FINAL

Agenda and Notes for February 26, 2025

Southern California Dredged Material Management Team (SC-DMMT) Meeting (SLO, Santa Barbara, Ventura, L.A., Orange, San Diego Counties)

US Army Corps of Engineers - Los Angeles District

Roll Call and Announcements: 10:00 – 10:05 AM

Discuss next scheduled SC-DMMT meeting 10:05- 10:15 AM

Project #1: 10:15 – 10:45 AM
1) Project name: POLA Berths 196-199 Maintenance Dredging
2) Applicant's name & affiliation: Port of Los Angeles
3) Project type (Regulatory/Navigation): Regulatory
4) Corps project manager who will attend: Theresa Stevens
5) Purpose/topic (draft SAP, revised SAP, SAPR): SAPR
6) Request for suitability determination? (y/n): Yes
7) Documents provided (emailed, or FTP link): Emailed on February 20, 2025
8) Time needed (15, 30, 45 min?): 30 minutes

Participants:
USACE: T. Stevens, M. Roseman, S. Gayagas, K. Lyons, L. Smith, J. Ryan, S. Ming
EPA: M. Scianni, D. Michaels
CCC: J. Kelly, J. Smith
Santa Ana Waterboard: H. Shahrokhnia
CDFW: L. Hart
Port of Los Angeles: K. Prickett, L. Nguyen, C. Le, J. Posadas
Pi Environmental (consultant to Port): B. Maridan

SAP was approved September 2024. Sediment and water samples collected November 2024.

Proposal is to dredge 4,350 cy of sediment and dispose at the Berths 243-245 confined disposal facility (CDF). Dredging would tentatively take place October 2025. The Port will use a Marine Improvement Contract (MIC), which is currently scheduled to advertise late March 2025. The Port will update to the USACE if there is a change in schedule that would affect dredging in October 2025.

Pi Environmental provided a presentation which summarized the chemistry test findings, and Port/Pi requested agency concurrence on suitability for disposal at the CDF.

Agency Determinations (SUAD):
USACE Regulatory: no objection to CDF disposal
EPA: no objection to CDF disposal, but defer to LA waterboard since this requires concurrence from the state
CCC: no objection to CDF disposal
CDFW: no comment
LA Waterboard: Port (K. Prickett) contacted the LA Waterboard (Emily Duncan) immediately after the meeting b/c LA Waterboard was not present during the meeting. Emily Duncan responded (email dated February 26, 2025) the LA Waterboard had no objection to the CDF disposal.

Project #2: 10:45-11:15

1) Project name: Back Bay Landing and Bayside Village Marine Redevelopment and Newport Bay Crossings Pipeline Replacement at BC-09
2) Applicant's name & affiliation: Michael Gelfand, Bayside Village Marina LLC
3) Project type (Regulatory/Navigation): Regulatory
4) Corps project manager who will attend: Gerry Salas
5) Purpose/topic (draft SAP, revised SAP, SAPR): Draft Supplemental SAP
6) Request for suitability determination? (y/n): N
7) Documents provided (emailed, or FTP link): Emailed February 20, 2025
8) Time needed (15, 30, 45 min?): 30 minutes

Participants:
USACE: G. Salas, T. Stevens, M. Roseman, S. Gayagas, K. Lyons, L. Smith, J. Ryan, S. Ming
EPA: M. Scianni, D. Michaels
CCC: J. Kelly, J. Smith
Santa Ana Waterboard: H. Shahrokhnia
CDFW: L. Hart
Anchor QEA (consultant to applicant): C. Osuch, A. Gale, D. Inman, C. Tenorio

EPA: Q- Is this the first review of results? A (Anchor QEA): Yes, but the supplemental SAP has all results to date.

CCC: Q- Why are there composites vs individual cores used for high resolution tests when we are trying to delineate problems? And, if there is a re-test, on which results do we base our decision?

A: (Anchor QEA) - high resolution composite tests delineate toxicity not chemistry.

A: (EPA)- high resolution/bio tests require 2-3 cores to obtain volume needed for bio tests, so it's not usually feasible to test individual cores. When there is a need for higher resolution bio testing, EPA usually requires each composite be divided into 2 or 3 smaller composites and with more cores per composite. EPA will use the higher resolution bio and chemistry results for assessing ocean disposal suitability.

EPA- Is ok with the approach to the tests. Questioned whether Ampelisca is the best choice for the high sand content composite. Would Rhepoxynius be a more suitability species? Suggested adding flexibility in SAP to use another species if the grain size is not

ideal for Ampelisca. Eohuastorius needs to be one of the species used since that was the amphipod used in the first round, but the second species can be flexible.

Anchor QEA notes/edits for this discussion item: An alternative sand-compatible species may be needed if Ampelisca is not suitable based on grain size (e.g., Rhepox amphipod or other species more suited to sand). Need to update the SAP stating that if grain size not appropriate, an alternative species will be used.

Q- Were there any refusal issues? A- Yes, only one refusal which was 1.1 feet from the bottom of the Z layer; this was in the west channel and due to accumulation of shell hash. No need to adjust core locations due to this refusal.

The SAPR will include all test results, including the initial sampling event from September 2024 and the proposed testing described in the Supplemental SAP.

SA waterboard: Q- Were there results from the first Z layer test? A-yes, preliminary results show exceedance of DDT; all will be explained in the supplemental SAPR.

CDFW: Q- Have there been any Caulerpa surveys prior to coring? A- No; if required applicant needs follow on discussion with the SCCAT. Since coring is considered a bottom disturbing activity, CDFW recommends coordination with the SCCAT to discuss the core sampling approach and eliminate any concerns regarding the potential spread of *Caulerpa* spp.

Agency Determinations:
EPA: approved supplemental SAP, but need updated amphipod section
CCC: approved pending the revisions requested by EPA
SA Waterboard: approved pending EPA's edits
CDFW: no objection