

Southern California Dredged Material Management Team (SC-DMMT)
January 22, 2014
Draft Meeting Notes

I. Participating Agencies /Attendees:

- a. *Theresa Stevens (USACE-Regulatory)*
- b. *John Markham (USACE-Regulatory)*
- c. *Daniel Swenson (USACE-Regulatory)*
- d. *Robert Smith[†] (USACE-Regulatory)*
- e. *Crystal Huerta (USACE-Regulatory)*
- f. *Joe Ryan (USACE-ED)*
- g. *Larry Smith (USACE-Planning)*
- h. *Jeffrey Devein (USACE – Geotech.)*
- i. *Jim Fields (USACE – PPMD)*
- j. *Ken Wong (USACE-PPMD)*
- k. *Kirk Brus (USACE-Planning)*
- l. *Blake Horita (USACE-PPMD)*
- m. *Allan Ota[†] (USEPA Region 9)*
- n. *Bill Paznokas[†] (CA-DFW)*
- o. *Michael Lyons[†] (RWQCB – Los Angeles)*
- p. *Peter Von Langen (RWQCB-Central Coast)*
- q. *Ken Kronschnabl (Contractor, Kennetics)*
- r. *Rachel McPherson (POLA/YTI)*
- s. *Kathryn Kurtis (POLA/YTI)*
- t. *Barry Snyder (AMEC)*
- u. *Laura Masterson (POLA)*
- v. *Alan Monji[†] (RWQCB, San Diego)*
- w. *Lock Dreizler[†] (Port of San Luis Harbor District)*
- x. *Fred Steiner[†] (?)*
- y. *Carol Roberts[†] (USFWS)*
- z. *Jason Conder (POLA Everport)*
- aa. *David Moore (POLA Everport)*
- bb. *Melissa Grover (POLA Everport)*
- cc. *Shelly Anghera (Anchor QEA)*
- dd. *Chris Osuch (Anchor QEA)*
- ee. *Tom Mathews (CAA Planning Inc)*
- ff. *Paul Grdner (Newfields)*
- gg. *Gerry Salas (USACE-Regulatory)*
- hh. *Janna Watanabe (POLB)*

† participating via teleconference.

II. Announcements:

- a. **Upcoming SC-DMMT meeting coordinator rotations:**
 - i. Bonnie Rogers Feb-Mar,
 - ii. Brianne McGuffie Apr-May,
 - iii. Gerardo Salas Jun-Jul,
 - iv. Steve Estes Aug-Sep.

- b. **Please review the times for your project. If you think you need more or less time, please contact agenda POC ASAP.**
 - i. Default time is 45 minutes.
 - ii. Projects generally requiring less time: small number of samples, small dredging area, intended discharge/disposal is CDF or landfill, projects where sampling results resulted in no SQG exceedances.
 - iii. Projects generally requiring more time: very large number of samples, very large dredging area(s), intended discharge/disposal is beach nourishment or offshore disposal site and many ERLS, any ERMs, or other SQGs are exceeded.
 - iv. New agenda request format:
 1. Project name:
 2. Applicant:
 3. Project Type (Regulatory/Navigation):
 4. Meeting Type (DMMT/CSTF):
 5. Purpose/Topic (e.g., SAP, SAPR and/or suitability determination):
 6. Presentation (y/n):
 7. **Time requested: ___ minutes**

- c. **Please use the following subject line for agenda requests:**
 - i. "SC-DMMT AGENDA REQUEST: [project name]..."

III. Project Review and Determinations

- a. **#1 Berths 212-224 Yusen Container Terminal Improvements Project (Theresa Stevens):** Summary by POLA: As a result of the EPA's and RWQCB's recommendation at the November 20, 2013 SC-CSTF/DMMT meeting, the clay, or "bottom" portion of Composite Area A was retested for PAHs, PCB Congeners, Chlorinated Pesticides, Metals and Pyrethroids. Barry Snyder of AMEC presented the results of the retest. The retested material was entirely free of all PCB Congeners, all Chlorinated Pesticides (including DDTs), and Pyrethroids above the reporting limit. Only one Pyrethroid (Permethrin-Cis/Trans) was detected, but it was reported as an estimated value (i.e. J-flagged) because it was detected below the reporting limit. It was noted by Mr. Snyder that the detection of this low level of Permethrin-Cis/Trans might be attributed to

lab contamination. Based on the low levels of metal and organic contaminants observed, the fact that only three ERL exceedances were observed (no ERM exceedances), and the low potential for bioaccumulation, confirms that the Composite Area A bottom layer is composed of native clay material. The Port recommended that the Composite Area A bottom layer and the all the Composite Area B material meets the suitability requirements for ocean disposal at LA-2. In addition, the Port recommended that the remaining upper unconsolidated material from Composite Area A (the top 2-foot layer) be placed in the Berth 243-245 Confined Disposal Facility (CDF).

i. Corps (Regulatory) comments:

1. Corps regulatory division staff (Swenson) concerned about inconsistent decision making between Regional Boards with respect to ocean disposal. Corps PM (Stevens) asked EPA if a future ocean disposal approval letter would be forthcoming if the material was deemed suitable for ocean disposal.
2. Corps asked why the Permethrin finding was erroneous and Barry said: It would be highly unlikely to detect pyrethroid pesticides in sediment and not also see DDT/DDE, since DDT/DDE are ubiquitous throughout the Port. DDT/DDE was in common use before synthetic pyrethroid pesticides were developed. DDE was even observed within the LA-2 reference sediments for this project. Based upon these observations, it is likely that the Permethrin observed at low levels in the Composite Area A clay layer is due to lab contamination.

ii. Corps (Planning) comments:

1. Larry asked if there was retesting of grain size analysis for the clay/bottom material? Barry replied there was not because 1) the material had been frozen (which affects the particle size characteristics of a sample) and 2) there was not sufficient material remaining following the chemical tests to conduct the grain size test. Barry indicated that there are very good pictures of the consistency of the clay material included in the appendix of the draft report.

iii. USFWS comments:

1. None.

iv. CDFW comments:

1. Asked when the EIR/EIS will be out and whether EPA would comment; Allan Ota affirmed he would comment.

v. RWQCB comments:

1. Michael Lyons indicated the material was suitable for ocean disposal on technical grounds but reiterated that this would make no difference to the Regional Board. In response to the Corps concerns about the lack of consistency in decision making among different Regions, which usually get elevated by the Corps to the State Board, Michael indicated the State Board has no authority over appointed reps in the Region.

vi. EPA comments:

1. EPA staff agreed that the stratified test results showed that some of the sediment was suitable for ocean disposal and agreed an approval letter may be forthcoming but this would be completed at the end of the Corps permit process.

vii. Other comments:

1. The Port staff asked everyone to provide a suitability determination for the re-tested material and also reminded the group that the CSTF was formed to address “contaminated” sediments, not sediments that test clean. This fact seems to have been forgotten amid the political agendas of the RWQCB board members and Heal the Bay which have resulted in all dredged material being placed in the CDF recently rather than clean material being taken to LA-2.
2. Dan Swensen suggested that the Port contact the Coastal Commission to get their input since they were unable to participate in this meeting (see below).
3. The EIR/S will be available for public review in April or May.

viii. Conclusions:

1. All CSTF agencies present at the meeting concurred that the bottom portion of Area A and the entirety of Area B were suitable for LA-2 disposal. The Port confirmed that the top (approximately 2 feet) portion of Area A would be disposed of in the Berths 243-245 approved CDF.
2. The Port subsequently contacted the Coastal Commission, who was not present at this CSTF meeting, and they concurred with the suitability determination made at the meeting via email to Kathryn Curtis (sent January 29, 2014 by Larry Simon). Excerpt from email: “Jack and I just discussed this matter and we concur with the decisions made at the recent DMMT meeting regarding the YTI and Everport projects, as described in your email below. As

you know, disposal of suitable dredged materials at LA-2 will require the POLA to prepare and submit a consistency certification to the Commission”

b. #2 Berths 226-236 Everport Container Terminal Improvements Project (Theresa Stevens):

i. Corps (Regulatory) comments:

1. Corps PM asked the group to provide comments today, and asked if a revised SAP (using strikeout/underline) could be reviewed via email in lieu of returning to next months’ meeting.
2. Corps suggested reaching out to CCC on project.

ii. Corps (Planning) comments:

1. None

iii. USFWS comments:

1. None

iv. CDFW comments:

1. Agreed to email review of revised SAP.
2. Bill-Regarding z-layer samples asked the Port to archive not only the z-layer composite samples but also the z-layer samples from individual core locations.
3. David Moore pointed out that it was possible z-layer samples would not be collected at every location due to refusal.

v. RWQCB comments:

1. Agreed to email review of revised SAP.

vi. EPA comments:

1. Agreed to email review of revised SAP. Requested a change to the title of the report to reflect the berths that would be dredged rather than the entire terminal. Applicant also agreed to check on location of storm drains.
2. Allen- the SAP is straightforward, although inclusion of the Berth 229 maintenance dredging area with the Berths 232-228 dredging was odd, but he understood that because the volume was so small it made sense to combine with one of the adjacent areas. He noted that the chemistry Table 4 needed to include selenium and silver, as well as pyrethroids.

3. Dan Swenson will send ENVIRON the latest draft SAP guidelines that include the latest list of recommended analytes including the specific pyrethroids to be evaluated.

vii. Other comments:

1. Dan Swenson suggested that the Port contact the CCC to get their input on the SAP, since they were unable to participate in this meeting (see below).
2. The Port will contact the CCC for their input, and make the following changes to the SAP: (1) include storm drain locations on a map and determine whether any of the proposed sampling locations needed to be shifted accordingly, (2) clarify in the SAP text that both individual and composite z-layer samples will be archived, (3) selenium, silver, and the appropriate pyrethroids will be added to the analyte list in the SAP. The Port will then submit a revised SAP (redlined to highlight the changes) for final agency review and concurrence via email.
3. The CCC subsequently concurred with the other agencies regarding the SAP comments via email to Kathryn Curtis (sent January 29, 2014 by Larry Simon). Excerpt from email: "Jack and I just discussed this matter and we concur with the decisions made at the recent DMMT meeting regarding the YTI and Everport projects, as described in your email below".

c. #3 Alamos Bay Marine Basins 2 and 3 Maintenance Dredging (Brianne McGuffie):

i. Corps (Regulatory) comments:

1. Corps requested a copy of the tissue analyte list that Anchor QEA will be sending to EPA (slide 10 of presentation).
Response: a copy will be provided to the Corps.
2. Corps permit does not specify how much material per basin, but just specifies a total amount of cubic yards for combined basins (i.e. Basins 1-7).
3. Are the proposed sampling locations the same as the 2007 sampling event?

Response: some points overlap but not all of them. There are more sampling points currently proposed.

Response: EPA will need to view the color-coded change in sedimentation map that Anchor QEA will be sending out before determining if sampling locations are sufficient.

ii. Corps (Planning) comments:

1. To EPA: do we really need the full Tier III testing again since the area was already fully tested in April 2007 and approved by EPA for LA-2 disposal in 2008?

Response: if the bathymetry hasn't changed much it's possible to just do sediment chemistry analysis and based on those results decide whether further Tier III testing is appropriate.

iii. USFWS comments:

1. N/A

iv. CDFW comments:

1. N/A

v. RWQCB comments:

1. Okay with holding off on Tier III testing, however, cannot increase the dredge volumes of the basins (i.e. increasing Basin 2 from 89900 to 96000 cy). If you want to modify the permit it will be very difficult to get approval again to go to LA-2, as previous approval was granted very reluctantly.

Response from QEA: The City will be notified that they cannot exceed the 89,900 cy for basin 2, as specified in their RWQCB permit.

2. Does the City plan on completing this work prior to the expiration of the RWQCB permit, which expires in October 2015? It would be wise to do so in order to ensure disposal LA-2.

vi. EPA comments:

1. Keep in mind that additional testing may still be required depending on the new chemistry results.
2. Is there a fuel dock or storm drains present?

Response: There is a fuel dock between Basins 1 and 2; B2DU1-02 sampling point is the closest sampling point available. There is also a pump-out station on the fuel dock.

vii. Anchor QEA comments:

1. The color-coded map depicting changes in bathymetry will be emailed to the DMMT, along with an updated SAP with a revised Table 7 to include pyrethroids, and an explanation of the new plan to proceed with Tier II testing and reserve Tier III testing for later, if it ends up being required.

Comment: The City of Long Beach concurs with the phased testing approach of Anchor QEA.

d. #4 City of Newport Beach and Irvine Company (Robert Smith):

i. Corps (Regulatory) comments:

1. Were there any culverts and if so, please show them.
2. Where is the grain size data and was there any grain size envelopes available?
3. Is there an upper silty sand layer in Area A near Area B that may be related to the Area B amphipod mortality?
4. Can the SAP be revised to discuss the compositing issues that were discussed.
5. Is the material going to nearshore or beach sites? If so the Corps would need to approve the nearshore or beach grain size and other data.

ii. Corps (Planning) comments:

1. None

iii. USFWS comments:

1. None

iv. CDFW comments:

1. None

v. RWQCB comments:

1. None

vi. EPA comments:

1. Suggested memo about additional testing and odor and Corps suggested revised SAPR.

vii. Other comments:

1. Note there are no ERM exceedances, but zero percent bioassay survival in Area B.
2. Note that material from Area A could go to LA-3 while material from Area B is not suitable for off-shore disposal.

e. #5 Port San Luis Maintenance Dredging and District Maintenance (Crystal Huerta):

i. Corps (Regulatory) comments:

1. Presented the Sediment Sampling and Analysis Report dated November 15, 2013.
2. No organo-pesticides or PAH's were detected in any of the samples. The samples were also free of sulfides. All samples are characterized as coarse to medium grained sand, with fines ranging from 1.4-4.1%, and when six sites were tested in 2009 results were similar at all the six sites with the percentage of fines ranging from 0.1-5.4%.
3. The Corps has no objections to re-authorizing the permit.
4. Coastal Commission was not on the call therefore the Corps will check and make sure that they are satisfied with these SAP results.
5. (Dan Swenson) wanted to know the location of the grain size discussion and what the fate of the material is.

ii. Corps (Planning) comments:

1. No additional comments.

iii. USFWS comments:

1. No additional comments.

iv. CDFW comments:

1. (Bill Paznokas) Make sure the proposed project would avoid eelgrass. No additional comments.

v. RWQCB comments:

1. Not concerned. No additional comments.

vi. EPA comments:

1. (Allen Ota) Communicated that 250,000 CY seemed excessive for an annual maximum. Expressed curiosity of the volume limits and the historical need of this annual maximum.
2. Did not have further concerns and feels that the sand is clean.

vii. Other comments:

1. (Lock Dreizler-Permittee)-In response to Dan Swenson's comments stated that there is no more build up than erosion and that the fate of the material stays within the crane with a versatile pump.

2. Applicant noted they have been in contact with CCC.

f. #6 Pier T, Pier S, Back Channel and Turning Basin SAP (John Markham):

i. Corps (Regulatory) comments:

1. Dredge Locations:

- a. Western Anchorage: Was the Western Anchorage site described in Middle Harbor presentation characterized previously? It is not described in the SAP under review. Response (Port): Recent report prepared by AMEC in 2012, SAP approved in (date TBD). Material seems to be suitable for CDF disposal/re-use, but the results of the SAPR will be presented in a future DMMT/CSTF meeting
- b. Pier T: Good to have a color contour for amount of cut. Response (Port): See figure 2. This distinction may not be very visible in this case due to steep slopes and amount of cut. Also see table 7 for locations for mudline elevations, which vary from -48.5 MLLW to -53 MLLW and average ~ -51.5 MLLW.
- c. Pier S: All sediment cores within channel are in approximately same line, as opposed to (standard) randomized locations throughout dredge units. Response: for desired (longer) length of the cores (15-20 feet) and steepness of slopes, they had to remain at these locations.
- d. Back Channel & Back Channel Turning Basin: Has the Port identified any major storm drains or discharge pipes? Response: Yes, but not on diagrams. No obvious locations to focus sampling sites. Port could revise or add a figure that represents the larger stormwater outfalls & discharge pipes (e.g., outfalls).

2. Disposal locations:

- a. Temporary Aquatic Storage: Why is bioaccumulation testing not proposed, as it will likely sit for months or years, and bioaccumulation testing itself only requires a 25-day period. Response: The CSTF/DMMT SAP Guidelines do not require this. However, this is a requirement of the new Regional Board permit for 5-year maintenance dredging. At Corps, Regional Board, and USEPA request, the Port will revise SAP to add

bioaccumulation testing for temporary aquatic storage.

3. No objections to SAP, but revised SAP should be distributed to CSTF/DMMT prior to implementation.

ii. Corps (Planning) comments:

1. Dredge Locations:

- a. Pier S: Yellow area that represents side slopes, for example, south of PS-DU-01, side slope is in water, so why is there is no core in this location. Response: given the steepness of side slopes, coring of in-water slope is too difficult.
- b. Back Channel & Back Channel Turning Basin: Figure 8, BC-DU-02 contains no cores in water on slope, which could be missing important data points (reiterated by EPA). Response: Port will revise sampling locations to add sampling of side slopes (which are to be excavated) for Back Channel and BC Turning Basin.

iii. USFWS comments:

1. No comments recorded.

iv. CDFW comments:

1. Disposal Locations:

- a. Temporary Aquatic Storage: Where are the proposed locations of Temporary Aquatic Storage areas, other than Western Anchorage? Response: Port will revise SAP accordingly.
- b. No objections to SAP.

v. RWQCB comments:

1. Disposal Locations:

- a. Temporary Aquatic Disposal Site: The new Regional Board permit for 5-year maintenance dredging requires bioaccumulation testing for these proposed disposal/storage sites. At Corps, Regional Board, and USEPA request, the Port will revise SAP to add bioaccumulation testing for temporary aquatic storage
- b. No objections to SAP, but revised SAP should be distributed to CSTF/DMMT prior to implementation.

vi. EPA comments:

1. Dredge Locations:

- a. Pier T: In Middle Harbor presentation, the dimensions of Slides 3 and 4 do not seem consistent, 1 of them seems inaccurate. Response: Port agrees, but it is likely due to differing scale of aerials.
- b. Pier T: Dredging proposed here is for “deepening”, and therefore is occurring predominantly in native material? Response: Yes, except where wharf/bulkhead was previously installed along Pier T face.
- c. Pier T: Figure 11 (testing flow chart for Pier T) is incorrect. If fail Phase II BP testing and Tissue chemistry, then must return to TTLC comparison or Phase II EET and SET chemistry. Response: Port will revise accordingly.
- d. Pier S: Did overlying fill layer located on slope or uplands come from a land source? Response: Yes, but the thickness, sediment quality, and soil profile are to be determined through testing.
- e. Pier S: No objections to use of this excavated (upland) material within MH CDF area. Response: Comment noted.
- f. Back Channel & BC Turning Basin: Comparing MH presentation & this SAP: Presentation (slide 7) indicates that MH East Basin Part 1 requires 2 million cy, whereas SAP speaks of 1 million cy needed. Which of these is correct? In addition, LA-2 has 1 million cy per year volume capacity (2005), therefore LA-3 would need to be proposed. Response: Port is over-sampling in order to have material available at these various disposal locations as needed, and thus their estimates may not be consistent. Latter comment noted.
- g. Back Channel & BC Turning Basin: Figures 7 through 10: Revise sampling locations to add sampling within side slopes where dredging is proposed (blue hatched and gold hatched areas). Response: Port will revise accordingly, at request of Corps Planning and EPA.
- h. Injection of deep soil cement occurs prior to dredging itself? In the water; i.e., in direct contact with marine environment? Response: Yes. Port will send description to CSTF/DMMT, including potential interaction with the marine environment.

2. No objections to SAP, but revised SAP should be distributed to CSTF/DMMT prior to implementation.

vii. POLA comments:

1. Middle Harbor fill project update (see presentation)
 - a. MH Fill Sequence: Slip 1 → Pier E Extension → East Basin Part 1 → East Basin Part 2
 - b. Slip 1 nearly complete, including surcharge/cap layer; material re-used from various sources, including Port and third parties.
 - c. East Basin Part 1: Between 1-2,000,000 cy of fill material needed, including surcharge/cap
 - i. Source of fill may come from Pier S, Back Channel & Back Channel Turning Basin, Pier T and Pier T Entrance Channel, and Western Anchorage site = total 3.7 million cy available.
 - ii. See slide for East Basin Part 1 tentative fill plan.
 - d. East Basin Part 2: amount of fill material TBD
2. Pier T & Entrance Channel (see presentation)
 - a. Dredging at this potential borrow site is planned along Berths T132-140 and the West Basin Approach Channel to a depth of -55 feet mean lower low water (MLLW), plus 2 feet of allowable overdepth. The proposed area to be dredged has been sectioned into 11 dredge units (DUs) for the purpose of sampling and analysis activities (see SAP Figure 2).
 - b. The total volume of proposed dredged material is estimated to be 934,000 cy, consisting of 485,000 cy above design depth and 449,000 cy of allowable overdepth.
 - c. The SAP also provides a summary of prior sediment investigations at Pier T, Pier S, and Back Channel & Back Channel Turning Basin.
3. Pier S
 - a. The Pier S project includes widening the Cerritos Channel. The wharf area includes a long submerged slope where a portion has been topped with clean imported soil to allow access to the site during previous improvements activities. Investigations require land-based borings through fill soil to historically subaqueous sediments that were

covered during development of Pier S. Dredging and/or excavation are planned at Pier S to a depth of -52 feet MLLW, plus 2 feet of allowable overdepth. The proposed area to be dredged and/or excavated has been sectioned into seven DUs for the purpose of sampling and analysis activities (Figure 3). Five DUs are located within Cerritos Channel and two DUs are located along the shoreline of Pier S. A typical cross section at Pier S is presented on Figure 4.

- b. The total volume of proposed dredged and/or excavated material is estimated to be 502,000 cy, consisting of 464,000 cy above project depth and 38,000 cy of allowable overdepth. Volume estimates for landside DUs (PS-DU06 and PS-DU07) does not include the overlying fill soil that was previously placed at this location; this material will be beneficially reused at upland Port locations unless the CSTF/DMMT approves re-use at Middle Harbor.

4. Back Channel & BC Turning Basin:

- a. Dredging is planned within the Back Channel and Turning Basin to a depth of -52 feet MLLW, plus 2 feet of allowable overdepth. The proposed area to be dredged has been sectioned into four DUs.
- b. The total volume of proposed dredged material is estimated to be 178,000 cy, consisting of 151,000 cy above project depth and 27,000 cy of allowable overdepth.

g. #7 Morro Bay Harbor (Blake Horita and Kirk Brus):

i. Corps (Regulatory) comments:

- 1. None

ii. Corps (Planning) comments:

- 1. None

iii. USFWS comments:

- 1. None

iv. CDFW comments:

- 1. Though not directly related to the 2013 Morro Bay Harbor federal Final SAPR and Suitability Determination Report, and Appendices, Bill asked if the maintenance dredging has

affects on the birds (e.g., western snowy plover) or vegetation (e. g., eelgrass) in Morro Bay. As the CDFW point of contact (POC) Eric Wilkins (CDFW) who covers the Morro Bay area was on the SC-DMMT monthly meeting by teleconference, Eric responded that the timing of the maintenance dredging (e.g., when the dredging occurs) determines which species (birds) or plants (eelgrass) could be affected, and Eric said he would have to research further on the species in the Morro Bay area. The Corps response about the CDFW discussion on species and the potential affect from Morro Bay Harbor federal maintenance dredging project would be discussed in the new 6 year Environmental Assessment (EA) for Morro Bay Harbor (federal) maintenance dredging project, and that Eric Wilkins (CDFW) is on the mailing distribution for review of the new 6 year draft EA when the new 6 year EA is ready for dissemination.

2. Bill Paznokas communicated that he had no problems with the Final SAP, 2013 Morro Bay Harbor federal Final SAPR and Suitability Determination Report, and Appendices.

v. RWQCB comments:

1. Though not directly related to the 2013 SAPR and Suitability Report, Peter Von Langen (Central Coast Water Quality Control Board) said that when the previous placement dredged material was piped onto Morro Strand State Beach, the public complained about an odor.

***Post January 22, 2014 SC-DMMT monthly meeting:**

The Corps response to Peter Von Langen's request, the Corps would work with the local sponsor, Morro Bay Harbor District, on putting up a sign, or sending out a notice to the public, that dredged material is being placed at Morro Strand State Beach through a pipeline.

vi. EPA comments:

1. Allan Ota (USEPA) was not able to participate in the phone call so he relayed his comments to Dan Swenson and Larry Smith. Allan's comments were on 2 separate cores, -20 and -23, in Table 10 of the 2013 Report. It should be noted these comments were previously provided during the November 20, 2013 SC-DMMT meeting.

***Post January 22, 2014 SC-DMMT monthly meeting:**

As a followup from the January 22, 2014, SC-DMMT

meeting Kirk Brus incorporation Allan Ota's comments into the 2013 Final SAPR and Suitability Report.

The Corps incorporated Allan Ota's review comments on Table 10. Test results in Table 10 are below project depth overdepths (also referred to as advanced maintenance depths) that WILL NOT be dredged as part of the Corps dredging project. The new discussion about cores -20 and -23 in Table 10 is located under Section 5.0, Discussion, on page 63, in the 2013 Morro Bay Harbor (federal) Final SAPR and Suitability Determination Report.

Table 9 was also updated (2013 Morro Bay Sieve Analysis Data above Project or Overdredge Depth For Each Individual Cores) to show data and the project depth that WILL be dredged by the Corps dredging project. This updated discussion for Table 9 is located under Section 5.0, Discussion, on page 63, in the 2013 Final SAPR and Suitability Report.

vii. Other comments:

1. Kirk Brus discussed the previous November 20, 2013 review comments from the SC-DMMT on the 2013 Morro Bay Harbor (federal) Final SAPR and Suitability Determination Report and its Appendices, and provided Corps responses and an explanation how each comment had been resolved. As there were no new review comments, Kirk Brus asked to finalize the documents.

IV. Other issues:

- a. Finalization of SPL SAP/SAPR guidelines including database submittal requirement:
 - i. See documents regarding on-going effort to consolidate sediment testing data in a centralized database across multiple Corps districts (SAGA).
 - ii. Final data schema expected in 1-2 months.
 - iii. Website including mapping interface expected in approx. 9 months.
 - iv. Would allow labs to submit their data and agencies to export data.
 - v. Plan: finalize guidelines with requirement to submit data using SAGA templates until SAGA interface operational, then to submit directly through SAGA. Prior data submittals will be loaded at that time.
- b. Demo requested, but not available at this time.
- c. Question: how will it be funded? [query pending with SAGA staff].

