Isha Alexander

I question whether BMPs for concrete in relation to the high water mark of surface water (>100 feet) and groundwater (>10 feet) is adequate given Thurston County flooding concerns and given the under review "Flood Hazard Mitigation Plan" Have the BMPs been help up against the recommendations in light of potential flooding?

I am also concerned that hexaalent chromium is being documented in recycled aggregate field tests and is exceeding state groundwater standards. What is being done to rectify this and ensure the individuals responsible are properly trained and doing their job adequately. What is the checks and balance and what is the plan to rectify this groundwater exceedance issue?

Some of the BMPs are broad and do not appear to have realistic monitoring to ensure they are being implemented properly, additionally there does not appear to be any way to detect when a BMP fails, which can have devastating consequences (e.g. the January 2022 flood that damaged several miles of the endangered spotted frog habitat). It is also not clear how potential dewatering, which can affect federally and State-protected species) is being addressed, particularly in light of climate change which Thurston County own Climate Change Vulnerability Assessment (https://s3.us-west-2.amazonaws.com/thurstoncountywa.gov.if-us-west-2/s3fs-public/2024-12/CPED- projects significantly hotter, drier summers through the years, up to ~8°F warmer with much less rain. These warmer temperatures will exacerbate potential impacts of dewatering and adverse effects on species that rely on the streams.