

**Agenda for January 29, 2025**  
**Southern California Dredged Material Management Team (SC-DMMT) Meeting**  
**(SLO, Santa Barbara, Ventura, L.A., Orange)**  
US Army Corps of Engineers - Los Angeles District

**Microsoft Teams**

Join the meeting now

**Meeting ID:** 993 196 036 407

**Passcode:** 79FL3Am2

**Dial in by phone**

+1 503-207-9433,,9367598# United States, Beaverton

Find a local number

Phone conference ID: 936 759 8#

**Roll Call and Announcements: 9:00 – 9:05 AM**

**Attendees:**

- Deanna Cummings- USACE Regulatory
- Max Roseman- USACE Regulatory
- Brian Kim-USACE Navigation
- Luis Sepulveda- USACE Engineering
- Jeremy Smith- California Coastal Commission (CCC)
- Kern Kronschnabl- Kinnetic Environmental
- Larry Smith- USACE Planning
- Brian Kim- USACE PPMD Navigation
- Kym Lyons-CESPL Planning
- Leslie Hart- CDFW
- Janna Morimoto- Port of Long Beach
- Jules Kelly- CCC
- Emily Duncan- LA Water Board

- Joe Ryan- USACE Costal Engineering
- Dylan Porter- Port of Long Beach
- Carol Roberts- USFWS
- Doland Cheung- USACE Planning
- Chris Osuch- Anchor QEA
- Claudia Tenorio- Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board
- Derek Lerma- Rincon Consultants
- Adam Gale- Anchor QEA
- Chris Miller- City of Newport
- Gerry Salas- USACE Regulatory
- Mckenna Brown- Anchor QEA
- Richard Parsons- Rincon Consultants
- Antal Szijj- USACE Regulatory

### **Announcements:**

Larry Smith (USACE Planning): Provided an update on maintenance dredging in Lower Newport Bay. Additional testing in 2024 Z-layer samples results in showed exceedances. USACE planning will provide and coordinate results with other agencies in future (February) meeting.

Deanna Cummings (USACE Regulatory): EPA not in attendance at this meeting. The Agency is advised to not coordinate with other federal agencies. EPA is able to still coordinate state agencies on guidance and coordination. EPA will passed comments to Coastal Commission. Corps will need to internally coordinate with management whether comments provided by CCC from EPA can be utilized as concurrence with DMMT suitability determination. Until further notice, EPA will not be attending or providing direct communication with Corps staff.

### **Project #1: 9:05 – 10:00 AM**

- 1) **Project name:** LA River Estuary and POLB Approach Channel Maintenance Dredging
- 2) **Applicant's name & affiliation:** Brian Kim, USACE

- 3) **Project type (Regulatory/Navigation):** Navigation
- 4) **Corps project manager who will attend:** Brian Kim
- 5) **Purpose/topic (draft SAP, revised SAP, SAPR):** SAPR
- 6) **Request for suitability determination? (y/n):** Y
- 7) **Documents provided (emailed, or FTP link):** DoD SAFE
- 8) **Time needed (15, 30, 45 min?):** 60 min

### **Agency Comments:**

Larry Smith (USACE Planning): Sand Trap area was consulted with EPA. Determined would not be acceptable for nearshore disposal.

Jeremy Smith (CCC): Melisa's (EPA) comments were passed along through CCC and are placed in the chat. Melissa agrees that the material is not suitable for beach or nearshore placement. The vegetation and debris cannot be disposed of at the ocean disposal sites. Melissa agrees that material with less than 30% vegetation debris can be considered suitable for ocean disposal, as shown on Figure 15 of the report. This threshold is the same that was used in 2018. However, the Corps will still need a vegetation/debris management plan for the suitable areas to ensure large amounts of vegetation and debris are not disposed of at LA-2. EPA does have one request for the SAPR. They would like to request a table be added to the document that shows the tissue concentrations compared to the lowest selected TRVs. Ideally this would all be in one summary table, but other tables could be modified to add this information.

Jeremy Smith (CCC): Coastal Commission agrees with EPA's comment that material is not suitable for beach or nearshore. No other comments.

Larry Smith (USACE Planning): The table Melissa (EPA) referred to in her comment should be incorporated in final version of SAPR.

Carol Roberts (FWS): Received SAPR only 1 day prior to the meet and is not able to review in a short timeframe. Request that information be provided earlier to allow time to review.

Emily Duncan (LA Water Board): Also has not had opportunity to review or provide comment on Report. Generally, LAWQCB defers to EPA & CCC. But will need to review and provide any comment on SAPR via email.

Deanna Cummings (USACE Regulatory): Will 1 Week or 2 weeks review be adequate time for agencies that were not able to review prior to this meeting?

Emily Duncan (LA Water Board): Will need 2 weeks for review and comments.

Carol Roberts (FWS): Try to give any feedback with 2 weeks but cannot ensure that this may occur within timeframe due to many priorities.

Brian Kim and Larry Smith (USACE Planning): 2 Week review and feedback from all agencies is fine.

## **Project #2: 10:05 – 11:00 AM**

- 1) **Project name:** Port of Long Beach Deep Draft Navigation (PoLB DDN)
- 2) **Applicant's name & affiliation:** Luis Sepulveda/Larry Smith, CESPL
- 3) **Project type (Regulatory/Navigation):** Navigation
- 4) **Corps project manager who will attend:** Doland Cheung
- 5) **Purpose/topic (draft SAP, revised SAP, SAPR):** SAPR
- 6) **Request for suitability determination? (y/n):** yes
- 7) **Documents provided (emailed, or FTP link):** FTP link (DoD SAFE)
- 8) **Time needed (15, 30, 45 min?):** 60 min

*\*Break if needed*

### **Agency Comments:**

Jeremy Smith (CCC): Comments received from Melissa (EPA) also provide to CCC. Comment placed in the chat. Melissa agrees with their suitability assessments in Table 48, including that all the material is suitable for LA-2 or LA-3 disposal. Melissa would like to make the same request previous project regarding the inclusion of TRVs tables, that they include a summary table showing the tissue concentrations and lowest selected TRV. This makes it easier to easily see that all the composites were below the TRV.

Jeremy Smith (CCC): Requested clarification for the use of the borrow area. Is the idea that material would be placed in borrow pit to be used in future use?

Larry Smith (USACE Planning): Borrow area has been used for Surfside Sunset Beach Nourishment Project. This would refill borrow area for future beneficial reuse purposes likely for sand for beach nourishment at Surfside Sunset or other similar uses.

Jeremy Smith (CCC): This dredge material is finer than the material for borrow site. Corps (Planning) should be careful to not place this sediment on top of higher quality suitable sand. Nearshore placement at Peninsula Beach or Surfside Sunset near shore is preferred over direct beach placement for potential future use.

Larry Smith (USACE Planning): Corps acknowledges nearshore placement areas would be preferential. Would apply for consistency determination at some point in future once the use of borrow site sediment is known.

Emily Duncan (LA Water Board): Water Board has not had opportunity to review report.

Larry (USACE Planning): Will a 2 week review timeframe work for Water Board?

Emily Duncan (LA Water Board): 2 week review period is fine. Water Board recommended an early coordination for 401 WQC.

Larry Smith (USACE Planning): A 401 pre-cert meeting will occur to start that approval process for the WQC.

### **Project #3: 11:05 – 11:30 AM**

- 1) **Project name:** Balboa Yacht Basin Maintenance Dredging
- 2) **Applicant's name & affiliation:** Chris Miller, City of Newport Beach
- 3) **Project type (Regulatory/Navigation):** Regulatory
- 4) **Corps project manager who will attend:** Gerry Salas
- 5) **Purpose/topic (draft SAP, revised SAP, SAPR):** Draft SAP
- 6) **Request for suitability determination? (y/n):** N
- 7) **Documents provided (emailed, or FTP link):** SAP and presentation emailed
- 8) **Time needed (15, 30, 45 min?):** 30 min

### **Agency Comments:**

Jules Kelly (CCC): Regarding Figures for proposed core locations. Based on history of elevated mercury and zinc and distribution of existing outfalls CCC would request moving 1 core moved further back in the marina and adding a new core near the channel. Bringing total number to 7cores. Could suggest 2 composite samples of materials rather than one.

Chris Osuch (Anchor QEA): Because of the confined disposal area at Port, a second composite was not considered. If need to can look into individual core chemistry.

Jules Kelly (CCC): So you believe the sediment is all from a continuous portion of the project area and that's why one composite is appropriate?

Chris Osuch (Anchor QEA): Based on the historical data, we likely know what material we are expecting. Likely know some elevated metals and mercury. We think it's going to be pretty consistent throughout the basin.

Jules Kelly (CCC): If that's the case CCC is comfortable with just one composite.

Larry Smith (USACE Planning): Would like to ensure core is moved and new core are right off the storm drain.

Jules Kelly (CCC): EPA comments have been shared to CCC and placed in chat. Melissa (EPA) recommends moving core location 1 to be further back in the marina and adding another core on the same side closer to the channel. Please see the attached map with suggested adjustments. Since the project is proposed for Pier G, Melissa defers to the Water Board and Coastal Commission about whether the testing proposed is adequate (note that the dredging location is in the Santa Ana Water Board region but the disposal location at the Port is in the LA Water Board region).

Leslie Hart (CDFW): Does consultant plan to conduct Caulerpa surveys due to known Caulerpa is infestation in Newport Bay?

Adam Gale (Anchor QEA): Not proposing protocol Caulerpa surveys. Would conduct some visual or video drop prior to collecting core at the location.

Leslie Hart (CDFW): Recommend coordinating approach prior to surveys with the SCCAT for surveys. Should be done for permitting of the activity.

Gerry Salas (USACE Regulatory): Caulerpa Surveys would be included as Section 10 permit.

Adam Gale (anchor QEA): Following Gerry's comment. Caulerpa surveys would be done prior to actual dredging works versus the proposed sampling work. However, this will be presented at the next SCCAT.

Claudia Tenorio (Santa Ana Regional Board): What is the 20% contingency?

Adam Gale (Anchor QEA): 20% contingency allows for flexibility between the time lapse between the survey date and what would otherwise be required as a pre-construction survey several months down the road from now.

Adam Gale (Anchor QEA): We will relocate existing sample point and will add 7<sup>th</sup> core per CCC and EPA comments. Figure was provided on locations. Will it need to be recirculated by the agencies to get approval?

Larry Smith (USACE Planning): You will need submit the revised draft SAP document via with changes to agencies to confirm the changes. Can confirm via email.

Adam Gale (Anchor QEA): Confirms revised draft testing SAP will be sent and will coordinate with SCCAT to comply with Caulerpa requirements.

#### **Project #4: 11:35 AM – 12:00 PM**

- 1) **Project name:** Ventura Harbor Maintenance Dredging
- 2) **Applicant's name & affiliation:** Derek Lerma, Rincon Consultants representing the Ventura Port District
- 3) **Project type (Regulatory/Navigation):** Regulatory
- 4) **Corps project manager who will attend:** Antal Szijj
- 5) **Purpose/topic (draft SAP, revised SAP, SAPR):** SAP Report

- 6) **Request for suitability determination? (y/n):** Yes
- 7) **Documents provided (emailed, or FTP link):** I will send tomorrow in the AM
- 8) **Time needed (15, 30, 45 min?):** ~30 minutes

#### **Agency Comments:**

Jeremy Smith (CCC): Comments for Melissa (EPA) were also provided to CCC and are provided in the chat. EPA's comments include that material appears to be chemically suitable for beach placement, and don't have any particular concerns with the chemistry. However, Melissa notes that the material is all 99% fine grained, which seems problematic. However, she defers to the permitting agencies as to whether this material can be placed in compliance with the current permits.

Jeremy Smith (CCC): I have not had the opportunity to review the report and need to coordinate with District Staff. Requesting additional time. CCC notes that high fines as something that is something of potential concern and may have follow-up questions and comments.

Emily Duncan (LA Water Board): Need to review report and will respond with any comments likely within 2 weeks.

Derek Lerma (Rincon): 2 weeks is fine not on expedited dredging timeline.