
To: Frank Winslow, Washington State Department of Ecology
From: Charlotte Mitchell, City of Wenatchee and Nick Rohrbach, GeoEngineers, Inc.
Date: January 4, 2021
File: 4296-008-02
Subject: Response to Ecology Comments, Draft Phase 2 Interim Removal Action, Preliminary Design Report – Saddle Rock Park, Wenatchee, Washington

The Draft Phase 2 Interim Removal Action, Preliminary Design Report, Saddle Rock Park in Wenatchee, Washington (Site) dated December 9, 2020, was prepared by GeoEngineers for the City of Wenatchee (City). This memorandum provides our responses to comments provided by the Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology), Central Region Toxics Cleanup Program, on December 10, 2020. We have extracted individual comments and numbered them as they appear sequentially in the PDF letter provided by Ecology.

Ecology Comment 1:**Page 5, Section 1, Paragraph 3**

Please revise the text as follows:

The Phase 1 IRA generally consisted of removal of the lower four waste rock piles (SR01, SR02, SR03 and SR08). The remaining upper waste rock piles (SR04, SR05 and SR06) were reserved for a second phase because the bulk of waste rock material **with arsenic concentrations** greater than ~~the~~ background concentration ~~as concentrated near~~ **were located at SR01, SR02, SR02, SR03 and SR08**. In addition, these four piles were located nearer to the Site entrance where potential public exposure was the greatest. A detailed evaluation of the remaining waste rock piles and access was conducted after the Phase 1 IRA to determine **appropriate next steps** and ~~adequate to estimate~~ project funding needed to conduct the remaining second phase.

City Response:

Comment accepted and text revisions completed.

Ecology Comment 2:**Page 5, Section 1, Paragraph 4**

Please revise the text as follows:

Further data review of the previously identified waste rock pile SR06, indicated that **non-native materials** in this location ~~was likely an~~ **were a result** of excavation into the hillside to accommodate road construction (the current primary haul road). ~~and~~ As as a result, this location is **was** no longer under consideration for remedial action at the Site (GeoEngineers 2019b). A statistical review (by GeoEngineers and Ecology) of the arsenic concentrations at SR04 indicated arsenic concentrations were not greater than the Site-specific background concentration. **Therefore, Ecology concluded that cleanup of SR04 was not required (Ecology**

2020a). In addition, SR04 is located in a remote area and is heavily vegetated so exposure risk is less than at the other waste rock piles.

~~and because of the remote location and heavy vegetation present at SR04, it was determined by Ecology that SR04 does not require cleanup (remedial excavation) (Ecology 2020a).~~

Please ensure that the references in Section 7 are complete. The reference for Ecology 2020a is not included there.

City Response:

Comment accepted and text revisions completed. The references in Section 7 were checked for completeness and the reference for Ecology 2020 (Ecology's October 12, 2020 letter) is now included there.

Ecology Comment 3:

Page 6, Section 2, Last Paragraph

The text current states:

This Report describes Phase 2 activities to address the remaining waste rock pile at the Site (SR05).

Please replace this text as follows:

This Report present the preliminary design for Phase 2 activities to address the remaining waste rock pile at the Site (SR05) and mitigation measures to prevent human exposure to bare soils that have elevated arsenic concentrations.

City Response:

Comment accepted and text revisions completed.

Ecology Comment 4:

Page 8, Section 3.3, sentence before bullets

Please revise as follows:

For the bare soil mitigation measures, the following mitigation measures ~~institutional control~~ will be installed:

Institutional controls are typically used to ensure compliance with MTCA.

City Response:

Comment accepted and text revisions completed.

Ecology Comment 5:

Page 17, Section 4.10.1

Ecology notes that the remedial action objectives for the Site cleanup are not solely the Site-wide background concentration for arsenic of 95 mg/kg. Those remedial action objectives have been stipulated in several previous Site documents, and Ecology does not require reiterating them within this design document (since the design document will be primarily used by the Contractor, and the remedial action objectives will be managed by the Site's Consulting Engineer).

City Response:

Comment noted. Text in this section was not revised.

Ecology Comment 6:

Page 18, Section 4.12

Please rename this section from "Installation of Institutional Controls" to "Installation of Bare Soil Mitigation Measures". Institutional controls are typically used to ensure compliance with MTCA.

For the first complete sentence on Page 18, please revise as follows:

Signage and bench mitigation measures are detailed in the attached Drawings **8 and 9**.

City Response:

Comments accepted and text revisions completed.

Ecology Comment 7:

Page 19, Section 4.12, last paragraph

Please add an aerial photo map that shows the plans for the existing trails (both formal trails and informal tracks) at the Site. We understand that trail closure will likely be managed by Chelan-Douglas Land Trust (CDLT); however, it is important that this Preliminary Design Report clearly identify what trails are expected to remain, and which are anticipated to be permanently closed. This should include both the area between SR01 and SR03 and the area around SR06, SR05, and the ridgetop area.

City Response:

Comment accepted. New aerial photo figures (Figure 2 through 4) have been added to this report, depicting the Ecology requested information above.

New text was also added to the last paragraph in Section 4.12: "Trails to be closed, altered or improved are preliminary presented in Figures 2 through 4. Final trail alterations will be confirmed between the City and the CDLT, to avoid areas with high arsenic concentrations based on the recent Bare Soils Evaluation. The CDLT and City intends to complete the Park-wide trail alterations in a phased approach, with timing between phases of trail work being dependent on the funding/manpower available to complete the work assigned in each phase. The City and the CDLT intend to complete community

outreach in 2021 to gather community input on these trail plans and will incorporate (as applicable) the mitigation measures presented in Appendix B.”

Ecology Comment 8:

Drawing 3

Drawing 3 includes trail closure signs (referenced 5/9 but shown on drawing 9 as 5/8). It is Ecology’s understanding that these trail closures may be solely during the implementation of the Phase 2 IRA. Since many hikers appear to ignore trail closure signs, for temporary trail closures, we recommend addition of the following to closure signs:

“Trail Temporarily Closed”

“Danger - Heavy Equipment in Operation.”

Is the closure of the trail to SR03 intended to be temporary or permanent? Ecology anticipates that many hikers will still use this trail system even if it has a trail closed sign.

City Response:

Comments accepted. Detail callout bubbles within all plan sheets, including for the trail closure signs, have been corrected to match the detail sheet detail callouts. A detail callout bubble definition has also been added to Drawing 2. The sign text has been revised to “Trail Temporarily Closed” on Drawings 3 and 9, as applicable. An alternate new sign saying “Danger, Construction Site, No Trespassing” was also added to Drawing 9, instead of a sign saying “Danger - Heavy Equipment in Operation.” This slight change was made because the signs are readily available and not a custom made sign.

The closure of the trail to SR03 (above SR02) is intended to be temporary, so that no public hikers enter the construction site from above park trails.

Ecology Comment 9:

Appendices

Ecology notes that some appendices included in the Preliminary Design Report may not be needed within the Final Design Report used for a bid package. The following ~~strikeout~~ Appendices could potentially be removed for the Final Design Report used in the bid package.

~~Appendix A. Technical Memorandum: Phase 2 Saddle Rock Interim Remedial Action,~~

~~Bare Soils Investigation Summary, August 2020 Appendix B. Mitigation Measures Assessment Report~~

~~Appendix C. Inadvertent Discovery Procedure Appendix D. Geotechnical Evaluation~~

~~Appendix E. Drainage Report~~

~~Appendix F. Sampling and Analysis Plan Appendix G. Revised Agreed Order Schedule~~

~~Appendix H. Construction Cost Estimate~~

~~Table H 1. Phase 1 Cost Estimate~~

City Response:

Comment noted and accepted. The strikeout appendices noted above were still retained for this report, but will be removed in the Phase 2 Final Design Report.

Ecology Comment 10:

App F – Sampling and Analysis Plan

Ecology notes that the 2019 SAP estimated an area of 4,608 ft² for the SR05 area. With a confirmation sampling grid of 15' x 15' feet, this resulted in an estimated 20 samples for XRF analysis, and 2 samples for laboratory analysis (see Table 3 from the SAP). The confirmation sampling locations/number may need to be adjusted based on the actual area of waste rock that is excavated.

City Response:

Comment noted and accepted.

Ecology Comment 11:

App B – Mitigation Measures Assessment Report

Page 61, Section 3.1.1, first two paragraphs

This section currently states:

Restrictive Covenants (RCs) are a type of Proprietary Control intended to limit future land use in order to control future contact with contaminated soils and ensure maintenance of the selected mitigation measures. A RC would be recorded to impose limitations at the Site to restrict activities or future resource use that may result in unacceptable risk to human health or the environment.

It is anticipated that an RC will not be recorded with Ecology after substantial completion of Phase 2 construction activities are completed because the remaining anthropogenically generated waste rock will be removed (at SR-05). Furthermore, as indicated in the Ecology letter dated October 28, 2011, a Site RC will not be required since Recreation and Conservation Office (RCO) funds have been utilized on this project (Ecology 2011).

Ecology notes that this report has already been approved and is solely an appendix in the Preliminary Design Report. As such, no change is requested. However, the following language would more accurately present this subject.

Restrictive Covenants, also known as Environmental Covenants (ECs), are a type of deed restriction intended to limit future land use in order to control future contact with contaminated soils and ensure any caps or controls are properly maintains. An EC would be at a Site to restrict activities uses that may result in unacceptable risk to human health or the environment.

It is anticipated that an EC will not be needed for the Site since no anthropogenically generated contamination is expected to remain above Site cleanup levels at the conclusion of the Phase 2 IRA. Note that elevated arsenic concentrations in native rock and bare soils have been determined by Ecology to not be considered MTCA-regulated contamination.

Please see also the email from Ecology dated October 22, 2020 that further explains Ecology's 2011 email.

City Response:

Comment noted. No revisions were completed in Appendix B. It appears the Ecology email and PDF letter referenced above, is actually dated October 15, 2020 and October 12, 2020, respectively.

Ecology Comment 12:

General Comment

Ecology notes that we prefer to have a representative present during the pre-bid meeting and project kickoff meeting. Please let us know at least two weeks prior to these events so that we can schedule our presence.

As conducted during the Phase 1 IRA, we highly recommend submittal of SR05 confirmatory sampling results to Ecology prior to demobilization to ensure concurrence on the sufficiency of the confirmatory data to state that no additional anthropogenically generated contamination remains above Site cleanup levels.

City Response:

Commented noted and accepted. The City will contact Ecology at least two weeks prior to the pre-bid meeting and project kickoff meeting, so that Ecology may attend the meetings.

Consistent with Phase 1 construction oversight, the City's consultant will submit SR05 confirmation sampling results to Ecology prior to demobilization to ensure concurrence on the sufficiency of the confirmation data to state that no additional anthropogenically generated contamination remains above Site cleanup levels. The information will likely be presented via website mapping (displaying XRF results) and analytical data received from the offsite laboratory.