

MEMORANDUM FOR RECORD

SUBJECT: Bradford Island Technical Advisory Group Meeting Minutes, 14 Feb 07

1. Attendees: Mark Dasso, USACE; Mike Gross, USACE; Carolyn Schneider, USACE; Ken Duncan, USACE; Pat Mason, USACE; Brian McCavitt, USACE; Jennifer Sutter, DEQ; Jeff Wallace, URS; Chris Moody, URS; Usha Vedagiri, URS, Heather Lloso, URS (on phone); Chuck Markham, URS; Jeff Lockwood, NMFS; Jeremy Buck, USFWS (on phone); Bob Schwarz, DEQ; Jennifer Peterson, DEQ; Paul Seidel, DEQ; Ryan Sudbury, Nez Perce (on phone).
2. Meeting Location: URS Portland, Grand Ronde Room.
3. After attendees were introduced, Mark Dasso opened the meeting with a brief summary of the goals for the day's meeting. A discussion of the Risk Assessment Strategy/Methods was added to the RI/FS portion of the agenda.
4. Mike Gross Provided an update on the design. URS has completed their portion of the design work. The project is one week away from final internal (Biddability, Constructability, Operability and Environmental (BCOE)) review. Outside stakeholders normally do not review this before advertising, but DEQ will be sent a copy. A request for proposal will be sent to three preplaced MARCs contractors (about 1 April), 30 days for preparation of proposals, review of proposals will result in an award and Notice to Proceed approximately 1 June. At that time the contractor will begin performance including submittal of the Removal Action Work Plan for review by all stakeholders. Mobilization will then occur in August. This schedule will be tight to get in the water 1 Oct.
5. Water Quality Monitoring was updated by Carolyn Schneider. This has changed since the last TAG. A meeting of interested parties (12/15/06) resulted in agreement that SPMDs will be used in three locations (reference, work area, downcurrent) during the action duration. End of pipe monitoring at the water treatment discharge will occur. Turbidity monitoring has not changed. DEQ and the services agreed in concept and the Biological Assessments were prepared and sent, the second one in January. This will be detailed in the monitoring plan but will not be reviewed and finalized prior to advertising of the contract.
6. Biological Assessments were discussed By Caroline Schneider. Both are in the hands of the agencies but a full consultation time of 135 days will result in Biological Opinions provided after the 1 April date needed to advertise. Jeff Lockwood has had several questions and answers were provided by email. Jeff has forwarded these to Jeremy. Greg Smith (not attending) has indicated to the Corps he is leaning toward a concurrence letter. Jeff L. said he is leaning slightly in that direction. The best chance for 1 April decisions and October construction

is a concurrence letter. Mark Dasso asked the services to let him know as soon as they know if 1 April concurrence is not forthcoming.

7. Mark Dasso reported on cultural resources consultation. He met in January with the Wanna Pa Koot Koot group (Tribal and state cultural resources organization for USACE projects). Washington State SHPO was at the meeting. A tour of the site with tribal leaders is being set up by USACE. A letter was sent 22 Jan 07 to the state of Oregon for Section 106 consultation and a letter on 1 Feb 07 was received from the Oregon SHPO concurring with the project.
8. The Action Memo, a decision document for the removal is ready with some minor changes to be forwarded to the USACE Division Commander for signature. It will not be signed before Service responses (Concurrence or BOs) or before contract advertisement.
9. A brief discussion of upland source control memo ensued. URS has prepared a memo describing the source control needs to ensure recontamination of the removal action area from upland sources does not occur. A draft memo has been provided to USACE and a copy to DEQ. After a site visit with Bob Schwarz in December, the primary data gap for source control was identified as the soils north of the landfill. USACE will sample them this spring using existing sampling plans. A drawing showing proposed samples will be prepared and given to DEQ. Jennifer Peterson was concerned that the number of samples would be adequate to characterize the area. Six to eight samples are planned. USACE reported samples would be collected in house.
10. USACE and URS provided an update on the Remedial Investigation Management Plan. As reported earlier, USACE internal review of the preliminary draft management plan resulted in repeating of the Technical Project Planning Process with the independent technical review team from Omaha to review the DQOs and plan the in water sampling. Contracting with URS to redraft the plan was completed on 25 Jan 07 so URS has not been working long on the new version. An outline of the process was provided (encl). When complete it will be provided for review to the TAG.
11. Chris Moody reviewed the overall process. USACE wants to complete data collection for the in water baseline risk assessment prior to dredging because conditions will be as close to equilibrium as possible. USACE will collect sediment, clam, crayfish, sculpin and bass tissue in the fore bay and upstream reference area (Cascade Locks), and sediment downstream of the dam. A multi-increment sampling strategy will be used to minimize uncertainty. Downstream sampling will be sediment only in depositional areas in five locations. A COI list reduction processed was outlined, but not in detail. The upstream sampling will calibrate the trophic model and hopefully differentiate site conditions from ambient.

12. TAG members had several concerns with the strategy. Ryan Sudbury asked if USACE could collect lamprey. URS responded that the TPP had reviewed the species to collect and determined that tissue proposed would be adequate to address the trophic model and calculate risk to all receptors. Lamprey do not feed much after becoming residents and are anadromous in their youth when are feeding, therefore not representative of the site.
13. Jeremy Buck questioned whether getting sediment to tissue BSAF would adequately address the site and felt that if that relationship fell apart, we would not be able to answer risk questions. Both Jeremy and Jennifer Peterson strongly suggested that tissue samples in the removal action area primarily and other non depositional areas would fill that gap especially if the sediment to tissue relationship is not representative of the site. Jeremy suggested two DQOs, 1) getting the BSAF sediment to water connection and 2) monitoring the reduction of tissue levels over time. Bob Schwarz also voiced concern that the removal action area itself would not be sampled prior to the action, given that monitoring over time was expected. Jeremy reiterated an earlier argument that collection of tissue in the area before and after the action is the best opportunity to measure success of the action.
14. Jennifer expects BSAF to be different in the non-depositional areas than the depositional areas. Jeremy said the site may be “BSAF challenged so important information may not be collected by our approach, and that we need baseline in the removal area. He questioned how we would be representing the area of the removal. The answer could be area weighted average. He thinks a risk assessment goal should be monitoring tissue over time, and not expecting a spike at this site given the removal techniques. USACE does not plan on collecting before and after clams for comparison in the removal area, something DEQ and USFWS strongly suggest we need. Although we did not present DQOs in the meeting it was suggested those need to be outlined in a separate discussion with the agencies. Agencies supported the plan for congeners; however, Jennifer was concerned that Aroclor data away from the site would not tell us much. The upland QAPP will come later.
15. Usha Vedagiri presented the risk assessment approach (attached). It is similar to the basic EPA/DEQ approach and uses appropriate schemes from Duwamish/Portland Harbor. It uses multiple lines of evidence as shown in the table. Jennifer Sutter said the table may be incorrect because the site/environment may be impacted at ambient levels. URS stated that the fish proposed are those with the most site fidelity and best able to distinguish the site release from ambient. Jennifer Peterson was concerned that higher trophic fish such as sucker and pike minnow were not in the model. They are present and we do have some collected, but they are not necessary to tune the model. Jennifer was concerned about eagle eating sucker, not bass. There was a concern that the pre-removal risk assessment would not adequately address risk in the area of the removal. Jeff Lockwood mention NOAA SQUIRTs as a potential screening tool. Usha said

these are considered in the analysis. Also, Portland Harbor uses Region 6 not Region 9 PRGs (Region 9 does not update their numbers).

16. A separate meeting to address questions was suggested. The next TAG was proposed for April 10. The next meeting should be before 22 Mar when Jennifer P. goes on maternity leave. Portland Harbor meetings are every other Wednesday.