HOULIHAN LAW
100 N. 35th Street ▪ Seattle, WA 98103

JOHN T. (J.T.) COOKE
ATTORNEY
JT@HOULIHAN-LAW.COM

October 27, 2026

Via Email: Olu.Akeroro@ecy.wa.gov

Olu Akeroro, Site Manager
WA Department of Ecology
PO Box 330316
Shoreline, WA 98133-9716

Re: Comments on draft Cleanup Action Plan ("dCAP") for Tiki Car Wash Site ("Site"); FSID No: 2352, CSID No: 5096

Dear Mr. Akeroro–

We represent TRF Capital LLC ("TRF"). TRF owns the real property at 699 120th Avenue NE, in Bellevue, Washington (the "TRF Property"). TRF's Property is impacted by petroleum contamination migrating from releases at the Tiki Car Wash property.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit comments on the dCAP for the Site. As you know, TRF has been engaged throughout Ecology's investigation and remediation of the Site. TRF submitted comments on the Remedial Investigation Report ("RI") on June 5, 2023. Additionally, TRF entered into an access agreement with Ecology to allow it and its contractors access for sampling on the TRF Property. TRF has a strong interest in continuing to cooperate and assisting Ecology successfully remediate the contamination.

TRF's consultant, Geosyntec reviewed the dCAP and identified several areas that it felt warranted comment. Geosyntec's comments are attached for reference and incorporation into the administrative record. We are available to discuss the attached comments if you have questions or we can provide additional information.

Sincerely,

John (JT) Cooke
Attorneys for TRF Capital LLC

Enclosure
Cc: Client
Howard Jensen, Veris Law Group (howard@verislawgroup.com;
Kevin Jackson (kevin@verislawgroup.com)

Geosyntec consultants

801 5th Avenue, Suite 2200
Seattle, WA 98104
PH 206.496.1450
www.geosyntec.com

Memorandum

Date: 23 October 2026

To: Tim Russell, TRF Pacific

JT Cooke, Houlihan Law

From: Dave Parkinson, PhD., L.G. (WA)

Subject: Comments on Tiki Car Wash Site draft Cleanup Action Plan

---

Below are comments on the draft Cleanup Action Plan (dCAP) for the Tiki Car Wash Site prepared for Washington Department of Ecology (Ecology) by Maul Foster Alongi (MFA), dated August 27, 2026.

- First sentence in last paragraph of Section 1.2 states "In 2017, the State of Washington removed the lien on the Property and terminated the CD." The CD has not been "terminated" – this sentence should be corrected.

- Second sentence in last paragraph of Section 1.2 states "Ecology then took over the cleanup responsibility for the Site." This sentence implies that Ecology only took on cleanup responsibility in 2017, but just above this is a paragraph describing Ecology implementing a remediation system in 1995. This statement needs revision or deletion to clearly indicate Ecology has had cleanup responsibility for the Site since 1993.

- Section 2 Site Description second paragraph states "Since 1971, the Property has operated as a gas station, car wash, and convenience store. Four single-walled steel underground storage tanks historically existed at the Property: three installed in 1971 and the fourth installed in 1979." Why weren't these single-walled USTs replaced with double walled, or with secondary containment, as required by WAC173-360A-0320? If the release was identified in 1990, and these USTs were known to be single-walled that apparently had leaked, why were these tanks not replaced? This issue goes to the question of whether there has been an ongoing release at the Site due to failing single-walled tanks. How will Ecology determine, during remedial action, whether this cleanup is for a single release in 1990 or an ongoing release?

- Section 3.2 describes the cleanup action for on-property and off-property areas of the Site. In particular, the on-property soil excavation and the targeted off-property soil excavation will occur where there are presently a number of monitoring wells. It should be noted that those monitoring wells within the footprint of the soil excavation will

require decommissioning. Sections 3.2.2.3 and 3.6.1 both mention remedy groundwater monitoring. We suggest that at least a parenthetical statement be included explaining that a sub-set of monitoring wells removed during excavation will be re-installed following excavation and that this will be further described in the "groundwater monitoring plan…as part of the future EDR".

- Section 3.2.2.1 Targeted Soil Excavation. Third to last sentence states "The area and depth of excavation will be further refined by design-phase sampling." We suggest more clearly stating that confirmation soil sampling of excavation floor and sidewalls will occur to further refine the extent of excavation. Incremental soil excavation to remove soil above cleanup levels based on confirmation sampling of sidewalls will ensure a "permanent remedy" as required by MTCA and reduce the extent of multiple rounds of more costly ISCO injections.

- Section 3.2.2.1 Targeted Soil Excavation. Last sentence states "The excavated areas will be backfilled with imported, clean structural fill and surface features…" We suggest, as is being done for on-site excavation, that oxygen release compound be added to the excavation/backfill to provide continued in-situ groundwater degradation of petroleum hydrocarbons.

- Section 3.5 first bullet mentions "targeted excavation area" of off-property portion of the Site. See comment above regarding extending incremental excavation based on confirmation sampling of sidewalls to remove soil above cleanup levels to the greatest extent possible and providing a "permanent remedy", while reducing the need for expensive rounds of ISCO, even if it requires removal and replacement of utilities, such as stormwater sewer lines.

- Section 3.6.1 Compliance Monitoring describes "performance monitoring" and "confirmation monitoring". We suggest these descriptions be expanded to clearly describe performance and confirmation soil sampling during excavation (e.g., excavation floor and sidewall soil sampling to confirm remaining soil is below cleanup levels), as well as subsequent groundwater performance monitoring during ISCO and confirmation groundwater monitoring following completion of the remedy.

- Figure 3-1 Selected Cleanup Action shows the extent of off-property excavation stopping at MW-38. We propose that the extent of off-property excavation be determined by confirmation soil sampling of the excavation sidewalls – both on the east, where MW-38 is located, and toward the south and west as well.

- As shown in Figure 3-1 there is a stormwater utility line that runs east-west along the south side of the NE 7th easement as well north-south just east of MW-38. In addition to this stormwater line there is a utility easement that runs east-west just south of the NE 7th access easement for a pressurized water line that would also fall within the excavation footprint. Because of the possibility of contamination following utility corridors, we

suggest that excavation continue as far east as the stormwater and south to the water line to confirm these have not acted as conduits for contamination. As pointed out above, we suggest that excavation to the fullest extent possible, as determined by excavation side-wall confirmation sampling, will ensure the remedial action meets both MTCA requirements of a permanent remedy as well as will likely be less expensive than repeated rounds of ISCO deployment.

* * * * *