

# Mark Nihart

The Old City Dump contains decades of what is considered today toxic and hazardous wastes. During its active life homeowner products were readily available at the local hardware store such as oil-based paint with lead, red lead primer, zinc chromate primer, copper wood treatment, copper bottom paints; insecticides such as Chlordane and DDT. Some homeowners did their own oil changes, brake work, air conditioning recharges, then put the oil, old brake fluid, transmission fluid, refrigerant and more in the trash.

I believe the trash from local gas stations also made it way to the dump. Additionally, Anacortes had an active industrial base: pulp mill, plywood mill, shake mill, shipyards, and marinas with haul outs where bottom painting took place. Likely industrial materials from these places made their way to the dump; materials such as toluene and benzene and more.

How can the public be sure that the testing will have a full panel screen of these products and other toxic/hazardous waste products buried and leaking in the dump site?

Clearly the dump site was not properly cleaned up and capped. It is a very specious argument, even for a simple-minded small-town boy like me that the debris left were not removed because they would have disturbed the soil: they were just not removed. Standing on the trail one can see items that are above the ground, the many photos concerned citizens took of the site show appliances above ground and stacks of tire above ground and even the Department of Ecology (DoE) photo of the bicycle show the bicycle above the ground. A trail was built alongside the capped dump clearly disturbing the soil.

To provide transparency of process and to better inform the public, is the Department of Ecology and the City of Anacortes going to provide group onsite survey(s) consisting of members of the DoE, City Management, City Council Members, other experts as appropriate and the government organization apparently responsible for the entire problem but not at the table: The Skagit County Department of Health? Is the DoE going to make public the extensive collection of photographs provided them by the concerned citizens?

What event(s) caused concerned citizens to investigate the old dump site, take pictures and engage the DoE to do a formal investigation? Why weren't their photographs included in the DoE presentation?

Before there was a dump it was not a dump but forest lands or wetlands at the old dump site. Does the City have pictures and topography of dump before the site was turned into a dump? Most dumps fill an empty space or dump off a "ledge" into an empty space. The old County dump at Marches Point dumped materials into the tidelands, the one near the Fidalgo School filled an old gravel pit. If the Old City dump site was a wetland or a depression the toxic and hazardous material would be closer to the water table and the material could flow under the surface undetected for long distances. I believe the soil around the dump site is porous.

How will the study be conducted to address the potential underground movement of toxic and

hazardous materials via underground water? How will the study be conducted to model different surface water flows? The next "Atmospheric River" could, would change up dramatically, how surface water flows in and around the dump site potentially gouging out previously undisturbed but toxic soil.

For consideration the DoE might review a recent study done by the Department of Transportation (DoT) - "SR 20 Skagit River O'Brian Reach Feasibility Study" – to see how a very comprehensive modeling of surface water flows at different level of flows move through an area... Albeit the modeling of the area around the old dump site would be less complex; however, the DoT model provides a current model for a current problem to leverage as a base model for the Old Dump site.

(The final Skagit O'Brian Feasibility Study Report - Part 1 (PDF 28MB) and the Skagit O'Brian Feasibility Study Report - Part 2 (PDF 26MB) documents the analyses and evaluation used in the study to develop the conceptual alternatives and conceptual design.)

It has been years since concerned citizens provided photographs and their request to review the old dump site for contamination. Tests were done by the DoE and found the site leaking problem toxic wastes. The City of Anacortes was told of DoE findings and a change of status for the site.

Why weren't danger signs posted immediately to warn people to keep their dogs and children from going off trail. Dogs likely have been drinking the toxic water and children may have ventured into the streams out of curiosity or just being kids thus exposed to toxic waste. In the interest of public safety are signs going to be posted in the future?

It is common practice in academia and even government and business to conduct peer reviews of research studies and or fund alternate independent research studies. Indeed, the DoE might fund a study in which the researchers find x, then industry funds a study that contradicts x as their researchers find y. The takeaway is researchers' findings can be different depending on who funds the researcher. The tobacco, fossil fuel and pharmaceutical industries are classical examples of this phenomena. Alas, this why multiple studies are necessary to get a comprehensive understand of what is being studied before a single study is considered solid acceptable research.

To keep public confidence and continue with an open and transparent public process by a public organization is the DoE going to engage other scientists to conduct peer reviews of the city plan funded study and fund independent studies with independent sampling of key areas?