

Glen Fuerstneau

To what extent did Ecology participate with Arcadis / Chevron Environmental Management Company with the preparation of Table 7-10 Public Draft Final Feasibility Study Report dated June 16, 2017, or subsequently review and comment about the report? [By the way, I have noticed some reference to Table 7-11, but I believe that the summary Table is 7-10.]

What efforts have been made by Ecology to verify the test results and assessment thereof of Arcadis / Chevron report and the accuracy/correctness of Table 7-10?

Who determined the parameter "Cost to implement the alternative" should have a parameter weight of "8"? It would seem that this parameter would have a significantly lower weighting than 8 (i.e. higher cost would be of a lesser concern) when considering the long-term health of the public and the health. Does Ecology agree that that a parameter weight of 8 out of 10 is correct?

In addressing the permanence, why did Alt 6 have a rate of "1" identical to Alt 4 in "the degree to which the alternative permanently reduces the toxicity, mobility of volume of hazardous substances" when compared to the seeming better outcome if the soil has been replaced? Alt 6 leaves toxicity and mobility of the hazardous substances close to the Puget Sound and how can it be as permanent after considering the impact of rising sea levels and potential historic storms possible with climate change?