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## 1 Introduction

This document presents the results of Phase III Pre-Design Investigation (PDI) conducted per the fourth amendment to the Administrative Order on Consent in support of remedial design (RD) for the upper reach (river mile [RM] 3.0 to RM 5.0) of the Lower Duwamish Waterway (LDW) Superfund site in King County, Washington (Map 1-1). The Phase III results are presented herein separately and in combination with the design dataset, which includes results from all three phases of the PDI as well as pre-PDI data from the Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study (RI/FS) and post-FS sampling events. The PDI has been implemented in accordance with the US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)-approved PDI Quality Assurance Project Plan (QAPP) (Windward and Anchor QEA 2020) and the Addenda to the PDI QAPP for Phase II (Phase II QAPP Addendum) (Anchor QEA and Windward 2021) and Phase III (Phase III QAPP Addendum) (Windward and Anchor QEA 2022).

A Phase III data package was developed and provided to EPA; it can be accessed on https://ldwg.org. This data package included maps and coordinates of sediment sampling locations, field notes and forms, chain of custody forms, laboratory and validation reports, photographs, and validated analytical results.

### 1.1 Data Quality Objectives

Phase III sediment sampling and topographical surveying was conducted to address data gaps remaining after Phase I and II activities. Phase I and II results are presented in the PDI Data Evaluation Report (DER) (Anchor QEA and Windward 2022). With the completion of Phase III, all 14 data quality objectives (DQOs) outlined in the PDI QAPP (Windward and Anchor QEA 2020) have now been fully met. Phase III data collection defined in the Phase III PDI QAPP and survey QAPP addenda (Windward and Anchor QEA 2022) satisfied the remaining elements of DQOs 10, 11, and 12 (Table A1-1).

Table A1-1
DQOs for Phases I and II PDI in the Upper Reach

| DQO | DQO Description | Activities Conducted to Address DQO |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| DQ01 | Delineate $0-10-\mathrm{cm}$ RAL exceedances in Recovery Category 2/3. | DQO was met through the collection and chemical analysis of surface sediment $(0-10-\mathrm{cm})$ samples in Phases I, II, and III. |
| DQO2 | Delineate 0-10-cm RAL exceedances in Recovery Category 1. |  |
| DQO3 | Delineate $0-45-\mathrm{cm}$ intertidal RAL exceedances in Recovery Category 2/3. | DQO was met through the collection and chemical analysis of subsurface intertidal sediment ( $0-45-\mathrm{cm}$ ) samples in Phases I, II, and III. |
| DQO4 | Delineate $0-45-\mathrm{cm}$ intertidal RAL exceedances in Recovery Category 1. |  |
| DQO5 | Delineate 0-60-cm PCB RAL exceedances in potential vessel scour areas in Recovery Category 2/3. | DQO was met through the collection and chemical analysis of subsurface subtidal sediment ( $0-60-\mathrm{cm}$ ) samples in Phases I, II, and III. |
| DQ06 | Delineate $0-60-\mathrm{cm}$ RAL exceedances in Recovery Category 1. |  |
| DQ07 | Delineate RAL exceedances in shoaling areas. | DQO was met through the collection and chemical analysis of shoaling interval samples in Phases I, II, and III |
| DQO8 | Conduct a visual inspection of the banks in the upper reach to identify features relevant to design, such as the presence/absence of bank armoring, and to plan how to access banks and areas under structures for sampling purposes. | DQO was met through the visual bank inspection conducted throughout the upper reach in Phase I. |
| DQ09 | If feasible, delineate RAL exceedances in areas under overwater structures. | DQO was met through Phase I and Phase II sampling, confirming that contamination does not extend under any overwater structures in the upper reach, with the exception of the South Park Bridge. |
| DQO10 | Further delineate RAL exceedances, as needed for unbounded areas. | DQO was met through further delineation of RAL exceedance areas in Phases II and III. |
| DQO11 | Assess chemical and physical characteristics of banks (including topographic survey), as needed, depending on remedial technology selected for adjacent sediment and whether bank is erosional. | DQO was met through sampling and surveying of banks during Phases II and III. |
| DQO12 | Delineate vertical elevation of RAL exceedances in dredge (and partial dredge and cap) areas and collect subsurface sediment chemistry data in cap areas where contamination under caps will remain. | DQO was met through analysis of vertical extent samples in Phases II and III. |
| DQO13 | Collect geotechnical data as needed depending on technology proposed and/or physical characteristics of RAL exceedance areas. | DQO was met through geotechnical investigations in Phase II. |


| DQO | DQO Description | Activities Conducted to Address DQO |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| DQO14 | Collect other engineering-applicable data as needed (e.g., structures inspection, utility location verification, thickness of sediment on top of riprap layers, groundwater velocities). | DQO was met through the following efforts during Phases I and II PDI: <br> - Inspecting structures and outfalls in Phase II near Phase I RAL exceedance areas <br> - Measuring the thickness of sediment on top of armored banks to estimate the volume of sediment over armoring and identify the toe of armored slopes (where applicable) in Phase II <br> - Assessing extent of vegetation along banks to inform engineering design <br> - Archiving samples for waste characterization to inform disposal options for engineering design |

Notes:
DQO: data quality objective
PCB: polychlorinated biphenyl
PDI: pre-design investigation
RAL: remedial action level

### 1.2 Report Organization

The remainder of this DER is organized into the following sections:

- Section 2: Phase III PDI Summary
- Section 3: Data Evaluation
- Section 4: Next Steps
- Section 5: References

The following attachments are appended to this document:

- Attachment A.1: Mudline Elevations and Coordinates
- Attachment A.2: Topographic Survey Data Report and Bank Features
- Attachment A.3: Vertical core diagrams with concentrations
- Attachment A.4: Interpolation Methods for Delineating Areas with Remedial Action Level (RAL) Exceedances


## 2 Phase III Pre-Design Investigation Summary

This section presents the results from the LDW upper reach Phase III PDI sediment sampling and analysis, topographical surveying, and inadvertent discovery plan implementation. Section 3 identifies areas with RAL exceedances based on the design dataset, including Phase III results.

### 2.1 Sediment Sampling

### 2.1.1 Field Sampling Overview

During the Phase III sampling in December 2022, sediment samples were collected from 77 locations throughout the upper reach of the LDW. ${ }^{1}$ Specifically, surface sediment grab samples were collected from 19 locations, and subsurface sediment cores (including short cores [i.e., $0-45-\mathrm{cm}$ or $0-60-\mathrm{cm}$ cores]; shoaling cores; and deeper vertical extent cores) were collected from 62 locations (Maps A-2a, $A-2 b$, and A-3); some surface and subsurface samples were collected at the same locations.

Target and actual sampling coordinates and mudline elevations for the sampling locations (both surface and subsurface) are provided in Attachment A.1. Maps of target vs. actual sampling locations are available in the Phase III data package.

### 2.1.1.1 Field Methods

Surface grab samples and subsurface sediment cores were collected and processed following the standard operating procedures described in Appendix F of the QAPP and Appendix J of the Phase II QAPP Addendum (Windward and Anchor QEA 2020; Anchor QEA and Windward 2021). Generally, sediment samples were collected from target depths using a pneumatic grab sampler (for surface sediment) or a vibracorer (for subsurface cores and deeper vertical cores). In several cases, samples were collected by hand during a low tide.

Mudline elevations were recorded for all locations. For surface sediment samples, mudline elevations were estimated using global positioning system (GPS) coordinates and bathymetry survey data. For subsurface sediment samples, mudline elevations were necessary for sample processing, so they were calculated in the field using field-measured tidal stage and water depth information (referred to as the real time kinematic tide elevation). For the subsurface sediment sampling locations, a table comparing real time kinematic and bathymetry mudline elevations is presented in Attachment A.1.

### 2.1.1.2 Field Deviations

Deviations from the Phase III QAPP Addendum (Windward and Anchor QEA 2022) involved modifications to sediment core acceptance criteria at six locations and the inability to collect

[^0]acceptable cores at two locations. EPA was notified of all modifications when the samples were collected.

Details regarding the six locations with core acceptance criteria deviations for Phase III are described below. These field deviations did not affect data quality (i.e., the deviations were minor); thus samples from these cores were analyzed in accordance with the QAPP.

- Location 757 - After three attempts, the core from the second attempt was accepted (with $71.1 \%$ recovery, below the target recovery criteria of $75 \%$ ), because it had the highest recovery and met the target penetration of 8 ft .
- Location $\mathbf{7 6 7}$ - After three attempts, the core from the first attempt was accepted (with 6.5 ft of penetration, less than the target penetration depth of 8 ft ), because all three attempts met early refusal. The accepted core had the deepest penetration ( 6.5 ft ) and highest recovery (100\%).
- Location 787 - After two attempts, the core with $72.1 \%$ recovery (below the target recovery criteria of $75 \%$ ) that met the $-26-\mathrm{ft}$ mean lower low water (MLLW) target elevation was accepted, because the top $4-5 \mathrm{ft}$ comprised soft, unconsolidated sediment, which prevented better recovery.
- Location 799 - After three attempts that did not meet the target recovery criteria, the core from the second attempt was accepted, because it met the $6.5-\mathrm{ft}$ target drive depth and had the highest recovery ( $71.1 \%$ ).
- Location $\mathbf{8 0 6}$ - After three attempts that did not meet the target recovery criteria, the core from the second attempt was accepted, because it met the $6.5-\mathrm{ft}$ target drive depth and had the highest recovery ( $66.7 \%$ ).
- Location $\mathbf{8 1 4}$ - A 6.5 - ft target drive depth could not be achieved because of early refusal. After seven unsuccessful attempts, a core from the final attempt was accepted because it had the deepest penetration ( 4.5 ft ) and highest recovery ( $80.0 \%$ ).

Details regarding the two locations where attempts to collect a core resulted in samples that did not meet the target criteria are described below. Unlike the six locations described above (for which deviations were minor), samples from these two locations were determined to be unsuitable for the objectives described in the QAPP for these locations. Thus, samples from the following locations were not analyzed.

- Location 763 - A core that met the target elevation ( -30 ft MLLW) could not be collected. After three unsuccessful attempts that hit refusal at approximately -21 ft MLLW, a core from the fourth attempt that hit refusal at -26 ft MLLW was archived. The samples from this core
were not analyzed because they did not meet the objectives for this location described in the QAPP.
- Location 807 - A $0-45-\mathrm{cm}$ subsurface sediment sample could not be collected. After three unsuccessful attempts that hit early refusal, the core from the second attempt was archived, because it had the deepest ( 1.0 ft ) and highest ( $100 \%$ ) recovery. This $0-45-\mathrm{cm}$ sample was not analyzed because it did not meet the objectives for this location described in the QAPP. Instead, as indicated in the QAPP, the archived $0-45-\mathrm{cm}$ sample from location 632 (Phase II) was analyzed.


### 2.1.1.3 Counts of Samples Collected and Analyzed

The numbers of sampling locations in the Phase III PDI sampling effort are presented in Table A2-1. Overall, sediment was collected from a total of 77 locations during the Phase III PDI sampling effort (Maps A-2a and A-2b). The sediment depth intervals collected at each location were specified in the Phase III QAPP Addendum (Windward and Anchor QEA 2022), based on the bathymetry of the sample location (intertidal, subtidal, or shoaling area) and the recovery category, consistent with Record of Decision (ROD) Table 28 (EPA 2014). Targeted depth intervals in the federal navigation channel (FNC) shoaling areas are shown in Figure A.2-1; Map A-3 shows the intervals sampled at each shoaling location during the PDI.

Table A2-1
Summary of Upper Reach Locations Sampled for Chemical Analysis During the PDI

| Phase | Total Locations ${ }^{1}$ | No. of Surface Sediment Locations ( $\mathbf{0}-10 \mathrm{~cm}$ ) | No. of Subsurface Sediment Locations |  | No. of Shoal Core Locations | Vertical Extent Core Locations |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Intertidal $(0-45 \mathrm{~cm})$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Subtidal }^{2} \\ & (0-60 \mathrm{~cm}) \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
| Phase I <br> (Summer 2020) | 266 | 249 | 120 | $88^{3}$ | $39^{3}$ | 0 |
| Phase II (Summer 2021) | 208 | 82 | 87 | $83^{4}$ | $10^{4}$ | 86 |
| Phase III (Winter 2022) | 77 | $19^{5}$ | $21^{6}$ | 34 | 7 | $45^{6}$ |
| Total | 551 | 350 | 228 | 205 | 56 | 131 |

Notes:

1. The total locations count is less than the sum of the counts by location type because some locations have results for multiple intervals (e.g., surface and subsurface samples are co-located).
2. The number of $0-60-\mathrm{cm}$ locations does not include shoal core locations.
3. No shoal material was present at one Phase I location (217) proposed for the collection of shoaling intervals. Instead, this location is counted as a $0-60-\mathrm{cm}$ subtidal subsurface location (i.e., rather than a shoaling location, as proposed in the QAPP) (Windward and Anchor QEA 2020).
4. No shoal material was present at two Phase II locations (548 and 549) proposed for the collection of shoaling intervals. Instead, these locations are counted as $0-60-\mathrm{cm}$ subtidal subsurface locations (i.e., rather than shoaling locations, as proposed in the Phase II QAPP Addendum) (Anchor QEA and Windward 2021).
5. The Phase III counts also include one surface sediment sample (SS826) collected in March 2023.
6. As described in Section 2.1.1.2, one intertidal ( $0-45-\mathrm{cm}$ ) core (Location 807) and one vertical extent core (Location 763) did not meet the target criteria; samples from these locations were not analyzed.
QAPP: Quality Assurance Project Plan
PDI: Pre-Design Investigation

Figure A.2-1
Federal Navigation Channel Design Sampling

(1) When thickness of shoal material is greater than or equal to 90 cm , then the core will be taken to -18 ft MLLW and three samples will be collected. Two samples will represent the shoal material and will be archived (Tier 2 ) and one sample will represent material between -15 ft and -17 ft MLLW and will be analyzed (Tier 1 ). A $1 \mathrm{ft} Z$-sample ( -17 ft to -18 ft MLLW) will be collected and archived. A $0-10 \mathrm{~cm}$ sample will also be collected (not shown).

2 When thickness of shoal material is greater than or equal to 30 cm and less than 90 cm , then the core will be taken to - 18 ft MLLW and two samples will be collected. One sample will represent the shoal material and will be Tier 2 and the other sample will represent material between -15 ft and -17 ft MLLW and will be Tier 1 . A $1 \mathrm{ft} Z$-sample ( -17 ft to -18 ft MLLW) will be collected and archived. A $0-10 \mathrm{~cm}$ sample will also be collected (not shown).

3 When thickness of shoal material is less than 30 cm , then the core will be taken to -18 ft MLLW and one sample will represent both the shoal material and the material between -15 ft and -17 ft MLLW. A 1 ft Z-sample ( $-17 \mathrm{ft} \mathrm{to}-18 \mathrm{ft}$ MLLW) will be collected and archived. A $0-10 \mathrm{~cm}$ sample will also be collected (not shown).
4. In the portions of the FNC that are not shoaled (deeper than -15 ft MLLW ) a $0-60 \mathrm{~cm}$ sample will be collected. A $0-10 \mathrm{~cm}$ sample will also be collected (not shown).

Note: The shoal thickness will be measured in the field based on field bathymetry at each location. The shoal thickness values provided here are approximate.

The numbers of samples collected and analyzed for Phase III are presented in Table A2-2. In addition, a count of pending samples (i.e., those submitted for analysis after December 2022) is shown in this table. Validated data are not yet available for these samples, which will be incorporated into the final design dataset once available. Field duplicates are not included in the sample counts. For many locations, multiple samples were collected, so the location counts and sample counts do not match. In the shoaling areas within the FNC, cores were collected to characterize the shoal material above the authorized navigation depth of -15 ft MLLW in this reach of the LDW, as well as the $60-\mathrm{cm}$ interval below the authorized depth (the allowable overdredge interval between -15 and -17 ft MLLW) and Z-samples below the overdredge interval (Figure A2-1; Map A-3). In addition, vertical
extent cores (including the appropriate subsurface RAL interval, where needed) were collected for further vertical delineation.

Table A2-2
Summary of Upper Reach Samples Collected and Analyzed for at Least One Analyte During the Phase III PDI

| Phase | Category | No. of Samples ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | RAL Interval Samples |  |  |  | Samples Below RAL Interval (Z-Layer and Vertical Extent) |
|  |  | Surface Sediment$(0-10 \mathrm{~cm})$ | Subsurface Sediment |  | Shoal Intervals ${ }^{3}$ |  |
|  |  |  | Intertidal $(0-45 \mathrm{~cm})$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Subtidal } \\ & (0-60 \mathrm{~cm})^{2} \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
| Phases I | Archive samples analyzed as part of Phase III ${ }^{5}$ | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Total pending ${ }^{6}$ | 0 | $1^{7}$ | 0 | 1 | 8 |
| Phase III ${ }^{8}$ | Total collected | 19 | 21 | 34 | 19 | 420 |
|  | Total analyzed ${ }^{5}$ | 18 | 16 | 20 | 19 | 336 |
|  | Total pending ${ }^{6}$ | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 |
|  | Total archived | 0 | 5 | 14 | 0 | 76 |

Notes:

1. Field duplicates are not included in counts.
2. The number of $0-60-\mathrm{cm}$ samples does not include shoal core samples.
3. Sample depths and number of samples collected per location for subsurface samples in shoaling areas varied depending on the depth of the shoal at each location (see QAPP Figure 4-1) (Windward and Anchor QEA 2020). Shoal interval samples counted herein include shoal material (i.e., sediment above -15 ft MLLW) and sediment from the -15 - to -17 - ft interval. Details for each shoaling location are presented on Map A-3.
4. Counts in this row enumerate Phase II samples that were analyzed as part of Phase III.
5. Total analyzed is the count of samples submitted for analysis through December 2022.
6. Total pending is the count of archived or additional samples submitted for analysis from January to April 2023. Validated data are not yet available for these samples.
7. Unvalidated, preliminary results for two pending samples (IT635 and SS826) have been incorporated into the interpolation and revised RAL exceedances areas. Other pending samples are not needed for the interpolation.
8. Counts in these rows include only samples collected during Phase III.

MLLW: mean lower low water
PDI: Pre-Design Investigation
QAPP: Quality Assurance Project Plan
RAL: remedial action level

### 2.1.2 Laboratory Testing Overview

### 2.1.2.1 Chemical Analysis Methods

The methods and procedures used to chemically analyze the sediment samples are described briefly in this section and in detail in the QAPP (Windward and Anchor QEA 2020) and Phase III QAPP Addendum (Windward and Anchor QEA 2022). This section also discusses laboratory deviations from
the QAPP. Laboratory and validation reports and the full chemistry results are provided in the PDI data packages. ${ }^{2}$

Analytical Resources, LLC (ARL) performed polychlorinated biphenyl (PCB) Aroclor, carcinogenic polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbon (cPAH), semivolatile organic compound (SVOC), dioxin/furan, arsenic and other metals including mercury, total organic carbon (TOC), and total solids analyses. Sediment samples were analyzed according to the methods presented in Table A2-3.

Table A2-3
Analytical Methods for Sediment Analyses

| Analyte | Method | Reference | Extraction Solvent | Laboratory |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PCB Aroclors | Gas chromatography/ electron <br> capture detector | EPA 3546/EPA 8082A | Hexane/acetone | ARL |
| PAHs/SVOCs | Gas chromatography/mass <br> spectrometry | EPA 3546/EPA <br> 8270E/EPA 8270E- <br> select ion monitoring | Dichloromethane/ <br> acetone | ARL |
| cPAHs/SVOCs | Gas chromatography/mass <br> spectrometry | EPA 3546/EPA 8270E- <br> select ion monitoring | Dichloromethane/ <br> acetone | ARL |
| Dioxins/furans | High-resolution gas <br> chromatography/high- <br> resolution mass spectrometry | Toluene | ARL | NPA 1613B |

Notes:
ARL: Analytical Resources, LLC
cPAH: carcinogenic polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbon
EPA: US Environmental Protection Agency
NA: not applicable
PAH: polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbon
PCB: polychlorinated biphenyl
SVOC: semivolatile organic compound
TOC: total organic carbon

[^1]A summary of the total numbers of samples analyzed for each contaminant of concern (COC) in Phase III is presented in Table A2-4. Field duplicate samples are not included in the sample counts.

Table A2-4
Total Number of Chemical Analyses in Phase III samples

| Sediment Type | Depth Interval | Total Samples Analyzed | No. of Samples Analyzed ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Human Health Risk Drivers |  |  |  | Other Benthic Risk Drivers ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |  | TOC/Total Solids |
|  |  |  | PCB <br> Aroclors | Dioxins/ <br> Furans | Arsenic | cPAHs | Other <br> Metals | PAHs | Phthalates | Other <br> SVOCs |  |
| Surface | 0-10 cm | 18 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 6 | 16 |
| Subsurface | Intertidal (0-45 cm) | 18 | 18 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 |
|  | Subtidal (0-60 cm) | 20 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 20 |
| Shoal intervals (depth varies) ${ }^{3}$ |  | 19 | 19 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 19 |
| Vertical extent (depth varies) |  | 336 | 336 | 17 | 29 | 14 | 14 | 14 | 19 | 0 | 336 |

Notes:

1. Sample counts include PDI samples submitted for analysis through December 2022 and do not include field duplicates. Counts for Phase III include Phase II samples analyzed as part of Phase III.
2. Other benthic risk drivers include RAO 3 COCs; PCBs and arsenic are counted separately. Other metals (cadmium, chromium, copper, lead, mercury, silver, and zinc), phthalates (bis[2-ethylhexyl]phthalate, BBP, and dimethyl phthalate), PAHs (2-methylnaphthalene, acenaphthene, anthracene, benzo(a)anthracene, benzo(a)pyrene, benzo(g,h,i)perylene, chrysene, dibenzo(a,h)anthracene, dibenzofuran, fluoranthene, fluorene, indeno( $1,2,3-\mathrm{cd}$ ) pyrene, naphthalene, phenanthrene, pyrene, total benzofluoranthenes, total HPAHs, total LPAHs), and SVOCs (1,2,4-trichlorobenzene, 1,2-dichlorobenzene, 1,4-dichlorobenzene, 2,4-dimethylphenol, 4-methylphenol, benzoic acid, hexachlorobenzene, $n$-nitrosodiphenylamine, pentachlorophenol, and phenol) are counted if at least one of the analytes in the group was analyzed.
3. Shoaling interval samples consisted of shoaled material from the FNC (i.e., sediment above -15 ft MLLW in this reach of the LDW) and sediment from the -15 to $-17-\mathrm{ft}$ interval. BBP: butyl benzyl phthalate
COC: contaminant of concern
cPAH: carcinogenic polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbon
FNC: Federal Navigation Channel
HPAH: high-molecular-weight polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons
LDW: Lower Duwamish Waterway
LPAH: low-molecular-weight polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons
MLLW: mean lower low water
PAH: polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbon
PCB: polychlorinated biphenyl
PDI: Pre-Design Investigation
RAL: remedial action level
RAO: remedial action objective
SVOC: semivolatile organic compound
TOC: total organic carbon

### 2.1.2.2 Analytical Laboratory Deviations from the QAPP

There was one deviation from the methods and procedures described in the QAPP (Windward and Anchor QEA 2020) that occurred in the analytical laboratory are as follows: Phase II samples analyzed during Phase III were analyzed outside of hold time for sample delivery group (SDG) 22L0473. As a result, sample results were qualified for PCBs, dioxins/furans, TOC, and total solids. Data were determined to be acceptable for use as qualified.

### 2.1.2.3 Data Validation Results

EcoChem performed independent data validation on all analytical chemistry results. Stage 4 validation was performed on a minimum of $10 \%$ of the data or a single SDG, as specified in the QAPP (Windward and Anchor QEA 2020). Stage 2B validation review was conducted on the remaining datasets.

The data validation reports, which are included in the data packages, comprise detailed information regarding all data qualifiers. No data were rejected. The issues that resulted in the greatest number of J-qualified (estimated concentration) results are as follows for Phase III.

- Replicate relative percent difference outside of quality control limits for EPA 7471 mercury (3 of 3 SDGs), individual EPA 1613 dioxins/furans (2 of 4 SDGs), EPA 9060 TOC (3 of 11 SDGs), and individual EPA 8082A PCB Aroclors (1 of 11 SDGs).
- Matrix spike percent recoveries outside of quality control limits for EPA 8270E SIM SVOC compounds ( 2 of 3 SDGs), EPA 9060 TOC (2 of 11 SDGs), and individual EPA 8082A PCB Aroclors (1 of 11 SDGs).

All data presented in this report were determined to be acceptable for use as qualified.

### 2.1.2.4 Sediment Chemistry Results

Sediment data in the Phase III PDI dataset were compared with RALs presented in ROD Table 28 (EPA 2014), and CPAH results were compared with RALs presented in the CPAH explanation of significant differences (ESD) (EPA 2021), ${ }^{3}$ in order to delineate RAL exceedance areas. A summary of RAL exceedances in the Phase III PDI dataset is presented in Table A2-5, and these exceedances (along with all exceedances in the design dataset) are shown by location on Maps A-4a through A-4j. A discussion of the full design dataset is presented in Section 3.2.

[^2]Table A2-5
Summary of RAL Exceedances in the Phase III PDI Dataset

| COC | Counts by Interval in the Phase III PDI Dataset ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Surface } \\ & (0-10 \mathrm{~cm}) \end{aligned}$ |  | Subsurface(0-45 cm ) |  | Subsurface$(0-60 \mathrm{~cm})$ |  | Shoal intervals (depth varies) ${ }^{2}$ |  |
|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { No. > RAL/ } \\ \text { Total } \end{gathered}$ | \% | $\begin{gathered} \text { No. > RAL/ } \\ \text { Total } \end{gathered}$ | \% | $\begin{gathered} \text { No. > RAL/ } \\ \text { Total } \end{gathered}$ | \% | $\begin{gathered} \text { No. > RAL/ } \\ \text { Total } \end{gathered}$ | \% |
| Human Health COCs |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| PCBs | 1/16 | 6 | 5/18 | 28 | 6/20 | 30 | 1/19 | 5 |
| Dioxin/furan TEQ | NA | - | 1/5 | 20 | NA | - | NA | - |
| Arsenic | NA | - | na | - | NA | - | 0/2 | 0 |
| cPAHs ${ }^{3}$ | 0/3 | 0 | na | - | NA | - | 0/3 | 0 |
| Benthic COCs (with RAL Exceedances) ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| BBP | NA | - | na | - | 1/1 | 100 | NA | - |

Notes:

1. Sample counts include PDI samples submitted for analysis through December 2022 and do not include field duplicates. Counts for Phase III include Phase II samples analyzed as part of Phase III. One additional surface sediment sample (SS826) is being analyzed for PCBs and TOC/total solids, and one additional intertidal ( $0-45-\mathrm{cm}$ ) sample ( 635 A ) is being analyzed for PCBs, dioxins/furans, and TOC/total solids. Validated results are not yet available for these samples; they will be included in the final design dataset.
2. Shoal interval samples consisted of shoaled material from the FNC (i.e., sediment above -15 ft MLLW in this reach of the LDW) and sediment from the -15 to -17-ft interval (see Map A-3).
3. cPAH results are compared with the RALs presented in the CPAH ESD (EPA 2021).
4. PCBs and arsenic are also benthic COCs but are counted separately under human health COCs. Benthic COCs shown here are those with RAL exceedances in the Phase III PDI dataset.
BBP: butyl benzyl phthalate
COC: contaminant of concern
cPAH: carcinogenic polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbon
ESD: explanation of significant differences
FNC: Federal Navigation Channel
LDW: Lower Duwamish Waterway
NA: not applicable (no Phase III samples analyzed)
MLLW: mean lower low water
PCB: polychlorinated biphenyl
PDI: Pre-Design Investigation
RAL: remedial action level
TEQ: toxic equivalent
TOC: total organic carbon

### 2.2 Inadvertent Discovery Plan Implementation

An archaeological monitoring and inadvertent discovery plan was developed to address the potential for any unanticipated discovery of cultural resources, artifacts, or other archaeological features during sampling activities. The plan, included as Attachment $G$ of the Phase II QAPP Addendum (Anchor QEA and Windward 2021), described the locations where archaeological monitoring was required and provided direction, contact information, and procedures to follow should an inadvertent discovery occur.

Prior to implementation of the field program, Stell Environmental Enterprises conducted a literature review of the Washington Information System for Architectural and Archaeological Records Data, as well as other cultural and environmental documents. During this review, 11 cultural resource surveys, 7 archaeological sites, 5 cemeteries, 6 registered historic properties, and 3,083 structures were identified within 1 mile of the upper reach.

During the Phase III PDI, Stell Environmental Enterprises performed archaeological monitoring from December 5 to 13, 2022. No significant cultural resources were encountered during monitoring.

### 2.3 Topographic Surveys

Topographic surveying was used to gather data to address DQO11 (Table A1-1), following the methods outlined in the Survey QAPP Addendum (Anchor QEA and Windward 2022b). The areas where topographic surveying was performed are shown on Map A-5. The topographic survey began on October 5, 2022, and was completed on October 7, 2022. The equipment and methods used to perform this survey were selected to obtain data with precision and accuracy comparable to those of the data from the bathymetric surveys. The key targets and related data for the topographic surveys are summarized in Table A2-6. The report from True North Land Surveying's 2022 topographic survey is provided in Attachment A.2.

Table A2-6
Key Targets and Related Datums for Topographic Surveying Description

| Description | Quantity or Datum |
| :---: | :---: |
| GPS horizontal positioning accuracy | $+/-0.3 \mathrm{ft}$ minimum |
| Total location horizontal survey accuracy | $+/-0.1 \mathrm{ft}$ minimum |
| Horizontal datum | North American Datum of $1983 / 1991$ Washington North Zone |
| GPS vertical survey accuracy | $+/-0.2 \mathrm{ft}$ minimum |
| Total location vertical survey accuracy | $+/-0.02 \mathrm{ft}$ minimum |
| Vertical datum | MLLW |

Notes:
Source: Table 3 of the Survey QAPP (Anchor and Windward 2019).
GPS: global positioning system
MLLW: mean lower low water
QAPP: Quality Assurance Project Plan

### 2.3.1 Field Deviations and Adjustments

Locations of the Area 33/34 outfalls (at RM 4.9) were not surveyed because permissions or right-ofentry agreements were not available. This did not result in an adverse effect on data needed for RD.

## 3 Data Evaluation

This section presents an updated count of RAL exceedances in the design dataset, as well as the RAL exceedance areas based on the design dataset. The data management rules for the design dataset are presented in the PDI DER (Anchor QEA and Windward 2022). The design dataset includes the PDI data as well as the pre-PDI data from the RI/FS and post-FS sampling events (Table A3-1).

Table A3-1
Number of Upper Reach Design Dataset Locations with RAL Intervals by Data Source

| Dataset | Date <br> Range | No. of Surface Sediment Locations ${ }^{1}$ ( $\mathbf{0}-10 \mathrm{~cm}$ ) | Subsurface Sediment Locations ${ }^{1}$ |  | No. of Shoal Core Locations ${ }^{1}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | No. of Intertidal ( $0-45 \mathrm{~cm}$ ) | No. of Subtidal ( $0-60 \mathrm{~cm}$ ) |  |
| RI/FS | 1990-2010 | 354 | 0 | 15 | 0 |
| Post-FS | 2010-2019 | 213 | 0 | 0 | $4^{1}$ |
| PDI (Phase I) ${ }^{3}$ | 2020 | 178 | 92 | 71 | $29^{4}$ |
| PDI (Phase II) ${ }^{3}$ | 2021 | 80 | 54 | 63 | $13^{5}$ |
| PDI (Phase III) ${ }^{3}$ | 2022 | 18 | 18 | 20 | $7^{6}$ |
| Total |  | 843 | 164 | 169 | 53 |

Notes:

1. When a sample location is re-occupied, the sample count includes only the new sample if the new sample has the same chemical list as (or one longer than) the older sample. However, if the new sample has a shorter chemical list than the older sample, both samples are included in the count.
2. The four post-FS shoal locations include a total of eight discrete depth interval samples. Three of these cores were collected in 2012 as part of the USACE sampling effort, and one core was collected in 2016 as part of sampling done at South Park Marina.
3. PDI location counts presented here are not intended to match those in Section 2. This table presents counts of locations where various RAL intervals were analyzed; Table A2-1 presents counts of locations where samples were collected (i.e., not necessarily analyzed), and Table A2-2 presents sample counts, which may be greater than the values presented here because, in some cases, there are multiple samples per location.
4. PDI Phase I shoal locations have a total of 52 discreet depth interval samples included in the design dataset.
5. PDI Phase II shoal locations have a total of 26 discreet depth interval samples included in the design dataset.
6. PDI Phase III shoal locations have a total of 19 discreet depth interval samples included in the design dataset.

PDI: Pre-Design Investigation
RAL: remedial action level
RI/FS: Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study
USACE: US Army Corps of Engineers

### 3.1 Comparison of Design Dataset with RALs

A summary of RAL exceedances in the design dataset is presented in Table A3-2 and shown by location on Maps A-4a through A-4j.

## Table A3-2

## Summary of RAL Exceedances in the Design Dataset

| COC | Counts by Interval ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total Counts |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Surface } \\ & (0-10 \mathrm{~cm}) \end{aligned}$ |  | Subsurface$(0-45 \mathrm{~cm})$ |  | Subsurface$(0-60 \mathrm{~cm})$ |  | Shoal Intervals (depth varies) ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |  |
|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { No. > RAL/ } \\ \text { Total } \end{gathered}$ | \% | $\begin{gathered} \text { No. > RAL/ } \\ \text { Total } \end{gathered}$ | \% | $\begin{gathered} \text { No. > RAL/ } \\ \text { Total } \end{gathered}$ | \% | No. > RAL/ Total | \% | No. > RAL/ Total | \% |
| Human Health COCs |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| PCBs | 67/776 | 9 | 23/157 | 15 | 45/165 | 27 | 1/105 | 1 | 136/1,203 | 11 |
| Dioxin/furan TEQ | 3/137 | 2 | 6/55 | 11 | 0/9 | 0 | 0/13 | 0 | 9/214 | 4 |
| Arsenic | 8/570 | 1 | 1/94 | 1 | 0/38 | 0 | 0/32 | 0 | 9/734 | 1 |
| cPAHs ${ }^{3}$ | 1/510 | 0.2 | 0/61 | 0 | 0/36 | 0 | 0/30 | 0 | 1/637 | 0.2 |
| Benthic COCs (with RAL Exceedances) ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lead | 1/563 | 0.2 | 0/9 | 0 | 0/32 | 0 | 0/30 | 0 | 1/634 | 0.2 |
| Mercury | 3/568 | 0.5 | 0/9 | 0 | 0/37 | 0 | 1/34 | 2 | 4/648 | 0.6 |
| Zinc | 1/532 | 0.2 | 0/9 | 0 | 0/35 | 0 | 0/30 | 0 | 1/606 | 0.2 |
| PAHs | 3/517 | 0.6 | 1/10 | 10 | 0/37 | 0 | 1/30 | 3 | 5/594 | 0.8 |
| Benzoic acid | 2/466 | 0.4 | 0/9 | 0 | 0/30 | 0 | 0/26 | 0 | 2/531 | 0.4 |
| Phenol | 1/472 | 0.2 | 0/9 | 0 | 0/30 | 0 | 0/26 | 0 | 1/537 | 0.2 |
| BBP | 9/475 | 2 | 0/9 | 0 | 2/42 | 5 | 0/26 | 0 | 11/552 | 2 |

Notes:

1. The design dataset includes samples from the pre-PDI and PDI datasets. Sample counts include PDI samples submitted for analysis through December 2022.
2. Shoal interval samples consisted of shoaled material from the FNC (i.e., sediment above -15 ft MLLW in this reach of the LDW) and sediment from the -15 to -17-ft interval (see Map A-3). In many cases, this count includes multiple samples per location.
3. cPAH results are compared with the RALs presented in the cPAH ESD (EPA 2021). See BODR Appendix F for a comparison of cPAH results with the 2014 ROD RALs.
4. PCBs and arsenic are also benthic COCs but are counted separately under human health COCs. Benthic COCs shown here are those with RAL exceedances in the design dataset.
BBP: butyl benzyl phthalate
BODR: Basis of Design Report
COC: contaminant of concern
cPAH: carcinogenic polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbon
ESD: explanation of significant differences
FNC: Federal Navigation Channel
LDW: Lower Duwamish Waterway
MLLW: mean lower low water
PAH: polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbon
PCB: polychlorinated biphenyl
PDI: Pre-Design Investigation
RAL: remedial action level
ROD: Record of Decision
TEQ: toxic equivalent

Key takeaways from Table A3-2 include the following:

- PCBs - PCBs were the primary COC in the upper reach with the most RAL exceedances. Concentrations of PCBs were greater than the RAL in $11 \%$ of samples in the design dataset across all sample types.
- Other COCs - Additional COCs with at least one RAL exceedance in the design dataset included the following (listed in order of frequency of RAL exceedances): butyl benzyl phthalate (BBP), dioxins/furans, arsenic, polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs), mercury, benzoic acid, cPAHs, lead, zinc, and phenol. These COCs exceeded the RAL in $0.2 \%$ to $4 \%$ of the design dataset samples. No PDI locations had cPAH toxic equivalents (TEQs) greater than the RALs in the EPA ESD (EPA 2021); one pre-PDI surface sediment sample had a concentration exceeding the ESD RAL at a location where other PAHs and BBP also exceeded their respective RALs.
- Surface samples - The majority of surface RAL exceedances were for PCBs; there were PCB RAL exceedances in $9 \%$ of surface sediment samples in the design dataset. Other COCs exceeded the RAL in surface sediment in up to $2 \%$ of the design dataset.
- Subsurface samples - The majority of subsurface RAL exceedances were for PCBs; there were PCB RAL exceedances in $21 \%$ of the subsurface samples (both intertidal and subtidal areas, not including shoaling cores). Dioxins/furans exceeded the RAL in $9 \%$ of subsurface samples (all exceedances in intertidal areas). Other COCs exceeded the subsurface RALs in up to $4 \%$ of the design dataset. Other COCs with concentrations greater than subsurface RALs were arsenic (one intertidal subsurface sample), PAHs (one intertidal subsurface sample), and BBP (two subtidal subsurface sample).
- Shoaling samples - There were no RAL exceedances in the majority of the shoaling samples. The exceptions were one sample each for PCBs (one sample), mercury (one sample), and PAHs (one sample). In addition, there were some Z-sample and vertical extent sample results from shoaling locations in the FNC at depth intervals below where ROD RALs apply (i.e., below -17 ft MLLW in this reach of LDW) with concentrations greater than shoaling RALs; these samples are shown in purple on Map A-3.

Vertical core diagrams for all cores (i.e., not just shoaling cores) are presented on the Map A-4 series; vertical extent samples with exceedances of surface sediment RALs are shown in purple. In addition, vertical core diagrams with concentrations are included in Attachment A. 3 for all PDI samples. These data provide vertical extent of contamination information to be used in $90 \%$ RD within RAL exceedance areas.

### 3.2 Areas with RAL Exceedances

This section presents a summary of the updated data interpolation process used to identify areas with RAL exceedances in the upper reach. Three phases of interpolation have been performed as new
information has been obtained during three successive PDIs: Phase I, Phase II, and Phase III investigations. The updated interpolation results presented herein are supported by the full design dataset, which incorporates Phase III data as well as data from all prior investigations. Details of the updated data interpolation are presented in Attachment A.4.

### 3.2.1 Defining Areas with RAL Exceedances

Spatial data interpolation methods were used to delineate areas with RAL exceedances for $90 \%$ RD. RAL interval data from the design dataset were used in the data interpolations. Interpolation uses a local neighborhood of surrounding data points to estimate the values at all unsampled points in the map domain. Interpolation is a standard method used in RD to define areas requiring remedial action (e.g., Anchor QEA 2014; Anchor QEA and Tetra Tech 2016; City of Tacoma 2002; Thornburg et al. 2005). Interpolation method selection and application were developed through a series of technical meetings with Lower Duwamish Waterway Group (LDWG) and EPA statisticians. The PDI DER (Anchor QEA and Windward 2022) and Appendix K to that document provide a summary of the interpolation analyses and results, based on data available at that time. This section summarizes any updates that have occurred with the incorporation of Phase III data into the design dataset.

A detailed geostatistical evaluation of the design dataset, including Phase III data, is presented in Attachment A.4. Specifically, Attachment A. 4 provides the following information: updated indicator kriging semivariograms for PCBs; comparisons of isotropic and anisotropic indicator kriging methods; Phase III indicator kriging interpolation maps for PCBs in surface, subsurface, and combined surface and subsurface sediment; comparisons of Phase II and Phase III PCB interpolations (i.e., before and after the addition of Phase III data); and updated Thiessen polygons for COCs other than PCBs.

### 3.2.1.1 Interpolation Methods

Consistent with previous interpolation work in the upper reach (Anchor QEA and Windward 2022, Appendix K), PCBs were selected as the primary COC for detailed numerical data interpolation, because PCBs delineate a large majority ${ }^{4}$ of the RAL exceedance areas in the upper reach. PCBs were interpolated using indicator kriging to delineate PCB RAL exceedance area boundaries.

PCB indicator kriging interpolations were performed on two sediment depth-defined datasets applicable to RALs: surface sediment, defined as 0 to 10 cm ; and subsurface sediment, defined as 0

[^3]to 45 cm in intertidal areas, 0 to 60 cm in subtidal areas, and shoaling intervals in the FNC. ${ }^{5}$ Using a GIS raster computation, the interpolations of surface and subsurface sediment were merged into a single map showing the combined PCB exceedance footprint of both surface and subsurface layers.

RAL exceedance area boundaries were expanded in localized areas where other COCs exceeded RALs but PCBs did not. Because these areas were small and localized, the RAL exceedance area boundaries for COCs other than PCBs were established using Thiessen polygons. Other COCs that determined the local RAL exceedance area boundary included metals, PAHs, other SVOCs (BBP, benzoic acid, phenol), and dioxins/furans, depending on the area.

### 3.2.1.2 Updated Interpolation Results

RAL exceedance area maps based on indicator kriging for PCBs and Thiessen polygons for other COCs were updated by incorporating Phase III data and, if appropriate, revised spatial correlation structures, as summarized in Attachment A.4. Indicator kriging contours used to delineate PCB RAL exceedance areas are presented for surface sediment (Maps A.4-4a through A.4-4c), subsurface sediment (Maps A.4-5a through A.4-5c), and combined surface and subsurface sediment (Maps A.4-6a through A.4-6c). The indicator kriging contours represent the probabilities of exceeding applicable RALs, expressed in units of percent. The $50 \%$ probability of exceedance contour represents the median estimate of the horizontal RAL exceedance area boundary. Other contours are provided for comparison, including the $20 \%, 30 \%, 40 \%, 60 \%, 70 \%$, and $80 \%$ probabilities of exceedance. Maps A.4-8a through A.4-8c show the median (50\%) PCB RAL exceedance boundary overlain with Thiessen polygons for other COCs that extend beyond the median PCB boundary. This interpolation approach is consistent with those used in previous phases of RD.

The primary results and conclusions of the interpolation update (including Phase III data) are summarized below:

- In surface sediments, there was only a nominal (2\%) increase in the upper reach sample count due to the addition of Phase III data. As a result, the Phase II semivariograms were still valid to use to define surface sediment correlation structures. In subsurface sediments, there was a more significant (12\%) increase in the sample count with the addition of Phase III data. Therefore, the semivariograms for subsurface sediments were re-evaluated and correlation structures were improved.

[^4]- The addition of Phase III subsurface data allowed for the resolution of anisotropy ${ }^{6}$ in the correlation structures of the middle and lower segments, which expanded the correlation range along the direction of current/tidal flow, approximately parallel to the shoreline and the bathymetric contours. Anisotropic correlation structures are common and expected in long, narrow waterways like the LDW, with prevailing directions of river currents and tides. The anisotropic correlation structures developed using the Phase III design dataset confirmed that the RD process is sufficiently robust to effectively address RAL exceedance areas, regardless of whether those exceedance areas are modeled using isotropic or anisotropic methods.
- One of the Phase III sampling objectives was to collect data in areas of higher uncertainty to help constrain the indicator probability contours and increase the confidence of the RAL exceedance area boundaries in those areas. This Phase III sampling objective was achieved.
- In some of the new Phase III data collection areas, RAL exceedances were observed outside the 60\% RD RAA (based on Phase II RAL exceedance areas), and/or non-exceedances were observed inside the 60\% RD RAA. In such areas, RD modifications were made during 90\% RD, as needed.
- There were only minor changes to the Thiessen polygon boundaries, which were used to delineate RAL exceedance areas for COCs other than PCBs. Those changes had a minimal effect on the $90 \%$ RD.

RAL exceedance areas are depicted in Map A-6 using the design dataset. These RAL exceedance areas form the foundation for $90 \%$ RD, prior to engineering considerations. See Maps A.4-8a through A.4-8e in Attachment A. 4 for further details.

[^5]
## 4 Next Steps

The Phase III data outlined in this appendix have been incorporated into the design dataset used for $90 \%$ RD. No data gaps remain to complete RD. Once $100 \%$ RD has been approved, the design dataset and relevant GIS files will be posted to https://ldwg.org/_and PDI data will be submitted to the Washington State Department of Ecology's Environmental Information Management database and EPA's Scribe database, as described in the PDI Work Plan.
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# Appendix A - PDI Phase III Data Report for the LDW Upper Reach 

## Attachment A. 1 <br> Mudline Elevations and Coordinates for Phase III Samples

This file is an attachment to the Phase III Data Report for the Lower Duwamish Waterway Upper Reach.

## Attachment A. 1 Table of Contents

Table A.1-1. Phase III Surface Sediment Coordinates
Table A.1-2. Phase III Subsurface Sediment Core Coordinates

[^6]| Location Category | Location Type | Location ID | Location ID | Collection Date | Collection Method | Mudline Elevation (ft MLLW) | Elevation Type | River Mile | Reoccupy Location | Target Coordinates |  | Actual Coordinates |  | Distance from Target (ft) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | X | Y | X | Y |  |
| Surface sediment | 0-10 cm sediment grab | LDW22-SS766 | 766 | 12/6/2022 | Power grab | -0.45 | LDW RTK tide station | 3.3 | DR203 | 1274270 | 196653 | 1274271.9 | 196656.2 | 3.7 |
| Surface sediment | $0-10 \mathrm{~cm}$ sediment grab | LDW22-SS771 | 771 | 12/6/2022 | Power grab | -3.32 | LDW RTK tide station | 3.5 |  | 1275130 | 195853 | 1275128.3 | 195850.2 | 3.1 |
| Surface sediment | $0-10 \mathrm{~cm}$ sediment grab | LDW22-SS772 | 772 | 12/6/2022 | Power grab | -4.68 | LDW RTK tide station | 3.5 | LDW-SS2214-U | 1275134 | 195819 | 1275138.3 | 195825.6 | 7.8 |
| Surface sediment | $0-10 \mathrm{~cm}$ sediment grab | LDW22-SS773 | 773 | 12/2/2022 | Hand collected | 6.45 | Bathymetric Elevation | 3.5 | 99-G | 1275094 | 195817 | 1275102.6 | 195812.1 | 9.9 |
| Surface sediment | $0-10 \mathrm{~cm}$ sediment grab | LDW22-SS774 | 774 | 12/2/2022 | Hand collected | 6.44 | Bathymetric Elevation | 3.5 |  | 1275114 | 195801 | 1275126.6 | 195787.3 | 18.6 |
| Surface sediment | $0-10 \mathrm{~cm}$ sediment grab | LDW22-SS786 | 786 | 12/6/2022 | Power grab | -2.05 | LDW RTK tide station | 3.7 | DR209 | 1275718 | 195037 | 1275720.5 | 195039.5 | 3.5 |
| Surface sediment | $0-10 \mathrm{~cm}$ sediment grab | LDW22-SS794 | 794 | 12/7/2022 | Hand collected | 14.4 | Bathymetric Elevation | 3.8 |  | 1275727 | 194720 | 1275727.0 | 194719.0 | 1.5 |
| Surface sediment | $0-10 \mathrm{~cm}$ sediment grab | LDW22-SS797 | 797 | 12/7/2022 | Hand collected | 9.74 | Bathymetric Elevation | 3.8 |  | 1275732 | 194684 | 1275732.3 | 194684.6 | 1 |
| Surface sediment | $0-10 \mathrm{~cm}$ sediment grab | LDW22-S8811 | 811 | 12/6/2022 | Power grab | -7.84 | LDW RTK tide station | 4.0 |  | 1276276 | 193750 | 1276276.3 | 193751.0 | 1.4 |
| Surface sediment | $0-10 \mathrm{~cm}$ sediment grab | LDW22-S8812 | 812 | 12/7/2022 | Hand collected | 7.5 | LDW RTK tide station | 4.2 | 04-intsed-3 | 1277194 | 192953 | 1277189.4 | 192953.0 | 4.6 |
| Surface sediment | $0-10 \mathrm{~cm}$ sediment grab | LDW22-S8818 | 818 | 12/6/2022 | Power grab | -1.36 | LDW RTK tide station | 4.8 | R79 | 1277664 | 190514 | 1277666.2 | 190514.3 | 2.2 |
| Surface sediment | $0-10 \mathrm{~cm}$ sediment grab | LDW22-S8819 | 819 | 12/6/2022 | Power grab | -8.26 | LDW RTK tide station | 4.8 | DR254 | 1277888 | 190434 | 1277887.3 | 190432.0 | 2.1 |
| Surface sediment | $0-10 \mathrm{~cm}$ sediment grab | LDW22-S8820 | 820 | 12/6/2022 | Power grab | -5.37 | LDW RTK tide station | 4.9 |  | 1278409 | 190269 | 1278411.1 | 190251.3 | 17.6 |
| Surface sediment | $0-10 \mathrm{~cm}$ sediment grab | LDW22-SS821 | 821 | 12/6/2022 | Power grab | -4.34 | LDW RTK tide station | 4.9 |  | 1278437 | 190197 | 1278439.3 | 190196.4 | 2.3 |
| Surface sediment | $0-10 \mathrm{~cm}$ sediment grab | LDW22-S5822 | 822 | 12/6/2022 | Power grab | -4.69 | LDW RTK tide station | 4.9 |  | 1278472 | 190175 | 1278470.6 | 190175.2 | 1.3 |
| Surface sediment | $0-10 \mathrm{~cm}$ sediment grab | LDW22-SS823 | 823 | 12/6/2022 | Power grab | 2.9 | LDW RTK tide station | 4.9 | NFK005 | 1278643 | 190121 | 1278638.2 | 190116.6 | 6.5 |
| Surface sediment | $0-10 \mathrm{~cm}$ sediment grab | LDW22-SS824 | 824 | 12/6/2022 | Power grab | 7.42 | LDW RTK tide station | 4.7 |  | 1277246 | 189848 | 1277242.1 | 189845.1 | 5 |
| Surface sediment | $0-10 \mathrm{~cm}$ sediment grab | LDW22-SS825 | 825 | 12/6/2022 | Power grab | 5.95 | LDW RTK tide station | 4.7 |  | 1277248 | 189880 | 1277243.4 | 189869.3 | 11.5 |
| Surface sediment | $0-10 \mathrm{~cm}$ sediment grab | LDW22-S8826 | 826 | 3/2/2023 | Power grab | -2.1 | LDW RTK tide station | 3.5 | T117-SE-84-G | 1275123 | 195810 | 1275121.9 | 195818.2 | 8.3 |


| Location | Location Type | Location ID | Location ID | $\begin{gathered} \text { Collection } \\ \text { Date } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Collection <br> Method | Mudline <br> Elevation <br> (ft MLLW) | Elevation Type | River Mile | Reoccupy Location | Target Coordinates |  | Actual Coordinates |  | Distance from Target <br> (ft) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Category |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | X | Y | X | Y |  |
| Subtidal | $0-60 \mathrm{~cm}$ vertical extent sediment core | LDW22-SC750 | 750 | 12/12/2022 | Vibracore | -6.3 | LDW RTK tide station | 3.0 |  | 1273269 | 197621 | 1273266.9 | 197617.2 | 4 |
| Subtidal | $0-60 \mathrm{~cm}$ vertical extent sediment core | LDW22-SC751 | 751 | 12/7/2022 | Vibracore | -13.6 | LDW RTK tide station | 3.0 |  | 1273287 | 197643 | 1273286.7 | 197641.8 | 1.3 |
| Subtidal | $0-60 \mathrm{~cm}$ vertical extent sediment core | LDW22-SC752 | 752 | 12/12/2022 | Vibracore | -7.53 | LDW RTK tide station | 3.0 |  | 1273388 | 197515 | 1273383.8 | 197513.2 | 5.2 |
| Subtidal | $0-60 \mathrm{~cm}$ vertical extent sediment core | LDW22-SC753 | 753 | 12/7/2022 | Vibracore | -13.4 | LDW RTK tide station | 3.0 |  | 1273404 | 197534 | 1273407.2 | 197537.9 | 5 |
| Subtidal | $0-60 \mathrm{~cm}$ vertical extent sediment core | LDW22-SC754 | 754 | 12/13/2022 | Vibracore | -9.69 | LDW RTK tide station | 3.1 |  | 1273478 | 197435 | 1273481.4 | 197443.3 | 9.3 |
| Subtidal | $0-60 \mathrm{~cm}$ vertical extent sediment core | LDW22-SC755 | 755 | 12/7/2022 | Vibracore | -14.71 | LDW RTK tide station | 3.1 | LDW21-SC519 | 1273499 | 197457 | 1273501.0 | 197460.7 | 4.2 |
| Subtidal | $0-60 \mathrm{~cm}$ sediment core | LDW22-SC756 | 756 | 12/5/2022 | Vibracore | -17.76 | LDW RTK tide station | 3.1 |  | 1273668 | 197401 | 1273671.1 | 197397.5 | 5.1 |
| Subtidal | $0-60 \mathrm{~cm}$ vertical extent sediment core | LDW22-SC757 | 757 | 12/13/2022 | Vibracore | -8.76 | LDW RTK tide station | 3.1 |  | 1273708 | 197229 | 1273704.5 | 197225.4 | 4.8 |
| Subtidal | $0-60 \mathrm{~cm}$ vertical extent sediment core | LDW22-SC758 | 758 | 12/8/2022 | Vibracore | -13.25 | LDW RTK tide station | 3.1 |  | 1273728 | 197252 | 1273727.4 | 197248.7 | 3.6 |
| Subtidal | $0-60 \mathrm{~cm}$ vertical extent sediment core | LDW22-SC759 | 759 | 12/9/2022 | Vibracore | -17.03 | LDW RTK tide station | 3.1 |  | 1273858 | 197259 | 1273858.1 | 197260.3 | 1.3 |
| Subtidal | $0-60 \mathrm{~cm}$ vertical extent sediment core | LDW22-SC760 | 760 | 12/7/2022 | Vibracore | -9.81 | LDW RTK tide station | 3.2 |  | 1273863 | 197087 | 1273864.5 | 197090.7 | 3.7 |
| Subtidal | $0-60 \mathrm{~cm}$ vertical extent sediment core | LDW22-SC761 | 761 | 12/8/2022 | Vibracore | -12.95 | LDW RTK tide station | 3.2 |  | 1273884 | 197111 | 1273888.5 | 197107.2 | 5.3 |
| Subtidal | $0-60 \mathrm{~cm}$ vertical extent sediment core | LDW22-SC762 | 762 | 12/7/2022 | Vibracore | -14.4 | LDW RTK tide station | 3.2 |  | 1273978 | 197019 | 1273981.0 | 197018.3 | 3 |
| Subtidal | $0-60 \mathrm{~cm}$ vertical extent sediment core | LDW22-SC763 | 763 | 12/7/2022 | Vibracore | -16.04 | LDW RTK tide station | 3.2 |  | 1274237 | 196962 | 1274250.0 | 196947.8 | 18.7 |
| Subtidal | $0-60 \mathrm{~cm}$ vertical extent sediment core | LDW22-SC764 | 764 | 12/6/2022 | Vibracore | -15.48 | LDW RTK tide station | 3.3 |  | 1274405 | 196819 | 1274399.9 | 196818.6 | 5.2 |
| Subtidal | $0-60 \mathrm{~cm}$ vertical extent sediment core | LDW22-SC765 | 765 | 12/13/2022 | Vibracore | -21.16 | LDW RTK tide station | 3.4 | LDW2-SC15 | 1274714 | 196536 | 1274711.0 | 196540.1 | 4.8 |
| Subtidal | $0-60 \mathrm{~cm}$ vertical extent sediment core | LDW22-SC767 | 767 | 12/9/2022 | Vibracore | -6.56 | LDW RTK tide station | 3.3 |  | 1274592 | 196474 | 1274591.9 | 196472.7 | 1.3 |
| Subtidal | $0-60 \mathrm{~cm}$ vertical extent sediment core | LDW22-SC768 | 768 | 12/6/2022 | Vibracore | -11.84 | LDW RTK tide station | 3.3 |  | 1274611 | 196497 | 1274601.4 | 196493.2 | 10.3 |
| Subtidal | $0-60 \mathrm{~cm}$ vertical extent sediment core | LDW22-SC769 | 769 | 12/6/2022 | Vibracore | -9.39 | LDW RTK tide station | 3.4 |  | 1274858 | 196285 | 1274856.4 | 196284.1 | 2 |
| Subtidal | $0-60 \mathrm{~cm}$ vertical extent sediment core | LDW22-SC770 | 770 | 12/6/2022 | Vibracore | -9.07 | LDW RTK tide station | 3.4 | LDW13 | 1274895 | 196242 | 1274899.0 | 196239.7 | 4.5 |
| Subtidal | $0-60 \mathrm{~cm}$ sediment core | LDW22-SC771 | 771 | 12/5/2022 | Vibracore | -2.88 | LDW RTK tide station | 3.5 |  | 1275130 | 195853 | 1275125.5 | 195851.5 | 4.7 |
| Subtidal | $0-60 \mathrm{~cm}$ sediment core | LDW22-SC772 | 772 | 12/5/2022 | Vibracore | -4.81 | LDW RTK tide station | 3.5 | LDW-SS2214-U | 1275134 | 195819 | 1275139.7 | 195823.5 | 7.3 |
| Subtidal | $0-60 \mathrm{~cm}$ vertical extent sediment core | LDW22-SC775 | 775 | 12/5/2022 | Vibracore | -9.36 | LDW RTK tide station | 3.5 | LDW14 | 1275296 | 195888 | 1275303.0 | 195885.0 | 7.2 |
| Subtidal | $0-60 \mathrm{~cm}$ vertical extent sediment core | LDW22-SC776 | 776 | 12/6/2022 | Vibracore | -11.68 | LDW RTK tide station | 3.6 |  | 1275523 | 195663 | 1275525.8 | 195664.0 | 2.6 |
| Subtidal | $0-60 \mathrm{~cm}$ vertical extent sediment core | LDW22-SC777 | 777 | 12/9/2022 | Vibracore | -16.7 | LDW RTK tide station | 3.6 |  | 1275596 | 195697 | 1275594.0 | 195696.5 | 2.2 |
| Subtidal | $0-60 \mathrm{~cm}$ vertical extent sediment core | LDW22-SC778 | 778 | 12/9/2022 | Vibracore | -19.52 | LDW RTK tide station | 3.6 |  | 1275642 | 195716 | 1275638.8 | 195715.0 | 3.4 |
| Subtidal | $0-60 \mathrm{~cm}$ vertical extent sediment core | LDW22-SC779 | 779 | 12/9/2022 | Vibracore | -16.17 | LDW RTK tide station | 3.6 |  | 1275710 | 195550 | 1275710.0 | 195552.6 | 2.5 |
| Subtidal | $0-60 \mathrm{~cm}$ sediment core | LDW22-SC780 | 780 | 12/5/2022 | Vibracore | -8.7 | LDW RTK tide station | 3.6 |  | 1275593 | 195544 | 1275587.7 | 195542.3 | 6 |
| Subtidal | $0-60 \mathrm{~cm}$ vertical extent sediment core | LDW22-SC781 | 781 | 12/13/2022 | Vibracore | -8.9 | LDW RTK tide station | 3.6 |  | 1275612 | 195487 | 1275609.0 | 195486.9 | 3.2 |
| Subtidal | $0-60 \mathrm{~cm}$ vertical extent sediment core | LDW22-SC782 | 782 | 12/5/2022 | Vibracore | -11.95 | LDW RTK tide station | 3.6 |  | 1275636 | 195492 | 1275635.0 | 195488.0 | 4.2 |
| Subtidal | $0-60 \mathrm{~cm}$ vertical extent sediment core | LDW22-SC783 | 783 | 12/12/2022 | Vibracore | -9.8 | LDW RTK tide station | 3.6 | LDW21-SC573 | 1275666 | 195365 | 1275668.3 | 195366.1 | 2.6 |
| Subtidal | $0-60 \mathrm{~cm}$ vertical extent sediment core | LDW22-SC784 | 784 | 12/5/2022 | Vibracore | -12.44 | LDW RTK tide station | 3.6 |  | 1275689 | 195373 | 1275692.0 | 195371.0 | 3 |
| Subtidal | $0-60 \mathrm{~cm}$ vertical extent sediment core | LDW22-SC785 | 785 | 12/5/2022 | Vibracore | -11.19 | LDW RTK tide station | 3.7 |  | 1275708 | 195276 | 1275713.0 | 195271.0 | 6.5 |
| Subtidal | $0-60 \mathrm{~cm}$ vertical extent sediment core | LDW22-SC787 | 787 | 12/8/2022 | Vibracore | -14 | LDW RTK tide station | 3.7 |  | 1275929 | 195015 | 1275928.2 | 195014.4 | 1.1 |
| Subtidal | $0-60 \mathrm{~cm}$ vertical extent sediment core | LDW22-SC788 | 788 | 12/13/2022 | Vibracore | -11.93 | LDW RTK tide station | 3.7 |  | 1275965 | 195026 | 1275964.2 | 195027.4 | 1.5 |
| Intertidal | $0-45 \mathrm{~cm}$ vertical extent sediment core | LDW22-IT789 | 789 | 12/8/2022 | Vibracore | -0.1 | LDW RTK tide station | 3.7 |  | 1276047 | 194993 | 1276043.4 | 194990.3 | 4.4 |
| Intertidal | $0-45 \mathrm{~cm}$ vertical extent sediment core | LDW22-IT790 | 790 | 12/8/2022 | Vibracore | 0.96 | LDW RTK tide station | 3.8 |  | 1276055 | 194896 | 1276054.6 | 194899.5 | 3.2 |
| Intertidal | $0-45 \mathrm{~cm}$ vertical extent sediment core | LDW22-IT791 | 791 | 12/13/2022 | Vibracore | 3.09 | LDW RTK tide station | 3.7 |  | 1275710 | 194923 | 1275718.1 | 194926.5 | 8.9 |
| Intertidal | $0-45 \mathrm{~cm}$ sediment core | LDW22-IT792 | 792 | 12/5/2022 | Vibracore | 3.97 | LDW RTK tide station | 3.8 |  | 1275741 | 194809 | 1275743.1 | 194807.8 | 2.7 |
| Intertidal | $0-45 \mathrm{~cm}$ vertical extent sediment core | LDW22-IT793 | 793 | 12/12/2022 | Vibracore | 4.5 | LDW RTK tide station | 3.8 |  | 1275749 | 194742 | 1275747.9 | 194738.0 | 4.6 |
| Intertidal | $0-45 \mathrm{~cm}$ sediment core | LDW22-IT794 | 794 | 12/7/2022 | Hand collected | 14.4 | Bathymetric Elevation | 3.8 |  | 1275727 | 194720 | 1275727.0 | 194719.0 | 1.5 |
| Intertidal | $0-45 \mathrm{~cm}$ vertical extent sediment core | LDW22-IT795 | 795 | 12/12/2022 | Vibracore | 5.49 | LDW RTK tide station | 3.8 | LDW21-IT66 | 1275745 | 194700 | 1275744.6 | 194696.9 | 3.1 |
| Intertidal | $0-45 \mathrm{~cm}$ sediment core | LDW22-IT796 | 796 | 12/5/2022 | Vibracore | -3.25 | LDW RTK tide station | 3.8 |  | 1275803 | 194711 | 1275803.1 | 194712.8 | 1.8 |
| Intertidal | $0-45 \mathrm{~cm}$ sediment core | LDW22-IT797 | 797 | 12/7/2022 | Hand collected | 9.74 | Bathymetric Elevation | 3.8 |  | 1275732 | 194684 | 1275732.3 | 194684.6 | 1 |

## Lower Duwamish Waterway Group

| Location | Location Type | Location ID | Location <br> ID | Collection Date | Collection Method | Mudline Elevation (ft MLLW) | Elevation Type | River Mile | Reoccupy Location | Target Coordinates |  | Actual Coordinates |  | Distance from Target <br> (ft) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Category |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | X | Y | X | Y |  |
| Intertidal | $0-45 \mathrm{~cm}$ sediment core | LDW22-IT798 | 798 | 12/5/2022 | Vibracore | 5.32 | LDW RTK tide station | 3.8 |  | 1275753 | 194665 | 1275751.7 | 194665.4 | 1.4 |
| Intertidal | $0-45 \mathrm{~cm}$ vertical extent sediment core | LDW22-IT799 | 799 | 12/13/2022 | Vibracore | 3.7 | LDW RTK tide station | 3.9 |  | 1275826 | 194306 | 1275832.0 | 194299.4 | 8.9 |
| Subtidal | $0-60 \mathrm{~cm}$ vertical extent sediment core | LDW22-SC800 | 800 | 12/12/2022 | Vibracore | -7.85 | LDW RTK tide station | 3.8 |  | 1276092 | 194553 | 1276094.1 | 194553.9 | 2.3 |
| Subtidal | $0-60 \mathrm{~cm}$ sediment core | LDW22-SC801 | 801 | 12/7/2022 | Vibracore | -8.41 | LDW RTK tide station | 3.8 |  | 1276120 | 194415 | 1276121.1 | 194419.7 | 4.6 |
| Subtidal | $0-60 \mathrm{~cm}$ vertical extent sediment core | LDW22-SC802 | 802 | 12/8/2022 | Vibracore | -12.87 | LDW RTK tide station | 3.9 | LDW17 | 1276123 | 194239 | 1276123.1 | 194240.9 | 2.1 |
| Subtidal | $0-60 \mathrm{~cm}$ sediment core | LDW22-SC803 | 803 | 12/7/2022 | Vibracore | -8.23 | LDW RTK tide station | 3.9 |  | 1276151 | 194291 | 1276150.4 | 194287.5 | 3.5 |
| Subtidal | $0-60 \mathrm{~cm}$ vertical extent sediment core | LDW22-SC804 | 804 | 12/12/2022 | Vibracore | -8.21 | LDW RTK tide station | 3.9 | LDW21-SC62 | 1276165 | 194247 | 1276164.5 | 194239.4 | 7.7 |
| Intertidal | $0-45 \mathrm{~cm}$ sediment core | LDW22-IT805 | 805 | 12/7/2022 | Vibracore | 3.51 | LDW RTK tide station | 3.9 |  | 1276298 | 194288 | 1276293.4 | 194286.8 | 5.2 |
| Intertidal | $0-45 \mathrm{~cm}$ vertical extent sediment core | LDW22-IT806 | 806 | 12/12/2022 | Vibracore | 3.23 | LDW RTK tide station | 3.9 | LDW-SSSP1-U | 1275890 | 194057 | 1275887.2 | 194064.6 | 8.1 |
| Intertidal | $0-45 \mathrm{~cm}$ sediment core | LDW22-IT807 | 807 | 12/7/2022 | Vibracore | 2.67 | LDW RTK tide station | 3.9 |  | 1276378 | 193929 | 1276373.7 | 193934.3 | 6.5 |
| Intertidal | $0-45 \mathrm{~cm}$ vertical extent sediment core | LDW22-IT808 | 808 | 12/12/2022 | Vibracore | 0.38 | LDW RTK tide station | 4.0 |  | 1276339 | 193880 | 1276340.3 | 193880.9 | 1.6 |
| Intertidal | $0-45 \mathrm{~cm}$ vertical extent sediment core | LDW22-IT809 | 809 | 12/9/2022 | Vibracore | 1.75 | LDW RTK tide station | 4.0 |  | 1276398 | 193852 | 1276382.1 | 193848.8 | 15.9 |
| Intertidal | $0-45 \mathrm{~cm}$ vertical extent sediment core | LDW22-IT810 | 810 | 12/9/2022 | Vibracore | 1.46 | LDW RTK tide station | 4.0 |  | 1276416 | 193738 | 1276414.4 | 193733.0 | 5.2 |
| Subtidal | $0-60 \mathrm{~cm}$ sediment core | LDW22-SC813 | 813 | 12/5/2022 | Vibracore | -8.39 | LDW RTK tide station | 4.2 |  | 1277356 | 192897 | 1277350.9 | 192894.5 | 5.6 |
| Intertidal | $0-45 \mathrm{~cm}$ vertical extent sediment core | LDW22-IT814 | 814 | 12/9/2022 | Vibracore | 0.95 | LDW RTK tide station | 4.7 | LDW21-IT697 | 1277570 | 190025 | 1277568.4 | 190053.8 | 28.9 |
| Intertidal | $0-45 \mathrm{~cm}$ sediment core | LDW22-IT815 | 815 | 12/5/2022 | Vibracore | 1.27 | LDW RTK tide station | 4.7 |  | 1277570 | 190062 | 1277566.2 | 190060.5 | 4 |
| Intertidal | $0-45 \mathrm{~cm}$ sediment core | LDW22-IT816 | 816 | 12/5/2022 | Vibracore | -0.24 | LDW RTK tide station | 4.7 |  | 1277608 | 190058 | 1277608.3 | 190054.6 | 3.4 |
| Intertidal | $0-45 \mathrm{~cm}$ sediment core | LDW22-IT817 | 817 | 12/5/2022 | Vibracore | 1.56 | LDW RTK tide station | 4.7 |  | 1277572 | 189969 | 1277572.1 | 189966.8 | 2.1 |


| Location ID | PDI Phase | Sample Type | Sample Collection Date | Collection Time | Sample Collection Method | Water Depth (ft) | Tide / Water Level Height (ft MLLW) | RTK Mudline Elevation (ft MLLW) | Bathymetric Mudline Elevation (ft MLLW) | Elevation Difference <br> (ft) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 750 | Phase III | 0-60 cm vertical extent sediment core | 12/12/2022 | 09:26 | Vibracore | -18.4 | 12.08 | -6.3 | -5.73 | -0.6 |
| 751 | Phase III | $0-60 \mathrm{~cm}$ vertical extent sediment core | 12/7/2022 | 10:56 | Vibracore | -21.1 | 7.50 | -13.6 | -11.42 | -2.2 |
| 752 | Phase III | $0-60 \mathrm{~cm}$ vertical extent sediment core | 12/12/2022 | 11:01 | Vibracore | -18.1 | 10.57 | -7.5 | -7.03 | -0.5 |
| 753 | Phase III | $0-60 \mathrm{~cm}$ vertical extent sediment core | 12/7/2022 | 10:08 | Vibracore | -21.3 | 7.63 | -13.4 | -11.74 | -1.7 |
| 754 | Phase III | $0-60 \mathrm{~cm}$ vertical extent sediment core | 12/13/2022 | 15:28 | Vibracore | -16.6 | 6.91 | -9.7 | -8.96 | -0.7 |
| 755 | Phase III | $0-60 \mathrm{~cm}$ vertical extent sediment core | 12/7/2022 | 09:20 | Vibracore | -22.9 | 8.19 | -14.7 | -12.35 | -2.4 |
| 756 | Phase III | $0-60 \mathrm{~cm}$ sediment core | 12/5/2022 | 09:33 | Vibracore | -24.5 | 6.74 | -17.8 | -17.17 | -0.6 |
| 757 | Phase III | $0-60 \mathrm{~cm}$ vertical extent sediment core | 12/13/2022 | 13:36 | Vibracore | -16.7 | 7.94 | -8.8 | -7.31 | -1.5 |
| 758 | Phase III | $0-60 \mathrm{~cm}$ vertical extent sediment core | 12/8/2022 | 14:29 | Vibracore | -23.0 | 9.75 | -13.3 | -12.17 | -1.1 |
| 759 | Phase III | $0-60 \mathrm{~cm}$ vertical extent sediment core | 12/9/2022 | 09:58 | Vibracore | -27.1 | 10.07 | -17.0 | -16.82 | -0.2 |
| 760 | Phase III | $0-60 \mathrm{~cm}$ vertical extent sediment core | 12/7/2022 | 13:30 | Vibracore | -19.2 | 9.39 | -9.8 | -9.1 | -0.7 |
| 761 | Phase III | $0-60 \mathrm{~cm}$ vertical extent sediment core | 12/8/2022 | 13:47 | Vibracore | -22.1 | 9.15 | -13.0 | -12.7 | -0.3 |
| 762 | Phase III | $0-60 \mathrm{~cm}$ vertical extent sediment core | 12/7/2022 | 14:14 | Vibracore | -24.4 | 10.00 | -14.4 | -12.28 | -2.1 |
| 763 | Phase III | $0-60 \mathrm{~cm}$ vertical extent sediment core | 12/7/2022 | 13:22 | Vibracore | -25.2 | 9.16 | -16.0 | -16.12 | 0.1 |
| 764 | Phase III | $0-60 \mathrm{~cm}$ vertical extent sediment core | 12/6/2022 | 14:06 | Vibracore | -26.1 | 10.62 | -15.5 | -16.5 | 1.0 |
| 765 | Phase III | $0-60 \mathrm{~cm}$ vertical extent sediment core | 12/13/2022 | 12:14 | Vibracore | -30.6 | 9.44 | -21.2 | -20.41 | -0.8 |
| 767 | Phase III | $0-60 \mathrm{~cm}$ vertical extent sediment core | 12/9/2022 | 12:45 | Vibracore | -14.9 | 8.34 | -6.6 | -5.22 | -1.3 |
| 768 | Phase III | $0-60 \mathrm{~cm}$ vertical extent sediment core | 12/6/2022 | 12:04 | Vibracore | -20.5 | 8.66 | -11.8 | -9.23 | -2.6 |
| 769 | Phase III | $0-60 \mathrm{~cm}$ vertical extent sediment core | 12/6/2022 | 10:03 | Vibracore | -16.6 | 7.21 | -9.4 | -10.35 | 1.0 |
| 770 | Phase III | $0-60 \mathrm{~cm}$ vertical extent sediment core | 12/6/2022 | 09:04 | Vibracore | -16.5 | 7.43 | -9.1 | -9.24 | 0.2 |
| 771 | Phase III | $0-60 \mathrm{~cm}$ sediment core | 12/5/2022 | 08:33 | Vibracore | -9.5 | 6.62 | -2.9 | -3.06 | 0.2 |
| 772 | Phase III | $0-60 \mathrm{~cm}$ sediment core | 12/5/2022 | 08:15 | Vibracore | -11.5 | 6.69 | -4.8 | -5.12 | 0.3 |
| 775 | Phase III | $0-60 \mathrm{~cm}$ vertical extent sediment core | 12/5/2022 | 09:37 | Vibracore | -16.1 | 6.74 | -9.4 | -9.76 | 0.4 |
| 776 | Phase III | $0-60 \mathrm{~cm}$ vertical extent sediment core | 12/6/2022 | 07:49 | Vibracore | -20.3 | 8.62 | -11.7 | -10.5 | -1.2 |
| 777 | Phase III | $0-60 \mathrm{~cm}$ vertical extent sediment core | 12/9/2022 | 08:52 | Vibracore | -27.8 | 11.24 | -16.7 | -15.49 | -1.2 |
| 778 | Phase III | $0-60 \mathrm{~cm}$ vertical extent sediment core | 12/9/2022 | 07:56 | Vibracore | -31.5 | 11.98 | -19.5 | -18.76 | -0.8 |
| 779 | Phase III | $0-60 \mathrm{~cm}$ vertical extent sediment core | 12/9/2022 | 08:09 | Vibracore | -28.0 | 11.83 | -16.2 | -15.5 | -0.7 |
| 780 | Phase III | $0-60 \mathrm{~cm}$ sediment core | 12/5/2022 | 10:23 | Vibracore | -16.0 | 7.30 | -8.7 | -8.38 | -0.3 |
| 781 | Phase III | $0-60 \mathrm{~cm}$ vertical extent sediment core | 12/13/2022 | 11:00 | Vibracore | -19.8 | 10.90 | -8.9 | -7.21 | -1.7 |
| 782 | Phase III | $0-60 \mathrm{~cm}$ vertical extent sediment core | 12/5/2022 | 11:22 | Vibracore | -20.3 | 8.35 | -12.0 | -10.45 | -1.5 |
| 783 | Phase III | $0-60 \mathrm{~cm}$ vertical extent sediment core | 12/12/2022 | 12:59 | Vibracore | -18.0 | 8.20 | -9.8 | -8.3 | -1.5 |
| 784 | Phase III | $0-60 \mathrm{~cm}$ vertical extent sediment core | 12/5/2022 | 12:20 | Vibracore | -22.1 | 9.66 | -12.4 | -11.16 | -1.3 |
| 785 | Phase III | $0-60 \mathrm{~cm}$ vertical extent sediment core | 12/5/2022 | 13:54 | Vibracore | -22.3 | 11.11 | -11.2 | -10.11 | -1.1 |
| 787 | Phase III | $0-60 \mathrm{~cm}$ vertical extent sediment core | 12/8/2022 | 11:27 | Vibracore | -22.8 | 8.10 | -14.0 | -13.89 | -0.1 |
| 788 | Phase III | $0-60 \mathrm{~cm}$ vertical extent sediment core | 12/13/2022 | 10:28 | Vibracore | -23.2 | 11.27 | -11.9 | -11.56 | -0.4 |
| 789 | Phase III | $0-45 \mathrm{~cm}$ vertical extent sediment core | 12/8/2022 | 8:17 | Vibracore | -11.2 | 11.15 | -0.1 | -0.01 | -0.1 |
| 790 | Phase III | $0-45 \mathrm{~cm}$ vertical extent sediment core | 12/8/2022 | 09:20 | Vibracore | -9.0 | 9.96 | 1.0 | -0.27 | 1.2 |
| 791 | Phase III | $0-45 \mathrm{~cm}$ vertical extent sediment core | 12/13/2022 | 09:50 | Vibracore | -8.6 | 11.69 | 3.1 | NR | na |
| 792 | Phase III | $0-45 \mathrm{~cm}$ sediment core | 12/5/2022 | 11:00 | Vibracore | -4.1 | 8.07 | 4.0 | 5.31 | -1.3 |
| 793 | Phase III | $0-45 \mathrm{~cm}$ vertical extent sediment core | 12/12/2022 | 08:26 | Vibracore | -7.8 | 12.30 | 4.5 | 6.05 | -1.6 |
| 794 | Phase III | $0-45 \mathrm{~cm}$ sediment core | 12/7/2022 | 11:10 | Hand collected | NR | 7.66 | NR | 14.4 | na |
| 795 | Phase III | $0-45 \mathrm{~cm}$ vertical extent sediment core | 12/12/2022 | 07:47 | Vibracore | -6.6 | 12.09 | 5.5 | 6.95 | -1.5 |
| 796 | Phase III | $0-45 \mathrm{~cm}$ sediment core | 12/5/2022 | 11:25 | Vibracore | -11.6 | 8.35 | -3.3 | -2.01 | -1.2 |
| 797 | Phase III | $0-45 \mathrm{~cm}$ sediment core | 12/7/2022 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Lower Duwamish Waterway Group

| Location ID | PDI Phase | Sample Type | Sample <br> Collection Date | Collection Time | Sample Collection Method | Water Depth (ft) | Tide / Water Level Height (ft MLLW) | RTK Mudline Elevation (ft MLLW) | Bathymetric Mudline Elevation (ft MLLW) | Elevation Difference (ft) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 798 | Phase III | 0-45 cm sediment core | 12/5/2022 | 11:43 | Vibracore | -3.7 | 9.02 | 5.3 | 6.22 | -0.9 |
| 799 | Phase III | $0-45 \mathrm{~cm}$ vertical extent sediment core | 12/13/2022 | 08:13 | Vibracore | -7.9 | 11.54 | 3.7 | 4.61 | -0.9 |
| 800 | Phase III | $0-60 \mathrm{~cm}$ vertical extent sediment core | 12/12/2022 | 12:14 | Vibracore | -16.9 | 9.05 | -7.9 | -8.81 | 1.0 |
| 801 | Phase III | $0-60 \mathrm{~cm}$ sediment core | 12/7/2022 | 12:17 | Vibracore | -16.7 | 8.29 | -8.4 | -8.78 | 0.4 |
| 802 | Phase III | $0-60 \mathrm{~cm}$ vertical extent sediment core | 12/8/2022 | 10:39 | Vibracore | -21.4 | 8.53 | -12.9 | -12.37 | -0.5 |
| 803 | Phase III | $0-60 \mathrm{~cm}$ sediment core | 12/7/2022 | 12:35 | Vibracore | -16.7 | 8.47 | -8.2 | -8.87 | 0.6 |
| 804 | Phase III | $0-60 \mathrm{~cm}$ vertical extent sediment core | 12/12/2022 | 11:18 | Vibracore | -18.5 | 10.29 | -8.2 | -9 | 0.8 |
| 805 | Phase III | $0-45 \mathrm{~cm}$ sediment core | 12/7/2022 | 08:40 | Vibracore | -5.6 | 9.11 | 3.5 | NR | na |
| 806 | Phase III | $0-45 \mathrm{~cm}$ vertical extent sediment core | 12/12/2022 | 08:35 | Vibracore | -9.1 | 12.33 | 3.2 | 4.64 | -1.4 |
| 807 | Phase III | $0-45 \mathrm{~cm}$ sediment core | 12/7/2022 | 09:10 | Vibracore | -5.8 | 8.47 | 2.7 | NR | na |
| 808 | Phase III | $0-45 \mathrm{~cm}$ vertical extent sediment core | 12/12/2022 | 9:46 | Vibracore | -11.4 | 11.78 | 0.4 | 0.43 | -0.1 |
| 809 | Phase III | $0-45 \mathrm{~cm}$ vertical extent sediment core | 12/9/2022 | 11:44 | Vibracore | -6.5 | 8.25 | 1.8 | 2.19 | -0.4 |
| 810 | Phase III | $0-45 \mathrm{~cm}$ vertical extent sediment core | 12/9/2022 | 08:40 | Vibracore | -10.0 | 11.46 | 1.5 | 2.11 | -0.6 |
| 813 | Phase III | $0-60 \mathrm{~cm}$ sediment core | 12/5/2022 | 13:45 | Vibracore | -19.5 | 11.11 | -8.4 | -8.91 | 0.5 |
| 814 | Phase III | $0-45 \mathrm{~cm}$ vertical extent sediment core | 12/9/2022 | 12:40 | Vibracore | -7.3 | 8.25 | 1.0 | 1.57 | -0.6 |
| 815 | Phase III | $0-45 \mathrm{~cm}$ sediment core | 12/5/2022 | 12:42 | Vibracore | -9.0 | 10.27 | 1.3 | 1.48 | -0.2 |
| 816 | Phase III | $0-45 \mathrm{~cm}$ sediment core | 12/5/2022 | 12:22 | Vibracore | -9.9 | 9.66 | -0.2 | 1.22 | -1.5 |
| 817 | Phase III | $0-45 \mathrm{~cm}$ sediment core | 12/5/2022 | 12:55 | Vibracore | -9.0 | 10.56 | 1.6 | 2.37 | -0.8 |

# Appendix A - PDI Phase III Data Report for the LDW Upper Reach 

Attachment A. 2
Topographic Survey Data Report and Bank
Features

## Introduction

This attachment to the Phase III Data Report for the Lower Duwamish Waterway Upper Reach presents detailed information related to the topographic surveying activities conducted as part of the Lower Duwamish Waterway (LDW) upper reach Phase III Pre-Design Investigation (PDI) by True North Land Surveying, Inc. (True North), the professional land surveyor. During Preliminary (30\%) remedial design (RD), data gaps among previous bathymetric and topographic surveys in areas of proposed remedial construction were identified (Anchor QEA and Windward 2022a). This Phase III PDI topographic survey augmented data collected during previous bathymetric and topographic surveys conducted from 2019 through 2021, as well as King County's light detection and ranging (LiDAR) data, which provided elevation data above approximately 0 feet mean lower low water. Generally, the areas with data gaps were 1) where the bank elevation was too high to collect data using bathymetric surveying and 2) where the land was inaccessible to the land surveyors in 2021.

To support RD, two types of information were needed in the remedial action level (RAL) exceedance areas adjacent to banks: detailed elevation contours and extents of features (e.g., structures, bank armoring, woody vegetation) that may affect the design and implementation of remedial actions. This information was used in Pre-Final (90\%) RD to help clarify bank site conditions that remedial action construction could disturb, and to design remedial actions to minimize impacts at bank locations above mean higher high waters. Topographic data and bank features information informed habitat inventory, remedial technology design, and slope stability analyses.

## Survey Methods

This additional topographic survey was performed as described in the Quality Assurance Project Plan Addendum for the Lower Duwamish Waterway Upper Reach: Supplemental Topographic Survey Phase III (Anchor QEA and Windward 2022b). The survey began on October 5, 2022, with an overview of the areas and identification of features that needed to be delineated for design, and it was completed on October 7, 2022. To gather data that overlapped with bathymetric survey data, the topographic survey was performed at low tide and to the top of bank or, for lower banks, to approximately 50 feet landward of mean higher high water. The horizontal datum for this survey was North American Datum of 1983, 1991 adjustment, State Plane Coordinate System, Washington North Zone, measured in U.S. Survey Feet, and the vertical datum was mean lower low water (North American Vertical Datum $88+2.34$ ').

The additional topographic survey was performed in RAL exceedance areas adjacent to banks (Areas $13,18,19,20,22,24,25,26,33$, and 34 ) using global positioning system (GPS) and total station instruments. True North established multiple control points at each RAL exceedance area where topographic surveying was performed using the control network established prior to the 2019
bathymetric survey. The geodetic control survey was conducted using GPS techniques from monuments with published positions and elevations.

The equipment used for the survey and associated precision of each instrument are as follows:

- Leica TS16 (Total Station), precision is 0.5 inches horizontally and vertically
- Leica GS16 (GPS RTK Unit), precision is 8.0 millimeters ( mm ) +1 parts per million horizontally and $15 \mathrm{~mm}+1$ parts per million vertically
- Leica LS10 (Digital Level with Bar Code Rod), 0.3 mm vertically.

Data were collected using a 25 -foot grid-like pattern, as well as at break lines (tops and toes of slopes) and significant changes in existing surfaces. The extents of significant surface bank features (e.g., structures, bank armoring, vegetation, utilities, debris) were determined by taking survey shots at corners of rectilinear features or, for curvilinear features, at changes of curvature.

The results of the survey in each RAL exceedance area are included in the RD maps. The figures in the Supplement to the Quality Assurance Project Plan Addendum: Pre-Design Surveys of the Lower Duwamish Waterway Upper Reach show the proposed limits of the survey, bathymetric and topographic contours, and the locations of surface features (Anchor QEA and Windward 2022c). The topographic survey overlapped with the bathymetric survey at all locations.

Near Area 13, the scope of the additional topographic survey work associated with the RAL exceedance was limited to locating an outfall pipe. The scope in Areas 18, 22, and 24 was to locate additional outfall pipes, debris, the toe of the existing walls, and (in Area 24) a building. For Areas 33 and 34 , right-of-entry could not be obtained, so outfall pipes were not located; however, the surveyors were able to collect topographic data on the area from their vessel, mainly behind a line of piles positioned under water and continuing up the slope.

## Deliverable

Topographic data were used to develop surface contours for each of the surveyed areas. The results of the topographic survey were provided in a drawing file (.dwg). (.xml), and a coordinate file (.txt). The drawing file displays the topographic contours and the limits of surface features identified as potentially significant during the initial site visit.

## Signature

## SURVEYOR'S CERTIFICATE

THIS MAP CORRECTLY REPRESENTS A SURVEY MADE BY ME OR UNDER MY DIRECTION IN THE REQUEST OF ANCHOR QEA


## References

Anchor QEA, Windward. 2022a. Preliminary (30\%) remedial design basis of design report for Lower Duwamish Waterway upper reach. Submitted to EPA August 29, 2022. Anchor QEA and Windward Environmental LLC, Seattle, WA.
Anchor QEA, Windward. 2022b. Quality assurance project plan addendum for the Lower Duwamish Waterway Upper Reach: supplemental topographic survey Phase III. Draft. For submittal to EPA September 2, 2022. Anchor QEA and Windward Environmental LLC, Seattle, WA.
Anchor QEA, Windward. 2022c. Supplement to the quality assurance project plan addendum: pre-design surveys of the Lower Duwamish Waterway Upper Reach. Final. Prepared for submittal to US Environmental Protection Agency September 22, 2022. Anchor QEA and Windward Environmental LLC, Seattle, WA.

# Appendix A - PDI Phase III Data Report for the LDW Upper Reach 

Attachment A. 3
Vertical Core Diagrams with
Concentrations for all PDI Locations

D/F TEQs (indicated as "DF") are in ng/kg dw.
Arsenic concentrations (indicated as "As") are in $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg} \mathrm{dw}$.

## Areas 1, 2, and 3 (RM 3 to 3.1 )

|  |  |  |  |  | eas 1,2 | 2, and 3 | 3 (RM | 3 to 3.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| location ID: <br> mudline: | 750 | 751 | 510 | 509 | 752 | 753 | 513 | 514 | 517 | 754 | 755 | 519 | 520 | 521 |
|  | -6.3 | -13.6 | -11.6 | -17.2 | -7.5 | -13.4 | -17.5 | -17.5 | -16.8 | -9.7 | -14.7 | -11.2 | -17.4 | -16.9 |
| -6 to -7ft |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $-7 \mathrm{to}-8 \mathrm{ft}$ | 0.59 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| -8 to -9 ft |  |  |  |  | 9.9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 0.44 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| -9 to - 10 ft | 0.4 U |  |  |  | 0.6 U |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $-11 \mathrm{ft}$ | 0.5 U |  |  |  | 0.6 U |  |  |  |  | 11 |  |  |  |  |
| -11 to -12 ft | 0.4 U |  |  |  | 0.4 U |  |  |  |  | 1.62 |  | 179 |  |  |
| -12 to -13 ft | ¢0.40 |  | $\stackrel{\text { ¢ }}{\substack{\text { ¢ }}}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | dw dw |  |  |  | 0.4 U |  |  |  |  | 0.7 U |  |  |  |  |
| ft | 0.3 U |  | 150 |  | 0.2 U |  |  |  |  | 40, |  | 67 |  |  |
| -14 to -15 ft |  | $\stackrel{\text { ¢ }}{\substack{\text { ¢ }}}$ |  |  |  | 13.6 |  |  |  | dw |  | 144 |  |  |
|  | 0.4 U |  | 160 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | б |  |  |  |
| $\begin{gathered} -15 \text { to }-17 \mathrm{ft} \\ \text { MLLW } \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  |  | 4 4 |  |  |  |  | 40 | $\stackrel{\text { ¢ }}{ }$ | 83.6 |  |  |
|  | 1 | B | D |  | dw | 49.7 |  |  |  | dw | ¢ | 102 |  |  |
|  |  | c | 28 |  |  | 21.8 |  |  |  | 4 U | B |  |  |  |
| -17 to -18 ft |  |  | 135 | ¢ |  |  |  |  |  | dw |  | 30.5 |  |  |
|  |  | 88 | dw | $\stackrel{\text { ¢ }}{\substack{\text { ¢ }}}$ |  | 17.6 |  |  | $\stackrel{\circ}{\circ}$ | 0.5 U | 107 |  |  | $\stackrel{\text { ¢ }}{\substack{\text { ¢ }}}$ |
| to -19 ft |  | 104 |  | 『 |  | 27.6 | 10.2 | 43.6 | $\checkmark$ |  | 139 |  | 6.69 |  |
| -19 to -20 ft |  |  |  | 64.7 |  |  |  |  | 58.3 |  |  |  |  | 48.8 |
|  |  | 33.6 |  |  |  | 74 | 59.9 | 21.9 |  |  | 88.3 |  | 31.3 |  |
| -20 to -21 ft |  |  |  | 18.9 |  |  | 12.6 |  | 43.4 |  |  |  |  | 9.12 |
|  |  | 1.83 |  | 3.6 |  |  |  | 9.36 | 2.6 |  | 39 |  | 0.98 | D |
| -21 to -22 ft |  | 1.26 |  |  |  | dw | 2.3 | D |  |  | 23.6 |  | D |  |
| -22 to -23 ft |  | 40 |  | 0.6 U |  |  |  |  | 0.34 |  |  |  |  | 3.1 |
| -23 to -24 ft |  | dw |  | F |  | 0.6 U | E | 0.3 | F |  | 0.34 |  | $0.3 \cup$ | F |
|  |  | 4 4 |  |  |  | 0.4 U | F | F |  |  | 0.5 U |  | F |  |
| -24 to -25 ft |  | dw |  | 0.2 U |  |  |  | 4 U | 0.34 |  |  |  |  | 0.34 |
| -25 to -26 ft |  | 0.5 U |  | H |  | 0.7 U | G |  | н |  | 1.90 |  | 0.40 | H |
| -26 to -27 ft |  | L |  |  |  | L | н | H |  |  | k |  | H |  |
|  |  |  |  | I |  | M |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  | 0.14 |
| -27 to -28 ft |  |  |  | , |  |  |  |  | J |  |  |  |  | J |
| -28 to -29 ft |  | N |  | K |  | N | J | J | k |  | M |  |  | K |
| -29 to -30 ft |  |  |  |  |  |  | k | к |  |  | N |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | L |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## egend

## No RAL exceedance

Exceeds RAL
Interval below RAL that exceeds surface sediment RAL
Archive
||||||||||||||||| Native sediment (can be any color)

## Areas 4, 5, and 6 (RM 3.1 to 3.35 Subtidal)



RM 3.3 W Intertidal

| location ID: | 543 | 545 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | -5 | 0.1 |

mudine: | -3.5 | -0.1 |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  |  |

+1 to 0

-1 to - 2 ft
-1 to -2 ft
-2 to -3 ft
-3 to -4 ft
-4 to - 5
-5 to - 6 ft
-5 to -6 ft
-6 to -7 ft

-8 to -9 ft
9 to - 10 ft

D/F FEQs (indicated as "DF") are in $\mathrm{ng} / \mathrm{kg}$ dw.
Arsenic concentrations (indicated as "As") are in $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ dw.


Legend
No RAL exceedances
Exceeds RAL
Interval
Archive
|il||ini|||||||Native sediment (can be any color)
Results pending Phase III analysis (results will be included in the final design dataset)


RM 3.4

## RM 3.5 to 3.55 w



Area 14 and 17 (RM 3.6-3.7 E)


Area 15/16 (RM 3.6-3.65 W)

| location ID: | 781 | 782 | 571 | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{T} 117-\mathrm{SE}- \\ 35-\mathrm{sc} \end{gathered}$ | 572 | 783 | 784 | 785 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| mudine: | -8.9 | -12.0 | $-7.0$ | -11.0 | -13.4 | -9.8 | -12.4 | -11.2 |
| -7 to -8ft |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| -8 to -9 ft |  |  | 1.8 |  |  |  |  |  |
| -9 to -10 ft | ¢ |  | 0.91 |  |  |  |  |  |
| -10 to -11 ft | $\frac{1}{4}$ |  | 5.33 |  |  | $\stackrel{\text { ¢ }}{\stackrel{\text { ¢ }}{+}}$ |  |  |
| $-11 \mathrm{to}-12 \mathrm{ft}$ | 25.3 |  | D |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | $(0-2 \mathrm{ft})$ |  | 49 |  | 6.59 |
| $-12 \mathrm{to}-13 \mathrm{ft}$ | 23.9 | ¢ | 0.6 U |  |  |  |  |  |
| -13 to -14 ft | 20.2 | $\stackrel{\circ}{4}$ |  |  |  | 6.8 | $\stackrel{\text { ¢ }}{\substack{\text { ¢ }}}$ | 4.15 |
| -14 to -15 ft | 1.01 | 7.85 |  | (2-4 ft) | $\begin{gathered} 2.96 \\ \text { shoal } \end{gathered}$ | 48.3 | ¢ | 3.25 |
| -15 to -16 ft | 100 | 519 |  |  |  | 8.79 | 2.77 | 77 |
|  | dw | 5.19 |  | 18 | 3.8 | 73.3 | 3.15 | 7.7 |
| -16 to -17 ft | 4.43 | 6.07 |  | (4-6 ft) | shoal |  |  | 4.83 |
| -17 to -18 ft | 22.3 | 33.9 |  |  | 7.9 | 16 | 4.98 | 7.54 |
| -18 to -19 ft |  | 79.3 |  | (6-8 ft) | 13.8 | 15.1 | 8.32 | 73 |
|  |  |  |  |  | 696 |  | 14.8 |  |
| -19 to -20 ft |  | 45.2 |  | 2.2 | dw |  | 10.4 | 21.3 |
| -20 to -21 ft |  | 52.2 |  | (8-10 ft) | F |  |  | 40.3 |
| -21 to -22 ft |  | 52.3 |  |  | 20.9 |  | 13.7 | 29.5 |
| -22 to -23 ft |  | 88.2 |  |  | H |  |  | 18.1 |
| -23 to -24 ft |  | 97.6 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 24.1 |
| -24 to -25 ft |  | 28.6 |  |  | J |  | 3.34 | 23.8 |
| -25 to -26ft |  | 2.78 |  |  | K |  | $\frac{\mathrm{dw}}{13.6}$ | 27 |
| -26 to -27 ft |  | 0.4 U |  |  | L |  | dw | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | N |  |
| -27 to -28 ft |  | 0 |  |  |  |  | $\bigcirc$ |  |
| -28 to -29 ft |  | P |  |  |  |  | P |  |
| -29 to -30 ft |  | Q |  |  |  |  |  |  |

D/F TEQS (indicated as "DF") are in $\mathrm{ng} / \mathrm{kg}$ dw.
Arsenic concentrations (indicated as "As") are in $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg} \mathrm{dw}$.

|  |  | rea 18 Subtid | (RM 3.7 | 3.85 E) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| location ID: mudine: | 787 | 788 | 577 | 587 | 591 | 596 |
|  | -14.0 | -11.9 | -11.3 | -9.5 | -6.0 | -8.0 |
| -6 to -7ft |  |  |  |  | A (0-60) |  |
| -8 to -9 ft |  |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { PCB: } 2.5 \\ \text { As: } 18.2 \\ \hline \text { PCB: } 1.62 \\ \text { As: } 10.6 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 4.69 |
| -10 to -11 ft |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { PCB: } 11.2 \\ \text { As: } 10.8 \end{gathered}$ | D | 1.2 |
| -11 to -12 ft |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { PCB: } \\ & 10.1 \end{aligned}$ | PCB: 39.8 | $\text { As: } 19.7$ | 2.6 |
| -12 to -13 ft |  |  | As: 8.45 | $\frac{\text { As: } 20.8}{\text { PCB: }} 18.9$ | F | 0.84 |
| -13 to -14 ft |  | A (0-60) | B | As 17.5 |  | 18.2 |
| -14 to -15 ft | PCB: 9.44 | PCB: 10.4 | c | D |  | 5.58 |
|  | As 5.5 (sh) | As: 13.3 |  | PCB: 13.4 |  |  |
| -15 to -16 ft | PCB: 7.49 | $\text { As: } 16.6$ | D | $\frac{\text { As: } 17.3}{\text { PCB: } 11.7}$ |  |  |
| -16 to -17 ft | As: 8.97 | PCB: 20.3 | E | As: 24.2 |  |  |
|  | PCB: 10.9 | As: 11.9 |  |  |  |  |
| -17 to -18 ft | As: 8.37 | As: 15.8 | F |  |  |  |
| -18 to -19 ft | PCB: 25.9 | PCB: 96.6 |  |  |  |  |
|  | As: 12 | $\frac{\text { As: } 17.2}{\text { PCB: } 1440}$ |  |  |  |  |
| -19 to -20 ft | $\text { As: } 10.1$ | $\text { As: } 26$ |  |  |  |  |
| -20 to -21 ft | PCB: 25.8 | PCB: 7.61 |  |  |  |  |
|  | As: 10.8 | As: 28.9 |  |  |  |  |
| -21 to -22 ft | PCB: 23.6 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | As. ${ }^{\text {PA. } 4.2}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| -22 to -23 ft | As:9.89 |  |  |  |  |  |
| -23 to -24 ft | PCB: 139 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | As: 11.7 |  |  |  |  |  |
| -24 to -25 ft | $\text { As: } 12.8$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| -25 to -26 ft | PCB: 10 dw |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | As: 2.34 |  |  |  |  |  |
| -26 to -27 ft | $\begin{aligned} & \text { PCB: } 7 \mathrm{dw} \\ & \text { As: } 3.97 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| -27 to -28ft | M |  |  |  |  |  |




## Legend
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Concentrations shown in blue with "dw" after the value are total PCB concentrations in $\mu \mathrm{g} / \mathrm{kg} \mathrm{dw}$.
D/F TEQs (indicated as "DF") are in $\mathrm{ng} / \mathrm{kg}$ dw.
Arsenic concentrations (indicated as "As") ar.

Area 24/25 and Area 26

| location ID: | 808 | 632 | 809 | 635 | 644 | 810 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| mudline: | 0.4 | 3.1 | 1.8 | 0.9 | ${ }^{0.4}$ | 1.5 |
| +3 to +2 ft |  | PCB: 102 |  |  |  |  |
| +2 to +1 ft |  | PCB: 136 | PCB: 136 |  |  | PCB: 27.9 |
|  |  | DF: 104 | DF: 61.4 |  |  | DF: 20.3 |
| +1 to 0 ft | PCB: 25.8 | PCB: 29.7 | PCB: 13.7 | PCB: 15.1* |  | PCB: 14.5 |
| 0 to -1 ft | DF: 6.93 | DF: 2.94 | DF: 5.66 |  |  | DF:8.22 |
|  | PCB: 27.9 |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CB: } 6.8 \mathrm{dv} \\ & \text { DF: } 2.27 \end{aligned}$ | B | A (0- | PCB: 7.18 |
| -1 to - 2 ft | DF: 19.7 |  | PCB: $7.1 . \mathrm{dw}$ |  | 45) | PF: 2.35 |
| -2 to -3 ft | CB: 40 dw | E | DFF:0.508 | c | 7.27 | DF: 2.67 |
|  | DF: 0.606 | F | PCB: 5.3 Cl | D |  | PCB: 29.5 dw |
| -3 to -4 ft | DE.0.008 |  | PF: 0.231 <br> PCB: 0.3 U |  | 4.69 | DF: 1.22 |
|  | PCB: 40 dw |  | DF: 1.33 | E |  | DF: 1.07 |
| -4 to -5 tt | DF: 0.224 |  | PCB: 40 dw |  | 3.68 | PCB: 0.3 O |
| -5 to -6ft | PCB: 40 dw |  | DF: 0.366 | F |  | DF: 1.65 |
|  | DF: 0.248 |  | H | G |  |  |
| -6 to -7 ft | G |  |  |  | F |  |
| -7 to -8ft | H |  |  |  |  |  |

Note: Core at 809 also analyzed for BBP; non-detect for all intervals,
*Preliminary/ unvalidated results are presemted for 635 A because these results
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## ABBREVIATIONS

| AC | activated carbon |
| :--- | :--- |
| COC | contaminant of concern |
| DER | Data Evaluation Report |
| ENR | enhanced natural recovery |
| FNC | federal navigation channel |
| LDW | Lower Duwamish Waterway |
| OC | organic carbon |
| PCB | polychlorinated biphenyl |
| PDI | pre-design investigation |
| RAA | remedial action area |
| RAL | remedial action level |
| RC | Recovery Category |
| RD | remedial design |
| RM | river mile |

## 1 Introduction

This technical memorandum presents updated Phase III interpolation methods and results for delineating remedial action level (RAL) exceedances for polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs) and other contaminants of concern (COCs) to support the $90 \%$ remedial design (RD) effort in the upper reach of the Lower Duwamish Waterway (LDW). Three phases of interpolation have been performed as new information has been obtained during three successive pre-design investigations (PDIs): Phase I, Phase II, and Phase III investigations. The updated interpolation results presented herein are supported by the full design dataset, incorporating Phase III data as well as data from all prior investigations. This memorandum builds on the Phase II interpolation work presented in the Pre-Design Investigation Data Evaluation Report for the Lower Duwamish Waterway Upper Reach (hereinafter referred to as the data evaluation report [DER]), specifically Appendix K, Interpolation Methods for Delineating Areas with RAL Exceedances (Anchor QEA and Windward 2022a). ${ }^{1}$

Subsequent to the DER, a detailed cross-validation analysis of Phase II indicator kriging results was performed to further assess the uncertainty associated with the RAL exceedance area boundaries, as presented in the Draft Cross-Validation Analysis of Indicator Kriging in the Upper Reach of the Lower Duwamish Waterway (Anchor QEA and Windward 2022b). This analysis was used to help inform the placement of additional surface and subsurface sediment sampling locations to refine RAL exceedance area boundaries and reduce interpolation uncertainty in specific areas, as described in the Quality Assurance Project Plan Addendum for the Lower Duwamish Waterway Upper Reach: PreDesign Investigation Phase III (Windward and Anchor QEA 2022).

Indicator kriging was selected as the interpolation method to delineate the RAL boundary for PCBs, which account for the majority of the RAL exceedance area footprint in the upper reach. As summarized in the DER (Anchor QEA and Windward 2022a), indicator kriging requires characterization of spatial correlation structures through semivariogram analysis; it provides direct, quantitative estimates of the uncertainty of RAL exceedance area boundaries. Other COCs with RAL exceedances not co-located with PCB exceedances were addressed separately using a simpler interpolation method (Thiessen polygons), due to their more localized areas of concern and data densities that are not conducive to kriging (Anchor QEA and Windward 2022a).

This technical memorandum incorporates Phase III PDI chemistry data into the design dataset to develop updated RAL exceedance area boundaries for use in $90 \%$ RD. The following information is presented herein:

- Updated indicator kriging semivariograms for PCBs, incorporating Phase III data
- Comparisons of isotropic and anisotropic indicator kriging methods

[^7]- Indicator kriging interpolation maps for PCBs in surface sediment, subsurface sediment, and combined surface and subsurface sediment
- Comparisons of Phase II and Phase III PCB interpolations
- Updated Thiessen polygons for other COCs


### 1.1 Site Description

The upper reach of the LDW is composed of the following segments:

- Lower Segment: River mile (RM) 3.00 to RM 3.58, with a channel alignment of 312 degrees
- Middle Segment: RM 3.58 to RM 4.61, with a channel alignment of 348 degrees
- Slip 6: RM 4.18 to RM 4.27, an off-channel slip approximately perpendicular to the main channel
- Turning Basin: RM 4.61 to RM 5.00, which includes the Norfolk area (RM 4.80 to RM 5.00) on the upper east side of the waterway

Spatial interpolations were performed for the entire upper reach. Segment-specific interpolations were also performed in the middle and lower segments, which exhibit more consistent channel morphologies and flow directions, and thus more uniform hydrodynamic and sedimentary conditions. Interpolations were generally improved (i.e., longer and better-defined correlation structures) by segregating and focusing on those particular subsets of data.

Interpolations were performed separately on surface and subsurface depth intervals, which are defined in the LDW Record of Decision (EPA 2014) as:

- Surface sediment: 0 to 10 cm below mudline
- Subsurface sediment: 0 to 45 cm (intertidal areas), 0 to 60 cm (subtidal areas), and shoaling intervals in the Federal Navigation Channel (FNC)

Different PCB RALs apply in different areas and depths of the upper reach (EPA 2014):

- Surface sediment: RAL=12 mg/kg organic carbon (OC) applies to all surface sediment
- Subsurface sediment:
- RAL=12 $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ OC applies to subsurface areas with a lower potential for natural recovery (Recovery Category [RC] 1) and shoaling intervals in the FNC.
- RAL $=65 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ OC applies to subsurface sediment in intertidal areas in RC 2 and 3 areas.
- RAL=195 mg/kg OC applies to subtidal sediment in potential vessel scour areas in RC 2 and 3 areas. Note that there are no exceedances in RAL= $195 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ OC areas in the upper reach; therefore, interpolations were not performed for RAL=195 mg/kg OC.
- In any areas subject to the application of more than one RAL, the more stringent RAL was applied.


### 1.2 Phase III Data

Design dataset sampling locations (including those for Phase III data) in surface and subsurface sediments are shown on Maps A.4-1a through A.4-1c and Maps A.4-2a through A.4-2c, respectively. The Phase III sampling locations are highlighted to show where the new data were collected. These maps also show: 1) RAL exceedances and non-exceedances in the design dataset, 2) the previously interpolated Phase II RAL exceedance area boundary, and 3) the previous 60\% RD remedial action area (RAA) boundary. Many of the Phase III samples were specifically collected to reduce the uncertainty of RAL exceedance area boundaries in particular areas (Windward and Anchor QEA 2022).

Design dataset sample counts (including Phase III data) are compiled in Table A.4.1-1 for surface sediments and subsurface sediments in each of the RAL application areas and upper reach segments. In surface sediments, there was only a nominal (2\%) increase in the upper reach sample count due to the addition of Phase III data (only 17 out of 776 surface sediment samples are Phase III data). In subsurface sediments, there was a more significant (12\%) increase in the upper reach sample count due to the addition of Phase III data ( 46 out of 377 subsurface sediment samples are Phase III data).

Table A.4.1-1
PCB Sample Counts and RAL Exceedance Frequencies - Design Dataset Including Phase III Data

| Upper <br> Reach Segment | Surface Sediment$\text { RAL }=12$ |  | Subsurface Sediment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | RAL $=12$ |  | RAL $=65$ |  | RAL $=195$ |  | Total Subsurface |  |
|  | Exceedance Count | Exceedance Percent | Exceedance Count | Exceedance Percent | Exceedance Count | Exceedance Percent | Exceedance Count | Exceedance Percent | Exceedance Count | Exceedance Percent |
| Lower | 8/176 | 5\% | 36/89 | 40\% | 0/17 | 0\% | 0/32 | 0\% | 36/138 | 26\% |
| Middle | 42/410 | 10\% | 10/82 | 12\% | 20/99 | 20\% | 0/11 | 0\% | 30/192 | 16\% |
| Slip 6 | 0/48 | 0\% | 2/11 | 18\% | 0/0 | NA | 0/4 | 0\% | 2/15 | 13\% |
| Upper <br> Turning <br> Basin | 16/142 | 11\% | 2/8 | 25\% | 0/22 | 0\% | 0/2 | 0\% | 2/32 | 6\% |
| All Segments | 66/776 | 9\% | 50/190 | 26\% | 20/138 | 14\% | 0/49 | 0\% | 70/377 | 19\% |

Notes:
NA: not applicable
PCB: polychlorinated biphenyl
RAL: remedial action level

## 2 Phase III Semivariograms

Phase III spatial correlation structures, as determined through semivariogram analysis, are presented in this section. Phase III correlation structures are supported by the full design dataset, including Phase III data and data from all previous investigations. Phase III surface sediment and subsurface sediment semivariogram plots and spatial correlation models are compiled in Figure A.4.2-1. Phase III surface sediment and subsurface sediment spatial correlation parameters (e.g., model type, anisotropy [if used], sill, nugget, and range values) are compiled in Table A.4.2-1.

Table A.4.2-1
Phase III Surface Sediment and Subsurface Sediment Spatial Correlation Parameters

| Depth: | Surface Sediment$\text { RAL }=12$ |  | Subsurface Sediment |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| RAL: |  |  | RAL $=12$ |  |  |  | RAL $=65$ |  |
| Segment: | Full Reach | Middle <br> Segment | Full Reach | Full Reach | Middle <br> Segment | Lower Segment | Full Reach | Middle (Intertidal) |
| Sample Count | 768 | 401 | 375 | 375 | 191 | 137 | 375 | 113 |
| Variogram Parameters |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Model type | Spherical | Spherical | Spherical | Spherical | Spherical | Spherical | Spherical | Spherical |
| Model directionality | Isotropic | Isotropic | Isotropic | Anisotropic | Anisotropic | Anisotropic | Isotropic | Anisotropic |
| Directional azimuth | -- | -- | -- | $332^{\circ}$ | $345^{\circ}$ | $314^{\circ}$ | -- | $345^{\circ}$ |
| Nugget | 0.020 | 0.02 | 0.05 | 0.05 | 0.06 | 0.05 | 0.02 | 0.03 |
| Nugget (\% of Full Sill) | 17\% | 18\% | 24\% | 24\% | 30\% | 22\% | 25\% | 13\% |
| Partial sill | 0.095 | 0.09 | 0.16 | 0.16 | 0.14 | 0.18 | 0.06 | 0.20 |
| Full sill | 0.115 | 0.11 | 0.21 | 0.21 | 0.20 | 0.23 | 0.08 | 0.23 |
| Major range (feet) | 30 | 45 | 40 | 60 | 120 | 80 | 40 | 60 |
| Minor range (feet) | -- | -- | -- | 30 | 40 | 40 | -- | 30 |
| Anisotropy ratio | NA | NA | NA | 2-to-1 | 3-to-1 | 2-to-1 | NA | 2-to-1 |
| Search Parameters |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Search sector type | Quadrant/45 | Quadrant/45 ${ }^{\circ}$ | Quadrant/45 ${ }^{\circ}$ | Quadrant/45 ${ }^{\circ}$ | Quadrant/45 | Quadrant/45 ${ }^{\circ}$ | Quadrant/45 ${ }^{\circ}$ | Quadrant/45 |
| Max neighbors to include | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| Min neighbors to include | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Major search radius (feet) | 100 | 100 | 150 | 200 | 300 | 200 | 150 | 200 |
| Minor search radius (feet) | -- | -- | -- | 100 | 100 | 100 | -- | 100 |

Notes:
NA: not applicable
RAL: remedial action level

### 2.1 Surface Sediment Semivariograms

Because there was only a $2 \%$ increase in the number of surface sediment samples with the addition of Phase III data, the Phase III surface sediment semivariograms are practically the same as the Phase II semivariograms.

### 2.2 Subsurface Sediment Semivariograms

Because there was a significant increase (12\%) in the subsurface sediment dataset with the addition of Phase III data, a re-analysis of the Phase III subsurface sediment semivariograms was warranted, and spatial correlation structures were refined and improved. Consistent with the Phase II approach, segment-specific models were developed for the middle and lower segments, while full-reach models were applied to Slip 6 and the Turning Basin because of the more variable channel and flow geometries in these areas. The spatial correlation structure for the RAL $=65 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ OC analysis in the middle segment was developed using only intertidal samples from RC 2 and 3 areas, because those are the only samples in this segment for which RAL=65 is applicable.

Model Directionality. The main update to the subsurface semivariograms pertains to model directionality. The addition of Phase III data to the design dataset allowed for the resolution of directional anisotropy in the middle and lower segments, which expanded the correlation range along the direction of flow. Anisotropic correlation structures are common and expected in long, narrow waterways like the LDW, with prevailing directions of river currents and tides. Anisotropic semivariograms require development of spatial correlation structures in both the longitudinal (along-flow) and transverse (cross-flow) directions. The correlation range of an anisotropic model varies with the compass direction, while the nugget and sill values remain constant. Nondirectional, isotropic models continued to be applied to Slip 6 and the Turning Basin, which have more variable channel and flow geometries.

Range Values. In the middle and lower segments, which supported the development of anisotropic semivariograms, longer correlation scales were observed in the longitudinal direction than in the transverse direction. Phase II subsurface correlation scales using isotropic models ranged from 50 to 75 ft . Phase III anisotropic correlation scales ranged from 70 to 120 ft in the longitudinal direction and from 35 to 40 ft in the transverse direction. The anisotropy ratios (longitudinal range/transverse range) in the middle and lower segments ranged between 2-to-1 and 3-to-1.

Nugget Values. Nugget values were relatively well controlled, ranging from $13 \%$ to $29 \%$ of their respective sill values.

Sill Values. Compared to surface sediment, higher sill values were typically observed in subsurface sediment, especially in RC 1 areas where the subsurface RAL is $12 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg} \mathrm{OC}$, because of the greater
percentage of PCB RAL exceedances in subsurface sediment and, as a result, greater population variances of the indicator variables.

### 2.3 Isotropic versus Anisotropic Method Comparison

With the addition of Phase III data, anisotropic correlation structures became more evident in subsurface sediments in the middle and lower segments. Using anisotropic correlation structures, interpolated sediment deposits with RAL exceedances are more elongated in the flow direction (i.e., parallel to the shoreline and bathymetry contours).

The use of anisotropic correlation structures is preferred to the use of isotropic correlation structures in LDW, because anisotropic correlation structures:

- Provide a longer correlation scale along the prevailing flow and tidal direction
- Are more consistent with the conceptual model of riverine/estuarine hydrodynamics and sedimentary processes in long, narrow waterways such as LDW
- Have been successfully applied at other sediment cleanup sites, including the Lower Fox River and the Hudson River (Kern et al. 2008; QEA 2007)

For example, the two areas shown on Map A.4-3a (the RC 1 area in the lower segment between RM 3.0 and RM 3.3) and Map A.4-3b (the middle segment near RM 4.1 East) illustrate the differences in interpolation results using isotropic (non-directional) versus anisotropic (directional) semivariograms.

The proposed use of anisotropic correlation structures in subsurface sediments was discussed with EPA during a teleconference on March 2, 2023. EPA (Michael Beuthe) subsequently approved the use of anisotropic correlation structures in an email communication on March 15, 2023.

## 3 Phase III Interpolation Results

Spatial correlation parameters, as determined through semivariogram analysis, and kriging search parameters are compiled in Table A.4.2-1. Kriging interpolation methods (i.e., isotropic versus anisotropic) and segmentation schemes (i.e. site-wide versus segment specific) are summarized in Table A.4.3-1.

Table A.4.3-1
Upper Reach Interpolation Methods and Segmentation

| Upper Reach Area |  | Phase II |  | Phase III |  | Phase II/III <br> Thiessen <br> Polygons |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Indicator Kriging: Sitewide | Indicator Kriging: Segmentspecific | Indicator Kriging: Sitewide | Indicator Kriging: Segmentspecific |  |
| Surface Sediment |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| PCBs | Lower segment (RM 3.00-RM 3.58) | I |  | 1 |  |  |
|  | Middle segment (RM 3.58-RM 4.61) |  | I |  | 1 |  |
|  | Slip 6 (RM 4.18-RM 4.27) | No RAL exceedances |  |  |  |  |
|  | Turning Basin area (RM 44.61-RM 4.80) | I |  | 1 |  |  |
|  | Norfolk area (RM 4.80-RM 5.00) | 1 |  | I |  |  |
|  | Other COCs - All Areas |  |  |  |  | X |
| Subsurface Sediment |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| PCBs | Lower segment (RM 3.00-RM 3.58) |  | 1 |  | $A^{1}$ |  |
|  | Middle segment (RM 3.58-RM 4.61) |  | I |  | $\mathrm{A}^{2}$ |  |
|  | Slip 6 (RM 4.18-RM 4.27) | 1 |  | $\left.\right\|^{3}$ |  |  |
|  | Turning Basin area (RM 4.61-RM 4.80) | 1 |  | $I^{4}$ |  |  |
|  | Norfolk area (RM 4.80-RM 5.00) | No RAL exceedances |  |  |  |  |
|  | Other COCs - All Areas |  |  |  |  | X |

## Notes:

1. Includes anisotropic correlation structure for $\mathrm{RAL}=12 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg} \mathrm{OC}$
2. Includes anisotropic correlation structures for RAL $=12$ and $R A L=65 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg} \mathrm{OC}$
3. Includes isotropic correlation structure for $R A L=12 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ OC
4. Includes isotropic correlation structures for $R A L=12$ and $R A L=65 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ OC

A: Anisotropic correlation structure
COC: contaminant of concern
I: Isotropic correlation structure
OC: organic carbon
PCB: polychlorinated biphenyl
RAL: remedial action level
RM: river mile

Indicator kriging provides point-based estimates of the probability of exceeding the RAL. Samples that exceed the RAL are assigned a probability value of $1(100 \%)$, and samples that do not exceed the RAL are assigned a probability value of 0 ( $0 \%$ ). Indicator kriging then interpolates the field of indicator values represented by zeroes and ones. Between sample locations, the indicator is a continuous variable spanning a range of values between 0 and 1 (i.e., $0 \%$ to $100 \%$ probability of exceedance), which is estimated by the kriging algorithm based on the correlation structure and spatial distribution of the data. Indicator kriging was performed using the Esri ArcGIS program (ArcGIS Desktop 10.8.1 and Geostatistical Analyst 10.8.1 extension).

Indicator kriging interpolation results are provided in the following map sets:

- Maps A.4-4a, A.4-4b, A.4-4c provide surface sediment interpolation for the lower, middle, and upper segments of the upper reach, respectively.
- Maps A.4-5a, A.4-5b, A.4-5c provide subsurface sediment interpolation for the lower, middle, and upper segments of the upper reach, respectively.
- Maps A.4-6a, A.4-6b, A.4-6c provide combined surface and subsurface sediment interpolation for the lower, middle, and upper segments of the upper reach, respectively. This map set also includes the updated $90 \%$ RD RAA boundary and toe of the dredge cut, which incorporate any $90 \%$ RD revisions needed to address Phase III data.

The indicator kriging contours on these maps represent the probabilities of exceeding the applicable RALs, expressed in units of percent. The $50 \%$ (median) probability of exceedance contour represents the median estimate of the horizontal RAL exceedance boundary. Other contours are also provided for comparison, including the $20 \%, 30 \%, 40 \%, 60 \%, 70 \%$, and $80 \%$ probabilities of exceedance.

### 3.1 Phase III Surface Sediment Interpolation

Updated surface sediment interpolations including Phase III PDI data are provided in Maps A.4-4a through A.4-4c. The Phase III surface sediment results helped refine the RAL exceedance area boundaries. Nearly all of the surface sediment results from the Phase III investigation (16 out of 17 samples, or 94\%) do not exceed the RAL. There was only one Phase III RAL exceedance in surface sediment, located in the intertidal area near RM 3.7 West (Maps A.4-1b and A.4-4b). This surface sediment sample had a relatively low exceedance ratio of 1.3 times the RAL.

### 3.2 Phase III Subsurface Sediment Interpolation

Updated subsurface sediment interpolations including Phase III PDI data are provided in Maps A.4-5a through A.4-5c. The Phase III subsurface sediment results helped refine the RAL exceedance area boundaries. A majority of the subsurface sediment results from the Phase III investigation ( 33 out of 46 samples, or $72 \%$ ) are less than the RAL.

There are several areas where Phase III PCB RAL exceedances were observed in subsurface sediments outside of previously developed RAL exceedance areas during 60\% RD, including the following:

- Lower Segment: RM 3.0 to RM 3.2 West (RC 1 area along the lower west slope)
- Lower-Middle Transition: RM 3.6 West (offshore of Terminal 117 along lower west slope)
- Middle Segment: RM 3.8 West (expansion of a small intertidal deposit); RM 3.8 to RM 4.0 East (expanded RAL exceedance areas near the enhanced natural recovery/activated carbon [ENR/AC] pilot plots on the lower west slope and adjacent intertidal areas)


### 3.3 Phase III RAL Exceedance Area Boundaries

Using a GIS raster calculation, the surface and subsurface PCB indicator kriging maps were combined into a single map showing the total combined RAL exceedance area footprint of both layers. This map represents the highest indicator probability value in either surface or subsurface sediments at each location, as shown in Maps A.4-6a through A.4-6c. In some parts of the upper reach, the maximum extent of the RAL exceedance area boundary is defined by surface sediment exceedances; in other parts of the upper reach, it is defined by subsurface sediment exceedances.

The 50\% probability contour, representing the median indicator value, was used as the starting basis for $90 \%$ RD (i.e., the same basis that was used in $30 \%$ and $60 \%$ RD). The $90 \%$ RD RAA boundaries and toe of cut in proposed dredging areas are shown on Maps A.4-6a through A.4-6c, along with the median probability boundary from both the Phase II and Phase III interpolations. These maps include areas where Phase III sampling results required modifications to RD, including expansions (based on Phase III exceedances) and contractions (based on Phase III non-exceedances) of the RAAs.

During the design process, the RAA footprint is expanded beyond the RAL exceedance area boundary in order to develop a constructible design and accommodate stable side slopes. As a result, the engineering design process imparts a greater level of confidence in the RD. Although the $50 \%$ probability contour is used as the starting basis for RD, the certainty in the final design is greater after incorporating constructability and side slope requirements, because the RAA boundary expands to intersect sediments with lower probabilities of exceedance, ranging from $40 \%$ to less than $20 \%$.

### 3.4 Phase II versus Phase III RAL Exceedance Area Boundaries

Comparisons of Phase II and Phase III interpolation results are provided in Maps A.4-7a through A.4-7e, which present side-by-side panels of Phase II and Phase III interpolations and indicator probability contours. In the subsurface dataset, there has been some reshaping of the indicator probability contours as a result of the change from using isotropic to anisotropic correlation structures in the middle and lower segments. Compared to the Phase II RAL exceedance areas, the

Phase III RAL exceedance areas in the middle and lower segments are more elongated along the axis of the waterway and parallel to the shoreline. The Phase III interpolation forms the basis for the $90 \%$ RD.

### 3.5 Updated Thiessen Polygons for Other COCs

Although PCB exceedances delineate the majority of contamination in the upper reach, the PCB RAL exceedance area boundaries were expanded in certain areas where other COCs exceeded RALs but PCBs did not. Because these areas are small and more localized, the RAL exceedance area boundaries for COCs other than PCBs were established using Thiessen polygons. Other COCs that locally determined a RAL exceedance area boundary included metals, polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons, other semivolatile organic compounds (butyl benzyl phthalate, benzoic acid, and phenol), and dioxins/furans, depending on the area.

A comparison of Thiessen polygons based on the Phase II and Phase III design datasets is shown in the left and right frames, respectively, on Maps A.4-8a through A.4-8e. This map set shows the distribution of PCB RAL exceedance areas delineated by the median (50\%) indicator kriging probability (pink areas), as well as Thiessen polygons for other COCs that extend beyond the PCB exceedance area boundaries (yellow).

In general, the changes to the Thiessen polygon boundaries are relatively minor. There are a few adjustments and expansions of polygon boundaries along the eastern slope and intertidal area near the ENR/AC pilot plots (between RM 3.7 East and RM 4.0 East), as well as a lost polygon at the western shore at RM 3.5 West, as a result of Phase III data. However, these changes are small.

## 4 Conclusions

This technical memorandum presents updated Phase III interpolation methods and results for delineating RAL exceedance areas for PCBs and other COCs to support the $90 \%$ RD in the upper reach of the LDW. The main results and conclusions of the Phase III interpolation update include the following:

- In surface sediments, there was only a nominal (2\%) increase in the upper reach sample count due to the addition of Phase III data. As a result, the Phase II semivariograms were still valid to use to define surface sediment correlation structures. In subsurface sediments, there was a more significant (12\%) increase in the sample count due to the addition of Phase III data. Therefore, the semivariograms for subsurface sediments were re-evaluated and correlation structures were improved in most cases.
- The addition of Phase III subsurface data allowed for the resolution of directional anisotropy in the middle and lower segments, thereby expanding the correlation range along the flow direction of river and tidal currents.
- One of the Phase III sampling objectives was to collect data in areas of greater uncertainty to help refine the indicator probability contours and increase the confidence of the RAL exceedance area boundaries in those areas. This Phase III sampling objective was achieved.
- In some of Phase III data collection areas, RAL exceedances were observed outside the $60 \%$ RD RAA and/or non-exceedances were observed inside the 60\% RD RAA. The 90\% RD uses the updated interpolation as its basis, including any refinements required by Phase III data prior to the addition of engineering considerations.
- There were only minor changes to the Thiessen polygon boundaries, which were used to delineate RAL exceedance areas for COCs other than PCBs.
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## Figures

Figure A.4.2-1
Phase III surface sediment and subsurface sediment semivariogram plots andspatial correlation models

## Surface - Full Reach - Isotropic



## Surface - Middle Segment - Isotropic



Figure A.4.2-1
Phase III surface sediment and subsurface sediment semivariogram plots andspatial correlation models
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## Subsurface RAL=12-Full Reach - Anisotropic
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Figure A.4.2-1
Phase III surface sediment and subsurface sediment semivariogram plots andspatial correlation models

## Subsurface RAL=65 - Full Reach - Isotropic



Figure A.4.2-1
Phase III surface sediment and subsurface sediment semivariogram plots andspatial correlation models

## Subsurface RAL=65 - Middle Reach (Intertidal Only) - Anisotropic



Maps





Map A-2b. Phase III PDI subsurface sediment chemistry sample locations and intervals



Map A-4a. RAL exceedance areas from RM 3.0 to RM 3.2 with RAL exceedances and vertical extent data in the design dataset

Lower Duwamish Waterway Group




Lower Duwamish Waterway Group
Map A-4c. RAL exceedance areas from RM 3.5 to RM 3.7 with RAL exceedances and vertical extent data in the design dataset








Map A-4i. RAL exceedance areas from RM 4.55 to RM 4.8 with RAL exceedances and vertical extent data in the design dataset



Lower Duwamish Waterway Group

Map A-5. Topographic survey extents
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Map A-6b. RAL exceedance areas in the upper reach, RM 4.0 to RM 5.0




Lower Duwamish Waterway Group
Map A.4-1c. Design dataset surface sample locations, including Phase III data, RM 4.3 to RM 5.0

| Subsurface PCBs in the design dataset <br> Intertidal Does not exceed RAL <br> Subtidal <br> Exceeds RAL <br> $\square$ Does not exceed RAL <br> Phase III core Subtidal ( $0-60 \mathrm{~cm}$ ) $\square$ 60\% RD RAA boundary $\square$ $60 \%$ RD toe of cut Phase II RAL exceedance area Recovery Category 1 Intertidal area Potential vessel scour area Shoal area <br> Deeper than -18 ft MLLW Bridge footing Early Action Area King Co tax parcel <br> --- Federal Navigation Channel <br> - River mile |  |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | Map A.4-2a. Design dataset subsurface sample locations, including Phase III data, RM 3.0 to RM 3.7 <br> 90\% Remedial Design Basis of Design Report for the LDW Upper Reach <br> JULY 17, 2023 |




Lower Duwamish Waterway Group
Map A.4-2c. Design dataset subsurface sample locations, including Phase III data, RM 4.3 to RM 5.0





Map A.4-4b. Updated indicator kriging for surface sediment, RM 3.7 to RM 4.3



Map A.4-4c. Updated indicator kriging for surface sediment, RM 4.3 to RM 5.0



Map A.4-5b. Updated indicator kriging for subsurface sediment, RM 3.7 to RM 4.3


Map A.4-5c. Updated indicator kriging for subsurface sediment, RM 4.3 to RM 5.0



Map A.4-6b. Updated indicator kriging for combined surface and subsurface sediment combined surface
RM 3.7 to RM 4.3

Lower Duwamish Waterway Group



Map A.4-6c. Updated indicator kriging for combined surface and subsurface sediment, combined surface
RM 4.3 to RM 5.0












[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ One additional surface sediment sample was collected in March 2023. This sample is included in the counts presented herein and has been incorporated into the revised RAL exceedance areas.

[^1]:    ${ }^{2}$ Data packaged can be accessed on https://ldwg.org.

[^2]:    ${ }^{3} \mathrm{CPAH}$ results are compared to the 2014 ROD RALs in Appendix F of the Basis of Design Report (BODR).

[^3]:    ${ }^{4}$ Based on the results of the interpolation work described in this section, PCBs were estimated to account for the majority of the RAL exceedance area in the upper reach. This percentage was calculated as the ratio of interpolated RAL exceedance area circumscribed by PCBs (in acres or square ft) to the total RAL exceedance area circumscribed by all COCs (see Map K-4a of the Phase II DER (Anchor QEA and Windward 2022)).

[^4]:    ${ }^{5}$ The maximum concentration in any shoaling interval or the -15 to -17 ft MLLW interval (i.e., 2 ft below authorized FNC depth in this reach of LDW) was selected for each shoaling core location.

[^5]:    ${ }^{6}$ Anisotropy is a directionally defined correlation structure with longer correlation scales along one axis (the predominant direction of flow) and shorter correlation scales perpendicular to that axis (flow). Nugget and sill values remain constant and directionally independent.

[^6]:    Table A.1-3. Comparison of RTK and Bathymetric Elevations for Phase III PDI Subsurface Sediment Locations

[^7]:    ${ }^{1}$ Appendix K of the DER provides an analysis of the statistical characteristics of the RD dataset, spatial correlation structures, interpolation method evaluation and selection, RAL exceedance area maps, and an uncertainty analysis.

