

Real-Time Monitoring of the Lake Combie Reservoir Sediment and Mercury Removal Project: Mercury Proxy for Adaptive Management Capabilities

> DTMC, February 9<sup>th</sup>, 2021 Environmental Scientist, Nick Graham, M.S.

#### LAKE COMBIE SEDIMENT & MERCURY REMOVAL PROJECT

#### **PROJECT OWNER**



The District will provide a dependable, quality water supply, continue to be good stewards of the watersheds, while concerving the available resources in our care.



For more information regarding this project, please visit, www.nidwater.com/projects

#### PROJECT CONTRACTOR



MONON STATEMENT Committed to monoscring your link and liability, through a culture of liability, involution, and excellence

#### **PROJECT PARTNERS**







#### PERMITTING AGENCIES





#### PROJECT FUNDING

Funding for this project has been provided in part by the Costa-Machado Water Act of 2000 (Proposition 13) and through an agreement with the State Department of Water Resources.





## Background

#### **Bear River and Mercury**

- One of the Sierra Nevada watersheds most severely impacted by hydraulic mining and mercury contamination (May et al., 1999; Alpers et al., 2018).
- The Bear River and its three impoundments; Rollins, Combie, and Camp Far West Reservoirs are 303(d)-listed as impaired for mercury by (CVRWQCB) and have Site Specific Fish Consumption Advisories for mercury (OEHHA, 2009)



Dutch Flat 1857-1870



#### Project Overview







#### Lake Combie Reservoir Sediment and Mercury Removal

#### Project Development





# Combie Reservoir Sediment and Mercury Removal

#### **Project Purpose**

- **Remove** accumulated sediment and mercury from Combie Reservoir, thus restoring reservoir capacity for agriculture, domestic drinking, hydroelectric power generation and recreation use.
- **Measure** and analyze ecological effects of MeHg concentrations in Combie prior and post removal activities.
- **Develop** an efficient, compliant and sustainable combination of processes for sediment removal at similar mercury-impacted reservoirs within the state.





### Dry Excavation-2018





# Dredging-2019





### Processing-2019





## Coagulation and Flocculation Water Treatment Process





## Water Treatment, Settling Ponds and Real-Time Monitoring







### Monitoring Overview



Lake Combie Sediment and Mercury Removal Project Sampling Locations:

- USGS Established Monitoring Points:
  - CRI-A
  - CRI-D

The Sierra Fund Established Monitoring Points:

LCILC2



### Real-Time Monitoring



LCI: Placement of this station ~100' upstream of the intake pump location represented background water quality levels, acting as the benchmark for the process effluent to be measured against.

**LC2**: Placement of this station inside a 3,000 gallon poly tank allowed for the water quality of the effluent to be monitored prior to release to Lake Combie Reservoir.





### Grab Sampling







### Data Collection & Maintenance



Data collection platforms were programed to send daily reports to mangers and stakeholders of the previous 7 days of data on a scheduled interval, "Combie Daily Report."

EXO's at LCI and LC2 were cleaned and calibrated monthly. Figure shows the amount of bio-fouling on the EXO following one month of deployment at LCI.

EXO deployment tubes were also scrubbed free of growth both inside and out reduce micro climate bias.





### LC1 p-THg Proxy Concentrations

Lake Combie Modeled p-THg Concentrations 50 -40· 30 ng/L 20 10 0 Jul 2019 Oct 2019 Jan 2020 Apr 2020

Predictive p-THg Proxy:  $p - THg\left(\frac{ng}{L}\right) = e^{3.37608 + 1.26408(\ln(X_1)) - 1.16008(ln(X_2))}$ Where: X<sub>1</sub>=Turbidity (FNU) X<sub>2</sub>= Total Dissolved Solids (mg/L) Model resulted in a R<sup>2</sup> value of 0.79 with a residual standard error of 0.71 on 58 degrees of freedom.





### LC1 f-THg Proxy Concentrations

Lake Combie Modeled f-THg Concentrations 10.0 7.5ng/L 5.0 2.5 -0.0 Jul 2019 Oct 2019 Jan 2020 Apr 2020

Predictive f-THg Proxy:  $f - THg\left(\frac{ng}{L}\right) = e^{3.78314 + 0.7103(ln(X_1)) + 0.928(ln(X_2)) - 1.9553(ln(X_3))}$ Where: X<sub>1</sub>= fDOM (QSE) X<sub>2</sub>= Turbidity (FNU) X<sub>3</sub>= Total Dissolved Solids (mg/L) Model resulted in a R<sup>2</sup> value of 0.82 with a residual standard error of 0.48 on 58 degrees of freedom.





#### Parameter Comparisons











### Conclusions

- Model outputs for the prediction of p-THg and f-THg suggest that the use of real-time monitoring at the Lake Combie Sediment Removal Project can provide NID and its partners with adaptive management capabilities for both compliance and mercury monitoring during operation.
- Having pre-project grab sampling data for Hg analysis and paired ancillary water quality data across a range conditions is key to model(s) creation and use at project initiation.
- Adding flow monitoring equipment to the data collections platforms would facilitate the quantification of Hg loading at and between the "Background" and "Effluent."
- Particulate (p-THg) and filtered (f-THg) mercury prediction models were developed for the Lake Combie Reservoir, similar relationships are expected in areas affected by legacy mercury contamination. This framework for model generation will have to be developed on a site by site basis.
- Having the ability to calculate statistically significant p-THg and f-THg concentrations instantaneously is revolutionary in the realm of trace metal sampling. This framework of data collection will facilitate the growth and scale of addressing Hg-contaminated sediments within reservoirs, lakes and rivers.



### Citations

May, J.T., Hothem, R. L., Alpers, C. N., and Law, M.A., 1999. Mercury Bioaccumulation in Fish in a Region Affected by Historical Gold Mining: The South Yuba River, Deer Creek, and Bear River Watersheds, California, 1999. U.S. Geological Survey Open-File Report 00-367.

USEPA, 1996. Method 1669: Sampling ambient water for trace metals at EPA water quality criteria levels. US Environmental Protection Agency. Office of Water, Washington, DC.

USEPA, 2000. 40 CFR Part 131; Water Quality Standards; Establishment of Numeric Criteria for Priority Toxic Pollutants for the State of California. US Environmental Protection Agency Washington, DC.

USEPA, 2002. Method 1631, Revision E: Mercury in water by oxidation, purge and trap, and cold vapor atomic fluorescence spectrometry. US Environmental Protection Agency Washington, DC.

USEPA (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency.) 2005. Method 415.3 determination of total organic carbon and specific UV absorbance at 254 nm in source water and drinking water, EPA Document #: EPA/600/R-05/055.



## Thank You Project Partners and Funders!

#### **PROJECT OWNER**



#### MISSION STATEMENT

The District will provide a dependable, quality water supply, continue to be good stewards of the watersheds, while conserving the available resources in our care.

For more information regarding this project, please visit: www.nidwater.com/projects

#### PROJECT CONTRACTOR



MISSION STATEMENT Committed to minimizing your risk and liability, through a culture of safety, innovation, and excellence.

#### **PROJECT PARTNERS**





#### PERMITTING AGENCIES





#### **PROJECT FUNDING**

Funding for this project has been provided in part by the Costa-Machado Water Act of 2000 (Proposition 13) and through an agreement with the State Department of Water Resources.





# Contact Us!

#### The Sierra Fund

204 Providence Mine Road, Suite 214 Nevada City, CA 95959 www.sierrafund.org

Nick.Graham@SierraFund.org Carrie.Monohan@SierraFund.org