

Final Notes for June 27, 2018
Southern California Dredged Material Management Team (SC-DMMT) Meeting
US Army Corps of Engineers - Los Angeles District

Attendees (*phone):

Bonnie Rogers (Corps Regulatory)
Allen Ota* (EPA Region 9)
Jason Freshwater* (Santa Ana Waterboard)
Larry Simone* (CCC)
Larry Smith* (Corps)
Robert Smith* (Corps)
Mark Cooke* (Corps)
Adam Gale (Anchor QEA)
Chris Osuch (Anchor QEA)
Gerry Salas (Corps Regulatory)
Scott Cunningham* (City of Newport Beach Harbor)
Steve Capellino* (Anchor QEA)
Joe Ryan (Corps)

Announcements: 10:00 – 10:05 AM

Project #1: 10:05 – 10:45 AM

- 1) Project name: City of Newport Beach Regional General Permit (RGP) 54
- 2) Applicant NAME & Applicant affiliation: Chris Miller, City of Newport Beach Harbor Manager
- 3) Project type (Regulatory/Navigation): Regulatory
- 4) Corps Project Manager name(s): Gerry Salas
- 5) Meeting type (DMMT/CSTF): DMMT
- 6) Purpose/topic (e.g., SAP, SAPR, and/or suitability determination): SAR

Notes:

Gerry: Maintenance Dredging.

Adam: Present results to authorize permit before it expires. Nearshore placement would be a new part of the permit for the first time.

Chris Osuch: Grain size will be used to determine compatibility for nearshore placement under RGP 54. Some areas suitable and some not suitable for LA-3. Some areas require chemical testing and agency approval for individual dredging project prior to nearshore allowance. Composite samples were created for Tier III testing. Individual cores were then analyzed for mercury and PCBs. Based

on those results, additional cores were collected to further evaluate extent of contamination. Samples met LPC requirements for ocean disposal.

Receiver site grain size: Areas 1, 2, 4, and 5 are candidates for nearshore placement.

Larry Simone (CCC): Would material with fines up to 47% be acceptable for beach placement.

Chris Osuch: The individual dredger will have to test for grain size at each event to determine if its compatible. If it's over 10% finer than receiver site, then it will not be compatible.

Bonnie: How would future individual dredgers sediment compatibility be determined if they don't go through DMMT?

Adam Gale: Each sediment testing result by an individual dredged tests if the material fits within a grain size envelope for the beach receiver site.

Jason Freshwater: Why was DDTs not re-tested?

Chris: EPA only requested individual cores and not for the DDTs.

Jason Freshwater: Was never informed DDT would not be retested.

Bonnie: Followup with Jason on not testing for DDT and the reason for that.

Jason: There are TMDLs restrictions for the bay and must be met. The TMDL restrictions are lower than what's being proposed.

Allan Ota: There has been a general agreement for all Regional Waterboards, that for dredging, when material is removed from waterbody it is a positive action that reduces the contaminant load. If the sediment is suitable for ocean disposal it can be removed and does not conflict with TMDL. Toxicity Reference Value comparison to tissue values in Tissue Residues Effects screening values should be reviewed in detail. Because material would still be in the Waterbody it may need your further Waterboard review.

Jason: The values compared and the same values as Waterboard's targets.

Adam: Sediment Suitability authorization expires July 2018 so would like to meet that date.

Jason: Should be able to provide decision by then.

Adam: Will need to seek authorization for areas not previously approved.

Jason: If a 401 has been issued using previous RGP 54 and values have changed, even in the interim, the permit could no longer be valid. Concerned about mercury levels of 4, and high DDT values. Levels have increased so have concern about that trend. TMDL status is currently being reviewed by their agency.

Steve C: The City is not proposing to touch the very highly contaminated areas. The surface material is considered under TMDL program. Composites are not always representative between cycles of actual condition. Can discuss further.

Jason: Must look at all evidence and any trends regarding contamination for water quality considerations. Discussions need to be had regarding loading calculations.

Larry Smith: Does green area need Z-layer testing if it results in no action or dredging.

Carol: If there is reason to believe contamination could be exposed then should be tested.

Allan Ota: Leaving Z-layer in place can help document where contamination is exposed.

Bonnie: Section 404 NEPA may need that information.

SUMMARY: Jason and Allan will provide comments and followup further, and try to avoid lapse in sediment suitability approval.

Project #2: 10:45 – 11:15

- 1) Project name: City of Newport Beach Federal Channel Dredging
- 2) Applicant NAME & Applicant affiliation: Chris Miller, City of Newport Beach Harbor Manager
- 3) Project type (Regulatory/Navigation): Navigation
- 4) Corps Project Manager name(s): Mark Cooke
- 5) Meeting type (DMMT/CSTF): DMMT
- 6) Purpose/topic (e.g., SAP, SAPR, and/or suitability determination): SAP

Notes:

Joe Ryan: Federal funding is not yet available for this project, so the City is moving forward with the Sampling Plan effort.

Chris Osuch: Newport Channel was not initially included in the Federal Channel sediment characterization. Federal Channels were sampled in January 2018, in addition to exploratory samples in Newport Channel. Newport Channel was cleaner than expected. Additional sampling proposed for placement at LA-3. In 2003 Federal Channel, Tier IV in 2006, post-dredge sampling in 2013. DDTs exceeded ERM and toxicity occurred in amphipod testing in 2003 and 2006. 2012-2013 Newport Channel was dredged and placed at Port of LB Middle Harbor fill site. Post-dredge surface sampling - metals and DDT exceed ERL.

Jason FW: Has questions about retest on *Mytilus* which had an issue at one point. Has questions about the toxicity report.

Chris: Results will be presented as Addendum to federal channel report. Composite areas will be defined after chemistry is analyzed on individual stations. 230,000 CY (includes overdepth).

Jason (Waterboard): Would like City to followup with him on specific toxicity text.

Allan (EPA): Good example why we don't use chemistry presence to toxicity response testing in lab, because they are not always correlated. High resolution testing is acceptable. Final compositing scheme will be determined after testing, is reasonable. Meets all other testing requirements. The supplemental SAP provided does not mention biological testing requirement, but agreed supplemental testing proposal is needed and okay.

Chris: Will present final report to DMMT. Initial preliminary results will be provided to EPA, Waterboard, USFWS and other agencies.

Larry: City is hoping Corps will come up with funding prior to 3-5 years from now for the dredging.