

Notes for August 28, 2019
Southern California Dredged Material Management Team (SC-DMMT) Meeting
US Army Corps of Engineers - Los Angeles District (3 Pages)

Attendance (*phone):

Stephen Estes (Corps Regulatory)
Amanda Wagner (Corps Regulatory)
Gerry Salas (Corps Regulatory)
Joe Ryan (Corps Coastal)
Natalie Martinez (Corps Planning)
Chris Hayward (Corps Engineering)
Jeff Devine (Corps Engineering)
Melissa Scianni (USEPA)
Chris Miller (City of Newport Beach)
Adam Gale (Anchor QEA)
Chris Osuch* (Anchor QEA)
Steve Cappellino (Anchor QEA)
Theresa Stevens* (Corps Regulatory)
Robert Smith* (Corps Regulatory)
Larry Smith* (Corps Planning)
Alan Ota* (USEPA)
Larry Simon* (CCC)
L.B. Nye* (RWQCB)
Cris Morris* (RWQCB)
Jason Freshwater* (RWQCB)
Kat Prickett* (POLA)
Hugo Cisneros* (POLA)
Barry Snyder* (Wood Environment & Infrastructure Solutions)
Kimbrie Gobbi* (Wood Environment & Infrastructure Solutions)
Ken Kronschnabl* (Kinnetic Labs)

Announcements: None

Oceanside Harbor Maintenance Dredging Project

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Los Angeles District (Corps) is seeking approval from the Corps South Pacific Division to conduct advance maintenance dredging in the Approach Channel and Advance Maintenance Areas of Oceanside Harbor down to a depth of -30 feet Mean Lower Low Water (MLLW) from the current -25 feet MLLW. Prior sediment testing in these areas was down to -30 feet MLLW to allow the Corps the flexibility to dredge deeper, if warranted. Shallow water and groundings just prior to annual maintenance dredging makes this desirable from a safety point. It is estimated that an additional 80,000 cubic yards of material would need to be dredged in the first year, anticipated to be in 2020. Subsequent years would revert back to the same volumes as before as deepening would not result in any changes to sediment transport, so the infill would be the same for -30 feet MLLW as it was for -25 feet MLLW.

The Corps proposed that sediments down to -30 feet MLLW are suitable for beach placement. The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA), California Coastal Commission (CCC), and Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) concurred.

Los Angeles River Estuary (LARE) Dredging Project/Port of Long Beach (POLB) Queens Gate Dredging Project

A combined Sampling and Analysis Plan Report (SAPR) was prepared for both the LARE and POLB dredge sediments evaluation.

The SC-DMMT agreed with the revised final SAPR for LARE. The SAPR was revised to state that the Corps would be disposing of all sediment dredged from the next dredge event for LARE and Queen's Gate footprints at the offshore LA-2 Ocean Dredged Material Disposal Site (ODMDS). The SC-DMMT determined that sediment grain size was too fine to consider further for nearshore placement at the Chaffey Island site and that all sediment would need to be placed offshore at the LA-2 ODMDS.

Sediment along the South and West sides of the LARE Sand Trap contained mostly vegetative debris. As such, sediments from the area identified on Figure 12 and Figure 24 of the SAPR (55,700 cubic yards) would be left in place. Sediments in the vicinity of core LAREVC-18-15, also shown on Figure 24 of the SAPR (approximately 1,600 cubic yards), were not included in the composite sample for Tier III testing. These sediments are considered to be unsuitable for ocean disposal as well.

The USEPA, CCC, and RWQCB concurred with the suitability determination for ocean disposal with the above exceptions for the LARE.

The SC-DMMT agreed with the final SAPR for Queens Gate. The SAPR was revised to state that the Corps would be disposing of all sediment dredged from the next dredge event for LARE and Queen's Gate footprints at the offshore LA-2 ODMDS. The SC-DMMT determined that sediment grain size was too fine to consider further for nearshore placement at Chaffey Island site and that all sediment would need to be placed offshore at the LA-2 ODMDS.

The USEPA, CCC, and RWQCB concurred with the suitability determination for ocean disposal for the Queens Gate sediments.

Newport Harbor Federal Channel Dredging Project

The City of Newport Beach, in conjunction with the Corps, presented the proposed suitability determination for the federal channels project in Newport Harbor. Mr. Larry Smith (Corps) noted that although the Corps Planning Division supports the project and the proposed plan as presented, the Corps is still working with the USEPA on a separate track to further refine the sediment suitability for the LA-3 ODMDS. However, those discussions would not preclude any direction given by the SC-DMMT at this meeting.

The City and Corps presented a plan whereby sediment with an approximate range of 1.5 ppm Hg could be disposed at the LA-3 ODMDS based on the recent sediment characterization performed by the City. The remaining material would be disposed at an in-harbor Confined Aquatic Disposal (CAD) site at a location to be finalized by the City but likely between Lido Isle

and Bay Island. The City would also propose a Newport Harbor Sediment Management Plan, which would offer harbor-wide solutions for other non-federal sediment that may have future disposal needs.

All composite areas with the exception of NC1 were determined suitable for ocean disposal with the Entrance Channel also suitable for nearshore placement.

The USEPA concurred with the plan, including the Sediment Management Plan component, but noted that the City could contribute (some or all) to future, incremental LA-3 ODMDS sediment testing for Hg in the coming years. The RWQCB agreed with the proposed approach, and the CCC also agreed but inquired about the future project details such as depth, interim cap for CAD, source material, etc.

Wilmington Waterfront Pile Jetting Project

- Presentation given on the SAPR

- Questions:

- 1) Corps – Where is the hole in the piling located?
 - a. Port of Los Angeles (POLA) – Confirmed with their engineering group that the hole is in the center and exits the bottom center of the pile. The 2-3 inch pile jetting hose has a nozzle that directs the stream directly under the pile.
- 2) USEPA – Need better understanding of the concentrations found in the sediment - are they the same and/or representative of the entire Wilmington Waterfront area?
 - a. POLA would research this information.
- 3) USEPA – A lot of turbidity is generated from the removal of piles and not jetting activities. The action of removing them causes resuspension. USEPA’s understanding is that when the piles are pulled there is some liquefaction of the sediments and this causes resuspension. What is the potential for resuspension during jetting vs. extraction? Is there more of an issue with extraction vs. jetting?
- 4) USACE – liquefaction of piles as driven is a big concern for projects. Best Management Practices (BMPs) for extraction may need to be implemented.
- 5) CCC – Leaning towards requiring silt curtains during project activities.
- 6) Wood Environment & Infrastructure – Jetting only occurs when necessary. If POLA can install without jetting, they would do so. At depth, resuspension of sediments is less likely (too far down in the substrate).
- 7) RWQCB – How long does sediment stay resuspended during jetting?
 - a. POLA – The time required for jetting changes with each site, but they can ask their engineering group. It is unlikely to be more than a few hours.
 - b. Corps – It is probable that the smallest number of piles is put into place at one time so the impact would be reduced. 10 piles can be installed in a day or less during daylight hours. 34 may take a couple of days. Piles to be penetrated approximately 5 feet down. Worst case scenario is 100+ piles to install. Short term impacts are probably a few hours on any given day during installation.
- 8) Corps – Number of piles to be removed is 244 – is there a way that the sediments would be contained during removal?
 - a. POLA Engineering – Silt curtains would be set up around the entire project limits of in-water work. They would be placed around timber piles and decks and would also be installed during jetting and driving activities.

- b. Silt curtain plan can be provided to Corps and RWQCB. POLA would prepare the plan.
- 9) USEPA – In regards to a suitability determination, what is proposed is adequate, with the caveat that the Corps and RWQCB get more information about boom and silt curtain BMPs.
- 10) Corps – Silt curtains catch surface turbidity and not much is anticipated.
- 11) USEPA – It would be beneficial to have a summary of what the sediments are surrounding the project area. It would also be helpful to know if adjacent sediments are of similarly high COCs.
 - a. POLA can provide prior sediment characterization results for landside investigations but there have not been many offshore.
 - b. USEPA – Element of 404 permit that includes a section for historical information
- 12) To Do Items:
 - a. Summarize available sediment data in area.
 - b. Provide plan on how silt curtains would be implemented during project.