CSTF AQUATIC SUBCOMMITTEE

MEETING NOTES (6/23/03)

POLA Conference Center

Attendees:

Scott Johnson – ABC Labs

Tom Johnson – POLB

Jim Fields, Josh Burnam, USACE Los Angeles District

David Moore – MEC

Ying Poon – Everest

Steve Cappellino – Anchor

Michael Lyons – LARWQCB

Steve Bay – SCCWRP

Rich Gossett – CRG Marine Labs

Bill Paznokos (via phone for the monitoring discussion)

1) **New Aquatic Subcommittee Chair** – Josh Burnam will be taking over Jim Fields' role as the lead of the Subcommittee as the work progress to a more technical role related to policy determinations. Josh is from the Corps regulatory branch.
2) **University of New Hampshire (UNH) Proposal** – A proposal has been received to create a partnership between the CSTF and the UNH Center for Contaminated Sediments Research to develop a decision support tool for managing contaminated sediments in Los Angeles. A conference call was held between the meeting participants and three staff from the UNH (Kevin Gardner, Shannon Rodgers, and Tom Seager) to discuss the proposal. The main goals for the proposed work include:
    - Investigate the potential of innovative decision support strategies to improve stakeholder satisfaction with the decision process and enhance understanding of pilot technologies under consideration for LA.
    - Create a quantitative basis for comparing and incorporating salient stakeholder values in the development and assessment of novel technologies.
    - Enhance technology transfer and decision support tools under development at the CCSR.

- Inform long-range planning activities regarding contaminated sediments in the Los Angeles County region.

A pilot study is currently underway in NH using this approach and the concept would be to try and apply as much as possible from the pilot study to the CSTF Strategy Report development process. According to Tom Seager, the two main advantages of using this approach for our project are that (1) it may be able to help facilitate the evaluation process between the CSTF participant by allowing a third party neutral to the issues be involved, and (2) they can work with the group to re-evaluate the proposed alternatives using less subjective criteria than "acceptable" or "not acceptable". A complete copy of the proposal can be obtained by contacting Jim Fields. The proposed dollar amount for their work would be $30K and the final product would be available at the end of the year.

After the conference call was concluded, the group discussed the proposal and had the following conclusions: All agreed that having a third party involved could be beneficial, but disagreed on whether it would achieve the desired outcome; the work that is proposed is to a large degree duplicative to what the CSTF is already doing as part of the Management Committee; and the results probably won't tell us anything that we already do not know. Although not strongly in favor of proceeding, the group agreed to present the issue to the Management Committee for consideration. One caveat to the proposed plan would be to make sure that Heal the Bay would participate in the process before proceeding. [NOTE: THE CSTF MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE MEETING WAS HELD THE FOLLOWING DAY AND THE DECISION WAS MADE NOT TO PURSUE THIS EXERCISE BECAUSE OF FINANCIAL CONCERNS AND THE FEELING THAT IT WILL NOT PROVIDE SIGNIFICANT VALUE AT THIS PART IN THE STRATEGY REPORT PROCESS].

3) **Review of Year 1 CAD Site Monitoring Results** – Scott Johnson of ABC Labs presented a brief overview of the results from last year's monitoring and a list of proposed changes for the second round of annual monitoring. A summary of the highlights follows:

Summary of Year 1 Monitoring:

- Cap construction objectives (thickness, integrity, etc.) were met

- Cap surface is not eroding
- Biological re-colonization has occurred rapidly
- Screening infauna with both 1.0 and 0.5 mm screens added many new species and higher densities, suggesting high recruitment rates
- Cap has been effective thus far at isolating contaminants
- Mounds were present on the surface of the cap suggesting that some bioturbation was occurring
- Burrow mounds showed elevated metals, but not elevated PAHs suggesting that the source of the material is not from the LARE sediments but some other source

Recommendations for Modifications to Year 2 Monitoring:

- Measure contaminants in sediments from both the surface of the cap and adjacent surface sediments to help identify source of burrow mound contaminants.
- Measure contaminants in burrow mound material and cap surface flocculent material, also to help identify source of burrow mound contaminants.
- Use a hand-held coring device ("slurp gun") to sample burrow mound material
- Further investigate the origins of the burrows on the CAD surface (possibly collect burrow castings, box coring, investigate potential for gas release, etc).
- Collect infauna samples from the SEIBP at two stations.
- Perform particle size and organic carbon analyses on all infauna samples.
- Continue to use both 1.0 and 0.5 mm screens for infauna sampling to ensure capture of juvenile organisms.
- Modify the sediment core sub-sampling strategy by moving the middle core sample to the point just above the LARE material interface to evaluate potential chemical flux. The rest of the core will be archived.
- Add an additional core at one location to collect samples at high resolution intervals for chemistry analyses, particle size distribution and organic carbon as a way to evaluate potential mixing and provide a better understanding of potential chemical flux from the LARE material.
- Move the sampling event to July to allow that data to be received in time to meet the Strategy Report schedule for a draft by the end of the year.

Steve Bay reminded the group that a draft monitoring report was sent out for the Year 1 sampling and they he would like to receive comments within two weeks from the group (July 9, 2003). Comments can be sent to either he or Scott Johnson directly.

4) **Elutriate Testing Enhancements** – One of the task items from the last meeting was to compile a list of data gaps related to elutriate testing and resuspended sediments field monitoring so that upcoming Corps and Port field projects might be modified to help collect additional data. Steve Cappellino sent out an email with an initial list of ideas, but had not received any comments. A brief discussion of the subject was started, but the group decided to postpone the issue for the next meeting as it was past noon and Tom Johnson had to leave for another meeting. The group agreed that having the ports present for the discussion was important so the issue was tabled for the next meeting.
5) **Pilot Study Response to Comments** – Again, because the meeting was already running late, the group decided to carry this item over for discussion in July. Draft comment responses have been prepared and are in review at the Corps. They should be finalized before the next meeting and will be distributed and discussed in July.
6) **Next Meeting** – The next meeting was scheduled for July 21, 2003, the day before the next Management Committee meeting. The location will likely stay the same at the POLA, but Jim or Josh will need to confirm with Kathryn Curtis.