Final Notes for February 27, 2019
Southern California Dredged Material Management Team (SC-DMMT) Meeting
US Army Corps of Engineers - Los Angeles District (9 Pages)

Attendance (*phone):
Bonnie Rogers (Corps Regulatory)
Larry Smith (Corps Planning)
Bob Phan (Corps Navigation)
Justin Pearce (Corps Regulatory)
Gerry Salas (Corps Regulatory)
Melissa Scianni (EPA)
Theresa Stevens* (Corps Regulatory)
Larry Simone (Coastal Commission)
Robert Smith* (Corps Regulatory)
Carol Roberts* (USFWS)
Allan Ota* (EPA)
Joe Ryan (Corps Coastal)
Mark Cooke (Corps)
Kat Prickett* (Port)
Chris Brown* (Port)
Ernie Robledo* (Port)
Pai Kim* (Port)
Brent Mardian* (Pi Environmental)
Chris Miller* (Newport Beach)
Jason Freshwater* (Santa Ana Waterboard)
Adam Gale* (Anchor QEA)
Chris Osuch* (Anchor QEA)
Steve Capellino* (Newport)
Allan Monji* (Waterboard)
Dan McCoy* (Western Solutions)
Janna Morimoto* (POLB)
Ken Kronsnoble* (Kinnetic)
Kim Garvey* (M&N)
Allan Alcorn* (M&N)
Theresa Bresler* (Navy)
Stephanie A.* (Navy)
John Weber* (Seal Beach)

Announcements: 10:00 – 10:05 AM

Corps will send DMMT Tracking sheet status out in next 2-3 weeks
Allan Ota will need to provide annual volume reporting to sites soon. Need totals for 2018 soon.

Kathryn Curtis has retired from the Port.

Project #1: 10:05 – 10:35 AM

1) Project name: Berths 174-176 Maintenance Dredging

NOTES:

Theresa S.: Intends to request approval under Regulatory Regional General Permit 29 (Port of LA permit for maintenance dredging).

Brett M.: The hazardous waste thresholds (sediment and elutriate) were not exceeded. A few ERM thresholds were exceeded. The DMMT was queried to see if there were any questions about the SAPR findings and to determine if they had any objection to disposal in the Confined Disposal Facility (CDF).

Scianni: EPA deferred to the RWQCB (RWQCB was not on the phone or at the meeting) regarding adequacy of proposed disposal in a CDF.

Simone: What is best estimate for remaining capacity at CDF? Answer: About 100,000 cubic yards.

Project #2: 10:35-11:05 AM

Project name: MOTEMS Projects Potential Clean-up Dredging

NOTES:

Brett M.: The SAPR indicated the hazardous waste thresholds (sediment and elutriate) were not exceeded. The DMMT was queried to see if there were any questions about the SAPR findings and to determine if they had any objection to disposal in the CDF.

Scianni: EPA deferred to the RWQCB (RWQCB was not on the phone or at the meeting) regarding CDF disposal.

Larry Simone: No questions or concerns regarding proposed disposal at CDF.

Brett M.: Will check with Waterboard to receive a WDR for disposal at CDF.

Project #3: 11:05-11:30

Project name: Lower Newport Bay Maintenance Dredging

Additional Attendees: Chris Miller (Newport Beach), Jason Freshwater (Santa Ana Waterboard), Joe Ryan (Coastal), Adam Gale (Anchor QEA), Chris Osuch (Anchor QEA). Steve Capellino (Newport), Mark Cooke (Corps), Carol Roberts (USFWS).

NOTES:

Larry: Corps is not yet funded for maintenance dredging. 'Newport Channel' was excluded due to historical contamination and no dredging. SAP shows it as less than 5 feet shoaled high. Providing status of testing program for Newport Channel. SAP includes addressing EPA's questions about historical testing/sampling.

Steve: Last summer had provided initial plan throughout Bay except one area. Had presumed area would be contamination and that 2009 dredging probably did not affect levels. At end of sampling, they sampled 2-3 cores in Newport Channel to compare current concentrations to 2009 results. Results showed two of three lower than expected and more similar to other Newport Bay areas. In 2009 a large quantity of material had been removed and disposed of at Middle Harbor. So sampled area again at three locations and recent results show first Dredge Unit (eastern) was clean with low mercury. Did biological testing.

Melissa EPA: Wants historical past results from 15 reports into a table at elevations (Turning Basin and Main Channel and other sites) and associated bioassay results. Wants to compare the biological results when mercury is high or conclude if mercury is bioavailable or not. And add to final SAPR report.

Steve: Will add a table and include in the SAPR, as it's relevant to their request for suitability.

Melissa EPA: Want to also see mass loading rates for what would be going to Ocean Disposal. Mercury in Turning Basin, Main Channel, and new Newport Channel site, are outstanding questions. Other sites look suitable.

Larry Smith: Want to see table before report is finalized to ensure it meets regulatory format requirements.

Steve: Will be working on final SAPR and then plug in new Newport Channel data at the end.

Allan Ota: Mass loading is a large issue for potential bioaccumulation at deep ocean disposal site for mercury.

Larry Smith: Results did show lack of bioavailability and toxicity issues for biological testing. Want to discuss that likely at the May DMMT meeting.

Jason Freshwater (Waterboard): Have not heard anything since July 2018. Have not reviewed breaking up channel sampling. Concerns are there is an Investigative Order regarding sediment quality because large volume is being moved around: discharge, mobilization, 401.

Larry Smith: Many discussions were made without Corps too. But hopefully it's a removal of the contaminated material. Also all still needs to go through permit processes and NEPA.

Jason Freshwater: Want to learn more about benthic recovery rates from beneficial use impairment. Concerned that SAP/R are approved without Waterboard input. This project will be incorporated as a finding into a TMDL.

Melissa EPA: Since 401 TMDL applies too, applicant should copy all agencies on coordinations.

Allan Ota: Dredging in general is a net removal of contaminants for long-term benefit.

Melissa EPA: Can Corps share the email data request to change the composite with the Regional Waterboard.

Anchor QEA: Will share that with Waterboard/Jason.

Larry Simone: Okay with plan to coordinate further on historical info and results. Agrees that overall goal is to remove contaminated sediments from the marine environment and acknowledge short-term temporary effects.

Project #4: 11:30-12:00
Project name: San Diego Harbor Maintenance Dredging

Additional Attendees: Allan Monji (Waterboard).

NOTES:

Larry Smith: The Corps is proposing beneficial reuse in nearshore (not beach) of material instead of offshore disposal. But remaining material would be suitable for LA-5 disposal site. Material is proposed for placement at site in Figure B. The Corps shared an updated figure that clarified areas proposed for beneficial use. In 2008 only copper was elevated. In 2017 more elevations were found but no red flags. Did not see high PCB issues in bioaccumulation. Copper below thresholds. Need to look to confirm which portions are suitable for reuse.

Allan M.: Table 11 has a typo (middle number is 16 and should be 17) for individual cores. Bioassays look okay, sediment chemistry similar to past samples. Okay with beneficial reuse component for nearshore.

Allan Ota/Melissa Scianni: Material is suitable for LA-5 or nearshore placement as proposed.

Larry Simone: Agree material is suitable.

Allan Monji: Agree material is suitable.

LUNCH (12:00 – 1:00 PM)

Project #5: 1:00:1:30
Project name: Los Angeles River Estuary Maintenance Dredging

Attendees: Bonnie Rogers (Corps), Larry Smith (Corps), Justin Pearce (Corps), Melissa Scianni (EPA), Joe Ryan (Corps), Larry Simone (California Coastal Commission), Dan McCoy (Western Solutions), Carol Roberts (USFWS), Allan Ota (EPA), Janna Morimoto (POLB), Ken Kronsnoble. (Kinnetic).

NOTES:
Larry Smith: Corps stated a couple spots in Sand Trap would be left in place due to woody/plant debris, while a couple areas are suitable for nearshore placement, others would go to LA-2 site. Ken from Kinnetic said that several elutriates exceeded thresholds. Corps has identified several areas to be placed at Chaffee Island placement area.

EPA: Report analyzed water column results for LA-2 disposal not Chaffee Island (which is shallower). LPC calculations will need to be redone if Chaffee Islands is kept as a disposal location. EPA asked if a report will be prepared for Chaffee Island placement site? Corps responded that the EA/NEPA will include that in the model discussing grain size.

EPA: EPA was concerned with placing fine grains so close to the beach. This type of material is usually disposed of and not used for beach nourishment, because the material is not suitable as beach sand. Placement of fines this area appears to be disposal rather beneficial use for nearshore sand nourishment.

Larry Smith: Due to proposed placement of high fines that could disperse to beach, they may consider placing the material closer to Cherry Island where it would be expected to stay in place. It could also extend the existing subtidal berm that protects the eelgrass area.

EPA: EPA noted that on Table 40, Page 120 shows that Zinc and Chlorodane was very bioavailable in tissues. The chemistry for nearshore placement does not look suitable. Would like to talk more about what Chlorodane tissue concentrations mean for ocean disposal. EPA does not recommend LAR1 and LAR2 sample areas go into the nearshore because it is not clean sand. Sandtrap material with plant debris should not be placed at nearshore or in the ocean. Melissa will send Chlorodane TRV method (based on ERED and Corps ERDC memo) to everyone.

Larry Smith: The Corps will remove proposal of placement at the Chaffee Island site.

EPA: Sandtrap material is suitable for LA-2 except for the area containing plant debris material.

Larry Simone: Are also concerned about high percent fines going to nearshore unless receiving beach was also similar regarding fines. Does not concur Chaffee Island as suitable.

Larry Smith: Corps will look at ERDC modeling more and will coordinate separately with the Waterboard.

Project #6: 1:30-2:00
Project name: Port of Long Beach Queens Gate Maintenance Dredging

NOTES:
EPA: EPA concurred material is suitable for LA-2. Looks clean enough to go to nearshore. However, the same concerns with Chaffe Island discussed above also apply to fine grained materials from Queens Gate.
CCC: Agrees with EPA.
Larry Smith: Corps will coordinate separately with Waterboard.

EPA: Long Beach is not outside MPRSA territorial sea line (along breakwater), so Section 103 does not apply.

Project #7: 2:00-2:45
1) Project name: Long Beach Cruise Terminal Improvement at the Port of Long Beach

NOTES:
Brian: SAP was approved September 2018 which looked at a range of disposal options, focusing on LA-2.

Ken: Composites were separated differently than normal. One composite representing maintenance dredging and one representing new work. No water column or sediment toxicity. Bioaccumulation took up metals and PCBs, however TRV showed none would be exceeded. Believe sediment is suitable for placement at LA-2.

Allan Ota: There are 3 distinct shoals in project area. The bulk chemistry is very high. Are there any storm drains?

Brian: L.A. River to right of figure.

Allan Ota: Wants to look into the bulk chemistry further. Concerned about total PCB congeners above 100 and cannot discern horizontal gradient based on compositing. Small a and b are vertical composites. C1 and b are same order of magnitude. Will have internal discussion and get back to Long Beach Terminal folks.

Brian: Materials archive are separated by 31 vertical feet.

Ken: Have 1-2 archives per core so could combine bottom & top into one.

Allan Ota: Want to know if we can delineate a horizontal gradient with individual cores to see if there are any hotspots. If there are no hotspots, it does not appear there is bioavailability of contaminants

close to any TRVs. Comp little a is combo of a1 and a2, so cannot determine anything about horizontal distribution. Will discuss internally and get back to Long Beach folks within a week.

Larry Simone: Defers to EPA regarding potential for hotspots.

Larry Smith: Appears to be uniform with no hotspots.

Bonnie: Can come back to DMMT if you like, or coordinate outside if okay.

Antal: The EPA concurred that the material for Project #7 is suitable for LA-2.

Project #8: 2:45-3:15
1) Project name: Pier G, Berth G236 Sediment Sampling

NOTES:
Janna: SAP for Pier 235 & 236.

Carol Roberts: SAP suggests you can compare Table 5-1 concentrations, but those are below their reporting limits.

Melissa: Is this standard reporting limits for elutriates testing?

Carol: Regional Board determines threshold criterions.

Bonnie: You will need to check in with Waterboard/Jun separately.

Larry Simone: No comments.

Melissa: No comments.

Carol: Wants to hear back about Waterboard's response.

DMMT: Possible workaround could be to do a single water column bioassay with a fish species likely to be affected.
POLB: Will reach out to LARWQB on how the chronic toxicity criteria are applied.

Project #9: 3:15-3:45
1) Project: AMMUNITION PIER & TURNING BASIN at ANAHEIM BAY, SEAL BEACH

NOTES:
Allan Alcorn: SAPR chemical and biological results. DMM Units did grain size testing for placement at LA-2 and LA-3. Chemistry was clean except for 7A which is fine grain. Tier III no benthic or water

column toxicity. Did all DDT testing. All were below TRVs including Chlordane. Want to maximize reuse of material so tested grain size. Proposed placement offshore of Surfside beach. Are asking for as much as 45% fines in nearshore area.

Larry Simone: Difference between grain sizes of mole area and receiver beach.

Allan Alcorn: Looked at recent data of beach for Sunset/Surfside.

Melissa: Section 5.3 does not show receiver beach grain size data and want to see it.

Allan Alcorn: Table 11 shows all Army Corps Sunset/Surfside data. The SCOOP is a 10% document stating up to 45% fines can be considered. The envelope does not incorporate the extra 10%. Finest sample was 23%.

Melissa: Plus 10% is 33%. They are asking for another 10% up to 45%. Typically would not go another 10% beyond the already 10% addition.

Bonnie: Has past Corps placement been that fine?

Larry Smith: No because Corps has placed offshore sandy sediment in nearshore only.

Allan Alcorn: Depth is -35 to -20 ft. MLLW.

Larry Simone: Could you modify the dredged material to reduce the percent fines?

Allan Alcorn: Trying to use coarsest materials and upper dune habitats first. So fine grain material is remaining.

Melissa: Some of the composites don't have weighted averages so it is difficult to tell which ones may be finer grained than others for selecting material. Would DMMU 13 (44%) be used for nearshore)?

Allan Alcorn: Would use DMMU 13 in truck turnaround as fill layered with sandy material.

Melissa: Fines are less than 50%, so would not object to Section 404 permitting, but does not mean it's suitable. Otherwise if over, would use Ocean Dumping act which involves a designated site.

Allan Alcorn: Fits within grain size envelope.

Larry Simone: Would like to cut out certain ones to decrease fines at nearshore placement to get closer to 33%. Volume would be 160,000 CY and 87,000 CY.

Bonnie: Was Sunset dredging project at same location.

Kim Garvey: Was maybe 15-20% fines about was placed very close to proposed placement site and there is no hard bottom there.

Bonnie: May consider other considerations like NEPA, ESA snowy plover occupied, and grunion habitat.

Carol Roberts: Without a compelling reason that reuse would provide a benefit, unsure why we would stretch the rule. Do not believe there is a biological reason to place the material here.

Allan Alcorn: Cannot mix the material as an option.

Larry Smith: The beach receiver point is the finest in the entire area including downcoast.

Melissa: If we allow 45% fines exception here for no clear reason, then why would we not extend that to every other project by default. The samples identified is suitable for LA-2 and LA-3. Would like the report to clarify that 9 and 10 top areas not tested for the ocean because those are not even eligible for ocean disposal because they are above MHW line. 7A and 7B are not suitable. 3A and 5A for nearshore are open for discussion.

Kim: Sample 13 table shows going to nearshore but should be removed.

Larry Simone: Suitable and agree with EPA.

Bonnie: Unless there is a compelling reason to continue using the high percent fines, the consideration for placing 3A and 5A in the nearshore should be removed.

Larry Simone: 3A and 5A need to go out to LA-3.

Navy: Will incorporate edits suggested above. They are as follows:

Suitable LA-2/3: 3A, 4A, 5A, 6A, 7A, 9 bottom, 13, 14

Suitable nearshore: 4A, 6A, 9 bottom, 14, 10T, 11, 12

Not suitable nearshore (too fine): 3A, 5A, 7A, and 10B

Not tested for ocean: 9T, 10T, 10B, 11, 12, 15

END