

Jerry Ninteman

Thank you for the opportunity to submit these comments on the October 3, 2022 Public Review Draft Remedial Investigation and Feasibility Study for the Gas Works Park Site. I am a long-time resident of the Wallingford neighborhood and frequent park visitor, and therefore have a special interest in seeing that cleanup actions at the site are conducted in the best interests of park users and the surrounding neighborhood.

I have a single overriding comment regarding the document having to do with consistency of the preferred remedial alternative with the end use of the park following completion of cleanup activities. I have long envisioned a swimming area off the south/southeast shoreline to the east of the Prow to allow children and adults to enjoy the water on a hot summer day in full view of the beautiful Seattle skyline. It is not clear from the document if a swimming area/beach was considered in evaluating and selecting the preferred remedy or if the remedy will emplace any restrictions on allowing a swimming area/beach to be established following completion of the remedy. Please clarify these concerns in the revised document and/or in your response to comments.

For example, the conceptual site model and risk evaluation presented in Section 7 of the document focus on current exposure pathways and receptors but do not appear to address other potential exposure pathways and receptors that might be present or could be present following completion of cleanup activities. The document emphasizes current exposure along the shoreline in the context of beach play and wading (see Section 7.5 and Figure 5-15) but does not identify swimming or swimmers as a pathway or receptor. This may be the case under current conditions where obtrusive signage warns park users against participating in such an activity, but it is my hope that these signs will be removed following cleanup (if so, this should be noted in the description of alternatives). Does the feasibility study consider that these areas will be, or could be, used for open water swimming or does it assume that this will continue to be a restricted activity within these areas following cleanup? Does the feasibility study require slight modifications to incorporate swimming as a potential activity? Potential modifications could include expanding the Direct Contact Wading Exposure Area into deeper water (currently ends at a water depth of 5 ft during summer low water conditions) and including swimmers in the conceptual site model presented on Figure 7-6.

I do not believe that any of my comments will result in the need to make significant changes to the preferred remedy (Alternative 6); limited dredging and 3 ft of capping should provide a high level of protection to park users participating in beach play, wading, and swimming activities off the Gas Works Park shoreline. My final comment/request is for the Parks Department to explore the possibility of incorporating the design of a swimming beach into the dredge and capping plans along a portion of the shoreline east of the Prow. What a wonderful opportunity this cleanup project presents to establish what could become the premier swimming beach in all of Seattle, enhance the overall Gas Works Park experience, and to get the public fully on board with the cleanup.

I look forward to your response to my comments.

Note: Figure 5-15 appears to be missing surface sediment screening data.