

Gwen Anonymous

Washington Dept of Ecology
PO BOX 330316
Shoreline, WA 98133-9716
Brett.Carp@ecy.wa.gov

RE: Public Comment to Lower Issaquah Valley PFAS Cleanup

I am a 19+ year resident and homeowner in census tract 321.03, living within direct proximity to the EFR. My daughter also spent her middle school and high school years at this address, attending schools in the valley. I submit the following comments and questions:

1. Why hasn't the City of Issaquah moved fully to another regional drinking water supply for the City of Issaquah Water Service area (rather than a dilution strategy), given the history and levels of contaminants (arsenic, PFAs, PFOAs), natural limits to utilizing the aquifer, increasing flood & drought cycles (climate change) and continued growth and development, with a necessary move toward population density for this area in particular? Other areas of Issaquah on regional water supplies do not have these issues.

2. Given the levels of contaminants to groundwater and the number of sites involved, what is the required frequency of drinking water testing for the City of Issaquah Water Service area for the interim, clean-up and post clean-up periods? How often would you want this water supply tested if it was your family's only source of drinking water/household water?

3. Why aren't residents in these impacted areas [minimally] being provided with funds to purchase or offset purchase for reverse osmosis filtration units (e.g., under sink, household) for the interim? The Issaquah Valley area has a higher concentration of

the city's most "affordable" housing options – and more vulnerable community members as identified within your own scoping documents.

4. Documents mention preliminary groundwater flow and transport findings related to the minimal extent of contaminated groundwater plumes, .e.g., for EFR & IVES/Dodds Fields in directions northward. However, there is no more detailed information related to potential flows eastward from originating sites – i.e., that would impact surrounding neighborhoods and Issaquah Creek. Similarly flow finding descriptions for the Rainier Trail and Memorial Field also present as limited.

This lack of important data or clarifying language, related to what is known and unknown for flows: North, South, East and West, could be interpreted as intentionally minimizing the extent of [potential] contamination across the valley.

5. The City of Issaquah typically does a great job of communicating with residents. However, given the limited public comment, and the lack of regular (i.e.) repeated email announcements, social media announcements and community-based signage – more frequent communication and more accessible modes / formats for communication would be important going forward.

Again, without changes and more detail and transparency related to a communications and engagement strategy, it could be interpreted that this information (e.g., contaminant levels, affected areas/boundaries, extent of clean up required) is intentionally being minimized.

Thank you.

June 6, 2024

Brett Carp, Aquatics Unit Supervisor
Washington Dept of Ecology
PO BOX 330316
Shoreline, WA 98133-9716
Brett.Carp@ecy.wa.gov

RE: Public Comment to Lower Issaquah Valley PFAS Cleanup

I am a 19+ year resident and homeowner in census tract 321.03, living within direct proximity to the EFR. My daughter also spent her middle school and high school years at this address, attending schools in the valley. I submit the following comments and questions:

1. **Why** hasn't the City of Issaquah moved **fully** to another regional drinking water supply for the City of Issaquah Water Service area (rather than a dilution strategy), given the history and levels of contaminants (arsenic, PFAs, PFOAs), natural limits to utilizing the aquifer, increasing flood & drought cycles (climate change) and continued growth and development, with a necessary move toward population density for this area in particular? Other areas of Issaquah on regional water supplies do not have these issues.
2. Given the levels of contaminants to groundwater and the number of sites involved, what is the required frequency of drinking water testing for the City of Issaquah Water Service area for the interim, clean-up and post clean-up periods? **How often would you want this water supply tested if it was your family's only source of drinking water/household water?**
3. Why aren't residents in these impacted areas [minimally] being provided with funds to purchase or offset purchase for reverse osmosis filtration units (e.g., under sink, household) for the interim? The Issaquah Valley area has a higher concentration of the city's most "affordable" housing options – and more vulnerable community members as identified within your own scoping documents.
4. Documents mention **preliminary groundwater flow and transport findings** related to the minimal extent of contaminated groundwater plumes, .e.g., for EFR &

IVES/Dodds Fields in directions northward. However, there is no more detailed information **related to potential flows eastward from originating sites** – i.e., that would impact **surrounding neighborhoods** and **Issaquah Creek**. Similarly flow finding descriptions for the Rainier Trail and Memorial Field also present as limited.

This lack of important data or clarifying language, related to what is known and unknown for flows: North, South, East and West, could be interpreted as intentionally minimizing the extent of [potential] contamination across the valley.

5. The City of Issaquah typically does a great job of communicating with residents. However, **given the limited public comment**, and the lack of regular (i.e.) repeated email announcements, social media announcements and community-based signage – more frequent communication and more accessible modes / formats for communication would be important going forward.

Again, without changes and more detail and transparency related to a communications and engagement strategy, it could be interpreted that this information (e.g., contaminant levels, affected areas/boundaries, extent of clean up required) is intentionally being minimized.

Thank you.