

MEMORANDUM FOR RECORD

SUBJECT: Bradford Island Technical Advisory Group Meeting Minutes, 15 Nov 06

1. Attendees: Mark Dasso, USACE; Mike Gross, USACE; Carolyn Schneider (on phone), USACE; Jeff Hurt, USACE; John Wakeman (on phone), USACE ; Jennifer Sutter, DEQ; Jeff Wallace, URS; Chris Moody, URS; Jeff Lockwood, NMFS; Jeremy Buck, USFWS; Bob Schwarz, DEQ; Jennifer Peterson, DEQ; Paul Seidel, DEQ; Barbara Creel, USACE.
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. Two items added to the agenda include a brief update on Community activities and Tribal Coordination.
4. Jeff Wallace provided an update on the design. The 100% design will be completed next week. Construction is scheduled for Oct 2007. USACE said we will not be awarding to Cherokee (8(a) set aside) because there are not sufficient funds left in that contract. The bid will be competed between three MARCS (Modern Army Remedial Contracts) contractors. These are indefinite delivery contracts specifically for remediation work.
5. Carolyn provided a brief update on the Biological Assessments. A draft BA went to NMFS on 31 Oct. The USFWS BA is pending information on bull trout in the Bonneville Pool. WDFW information on bull trout in the pool was received on 15 Nov and shows that there is evidence that the fish are in the pool, but spawn in tributaries during the fall and are unlikely to be in the pool at the time of the construction. It is unknown whether bull trout spawn every year, so those that may not be spawning could be present.
6. Jeremy Buck reemphasized his opinion of the lack of complete characterization of the contamination at the site because of the widely variable PCB results and a concern for oil phase residuals in a low TOC environment. Jeremy's concern was that no real time end of pipe monitoring would occur. Chris Moody pointed out that the design uses best management practices, diver directed dredging that can minimize point of dredging impacts, increased settling time for sediments, and sand filtering. Mark said the Corps had added XAD and SPMD as a way to monitor impacts to dredging and discharge, but recognized that there were no real time monitoring methods that can work, so he offered that if we added granular activated carbon (GAC) treatment to the end of the treatment train we could alleviate concerns for dissolved and/or oil phase PCBs in effluent. He also suggested that this should eliminate the need for SPMD. Jeremy's data need is to get a concentration for fish protectiveness, and a concern for real time data to

- change practices. With the addition of GAC we are more confident, but still don't have a trigger to change our construction practices. Eliminating SPMD leaves only XAD to characterize point of dredging impacts. Jennifer Peterson said the idea is to prevent the release to begin with and with the GAC we are doing what we can. If we need a tradeoff, the value of the SPMD is reduced since it is after the fact measurement and only good to feed future projects. Jeremy and Jeff Lockwood suggested a change to the monitoring array if only XAD were used
7. The BA states what the project is likely to affect. Jeff Lockwood said that even if we use GAC the Biological Opinion will not be a "no effect" opinion. It could be a "not likely to adversely effect" opinion. He needs to quantify prospective take owing to the construction. If he agrees with our Biological Assessment he will write a letter of concurrence. If he disagrees, he will describe required measures.
 8. In past conversations Alex Cyril (not present) has said she needs the XAD data. She has said she is not changing her recommendation from XAD and turbidity monitoring. Therefore USACE proposed XAD, turbidity monitoring, without SPMD monitoring. None of the TAG members objected to this proposal at the meeting. Jeremy said he thought the SPMDs were USACE's idea. Chris Moody said they were Marty Fitzpatrick's idea. Alex had thought that the XAD were more comparable to screening values. The question was asked, what does the monitoring plan with XAD look like? We don't know yet. This will be proposed by USACE after URS designs it. Jeff Lockwood said he needs to see the monitoring plan prior to completing the BO. Jeremy reiterated the need for tissue and sediment as a requirement for the USFWS BO. (This will be detailed in the RI/FS Management Plan and associated QAPP.) A new figure in the design may be necessary. The 4 XAD samples proposed so far include one reference, one at the point of discharge in the river, one at the point of dredging, and 1 downcurrent from the work. The plan was to use on XAD instrument. Jennifer Peterson suggested contacting Integral for use of their units. She suggested at least two contemporaneous XAD samplers. She also thought we should consider where in the water column samples are collected. In the past, samples were collected about 15 feet below water surface. Plans need to be detailed for their comment.
 9. Jeremy indicated grab samples (s) in the decant water with detection limits to 0.010 ug/l would be acceptable for near-real-time information. The number of grabs may be used to reduce the number of XAD deployments. There is a need to characterize construction-related conditions versus baseline.
 10. The Biological assessment that is sent to Jeremy will include GAC and the new monitoring proposal. The BA sent to Jeff Lockwood will be resubmitted. It was not decided whether the resubmittal would be the official final BA. NMFS said we needed to include the purpose of the project and details. Jeremy indicated that the BA should state the objectives of the XAD monitoring and describe the plan in general terms. PCB monitoring would be used as a surrogate to quantify take. He needs to predict ahead of time the amount and extent of take, an estimate of

the area at or above the criteria, and confirm that with our monitoring. February 07 is the estimated date for submitting the draft monitoring plan. If the final BA is submitted in January as proposed, the final BO could be within the 135 days.

11. Mark Dasso discussed the Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study Management Plan (RI/FS MP). Originally the plan was to be an overall plan submitted for agency review in August 06 with QAPPs for detailed sampling to follow. Now the RIMP will be submitted to agencies in April 07, and will accompany the in-water QAPP for the RI. The in water QAPP will include sediment and clams, crayfish and fin fish. Sampling will be done in a reference area upstream, in the forebay and downstream of the dam. Jennifer Peterson asked if we could analyze the bass sooner. We want the bass to be in accordance with the RI/FS Management Plan. USACE proposed a February TAG meeting to finish discussion of monitoring, and an April Tag for the RI/FS MP.
12. Mark updated the group on the Community Involvement Committee. At the September meeting 6 of 9 members attended and worked on how the community could be informed. The October meeting focused on developing key messages for the community communications. Only 2 of 9 members attended. Fact Sheets are being prepared by Jones and Stokes, the Community Involvement contractor.
13. Barbara Creel summarized the 7 Nov 06 meeting at the Yakama tribe with Colonel O'Donovan and the tribal council. Sylvia Kawabata from EPA and Bob Schwarz were in attendance. The main concern was over funding of tribal participation. The Yakama do not object to the removal, but want to be funded to participate. They were told that legislation is necessary to authorize USACE to pay for their involvement. Although this did not satisfy them, the government to government communication line is open. They acknowledged the briefing given in January 05 to the technical staff.
14. Jeff Hurt announced he will no longer be part of the team and is moving to a different job.
15. The next TAG was tentatively set for 14 Feb 07.