

Southern California Dredged Material Management Team (SC-DMMT)
August 25, 2010
Meeting Notes

I. SC-DMMT Participating Agencies*

- a. Jorine Campopiano – EPA
- b. Allan Ota[†] - EPA
- c. Ken Wong – USACE
- d. Jason Lambert – USACE
- e. Larry Smith – USACE
- f. Mike Lyons[†] – LARWQCB
- g. Larry Simon[†] – CCC
- h. Theresa Stevens[†] – USACE
- i. Robert Smith[†] - USACE
- j. Antal Szijj[†] - USACE
- k. Spencer MacNeil[†] – USACE
- l. Jack Gregg[†] – CCC
- m. Bill Paznokas[†] – DFG
- n. Wanda Cross[†] - SARWQCB

See Attachment A for the August 25, 2010 meeting sign in sheet.

II. Project Review and Determinations^Δ

A. Pyrethroid Pesticides Seminar (CSTF):

- a. **Presenter/DMMT POC:** Steve Bay (SCCWRP)/Jorine Campopiano (EPA)
- b. **Purpose of Discussion:** Consideration for inclusion of Pyrethroid class of compounds as part of the standard SC-DMMT analyte list.
- c. **Background:** See PowerPoint presentation for the topic available for download at <ftp://ftp.usace.army.mil/pub/spl/USGS%20PPT/>
- d. **Discussion:** Seminar for informational purposes only. Attendees posed number of questions to presenter.
- e. **Determination:** SC-DMMT to schedule discussion of whether to include Pyrethroids as part of the forthcoming standard SC-DMMT analyte list during fall 2010 sessions.

* Participating agencies are composed of (1) core members that have regulatory authority over dredging-related projects; (2) stakeholder agencies such California State Lands Commission, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, California Department of Fish and Game, and National Marine Fisheries Service.

[†] Agency representatives participating via teleconference.

^Δ Decisions of the California Coastal Commission (CCC) are partly based on recommendations provided by its staff. Therefore, SC-DMMT determinations reflect the views of the CCC staff but not necessarily of the CCC.

B. Tijuana River - Fine Sediment Fate & Transport Study Results (CSTF):

- a. **Presenter/DMMT POC:** Jon Warrick (USGS), Karen Banes (Ca. Coastal Conservancy)/ Robert Smith (Regulatory), Corri Farrar (Regulatory)
- b. **Purpose of Discussion:** Inform ongoing SC-DMMT discussions on technical/policy issues concerning beach nourishment.
- c. **Background:** See PowerPoint presentation for the topic available for download at <ftp://ftp.usace.army.mil/pub/spl/USGS%20PPT/>
- d. **Discussion:** Seminar for informational purposes only. Attendees posed number of questions to presenter.
- e. **Determination:** None.

C. SC-DMMT draft SAP template

- a. **DMMT POC:** Ken Wong (Regulatory)
- b. **Purpose of Discussion:** Review updated SAP template and proposed sample nomenclature convention.
- c. **Background:** N/A
- d. **Discussion:** Discussion canceled to make time for Pythreoid & Tijuana Fine Sediment presentations.
- e. **Determination:** SC-DMMT to reschedule discussion for September 2010 meeting.

D. Rhine Channel (SC-DMMT):

- a. **Project Proponents/Corps PMs:** city of Newport Beach/Robert Smith (Regulatory)
- b. **Purpose of Discussion:** Project overview
- c. **Background:** See July, 2010 SC-DMMT notes.
- d. **Discussion:** Project proponent provided overview of purpose and background of project for Robert Smith who replaced Cori Farrar as the primary Regulatory PM.
- e. **Determination:** Action items for project proponent remains unchanged.
 - i. Evaluate bathymetry of three smaller areas.
 - ii. Submit for SC-DMMT review 2005 SAR for Rhine Channel, SAR for RGP 54 and 2010 confirmatory bathymetry for all areas.
 - iii. If submitted studies are deemed to be insufficient, SC-DMMT may request additional confirmatory testing.

E. Regional General Permit 54 (SC-DMMT):

- a. **Project Proponents/Corps PMs:** city of Newport Beach/ Cori Farrar (Regulatory)
- b. **Purpose of Discussion:** Approval of conceptual SAP. See Attachment B.
- c. **Background:** Proponent seeks to renew RGP 54 which enables owners of docks in Newport Bay to undertake small individual dredging projects. City

periodically reapplies for RGP 54 (and other regulatory authorizations) including testing of sediments on behalf of city residents. RGP 54 will expire in November 2011.

- d. **Discussion:** Project proponent proposes to exclude from sampling those areas adjacent to the federal channel in lower Newport Bay which was characterized in 2009 in support of planned USACE dredging operations scheduled for 2011 and 2012. Areas not adjacent to the federal channel would be subject to phased tiered testing as needed. Due to past sediment characterization in Newport Bay, and previously scheduled dredging operations, project proponent does not propose full tiered testing for the entire geographic area until 2014 renewal of RGP 54 when completion of all previously scheduled dredging operations are expected to yield a new sediment characterization baseline.
- e. **Determination:**
 - i. Conceptual SAP approved.
 - ii. Include maps and figures in forthcoming draft SAP areas proposed for exclusion, phased tiered testing, and areas subject to dredging operations between 2011 and 2014.

F. Marina del Rey Dredging: See attachment B.

SC-DMMT

Sign-In Sheet, August 25, 2010

PRINT NAME	ORGANIZATION	EMAIL
1. Steve Bay	SCCWRP	steveb@scwrp.org
2. Jorine Campopiano	US EPA	campopiano_jorine@epa.gov
3. Jason Lambert	USACE	jason.p.lambert@usace.army.mil
4. Jannica Chan	USACE	veronica.e.chan@usace.army.mil
5. Lorry Smith	USACE	
6. Susie Santilena	Heal the Bay	ssantilena@healthebay.org
7. Karen Bane	CA Coastal Conservancy	kbane@scc.ca.gov
8. Jon WARRICK	USGS	JWARRICK@USGS.GOV
9. Josh Burnam	AOEA	jburnam@andugel.com
10. Chris Miller	City of N.B	cmiller@newportbeachca.gov
11. Ken Wong	USACE	kenwong@usace.army.mil
VIA TELEPHONE		
12. Allan Ota		
13. David Moore		
14. Theresa Stevens		
15. Mike Lyons		
16. Bill Paznokas		
17. Spencer Maclell		
18. Antal Szij		
19. Robert Smith		
20. Wanda Cross		
21. Jack Gress		
22. Larry Simon		

SC-DMMT Meeting Notes
25 August 2010
Beach Nourishment

Discussion centered on the recent Coastal Commission Consistency Determination for maintenance dredging at Marina del Rey. In response to concerns raised by Heal the Bay (including both human health and ecological effects), the Commission attached a condition in its concurrence with the Corps' CD. The condition was to conduct toxicity testing for areas 4, 5, & 6. The Corps contends that condition is vague as to scope (did it apply strictly to Marina del Rey or to all beach nourishment activities?), as well as to intent (what exactly was meant by "toxicity testing"?). The commissioners were on record as being concerned with human health issues related to the placement of dredged sand from Marina Del Rey on public beaches. However, the Corps staff contends that toxicity testing would only aid in evaluating risks to aquatic environment but could not be extrapolated to evaluate risks to human health. Agency members appeared to concur that any additional analysis should address both these exposure pathways. The Corps has already responded in writing to the Coastal Commission stating that the condition is unacceptable. This results in the conversion of the conditional concurrence to an objection on the part of the Coastal Commission.

Toxicity testing, at this late date, could cost \$100K or more. Discussion related to the scope of toxicity testing included the use of a single benthic toxicity test using composite samples. The use of surface grab samples neglecting sediment chemistry was suggested by Coastal Commission staff. Consideration was given to asking Los Angeles County to pay for and conduct toxicity tests. It is likely that Los Angeles County would not have funds available to undertake testing. The Corps contends that toxicity testing without matching sediment chemistry is meaningless in terms of using the results for both present and future decision-making. EPA agreed having sediment chemistry matched with any toxicity testing is necessary. Consideration was made for using the results of recent Bight testing, which may include toxicity testing and may include a site near Marina del Rey. This will require further investigation.

Human health concerns may be addressed by comparing sediment chemistry to EPA's RSL values (formerly known as PRG) and CHSSLs (from the State). This also requires further investigation.

The Corps indicated that while objecting to the condition, it has not yet determined to proceed with the project over the Coastal Commission objection. There is time to look further into some of the considerations briefly described above. Coastal Commission and EPA both agreed to work further with the Corps to investigate options.

A suggestion made by Coastal Commission staff was to consider a new CD including only those sediments proposed for disposal in the POLB. Dredging and disposal of those sediments is a priority for the Corps to take advantage of the disposal opportunity presented by the POLB facility. Consideration will have to wait until January 2011 when the next federal budget is expected and the Corps will know more about how much additional funding may be available. Total funding will drive the amount of dredging possible.

Some discussion also centered on toxicity testing of future beach nourishment projects. There was general agreement that toxicity testing may be warranted in some cases, but that toxicity testing should not be a general requirement. Additional work is needed to set up a decision tree for identifying the types of projects where toxicity testing is warranted. This issue will require

further discussion by the SC-DMMT. [Note - EPA submitted a draft decision tree for toxicity testing for future projects that was not received by all SC-DMMT members. However, no decisions have been made (this draft decision tree was e-mailed to everyone before this call, and is attached again here).

EPA and CCC staff agreed to work with Corps staff to compare MDR sand chemistry to human health screening values and consider available options for addressing the CCC toxicity testing condition.