Calapooia Watershed Council
Brownsville Dam Technical Team Meeting
January 17, 2007
Brownsville Library

Meeting Summary

Technical Team members in attendance

Bud Baumgartner, Council Chair	Tim Otis, Council Vice Chair
Bob Danehy, Council Steering Committee/Weyerhaeuser	Tara Putney, Council Coordinator
Karen Strohmeyer, Cascade Pacific RC&D	Karen Hans, ODFW
Douglass Fitting, OWEB	Chuck Knoll, Linn Cty Engineer
Susan Novak, NMFS	Mike Lambert, ODFW
Jared Rubin, DEQ	Bill Sattler, City of Brownsville

Contractors in attendance

John Martin, Project Manager CES	**Error! Contact not defined.**, Project Manager Council

Several hand-outs were presented:

- Background on sediment evaluation frame work – *prepared by Denise*
- Brownsville Dam Removal and Canal Diversion Improvement – Draft - Existing Data Summary – *Prepared by CES*
- Selected sections of the NW Regional Sediment Evaluation Framework (SEF)

Denise provided an overview of the project status and current discussions that have been occurring re: Section 401 permit required by DEQ as part of the USACE/DSL Section 404 permit process. Denise provided background information on what is in the SEF itself and what is required under Level I.

Link to SEF document:
http://www.nws.usace.army.mil/PublicMenu/Menu.cfm?sitename=dmmo&pagename=RSET

Most relevant sections of the SEF discussed at meeting:
Figure 4-14. Flowchart that shows the steps for a Level I vs Level II project

Section 4.4.1 – Initial Assessment – reasons why the project is being conducted, reasons motivating the project, assessment of potential risks and what type of risks

Section 4.4.2 – Primary Assessment – Further understanding of the project, more detail on the Conceptual Site Model (CSM), begins with data collection on contaminant sources, Resources of Concern (ROCs), biological or chemical data from site/sediment, review of data quality, identify preliminary list of contaminants, compare existing data with appropriate sediment and tissue guidelines.

Table 5-1. – Management Area Ranking Definitions ***Does our project fall into exclusionary category? If we can demonstrate the following 3 criteria, are we done?***

- At least 80% sand retained in a No. 230 sieve
- Total organic carbon content of less than 0.5 percent TOC
- Location sufficiently removed from potential sources of contamination based on historical information and/or best professional judgment.

The group thought that at the very least, the project should have the opportunity for the Regional Sediment Evaluation Team (RSET) to review it as a Level I project and if RSET has additional questions that need to be answered, they can pose the actual questions so the project engineers aren't guessing at what information would be adequate to move forward.

John Martin at CES provided information on the existing data for the site. His handout is available upon request.

Notable Existing Data

- CES obtained primary records for federal, state, tribal, state and historical databases. Upon review, NO facilities were found in a 2-mile radius of Brownville Dam. Four unmappable facilities (orphan site) were identified **downstream** of the dam in or near the City of Brownsville.
- Review of ODEQ facilities upstream of the dam identified LUST clean-up locations. Three sites were found, none located near the Calapooia River and all have been remediated or DEQ is not requiring any further action on the sites.
- Seismic Refraction Review – Volume of sediment stored by the dam estimated based on seismic data indicate the wedge stores approximately 5,748 cy.
- ODEQ 303(d) review does not find any specific concerns for the area upstream of or at the dam other than temperature. All the DEQ data collection has taken place at the Queen Bridge in Albany (over 30 miles downstream of the dam). Pesticides, metals, PAHs, etc. have been detected at this location, but this is downstream of the watershed's heavy industry in Albany.
- *New information since meeting on 1/17 - Denise checked DEQ's LASAR database and found information on sediment samples collected to test for mercury in the Calapooia River in Brownsville. There are no known sources of mercury in the watershed, so this is likely background mercury content. Checking on this in the TMDL for the Willamette.*

Thanks to Jared for summarizing our discussion with the following email message he is planning to send to Alex Cyril at DEQ:

"The group was a bit daunted by the prospect of working within the NW Regional Sediment Evaluation Framework to characterize the sediment behind the dam. The project itself is a relatively small dam removal and it appears like the SEF was written to support channel dredging activities and/or the removal of contaminated sediments. I wanted to follow-up with you to get some historical perspective on the SEF guidance and how it has been applied in the past. Many of the folks familiar with other proposed dam removals (such as Marmot, Savage

Rapids and Chiloquin) hadn't heard about the SEF guidance, the Level I/II distinction, and the RSET review.

- To your knowledge, have people been asked to use the SEF guidance document to characterize the sediment for other dam removal projects?
- Would this guidance (and the corresponding data collection needs) apply to each and every 404/401 permit that we and the Corps/DSL would issue?

Jared spoke with Christine S. and Avis N. at DEQ about the Marmot dam and it sounds like RSET did play a role in that review and that some sediment characterization (for chemical contaminants) was conducted. He's not sure about the case of Savage Rapids and Chiloquin.

The scale of the Brownsville Project is much smaller than Marmot - with less sediment present behind the dam and less of a potential for contamination - so the group is trying to determine how best to proceed through the permitting process. A review of upstream land uses suggests that there really aren't any reasons to suspect the presence of contaminated sediments since there are no known industrial/municipal point sources, industrial activities, or contaminated cleanup sites.

The preliminary modeling conducted to date yielded a conservative estimate for the amount of sediment present behind the dam of 5,750 cubic yards. The State and Federal fishery agencies have all indicated that they'd much rather see the sediment/gravel stay in the river than be dredged.

The group would obviously like to see this project move forward in a timely fashion but if, for example, the project were placed in a Level II category, as described in the SEF process, the potential sampling requirements and the associated costs would necessitate additional grant writing, a much longer timeframe, and a significant loss of momentum. It is important to remember that we aren't talking about a project that was conceived for economic benefit. The dam removal project was designed to benefit native fish species and it has broad support from the local stakeholders as well as the partner Agencies.

The Council would like to make the case to the Corps that this is a relatively innocuous project, with net environmental gain, and that there really isn't much of a risk related to the movement of contaminated sediments downstream. Any advice as to how the group can best support those assertions to ensure that this doesn't end up in a Level II type process, would be appreciated."

2:20 pm Meeting adjourned

NEXT MEETING DATE, TIME, LOCATION TBD. I will email you with some potential days/times as we receive more information about how to proceed with permits.