description of the final locations of the "Cap Protection Area," the "Groundwater and Portal Protection Area," and, to the extent not already encompassed by the Groundwater and Portal Protection Area, the No-Build Buffer Areas, depicted in Figures 1, 2, 3, and 4 attached to Exhibit E-1.
- Restriction of future uses of the Site (as defined in Section IV.A) within the "Cap Protection Area," the "Groundwater and Portal Protection Area," and, to the extent not already encompassed by use restrictions for the Groundwater and Portal Protection Area, restriction of future uses within the No-Build Buffer Areas, according to the terms of Exhibit E-1.

Defendants shall provide Ecology with a copy of the recorded Environmental (Restrictive) Covenant within thirty (30) days of the recording date.

Defendants shall also make good faith efforts to cause an Environmental (Restrictive) Covenant substantially in the form of Exhibit E-2 to be recorded concurrent with the recording of the covenant substantially in the form of Exhibit E-1. The Environmental (Restrictive) Covenant shall restrict future uses of the property designated in Exhibit E-2 according to the terms of Exhibit E-2. Defendants shall provide Ecology with a copy of the recorded

Environmental (Restrictive) Covenant within thirty (30) days of the recording date. If Defendants are unable to secure such covenant, Defendants shall provide notice to Ecology of their inability to secure such covenant within ten (10) days of Ecology's written approval of the As-Built Drawings for the low-permeability soil cap, together with a description of their good faith efforts to secure such covenant.

XXI. FINANCIAL ASSURANCES

Pursuant to WAC 173-340-440(11), Defendants shall maintain sufficient and adequate financial assurance mechanisms to cover all costs associated with the operation and maintenance of the remedial action at the Site, including institutional controls, compliance monitoring, and corrective measures.

Defendants have submitted to Ecology for review and approval an estimate of the costs that they will incur in carrying out the terms of this Decree, including operation and maintenance, and compliance monitoring. Ecology approves the initial estimate dated September 17, 2012, which is in the amount of \$775,000 for purposes of establishing an initial financial assurance amount. Within sixty (60) days of the effective date of this Decree, Defendants shall provide proof of financial assurances sufficient to cover all such costs in a form reasonably acceptable to Ecology.

Defendants shall adjust the financial assurance coverage and provide Ecology's project coordinator with documentation of the updated financial assurance for:

- A. Inflation, annually, within thirty (30) days of the close of the calendar year; or if applicable, ninety (90) days after the close of Defendants' fiscal year if the financial test or corporate guarantee is used.
- B. Changes in cost estimates, within thirty (30) days of issuance of Ecology's approval of a modification or revision to the CAP that result in increases to the cost or expected duration of this Decree as provided in Section XXVIII (Duration of Decree). Any

adjustments for inflation since the most recent preceding close of the calendar year shall be made concurrent with adjustments for changes in cost estimates.

XXII. 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, their 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.

XXIII. COMPLIANCE WITH APPLICABLE LAWS

- A. All actions carried out by Defendants pursuant to this Decree shall be done in compliance 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 may be applicable and that are known at the time of entry of this Decree are identified in the Technical Memorandum dated June 7, 2017, prepared by Golder Associates Inc., attached to this Decree as Exhibit F.
- B. Pursuant to RCW 70.105D.090(1), Defendants are exempt from the procedural requirements of RCW 70.94, 70.95, 70.105, 77.55, 90.48, and 90.58 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 the Technical Memorandum dated June 7, 2017, prepared by Golder Associates Inc. attached to this Decree as Exhibit F.

1	
2	í
3	:
4]
5	J
6	1
7]
8	
9	
10	
11	,
12	,
13	
14	
15	
16	

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

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, that Party shall promptly notify the other Party/Parties 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.

XXIV. 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 RCW 70.105D, including remedial actions and

1 | D
2 | pr
3 | ir
4 | W
5 | tc
6 | d
7 | D
8 | it
9 | ir
10 | g
11 | st
12 | E

13 14

1516

17 18

19 20

21

2223

24

2526

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). Ecology has accumulated \$224,089.53 in remedial action costs related to this Site as of March 31, 2017. Payment for this amount shall be submitted within thirty (30) days of the effective date of this Decree. For all costs incurred subsequent to March 31, 2017, Defendants shall pay the required amount within thirty (30) 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 with each statement. 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.

In addition to other available relief, 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.

XXV. 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 XXIV (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).

XXVI. 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 remedial 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 by following the provisions of Section XV (Amendment of Decree). This provision shall remain in effect for the duration of this Decree as provided in Section XXVIII (Duration of Decree).

XXVII. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

A Public Participation Plan is required for this Site. Ecology shall review any existing Public Participation Plan to determine its continued appropriateness and whether it requires amendment, or if no plan exists, Ecology shall develop a Public Participation Plan alone or in conjunction with Defendants.

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 lists, 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

engineering design reports. As appropriate, Ecology will edit, submit to Defendants for comment, 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. Black Diamond Library, 24301 Roberts Drive, Black Diamond, Washington 98010
 - 2. Ecology's Northwest Regional Office, 3190 160th Avenue SE, Bellevue, Washington 98008

At a minimum, copies of all public notices and fact sheets shall be promptly placed in these repositories. A copy of all documents related to this Site shall be maintained in the repository at Ecology's Northwest Regional Office in Bellevue, Washington.

XXVIII. 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.

XXIX. 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; 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 WAC 173-322A.

XXX. EFFECTIVE DATE

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

XXXI. 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.

22 ||

1 |

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

23 |

//

24 | //

25

26

1	STATE OF WASHINGTON	ROBERT W. FERGUSON
2	DEPARTMENT OF ECOLOGY	Attorney General
3	Jalley 1 -	/ Vans lit 1. 12
	JAMES J. PENDOWSKI	CAROLINE E. CRESS, WSBA #48488
4	Program Manager Toxics Cleanup Program (360) 407-7177	Assistant Attorney General (360) 586-4613
5	(360) 407-7177	
6		11/11/12
7	Date: 10 24 17	Date: 16/24/17
8		
9		
10	PALMER COKING COAL COMPANY, LLP	
11		
12	By: Its:	
13	Date:	
14		
15		
16	WEYERHAEUSER NR COMPANY	
17		
18	By:	
	Its:	
19	Date:	
20		
21	BNSF RAILWAY COMPANY	
22	DINSE KAILWAT CUMPANY	
23		
24	By:	
25	Date:	
26	Duic.	

1	STATE OF WASHINGTON	ROBERT W. FERGUSON
2	DEPARTMENT OF ECOLOGY	Attorney General
3		
4	JAMES J. PENDOWSKI Program Manager	CAROLINE E. CRESS, WSBA #48488 Assistant Attorney General
5	Toxics Cleanup Program (360) 407-7177	(360) 586-4613
6		
7	Date:	Date:
8		
9	DATMED COVING COAT COMPANY IID	
10	PALMER COKING COAL COMPANY, LLP	
11	Dy William T. Komani	
12	By: WILLIAM J. KOMBOL Its: Manager Date: Siptimber 11, 2017	
13	Date: Stptimber 11, 2017	
14	,	
15	WEYERHAEUSER NR COMPANY	
16	WE LENHAEUSER IN COMPAIN I	
17	By	
18	By:	
19	Date:	
20		
21	BNSF RAILWAY COMPANY	
22	DIADI KAILWAT COMITAINT	
23	By:	
24	Its:	
25	Date:	
26		

1	STATE OF WASHINGTON DEPARTMENT OF ECOLOGY	ROBERT W. FERGUSON Attorney General
2	DELAKTIVENT OF ECOLOGI	Attorney Ocheral
3	JAMES J. PENDOWSKI	CADOLINE E CDECC WCDA #40400
4	Program Manager Toying Cleanup Program	CAROLINE E. CRESS, WSBA #48488 Assistant Attorney General (360) 586-4613
5	Program Manager Toxics Cleanup Program (360) 407-7177	(300) 300-4013
6		
7	Date:	Date:
8		
9	DAIMED COMPANY IID	
10	PALMER COKING COAL COMPANY, LLP	
11	Dy	
12	By:	
13	Date:	
14		
15	WEYERHAEUSER NR COMPANY	
16	WE LEKTIABOBER IVIC COMITAIN I	
17	futer awn	ment of Salete
18	By: VI, Government Affairs, Environment Affairs	7
19	Date: 10/2/17	
20		
21	BNSF RAILWAY COMPANY	
22	DINSI KAILWAT COMITANT	
23	Dv	
24	By:	
25	Date:	
26		

1	STATE OF WASHINGTON DEPARTMENT OF ECOLOGY	ROBERT W. FERGUSON Attorney General
2	DELAKTMENT OF ECOLOGI	Attorney General
3	TAMEG I DENDOWGUI	CAROLINEE CRESS WSDA #49499
4	JAMES J. PENDOWSKI Program Manager	CAROLINE E. CRESS, WSBA #48488 Assistant Attorney General
5	Program Manager Toxics Cleanup Program (360) 407-7177	(360) 586-4613
6		
7	Date:	Date:
8		
9		
10	PALMER COKING COAL COMPANY, LLP	
11		
12	By:	
13	Date:	
14		
15		
16	WEYERHAEUSER NR COMPANY	
17		
18	By:	
19	Date:	
20		
21		
22	BNSF RAILWAY COMPANY	
23	Joh D. Fovaly	
24	By: John D. Lovenburg Its: Vice President Environmental	
25	Date: September 11, 2017	
26		

1	PACCAR PyC
2	
3	By: G. E. West
4	Its: Vice President of Manufacturing Date: 10/2/2017
5	Date: 70/2/3017
6	DROWNING FERRIS DIDUSTRIES OF HIL BIOIS BIS
7	BROWNING-FERRIS INDUSTRIES OF ILLINOIS, INC.
8	D
9	By: Its:
10	Date:
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	ENTERED this day of 2017.
- 1	
16	
16 17	IIIDGE
	JUDGE King County Superior Court
17	
17 18	
17 18 19	
17 18 19 20	
17 18 19 20 21 22	
17 18 19 20 21	
17 18 19 20 21 22 23	

1	PACCAR INC
2	
3	By:
4	Date:
5	
6	BROWNING-FEŖRIS INDUSTRIES OF ILLINOIS, INC.
7	
8 9	By Soloma Mizrachi Its: Vice President
10	Date: September 15, 2017
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	ENTERED this day of 2017.
16	
17	JUDGE
18	King County Superior Court
19	
20	
21	
22 23	
24	
25	
26	

King County Superior Court Judicial Electronic Signature Page

Case Number: 17-2-28787-3

Case Title: Not available at this time

Document Title: AGREED ORDER

Signed by: Commissioner Henry Judson

Date: 11/6/2017 9:46:11 AM

Judge/Commissioner: Commissioner Henry Judson

This document is signed in accordance with the provisions in GR 30.

Certificate Hash: 252A2613AD1DF6F184ADD5EFD5753C76D53A5CB8

Certificate effective date: 7/16/2014 12:09:30 PM Certificate expiry date: 7/16/2019 12:09:30 PM

Certificate Issued by: C=US, E=kcscefiling@kingcounty.gov, OU=KCDJA,

O=KCDJA, CN="Henry Judson: WPypi5D74hGx6nH1YIhwmw=="