

MEMORANDUM FOR RECORD

SUBJECT: Bradford Island Technical Advisory Group Meeting Minutes, 26 Apr 07

1. Attendees: Mark Dasso, USACE; Mike Gross, USACE; Carolyn Schneider, USACE; Brian McCavitt, USACE (on phone); Jennifer Sutter, DEQ; Jeff Wallace, URS; Chris Moody, URS; Usha Vedagiri, URS; Jeff Lockwood, NMFS; Bob Schwarz, DEQ; Paul Seidel, DEQ; John Wakeman, USACE; Terry Walker, USACE HTRW-CX (on phone) Amy Echols, USACE (on phone); Kitia Chambers, USACE; Steve Sander, BPA.
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. The primary goals are to discuss the upcoming draft RI/FS Management Plan and the River OU QAPP, and discuss technical issues raised during agency reviews of DQO tables.
4. Mike Gross provided an update on the Removal Contract. We are still looking for a 1 June award, but are about one week behind schedule. HAI, the 8A contractor has been on site. The Contract has undergone (Biddability, Constructability, Operability and Environmental (BCOE)) review and is in final preparation to being issued for proposal.
5. Chris Moody discussed the Water Quality Monitoring Plan for the Removal Action. The plan is due for review to the agencies and USACE on 10 May. It includes weekly grab sampling at the end of pipe plus the Semipermeable Membrane Devices (SPMD) samples all previously coordinated with the agencies. The review will be for two weeks.
6. Carolyn Schneider provided updates on the Biological Assessments (BAs) and Biological Opinions (BOs) for the removal action. USFWS has provided concurrence for the action. USACE is working with Jeff Lockwood to answer questions for the BO he is writing. He has drafted it and is hoping to meet the June 1 date for submittal. He has several questions. There is a conflict in the BA text and reference documents about 99% settling in one hour. He wants to quantify the amount of PCB lost to the river during dredging. The downstream sampling locations for the RI were discussed. He may ask for downstream actions after the removal. He is concerned with gill effects and food web effects where sediment settles.
7. Cultural Resource coordination for the removal is complete. The Wanna Pa Koot Koot group was briefed in February. The Oregon SHPO has provided concurrence. DEQ wants a copy of the letter. A site tour with tribes is planned in May.
8. Upland Source control samples were collected on April 10. Soils samples were collected on the north slope and the east slope of the landfill. A tech Memo

summarizing results and a plan of action for source control prior to in water removal are due in May.

9. The RI/FS Work plan schedule was summarized by Mark Dasso. Corps' Independent Technical Review (ITR) will be done concurrently with the agency review. A brief review by the Corps' ITR team will precede this. June will be the month for agency review. The review will be done in Dr Checks. Jeremy wants to review all documents at once.
10. Chris Moody passed out handouts for the RI/FS DQO tables and maps of the River OU sampling locations. Usha discussed areas of concern raised by DEQ and others during previous meetings. COIs that may be transported from upland soils to the forebay have been identified using a process similar to DEQ's Joint Source Control strategy. Current groundwater and seep information will be needed in the landfill and sandblast area. DEQ asked that there be a database for electronically-sharing data.
11. Usha Vedagiri said a screening level risk assessment cannot be done due to the presence of bioaccumulative compounds. A DEQ Level 3 equivalent Baseline Risk Assessment will be completed and should focus on bioaccumulative COIs and non-bioaccumulative COIs retained after Level 2 screening.
12. There was discussion that USACE needs to use reliable soil-based bioaccumulative screening levels and will try to identify such sources during the execution of the risk assessment.
13. For the River OU, the COI list for sediments is limited because the detection frequency and comparison to reference area screening that has been completed and reduced the COI list. This process will continue using additional data collected during the RI for tissue and surface water.
14. USACE has added large scale sucker to the list of fish species to be collected. The use of the data is not clear because the range of the fish is such that site specific contamination cannot be separated from other sources, but they are being collected for the ecological risk (osprey) and for human health (tribal consumption).
15. The use of the trophic model versus directly measured tissue concentrations was discussed. URS will use both food web model (predicted) and tissue data (observed). Tissue levels for a number of the receptors (wide-ranging fish and crayfish) may be difficult to relate to a source associated with the Bradford Island project, therefore use of a model that can be adjusted to reflect site-specific conditions is also necessary. DEQ was satisfied with information URS provided on Aquaweb, according to Paul Seidel. DEQ (Jennifer Peterson, in a series of prior conversations) had asked whether multiple guilds were being evaluated. URS said the plan calls for evaluating up to 8 guilds, but not for collecting tissue data for all the guilds. Confirmation of the model will be based on certain guilds only. The Corps' Environmental Residue Effects Database (ERED) will assist the team to interpret whole-body effects based upon both the modeled and the observed body-residue values.

16. The Risk Assessment for PCB will be congener-based, but both congener (EPA Method 1668a) and Aroclor (EPA Method 8082) data will be collected for a portion of the sediment and tissue dataset. A statistical relationship from Aroclors to congeners will be developed, such that an Aroclor based cleanup goal may be developed, if supported by the relationship. The primary goal is to calculate and agree on an actionable level in sediments. Jennifer Peterson had previously stated that modeled values would not be suitable for decision-making (in particular for establishing sediment-based cleanup goals). Paul Seidel said that DEQ regulates based upon environmental concentrations (that is, sediment, water, air) , and the model may generate data suitable for this purpose.
17. Porewater in sediment was discussed. The plan calls for collecting river water just above sediment, since the sediment porewater is expected to be nearly impossible to collect due to the lack of sufficient depths of sediment in the areas where effects need to be characterized.
18. Human fish consumers will be addressed. The Native American fish harvesters will be evaluated using resident fish, because these are the fish with the greatest potential to accumulate PCBs (or other compounds) from the Bradford Island site. Direct contact will also be in the exposure model. Non-tribal high consumption fishers do not appear to be present in the forebay and upstream reaches of Bradford Island. However, they may be present in the section of the river downstream of the Dam. . Creel surveys from ODFW indicate the Europeans prefer to fish for sturgeon, and that Asians prefer to consume salmon. These species are less likely to be exposed to site-related chemicals than resident, small home –range fish such as small-mouth bass. Therefore, in the forebay, the receptors selected include the Native American and recreational anglers. For the downstream segment, the selected receptors, will include Native American anglers, recreational anglers and the non-tribal high consumption anglers. The small mouth bass full-body concentrations will be evaluated for tribal consumers with bass as 25% of their diet, consistent with consumption of resident fish from earlier surveys.
19. Table 8-3 discusses why each species and fish size was selected. For example, the Large Scale Sucker size was selected to be small enough for an osprey to carry, but large enough that a human might eat it.
20. Jeff Lockwood was concerned that surface water values would be compared to Ambient Water Quality Criteria (AWQC). EPA and USFWS/NMFS are consulting programmatically regarding the protectiveness of AWQC for Threatened, Endangered, and Listed Species. EPA has prepared two draft BAS with a fall 2008 BO expected. NMFS says many levels for chemicals in the AWQC are not deemed to be protective, specifically on sublethal chronic criteria for salmonids. (The Corps will consider this information as it is provided by the Services.)
21. USACE is planning February 2008 sampling for the River OU and a final RI in 2009.

22. The draft RIMP and River OU QAPP will be available in mid May for concurrent review. DEQ requested 4-6 weeks for review. Mark asked DEQ for a fatal flaw review early in the time frame so we could resolve issues as they arise.
23. Mark updated the group on tribal funding and participation. A \$30,000 grant from BPA has funded the four main stem tribes participation for the remainder of the year. On March 13, Mark emailed the tribes with a proposed grant agreement. On April 13, he followed up with formal letters to the four, plus the Chinook and Grande Ronde. He has not received a response and will call the week of April 30.
24. The Fact Sheet produced by the Corps for the CIC and public was passed out. Emailed versions will be provided. The CIC is represented by 9 organizations/agencies. Those who wish Russian, Ukrainian or Spanish translations will be directed to the USACE web site.
25. The next TAG was proposed for June 26 at 1300h.

Agenda Enclosed

Bradford Island Technical Advisory Group Meeting
April 26, 2007
9:00 am – 11:30 am
URS, Grande Ronde (14th Floor) Conference Room
(Check in on 15th Floor)
111 SW Columbia, Suite 900
Portland, Oregon 97201

Call-In Number 503-808-5199; Password - 2580

Agenda

1. Introductions and Today's Goals. (Dasso)
2. In-Water Sediment Removal Action
 - A. Contract Status (Gross)
 - B. Water Quality Monitoring (Moody)
 - C. Biological Assessments (Schneider)
 - D. Cultural Resources Consultation (Dasso)
 - E. Action Memo (Gross)
 - F. Upland Source Control (Gross)
 - G. Discussion
3. RI/FS
 - A. General (Dasso)
 - B. Work Plan – Data Quality Objectives Discussion (Moody/Vedagiri)
 - C. In-Water QAPP – Summary of Essential Elements of In-Water Sampling Effort (Moody)
 - D. Risk Assessment Strategy/Methods (Vedagiri)
 - E. Schedule (Moody)
 - F. Discussion
4. Tribal Participation
 - A. Recent Developments (Dasso)
 - B. Discussion
5. Other
 - A. CIC Fact Sheet (Dasso)
 - B. Meeting Conclusions
 - C. Schedule Next Meeting (Dasso)