

Carol Piening

These comments are based on conversations with Ecology staff at the public meeting on 5/12/2025.

1. I support applying the "unrestricted" cleanup standard, rather than the less-stringent "industrial" clean up standard. Poster at the public meeting indicated that this is what TCP will require. Thank you.
2. Land use changes over time; climate change will drive sea level and groundwater changes; earlier cleanup effort (circa 2010) missed some important contaminants. For these reasons I support removal of contaminants, to the extent that is possible, rather than capping. I also am strongly against filling waterward of the current upland/fill, both because of the ecological impacts on water-dwelling organisms and because of the potential for masking contamination in aquatic sediments and making future cleanups even more difficult.
3. I support ongoing monitoring that recognizes that climate change may drive changes in sea level, ground water movement, and sediment movement and thus the movement of contaminants.
4. Outside of the specific scope of the cleanup, I strongly encourage Ecology to coordinate across programs, for example between TCP and SEA to analyse whether the Shoreline Managment Plan that includes this area, and that was developed a couple of decades ago, is still appropriate given current data and information about sea level rise, historic contaminants, and climate-driven changes.
5. Also outside the scope of the cleanup - Hat tip to Steve Teel and the other Ecology staffers at today's information session; they were welcoming, well informed, and patient with my many questions.