

Meeting Record: Bradford Island

Subject: **Technical Advisory Group Meeting**

Date of Meeting: 7/8/2005

Location of Meeting: Executive Conference Room, Portland District, Portland, OR

1. Participants:

Corps and Consultants to Corps (URS):

Jeff Hurt	Mike Gross	Carolyn Schneider
Kathryn Carpenter	Sandy Lemlich	John Wakeman
Todd Bridges (phone)	Thomas Georgian (phone)	Jeff Wallace, URS
Chris Moody, URS	Bill Winter, URS	Paul Johanssen, URS

Agency/Tribal Members:

Bob Schwarz, ODEQ	Jennifer Sutter, ODEQ	Dave Stone, ODHS (phone)
Rose Owens, ODFW	Patti Howard, CRITFC	Audie Huber, Umatilla Nation (phone)
Jeremy Buck, US FWS (phone and in person)	Ted Buerger, US FWS (phone)	

Invited But Unable to Attend

Ken Marcy, EPA	Kathleen Feehan, Umatilla Nation	Steve Parker, Yakama Nation
Bard Houslet, Warm Springs Tribe		

2. Discussions (**see also Attachment A**)

a. Purpose and Agenda (Jeff Hurt)

- ❖ Corps' team composition
- ❖ Roles of TAG members
- ❖ Project background presentation
- ❖ Work completed to date
- ❖ Path forward; a CERCLA path is being followed  
(It is worthy of note that at this meeting, the decision – made later – to advance the In-water Non Time Critical Removal Action had not yet been made.)

b. Topics (**see also Attachment A**)

- ❖ Listing of units on Bradford Island
- ❖ Site investigation summary
- ❖ Initial discussion of data gaps
- ❖ Fish Consumption Advisory
- ❖ RI/FS Process and Initial Prioritization of Tasks

### 3. Key Discussion Points

a. Schedule. Request for detailed schedule from Patti Howard, Jennifer Sutter, and Bob Schwarz.

❖ The Corps will present a schedule at the next meeting(s). As the RI/FS Work Plan evolves, the schedule will be altered.

b. US EPA has deferred to ODEQ for oversight. This activity continues under the Voluntary Compliance Program at ODEQ. Jennifer Sutter said that the Corps' activities need to be compliant with State of Oregon processes for site cleanup.

c. Natural Resource Damage Assessment. Both Jeremy Buck and Rose Owens stated that Natural Resource Damage Assessment are important considerations.

❖ There are restrictions on doing work for NRDA under the CERCLA process; needs will be accommodated as they parallel the CERCLA data needs.

d. Request for archived clam analysis was discussed, and the pros and cons of using the archived clams from 2002 were laid out (see attachment A).

❖ Determination of what to do was left for another meeting, after the Corps could inquire into the condition of the samples.

### 4. Action Items/Future Meetings

❖ Distribute notes to the meeting (Attachment A).

❖ Prepare schedule

❖ Inquire into clams' status

5. Next meeting. (No future date was scheduled at the meeting.)