Remobilisation of Lead and Nickel Residues in Esperance

Report of the Working Group to the Steering Committee of the Esperance Cleanup and Recovery Project



Project Scope

Purpose – to determine if

- lead
- and/or nickel [harder, with ongoing export]
- residues in the Esperance townsite [includes remobilisation from port to town]
- are being [concentrated on recent data]
- remobilised. [includes by air, water and by human or animal activity].



Data sets reviewed

Air

Rainwater

Vegetation

Bird feathers

Homes

- Deposition Gauges (EsPA)
- Hivol samplers (EsPA)
- 1539 tanks, 2007 (DOH/UWA/Shire)
- 5 tanks, monthly (EsPA)
- 21 homes, 2007, 09 (DOH)
- 11 homes, 2008 (LED)
- Leaves, flowers '08, '09 (DEC)
- 4 sites, '07, '08 (ConsCouncilWA)
- Playgrounds 10 sites, '08, '09 (Shire)



Bees - too late, site not known. Golder Report - not reviewed.

Air Sampling Sites





Lead Deposition on Gauge 8

indicates concentration below limit of reporting





Below detection before and after export.
Some lead during port cleanup, none from final export.
No standard for lead in dust deposition.

Lead Concentration at Hivol site 2

NEPM Standard (0.5 µg/m³) (Annual)



Environmental Consultant

Scale expanded to show readings - ↑error near LOD.
Some lead (extremely low levels) – Port shed removal?

Nickel Deposition on Gauge 1

indicates concentration below limit of reporting



Nickel Concentration at Hivol site 2

Shiploading events

JIM MALCOLM Environmental Consultant

Licence Target (0.14 µg/m³)



•Recently below detection during loading.

Rainfall vs Lead in Tankwater near port, 2008





Spikes unrelated to rainfall or lead dust levels.
Many confounding factors.
Potential stocks must be removed.

DOH Tank survey

- Post-cleaning sampling October '07;
- Cleaning reduced lead level;
- Some lead persisted may be
 - Remobilisation, or
 - Lead from '07 port cleanup;
- No sig. differences for tank or catchment characteristics.

EsPA Cleaning protocol too limited?



Lead in tanks confounding factors

- Lead from flashing on roof, solder in gutters;
- Roof surface rough or smooth;
- Size of tank relative to catchment;
- Size of tank relative to usage rate;
- Tank galvanised, concrete or plastic;
- Tank cleaned, first flush device fitted;
- Gutters, roof cleaned, wash diverted;
- Rain may mobilise, stir sediment or dilute.



Lead dust in houses

Internal dust

(std. 0.04 µg/cm² accessible to young children)

Survey	<0.04	0.04-0.24	>0.24
LED 2008	10	6	0
(near port)	62.5%	37.5%	
DOH 2009	119	16	4
(transects)	86%	11%	3%

•Focus on points common to both surveys.

•Export ceased, some cleaning, still exceedances.



- •Surfaces may have been overlooked cleaning protocol must be thorough.
 - •Need ongoing monitoring for recontamination.

Internal lead levels in cleaned houses



Recontamination or surfaces overlooked in cleaning?

Lead dust in houses

- '07 DOH survey cleaning controlled lead dust but recontamination occurred;
- '08 LED survey some accessible surfaces still above limit; ceiling voids may be ongoing source of contamination;
- '09 DOH survey recontamination or overlooked surfaces?

Thorough cleaning protocol with verification.



Lead in flowers March '08 vs '09

*Concentration <LOR



JIM MALCOLM Environmental Consultant Much lower in 2009, but some still above remote control.

Lead in flowers ('09) vs Distance from Port





- •Some sites close to port low, but still slightly elevated.
- Traces of lead transferred from adjacent old leaves?

Lead on Bush Bird Feathers

- First sample Oct 2007 found high to very high lead levels at impact sites;
- Second survey Oct 08, levels "much lower", bulked samples to get readings;
- Food chain (ants) sampled to check for bioaccumulation. No high lead found.
- What is ultimate fate of lead in envt?
- Lead binds to surfaces -

JIM MALCOLM Environmental Consultant

- Harder to remobilise; and
- Harder to cleanup.

Lead in Playgrounds

- Some swabs of slide handrails above standard – equipment cleaned, 'soft-fall' sand replaced, if present;
- Some again elevated after cleaning suggests remobilisation – how?
- Isotopic analysis of recent swabs <u>not</u> Magellan lead.



Nickel – the surveys

Houses

Rainwater

Feathers

Flowers

Playgrounds



- DOH did not get data;
- LED "continual recontamination"; Remobilisation from ceiling or new nickel?
- DOH 8% >ADWG after cleaning;
- EsPA 2 sites >ADWG most of last year;
 New nickel, since other sites OK?
- higher at impact sites in '08;
- almost undetectable in '09;
- '09 well below '08 but still some nickel at sites close to port;
- all sites below detection at February 2009.

Conclusions of data review

- No significant remobilisation of lead in air;
- Some detected in rainwater, playgrounds after cleaning, but source unclear.
- Near port ongoing low level lead on flowers may be historic from leaves.
- Ongoing low levels of nickel detected.
- Further sampling will help to focus cleanup area.



Recommendations

- No general remobilisation, Cleanup OK.
- Protocol must be thorough to remove possible sources of micro-remobilisation (tanks, roofs, cavities).
- Verification sampling needed.
- Ongoing sampling to detect possible remobilisation.
- Strict controls on nickel handling to avoid new nickel contamination.



Acknowledgements

- Paul Clifton, Shire of Esperance
- Michelle Crisp, LED
- Nick Dunlop, Conservation Council of WA
- Richard Grant, Esperance Port Authority
- Martin Matisons, DOH
- Peter McCafferty, ChemCentre
- Peter Skitmore, DEC

and, of course, Wayne & Sam.

