

## Lower Duwamish Waterway (LDW) Roundtable Meeting Summary September 28, 2022 | 5:30-7:30 PM | Virtual Meeting

### Welcome, Introductions, and Where We Left Off

The meeting facilitator, Sophie Glass (Triangle Associates), welcomed participants to the Lower Duwamish Waterway (LDW) Roundtable meeting. She reviewed the purpose and structure of the LDW Roundtable forum and shared that the meeting's purpose was for Roundtable members to learn about the early cleanup design for the Upper Reach of the LDW and provide input about how activities at each location within the cleanup area may affect residents, Tribes, industry, habitat, fishers, and recreationists. The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) will then consider input received in subsequent planning documents in the design of the cleanup.

Sophie introduced Elly Hale, Remedial Project Manager, EPA, and Laura Knudsen, Community Involvement Coordinator, EPA. Sophie reviewed the outcomes of the previous Roundtable meeting on March 31, 2022, at which Roundtable members provided feedback about the types of LDW cleanup impacts that could affect people who live, work, and recreate in the Duwamish Valley.

Sophie thanked the Roundtable Steering Committee for advising the planning of the September 28 meeting. She noted that EPA held several pre-Roundtable meetings with individual caucuses to review the agenda and to clarify the kind of input EPA sought from the Roundtable. Sophie reviewed the September 28 Roundtable agenda and explained that, in response to feedback EPA heard during pre-Roundtable meetings, EPA and the facilitation team decided to prioritize large group discussion instead of breaking out into separate caucus discussions.

### Initial Cleanup Design for the Upper Reach

Elly Hale, EPA, presented on the 30% design (the initial design) for the Upper Reach of the LDW. Her presentation included:

- An update on the Superfund process for the Upper Reach (explanation of process, review periods, and timing considerations).
- An explanation of cleanup construction in the waterway (examples of equipment and techniques).
- Review of early design for the Upper Reach (information about areas of active cleanup and engineering drawings related to cleanup areas).

[Click here to see presentation slides for details.](#)

### Comments, Questions, and Answers

*Question:* Are there different odors associated with different cleanup activities?

*Answer from EPA:* Mud has oxygen near the surface – but below that, sometimes the mud can smell like rotten eggs because it is not oxygenated. Odor from the diesel equipment may also be associated with cleanup activities.

*Question:* Why are open clamshell dredge buckets used sometimes instead of environmental buckets?

*Answer from EPA:* If there is a lot of debris, such as old logs, then the environmental bucket does not function very well. Typically, we might use an open bucket to get debris first and then dredge with an environmental bucket. Sometimes the environmental

bucket doesn't have a very good "bite" and depending on the sediment conditions it might not have a very good ability to dig down. We plan to use environmental buckets or have them available. We believe the operators will use the right bucket to do the job with the least impact. This should be made clear in the design.

*Question:* How much contaminant leaches out through the porous screen of a clamshell bucket? Is that a closed bucket?

*Answer from EPA:* There is always some water that needs to get drained out. The environmental bucket should hold more of the water, but some of the water will still be lost and because some of the sediment is very fine, some of that may get into the water. When mud is picked up from the water, the river bottom will always be disturbed a little. That is why EPA monitors the success of the cleanup over time.

*Question:* Are there environmental justice communities (low-income, communities of color, etc.) near the sites where the material will ultimately be disposed? If so, are those communities being protected through this process?

*Answer from EPA:* The two landfill facilities (in Oregon and Eastern Washington) are used by many people. At this time, we do not know if there are communities nearby who would be affected by the use of the landfill.

*Question:* It sounds like the conditions on the bottom of the river determine the type of bucket being used. Who exactly is doing the monitoring to ensure things aren't spilling? And what kind of sampling happens in the water to ensure the contamination isn't leaking from the bucket into the river?

*Answer from EPA:* As a part of the design, we have two kinds of monitoring plans. One is a construction quality assurance monitoring plan and the other is water quality monitoring plan. There is a contractor who does this monitoring work.

*Question:* Will there be a boom around the dredging?

*Answer from EPA:* It is likely there will be a boom. Sometimes a boom is used to define the workspace, but if there is too much current, the boom can be a problem. As the cleanup design progresses, we will have the ability to look at the boom protocols.

*Question:* Along 8<sup>th</sup> Ave, there are a couple different active train tracks (East Marginal Way, Othello). When material goes from the barge to the train tracks, what is the process? How will that impact traffic? Will there be any signage? How much more activity?

*Answer from EPA:* At this point, we do not know the quantity of material, the rate, or the tracks. But we can find that information and report back.

*Question:* Does upland cleanup come before or after sediment cleanup?

*Answer from EPA:* It depends on the decisions to be made upland. Ideally, we will wait to do in-waterway cleanup until sources of pollution have been sufficiently controlled in the upland areas so recontamination does not occur. If cleanup in the waterway happens first, then we need to make sure that the upland cleanup is planned carefully with controls so contaminated material does not get into the waterway.

*Question:* What replaces contaminated mud that must be excavated from mudflats? Is that an area of lost habitat?

*Answer from EPA:* We typically replace sediment to the same elevation, using material that is coarser than mud. This material is called fish mix because the size and shape supports organisms that fish like to eat. Because new sediments naturally settle on top of the river bottom over time, there will be more mud landing on the mudflats in the future. But we cannot put new mud down and hope that it stays. EPA will investigate what has been done at similar sites in the past.

*Question:* What is an upland cleanup?

*Answer from EPA:* The land next to the waterway that has contaminated soil and/or groundwater. Upland cleanups are separate from EPA's in-water cleanup of the LDW.

## Large Group Dialogue and Input on Cleanup Impacts

The facilitator invited Roundtable members to provide input on how cleanup in the different areas of the Upper Reach might affect them and others in their caucus. The facilitation team used a virtual [Mural](#) board to show the map of the areas of the Upper Reach and to capture feedback from members.

Additionally, this feedback from the September LDW Roundtable (and previous feedback from pre-caucus meetings for the September LDW Roundtable as well as the March 2022 LDW Roundtable) was summarized and provided to the Lower Duwamish Waterway Group as part of EPA's comments for the draft 30% design document for the Upper Reach (please see Appendix B: LDW Roundtable input on Draft 30% Remedial Design for the Upper Reach).

Comments on Cleanup Areas 1-12:

- Concern about noise, air, and odor along Cleanup Areas 1-12 and in nearby neighborhoods.
- Desire for water and beach access for rowing shell launches from Duwamish Waterway Park.
- Request for protection of restoration areas along Boeing property.
- Concern about truck traffic if sediments are offloaded at Waste Management in Georgetown, specifically on the South Park Bridge.
- Comment about rowers' navigation around dredging and barge activities based on past experience. Typically need 25 feet width of clearance (counting oars). The boats range from approximately 30-45 feet long. And typically, no rowers on the river between November and February.
- Question about understanding techniques for containing and monitoring sediment so it doesn't end up on shorelines at parks or residences.
- Comment to expect increase in visitor use near areas 8 and 10 when the City constructs the South Park Plaza.
- Depending on timing, the Unity Electric site could eventually house a community-services building, connect to the Duwamish Waterway Park, and have river access. The City anticipates the site will see an increase in use (e.g., more visitors, spend more time at the site, more people accessing the water, etc.).
- South Park Marina could have concerns and it would be good to engage with them early on potential impacts.

Comments on Cleanup Areas 13-17:

- Request to add more vegetation/plants in the river.

- Concern that construction noise might impact wildlife near the cleanup, especially at Duwamish People's Park.
- Concern about contamination affecting Duwamish People's Park.
- Comment that some of the cleanup plan extends to but doesn't include early action areas. EPA has made assurances in the past that Early Action Areas, if recontaminated, will be addressed during the river-wide cleanup in that reach.
- Request for special or temporary signage near Duwamish People's Park to inform community during cleanup.
- Question about if there is a way to soften the shoreline at Area 17 as part of the Remedial Action and if rip rap will be removed during the process.

Comments on Cleanup Areas 18-26:

- Concern about traffic on the roads if trucks are carrying sediment.
- Question about how much more difficult will it be to get at these areas in Reach C that are along the bulkheads. Will it take much longer?
- Concern about worker safety in areas along bulkheads.

Comments on Cleanup Areas 27-28:

- Concern about traffic on the roads if trucks are carrying sediment.
- Question if there is a way to accelerate the return to mudflats after dredging. Is this something EPA has done before at other sites?
- Concern about ability of boats in Duwamish Yacht Club, Delta Marine, and large boats at shipyards to navigate around barges during dredging.
- Seattle City Light is looking into potential climate change adaptation project for the Hamm Creek area and the substation. There may be a need and/or opportunity to coordinate with them.

Comments on Cleanup Areas 29-35:

- Concern about seismic stability of 102<sup>nd</sup> Street Bridge if there will be additional traffic.

General Input (not site-specific):

- Request for signage surrounding train tracks that will be more active as a result of sediment transport.
- Concern about impacts to residents along the whole river and possible contamination of shorelines of homes and parks.
- Desire for closed buckets to reduce air pollution.
- Request to have sampling of salmon during the cleanup to ensure community members and fishers feel safe eating the salmon.
- Request for outreach not just in the Duwamish Valley and Upper Reach but in the broader community as well (West Seattle, for example).
- Question about how design plans will account for climate change and include adaptation strategies.

[A PDF of the Mural can be found online.](#)

## Announcements from Roundtable Caucuses—All Caucuses

Jamie Hearn shared that the Duwamish River Community Coalition is hosting a post-Roundtable meeting on Wednesday, October 12 from 6-7p.m. to discuss the Roundtable meeting.

## Opportunity for Comments and Questions from Observers

There were no comments or questions from observers.

## Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 7:30p.m.

## Comments from Post-Meeting Debrief (Shared with EPA for Consideration)

- A few Roundtable members indicated that this Roundtable meeting's format and substance were very effective.

## Attachment A: Roundtable Members and Participants

This list of participants was generated from the Zoom User report and does not include the names of phone participants who didn't identify themselves or participants who had anonymous participant IDs (e.g. "iPhone user").

Name	Affiliation
1. Tom Wang	Anchor QEA
2. Kizz Prusia	BERK Consulting
3. Katie Moxley	Boeing
4. Rath	Community Health Advocate (CHA)
5. Soun Hour Pov	CHA
6. Paco Ramos	CHA
7. iPhone de Roxana	CHA
8. Emma Maria	CHA
9. Luz María Cardenas	CHA
10. Cindy Navarro	CHA
11. Emma Maria	CHA
12. Ai Nguyen	CHA
13. Trieu Nguyen	CHA
14. Noe y Luz	CHA
15. Sophorn Sim	CHA Lead
16. Alberto J. Rodríguez	City of Seattle
17. Pete Rude	City of Seattle
18. Dave Schuchardt	City of Seattle
19. Chayo Rosario Medina	Duwamish River Accountability Group
20. Robin Schwartz	Duwamish River Community Coalition
21. Jamie Hearn	Duwamish River Community Coalition
22. Christian's iPhone	Duwamish River Community Coalition
23. Cathy B	Duwamish Rowing Club

Name	Affiliation
24. Ken Workman	Duwamish Tribe
25. Meshach Padilla	EPA
26. Laura Knudsen	EPA
27. Elly Hale	EPA
28. Piper Peterson	EPA
29. Giovanna Pagnozzi	Geosyntec
30. Linn Gould	Just Health Action
31. Tracie Friedman	Khmu National Federation
32. Debra Williston	King County
33. Jeff Stern	King County
34. Jim Bolger	King County
35. Marla Steinhoff	NOAA
36. Sarin Phum	Not provided
37. Thao Thach	Not provided
38. Katy Gross	Not provided
39. Eduardo	Not provided
40. Dominga Gal (Eduardo)	Not provided
41. James Graves	Not provided
42. Caitie Sheban	Not provided
43. Derek Gauthier	Not provided
44. Kc	Not provided
45. Quan	Not provided
46. Tamara Erickson	Not provided
47. Pat S	Not provided
48. KimHeng Lim	Not provided
49. Cindy Navarro	Not provided
50. Myhanh	Not provided
51. CROWLEA	Not provided
52. Peggy J. Printz	Not provided
53. Kevin	Not provided
54. Azalea Hermann	Not provided
55. Hoang Nguyen	Not provided
56. Braden LeMaster	Not provided
57. Carlos Urias	Not provided
58. Philip Spadaro	Not provided
59. Kim Johannessen	Not provided
60. Paula Jantzen	Not provided
61. Greg Wingard	Not provided
62. Quan's Z Fold3	Not provided
63. Deborah	Not provided
64. Tammy (Deborah)	Not provided
65. Derek	Not provided

Name	Affiliation
66. Karen Paola	Not provided
67. Pat Jablonski	Nucor
68. Joanna Florer	Port of Seattle
69. Shirlee Tan	Public Health – Seattle King County
70. Julie West	Public Health – Seattle King County
71. Khanh Ho	Public Health – Seattle King County
72. Ruben Chi Bertoni	Public Health – Seattle King County
73. Sean Dixon	Puget Soundkeeper
74. Nate Hart	Seattle Public Utilities
75. Martha Flores Perez	Spanish Interpreter
76. Erin O’Connell	TIG Environmental
77. Kristen Kerns	US Army Corps of Engineers
78. BJ Cummings	UW EDGE
79. Tom Burbacher	UW Superfund Research Program

#### Facilitation Team

Cheryl Klotz	Triangle Associates
Annalise Ritter	Triangle Associates
Alyssa Bonini	Triangle Associates
Anna Hamilton	Triangle Associates
Sophie Glass	Triangle Associates

#### Interpretation Team

1. Martha Flores	Interpreter
2. Tammy Dang	Interpreter
3. James Heng	Interpreter

## Attachment B:

Lower Duwamish Waterway Superfund Site – LDW Roundtable input on Draft 30% Remedial Design for the Upper Reach, as summarized and provided to LDWG with EPA’s comments dated October 18, 2022

**Note:** Many of these comments will be addressed in plans that are part of the 90% design submittal, and so may not be directly addressed in the next submittal (60% design). We are including all of them here so LDWG may understand comments/concerns raised by the LDW Roundtable and can respond to and/or incorporate the concerns at the appropriate stage of the design and cleanup process. EPA will revisit the list as subsequent cleanup design submittals are received. *Comments that do not relate to the upper reach design are shaded in gray.*

Cleanup Construction Impacts
<b>DRAG</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Describe potential traffic increases, whether trucks or trains, associated with transport from transload facilities to the landfill. DRAG is concerned about traffic impacts if dredged sediments are transloaded at the Waste Management Facility in Georgetown.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Describe potential impacts of transloading on nearby communities. DRAG is concerned about potential impacts to users of Gateway Park North. Specify what rail-line would be used (E. Marginal Way or Othello?)</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>S. Michigan St. is another place where people have been seen fishing [not included in Upper Reach design comments, as Michigan Street is in Middle Reach and isn’t near Waste Management Facility].</li> </ul>
<b>DRCC</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>EPA should discuss whether fishing is appropriate during cleanup construction.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>What communities live near the landfills to be used for the dredged sediment, and will they be impacted?</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>How will Duwamish Waterway Park beach sediment be protected from sediment disturbed during remediation?</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>How will shorelines near homes on the west side of the waterway be affected by sediment disturbed during remediation?</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Where are criteria for hiring local contractors to do the remediation work? In almost all the work that the City/County/Port do, local hiring occurs.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Superfund Job Training Initiative (JTI): Previous application of this program in the Lower Duwamish Waterway resulted in training 14 people but only one person got hired. How can we make the process better for next time so that more people can get jobs in the cleanup? DRCC wants to help increase success of Superfund JTI.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Clearly specify work hours, lights, noise limitations and ways to address complaints/concerns if they arise.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Discuss the potential for deposition of contaminated sediment on the shore next to South Park, and explain how this will be prevented or detected and addressed.</li> </ul>
<b>Duwamish Tribe</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concern about impacts to T-105 fishing pier. (T105 is adjacent to the lower reach, for which design has not begun.)</li> </ul>
<b>Fishers</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Fishers’ Caucus wants to know if fishing sites will still be available and safe to use during cleanup. The Community Health Advocates do direct outreach at fishing sites, so limited access to sites will impact their work. A caucus member suggested partnering with King County Metro to transport fishers from their regular sites to alternative sites. Multiple members of the caucus expressed concerns about fishing during construction activity.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Khmer Community Health Advocates: Concern about impacts to Duwamish People’s Park fishing site.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Latinx Community Health Advocates: Concern about increased interest in fishing now that the West Seattle bridge has reopened.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Vietnamese Community Health Advocates: Should CHAs advise people to fish in areas further from the upper reach construction activities? Would fish from places like the Spokane St Bridge be less subject to increases in contamination?</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Vietnamese Community Health Advocates: What kinds of smells are expected, will they be noticeable by people fishing nearby, and can the smells be controlled?</li> </ul>



**Lower Duwamish Waterway Superfund Site – LDW Roundtable input on Draft 30% Remedial Design for the Upper Reach, as summarized and provided to LDWG with EPA’s comments dated October 18, 2022**

**Note:** Many of these comments will be addressed in plans that are part of the 90% design submittal, and so may not be directly addressed in the next submittal (60% design). We are including all of them here so LDWG may understand comments/concerns raised by the LDW Roundtable and can respond to and/or incorporate the concerns at the appropriate stage of the design and cleanup process. EPA will revisit the list as subsequent cleanup design submittals are received. **Comments that do not relate to the upper reach design are shaded in gray.**

- Vietnamese Community Health Advocates: People living near and visiting the waterway will see big construction equipment, and maybe smell diesel and hear noises. Are there ways to use more clean energy instead of diesel? Could plants and trees be established to block to view and reduce noise and smells? Could floating plants in the river help clean the river?

**Cleanup Construction Impacts (Continued)**

- Vietnamese Community Health Advocates: Will the cleanup process affect resident fish and crabs, which could disperse and carry contamination to other areas. Do we know how quickly stirred up sediments will settle?
- Vietnamese Community Health Advocates: Will there be more trains carrying the contaminated mud through the community. How is EPA ensuring that these will not leak? How much will train noise and safety issues increase in the area?
- Vietnamese Community Health Advocates: What dust or smoke will be generated by the cleanup equipment? Should the dredging be done with “environmental bucket” so less sediment will escape when bucket is pulled up from the bottom? Will there be construction detours or will vessel traffic cause the south park bridge to be up more often? Could it impact businesses & residents?

**General Comment**

- Near **Areas 22, 24, 26:** Are there worker safety hazards related to cleanup construction near shoreline structures and bulkheads?

**Government PRP**

- **Areas 32 – 35:** Will there be additional traffic on the 102nd street bridge as a result of construction work? Could the work affect the bridge’s structure? Is the bridge stable and safe in an earthquake?
- What impacts will construction have on liveaboards?

**Non-Government PRP**

- **Areas 1-17:** If sediments are taken to the landfill in trucks, what are the potential traffic impacts? How much of an increase to train traffic would be likely? How much will it increase train or truck traffic? This could be a concern for Georgetown residents if Waste Management’s Duwamish Reload Facility is used.
- **Areas 18-28:** Same as above.
- What economic or other impacts might construction have on people who live and work in the area? Would it affect businesses, community events such as festivals?
- The Unity Electric site (former port-a-potties business!) near Duwamish Waterway Park may eventually house a community-services building with shoreline access. Could the timing of the property development bring an increased number of visitors and shoreline users to the area as sediment cleanup is ongoing?
- Find ways to mitigate noise pollution.
- For **Areas 1-12** there are noise, air, and odor concerns.
- For getting word out to fishers, be aware that people fish in many places, not just from fishing piers. People fish from Duwamish Waterway Park and several street ends next to the waterway. They also use the new Duwamish River People's Park.
- Regarding **Area 8 and Area 10**, the City of Seattle will be doing construction at the South Park Plaza (just SW of the South Park Bridge). Depending on the timing, could the sediment cleanup occur during Plaza construction and/or affect the area as visits and shoreline use are increasing there? Here is more information about the SP Plaza: <https://www.seattle.gov/parks/about-us/projects/south-park-plaza-landbanked-site-park-development>

**Lower Duwamish Waterway Superfund Site – LDW Roundtable input on Draft 30% Remedial Design for the Upper Reach, as summarized and provided to LDWG with EPA’s comments dated October 18, 2022**

**Note:** Many of these comments will be addressed in plans that are part of the 90% design submittal, and so may not be directly addressed in the next submittal (60% design). We are including all of them here so LDWG may understand comments/concerns raised by the LDW Roundtable and can respond to and/or incorporate the concerns at the appropriate stage of the design and cleanup process. EPA will revisit the list as subsequent cleanup design submittals are received. *Comments that do not relate to the upper reach design are shaded in gray.*

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The City of Seattle and King County have been talking about acquiring a riverfront property to the east (EPA is not clear if this is referring to something separate from the Unity Electric site). This is still preliminary.</li> </ul>
<b>Cleanup Construction Impacts (Continued)</b>
<b>PRP Business</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>How might movement of trucks and construction equipment affect the businesses and users of these areas.</li> <li>LDWG’s design team should engage with South Park Marina early on to assess potential impacts.</li> </ul>
<b>Puget Soundkeeper Alliance</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>How difficult will it be to clean up next to bulkheads (<b>Areas 18, 24, 26, 27</b>)? Will these take more time? Will there be impacts on people who work on land adjacent to the shoreline and bulkheads.</li> </ul>
<b>Recreational River Users</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Will there be impacts to the Rowing Club? Based on past years' experience with cleanup on the river, rowers can usually navigate past most dredging &amp; barge activities upriver. The Rowing Club boats typically need 25' width of clearance (counting oars). The boats range from ~30-45' long. They typically don't row on the river between Nov-Feb.</li> <li>What impacts are expected during construction on beach access at Duwamish Waterway Park? Will barges and equipment block access, and if so, when and for how long? The Rowing Club needs beach and waterway access for launching rowing shells (from Duwamish Waterway Park) several times a week. [As noted above, they typically don't row on the river between Nov-Feb.]</li> </ul>
<b>UW EDGE (Exposures, Diseases, Genomics, and Environment)</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>How might construction affect the ability of large boats, including boats from the Duwamish Yacht Club or Delta Marine, to access and travel through the waterway during dredging?</li> <li>Will there be impacts to 8th ave street end in Georgetown (Anarchy point). This is in Middle Reach, but is near Waste Management Inc’s Duwamish Reload Facility.</li> <li>Will shorelines next to residential properties be protected from contaminated sediments disturbed by dredging in this reach?</li> </ul>
<b>Cleanup Technology and Equipment</b>
<b>DRCC</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Are all the dredging technologies created equal? (e.g. is clamshell dredging as good a technology as environmental bucket dredging)?</li> <li>DRCC has asked that the City of Seattle and King County commit to using the best technology, as was done for the Boeing Plant 2 cleanup. Why would LDWG let the contractor decide whether to use an environmental dredge bucket?</li> </ul>
<b>Climate Change</b>
<b>Non-Government PRP</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>EPA should be aware of and coordinate with the Resilience District work City of Seattle is launching (it will include sea level rise adaptation planning). You can read more about our vision here: <a href="https://www.lincolnst.edu/publications/articles/2021-04-climate-health-equity-resilience-district-concept-gathers-momentum-in-seattle">https://www.lincolnst.edu/publications/articles/2021-04-climate-health-equity-resilience-district-concept-gathers-momentum-in-seattle</a></li> <li><b>River miles 4.3-4.5</b>, Seattle City Light is looking into a potential climate change adaptation project for the Hamm Creek area and the substation. EPA should be aware of and coordinate as necessary with City Light.</li> </ul>

**Lower Duwamish Waterway Superfund Site – LDW Roundtable input on Draft 30% Remedial Design for the Upper Reach, as summarized and provided to LDWG with EPA’s comments dated October 18, 2022**

**Note:** Many of these comments will be addressed in plans that are part of the 90% design submittal, and so may not be directly addressed in the next submittal (60% design). We are including all of them here so LDWG may understand comments/concerns raised by the LDW Roundtable and can respond to and/or incorporate the concerns at the appropriate stage of the design and cleanup process. EPA will revisit the list as subsequent cleanup design submittals are received. *Comments that do not relate to the upper reach design are shaded in gray.*

<b>UW EDGE (Exposures, Diseases, Genomics, and Environment)</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>How are the design plans accounting for/adapting to climate change?</li> </ul>
<b>Communication Needs</b>
<b>Individual 9/28 LDW Roundtable attendee</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Will EPA make recommendations about activities on the river/shore that should be avoided while the construction is ongoing and while sediments are being stirred up during dredging?</li> </ul>
<b>DRAG</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>EPA, ECY, Port, DRCC need to come to community members more directly with outreach efforts. Flyers, posters should be used to distribute information. Community members should feel included, not just invited.</li> </ul>
<b>DRCC</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Interpretive signs and QR codes would be great. Would be good for people to be able to go somewhere and see a “live” update (such as ‘dredging is happening here’) or up to date explanations.</li> <li>It is hard for community members to remember what phone number/agency to call about different concerns in the Duwamish Valley (pollution from encampments, source control from industrial sites, tire particles, etc.). Could there be a hotline community members could call?</li> </ul>
<b>Fishers</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Vietnamese Community Health Advocates: Have people doing outreach &amp; post signs in language to explain about the cleanup, so people won’t fish during the active cleanup time, as phased cleanup work progresses.</li> </ul>
<b>Individual 9/28 LDW Roundtable attendee</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>EPA doesn’t appear to be doing outreach to West Seattle neighborhoods, but this community should be informed.</li> </ul>
<b>Non-Government PRP</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Can EPA host a website to inform the public about construction? Could it include an option for the public to submit complaints, concerns, comments?</li> <li>Is mitigating noise pollution addressed as a priority in the cleanup design? A system should be established to catalogue complaints.</li> </ul>
<b>Puget Soundkeeper Alliance</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Will there be special signage or perhaps a staffed info booth at the Duwamish People’s Park to talk to the community when cleanup work is addressing contaminated areas next to the park?</li> </ul>
<b>Dredging</b>
<b>DRCC</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>How will sediment resuspension be minimized so contamination doesn’t end up affecting shorelines in South Park?</li> </ul>
<b>Duwamish Tribe</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In the video with environmental dredge bucket, water was coming through a porous screen. How much contamination gets out through the screen? Is that really considered a "closed" bucket?</li> </ul>
<b>NOAA</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provide information about how impacts to Duwamish People’s Park and Shoreline Restoration and the habitat created as part of the Boeing Plant 2 cleanup will be monitored and prevented during dredging.</li> </ul>
<b>PRP Business</b>

**Lower Duwamish Waterway Superfund Site – LDW Roundtable input on Draft 30% Remedial Design for the Upper Reach, as summarized and provided to LDWG with EPA’s comments dated October 18, 2022**

**Note:** Many of these comments will be addressed in plans that are part of the 90% design submittal, and so may not be directly addressed in the next submittal (60% design). We are including all of them here so LDWG may understand comments/concerns raised by the LDW Roundtable and can respond to and/or incorporate the concerns at the appropriate stage of the design and cleanup process. EPA will revisit the list as subsequent cleanup design submittals are received. *Comments that do not relate to the upper reach design are shaded in gray.*

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Maintenance dredging has not been done between First Ave South Bridge and the South Park Bridge for a long time, and the depth is now 15 feet when it should be 20 feet. Barges and tugboats find it increasingly difficult to navigate.[This relates to the Middle Reach]</li> </ul>
<b>Information Needs</b>
<b>DRCC</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Should salmon tissue be monitored so that fishers have a better idea of how much fish they should be consuming?</li> </ul>
<b>Fishers (Vietnamese CHA)</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>How do we ensure that levels of PCBs in salmon are not increased as a result of the cleanup? Community members would feel safer with data to support EPA assurances that PCBs won’t increase in adult salmon because the fish are focused on spawning and are not eating.</li> </ul>
<b>Other General Concerns</b>
<b>Fishers (Vietnamese CHA)</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There needs to be cleanup on land, not just in the waterway. Garbage and needles make it less pleasant to fish here.[This does not apply to the upper reach design]</li> </ul>
<b>PRP Business</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Businesses need access to docks and piers and to be able to navigate in the waterway. Will this be affected? How will the design avoid or minimize impacts during cleanup?</li> </ul>
<b>Remedial Design Approach</b>
<b>DRCC</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If upland cleanup is not done before sediment cleanup, how will upland cleanups be done to avoid recontamination of sediments?</li> <li>What testing will be done to demonstrate that dredging and upland cleanups are not affecting the waterway?</li> <li>What design submittal will include plans that will show how monitoring will be done? When? At Duwamish Diagonal, the entire area outside of the cleanup area was carefully characterized before construction began, and monitoring was done after dredging. This helped EPA figure out where dredging spillage happened.</li> <li>Will monitoring/testing of potential dispersal take place during work? Will it be done by someone other than the contractor? What EPA and LDWG oversight will be done during the cleanup work?</li> </ul>
<b>Fishers (Vietnamese CHA)</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Vietnamese want salmon samples to prove that it is still safe to eat.</li> </ul>
<b>Non-Government PRP</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Area 15 and Area 16:</b> How will contamination of the habitat at Duwamish River People’s Park be avoided during cleanup.</li> </ul>
<b>PRP Business</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Can the sampling of the sediment (waterway bed and banks) be done soon to determine if there is pollution and to take care of it immediately? Maintenance dredging can’t be done until after cleanup. [This relates to the Middle Reach, which is the next phase of waterway cleanup.]</li> <li>Shoreline businesses and property owners need to be informed about when sampling will happen in their portion of the waterway as the design and clean progresses. Some are concerned about sampling on their land.</li> </ul>
<b>UW EDGE (Exposures, Diseases, Genomics, and Environment)</b>

**Lower Duwamish Waterway Superfund Site – LDW Roundtable input on Draft 30% Remedial Design for the Upper Reach, as summarized and provided to LDWG with EPA’s comments dated October 18, 2022**

**Note:** Many of these comments will be addressed in plans that are part of the 90% design submittal, and so may not be directly addressed in the next submittal (60% design). We are including all of them here so LDWG may understand comments/concerns raised by the LDW Roundtable and can respond to and/or incorporate the concerns at the appropriate stage of the design and cleanup process. EPA will revisit the list as subsequent cleanup design submittals are received. *Comments that do not relate to the upper reach design are shaded in gray.*

- EPA has made assurances that Early Action Areas will be addressed during the river wide cleanup in that reach if there has been recontamination. These areas are not shown as part of the design of the upper reach cleanup. The design should document whether recontamination has occurred in these areas.

**Wildlife and Habitat**

**DRAG**

- How will birds and wildlife at Duwamish River People's Park be protected during the cleanup? Will the noise and disturbance of cleanup construction impact them?

**DRCC**

- Where there is mudflat that must be cleaned up, what will replace the mud after cleanup. If mud is replaced by coarser material (sand, for example) is that counted as lost habitat?

**NOAA**

- **Area 27:** Are there ways to accelerate restoration of mudflat next to the former Rhone Poulenc site after the sediment cleanup?
- **Area 17:** Is there a way to soften the shoreline (next to Earle M. Jorgensen) as part of the remedial action, particularly if rip rap will be removed during the cleanup process?
- **Area 29.** Can the shoreline be softened (here and elsewhere?). How will the cleanup design incorporate habitat friendly substrates?

**PRP Business**

- Is a Hydraulic Project Approval (HPA) from the Washington Department of Fish & Wildlife required? Will WDFW fish biologists be reviewing the plans?