

Contaminated Sediments Task Force

Aquatic Subcommittee Meeting Notes

March 27, 2001, Port of Los Angeles

A list of the meeting attendees is attached.

1) Aquatic Capping Monitoring Plan Presentation – Carl Stivers of Anchor

Environmental presented an overview of the proposed aquatic capping monitoring plan (see attached overview). A copy of the PowerPoint slide presentation can be obtained by contacting Carl Stivers at Anchor Environmental (206-287-9130). The following summarizes the questions and discussions that ensued during the presentation:

- Steven Bay – Wasn't the cap material supposed to be imported from a location other than the SEIBP? Group agreed that it may have been early on, but that the current thought is that it would be obtained from SEIBP.
- David Moore – How soon after cap placement will post-construction monitoring be initiated? Generally, cap will be allowed to consolidate for between 2-4 weeks before post construction sampling; however, sampling outside the NEIBP can be conducted immediately after construction.
- Maile Gee – When will we know final cap location? Biggest factor is the production rates for the dredge contractor. Goal is to remove as much material within schedule constraints. Current estimate is that the final volume will be between 40,000 and 70,000 cubic meters. Should know final location shortly.
- David Moore – What are the units for turbidity and light transmission? Units for turbidity are NTU (nephelometric turbidity units) and for transmission, percent decrease in transmission compared to background.
- David Moore – Why sample benthos in March? March was chosen so that the monitoring can also be timed with expected occurrence of juvenile ghost shrimp in the upper sediment layers. Group discussed this issue and Moore recommended that summer might be better and that Stivers should use the POLB/POLA quarterly benthic data collected by MEC to help decide target sample period.

-
- Steven Bay – How were the sampling stations selected and why are they different for chemistry and benthos? Stations for chemistry and benthos are actually just a few meters apart. The goal is to actually collect from the same area, but avoid the disturbed areas created by sampling for surface and core chemistry. Stations were selected based on limited info thus far. Bay recommended that the group look at the stations in more detail to make sure we have them where we want them long term.
 - David Moore – Are there any other ancillary questions that we want to answer (big picture) with the monitoring program like how well the cap returns to “normal” conditions following construction. Stivers mentioned that we will have a reference station for the benthos sampling and that this info could be use to assess rates of benthic recolonization at the site. Group agreed that all should think about long-term goals for the monitoring data and send ideas to Stivers for consideration.
 - Steven Bay – Do we have a list of specific objectives that we are trying to answer with the monitoring plan? They are presented in the report for each task proposed in the monitoring plan.
 - Steven Bay – Has a concern with the subsurface sediment sampling strategy. Bay does not agree with focusing just on the interface and surface layers. His suggestion is that we sample each interval and/or composite over larger depths so that the entire core is tested for both the post cap and long term monitoring. Foxworthy agreed and added that we need to be careful because every time we go back out there the transition depth might different simply due to uneven distribution of the cap material during placement. Bay added that we might also want to look at things such as sediment density of the core samples to determine interface as well as radioisotopes which can help determine mixed layers (i.e., bioturbation depths).
 - Mitzy Taggart – Is the monitoring plan final or can they still provide comments? Field responded by saying that comments can still be provided. Gee added that if the submittal is complete and it is scheduled for the May agenda, the staff report must be completed by April 19th to make the May agenda.
 - Steven Bay – Asked if the purpose of the monitoring plan was to provide a quantitative analysis of ghost shrimp bioturbation? Stivers responded by saying

that it was not the purpose of the plan and that they should table that discussion until after the presentation on the ghost shrimp white paper.

- Michael Lyons – Did Anchor consider pre-dredge surveys of water column metals concentrations to provide a measurement of ambient conditions? No because there will be upcurrent locations sampled at the time of monitoring to provide ambient concentrations.
- Foxworthy – How and when will we decide final dredging and placement techniques? Options were presented in the Dredge Construction Plan that is contained as an appendix in the LARE EA. Final selection will occur after we get all the chemical and physical data back and have consulted with the dredge contractor. Foxworthy stated that we may want to consider other types of information that may be collected that could help answer regional dredge issues. For example, consider the types of equipment that are routinely used by the ports so that the pilot study is applicable to regional practices.

Group decided that there was sufficient interest to warrant another meeting to further discuss comments on the monitoring plan. That meeting was set for Thursday, April 5th at 9 am in the Corps Con-Ops conference room. The group agreed to provide written comments to Carl Stivers (cstivers@anchorenv.com) by the close of business on Monday, April 2nd so that they can be reviewed prior to the meeting on the 5th. The entire CSTF Aquatic Subcommittee should be copied on the comments to Anchor so that the members can see each other's comments.

- 2) Long-Term Monitoring Cost Estimate – Current cost estimate is approximately \$300,000 over a three year period (i.e., \$100,000 per year).
- 3) Ghost Shrimp White Paper Discussion – Carl presented an overview of the white paper that was recently forwarded to the group via e-mail. Larry Smith of the Corps asked if the shrimp larvae could be identified to species. Stivers responded that they could. Mitzy Taggart asked how many of the studies were conducted in deeper water similar to the NEIBP. Stivers responded by saying that none of them focused on that deep of water because that is not where the densest populations exist.

Researchers have historically focused only on those areas where the shrimp are found in high numbers.

- 4) Other Pilot Study Updates – Steve Cappellino provided brief updates on the soil washing and blending studies and Russ Boudreau provided an update on the cement stabilization bench scale study.
- Soil Washing – Meeting was held on March 6th with Corps staff and Michael Lyons to discuss scope and objectives. Group agreed to proceed with three general approaches to soil washing:
 - washing the material using a passive (column) rinsing approach;
 - using a filter press and washing the residual cake; and
 - removing the water and diluting the remaining chlorides.WES staff are currently conducting a literature review for examples of these types of studies and are developing a draft work plan using the above three approaches.
 - Soil Blending – Still need to schedule a meeting with the port engineers to obtain any data that they may have before developing work plan.
 - Cement Stabilization – Moffat & Nicholl still do not have a SOW finalized yet, but should have it completed within the next week. Sampling should commence shortly. Meeting was held on March 7th between Corps, Michael Lyons and ECDC (contractor) to discuss approach and concerns. Both the POLB and POLA have been contacted about space to conduct the pilot study. POLB old Navy area or Pier T appears most feasible at this point. Plan is still to conduct the bench scale study using material from all four locations.
- 5) Miscellaneous – Steven Bay asked when the Chambers report on dredge BMPs would be ready so that he could finalize his RFP for the next phase. Corps has received a draft copy of the report, but not sure when it will be released. Steven Bay stated that he expected to get the RFP out by the end of April, assuming he receives the Chambers report very soon.
- 6) Next Meeting Date – Tuesday, April 24th from 10-12 at the same POLA location.