

**Attendees:**

- Asgard, L.L.C.: Annie Shaha, Joe Gerber
- GeoEngineers: Aaron Fredericy, Kurt Harrington
- DEQ: Sarah Van Glubt, Wes Thomas, Amanda Wozab

**Agenda with discussion notes:** (Note that "Asgard" corresponds to Asgard, L.L.C. and GeoEngineers representatives and "DEQ" corresponds to DEQ representatives)

**1. Introductions**

**2. Status update: vapor system**

**a. Plan for addressing DEQ comments, data gaps, performance criteria, design, etc.**

Discussion:

- Asgard put out a request for bids for sub-slab depressurization systems. Bids were received from two companies.
- Asgard noted new plans for current tenants to move out of the building by the end of 2026; this presents an opportunity to potentially complete source removal work at a lower cost than previously estimated and without disturbing tenants.
- Asgard requested revised bids including source removal work. Once received, Asgard will reevaluate remedial options and potentially update suggested remedial action. Asgard will determine an updated path forward by the end of 2025.
- Asgard will provide DEQ with plans to move forward in the form of a workplan to address data gaps, performance criteria, and design gaps in Q1 of 2026.
- DEQ will provide guidance documents related to engineered systems.
- Discussion of post-remedy monitoring: DEQ clarified that requirements are site-specific and we can discuss timelines and lines of evidence (e.g., pressure differential sampling, vapor sampling) for assessing system performance

**3. DEQ's envisioned path forward - evaluate and address as needed:**

- a. Continue path to address soil vapor hot spots**
- b. Groundwater and stormwater potential Ball Creek and ecological impacts**
- c. Groundwater potential off-site impacts**

- d. Groundwater potential PFAS and hexavalent chromium contamination**
- e. Potential supply well impacts (CLAC 03011 and WASH 011643)**

**Discussion:**

- Asgard expressed the opinion that Williams Control (WC) is largely responsible for groundwater contamination on the site and that work to address groundwater pathways should be led by WC. Asgard also expressed concern that WC is not being required to do the same work at the same pace.
- DEQ clarified that the same requirements are being made of both parties, such as evaluating potential contaminated groundwater impacts to Ball Creek. DEQ also clarified this work could be done by Asgard in collaboration with WC or separately. DEQ anticipates a workplan related to assessing ecological risk will be submitted by WC to DEQ in Q4 of 2025.
- Asgard asked if they will be kept apprised of WC work submitted to DEQ; DEQ clarified that the best way for Asgard to track and obtain this information is by checking the Oregon Records Management System, where electronic project files are stored and made publicly available.
- DEQ noted the other evaluations that need to be addressed at the site, such as groundwater potential off site impacts, groundwater potential PFAS and hexavalent chromium contamination, and potential impacts to identified supply wells near the site.
- DEQ expressed that Asgard will need to evaluate all beneficial uses at the site, such as those related to groundwater, and that this could be done in several ways, such as evaluating existing data or providing a workplan to address data gaps and complete necessary evaluations.

**4. Chromic acid release identified in YDO**

**Discussion:**

- DEQ noted that a 1986 report created by Asgard was located documenting the chromic acid release in internal files; however, the file is labeled as confidential so DEQ is working to determine what information can be shared.