

**Notes for May 27, 2020**  
**Southern California Dredged Material Management Team (SC-DMMT) Meeting**  
US Army Corps of Engineers - Los Angeles District (5 Pages)

**Attendance** (WebEx):

Gabrielle Dodson (Corps Planning)  
Larry Smith (Corps Planning)  
Chris Chabot (Corps Planning)  
Kirk Brus (Corps Planning)  
Joe Ryan (Corps Coastal)  
John Goertz (Corps Coastal)  
Vanessa Navarro (Corps Regulatory)  
Amanda Wagner (Corps Regulatory)  
Robert Smith (Corps Regulatory)  
Allan Ota (USEPA)  
Melissa Scianni (USEPA)  
Carol Roberts (USFWS)  
Emily Duncan (RWQCB Region 4)  
Alan Monji (RWQCB, Region 9)  
Larry Simon (CCC)  
Loni Adams (CDFW)  
Andy Winje (City of Redondo Beach)  
Geraldine Trivedi (City of Redondo Beach)  
Stephen Campbell (Wood Environment & Infrastructure Solutions)  
Kimbrie Gobbi (Wood Environment & Infrastructure Solutions)  
Barry Snyder (Wood Environment & Infrastructure Solutions)  
Ron Noble (Noble Consultants)

**Announcements:**

- The next three DMMT meetings will be run by the Corps Planning Division due to staff shortages in the Regulatory Division

**King Harbor Maintenance Dredging Project**

Presenter: Kimbrie Gobbi

- Provide updates to March presentation, go over highlights in King Harbor SAP Report (attached to meeting invitation email), and give a response to comments from March meeting.

Overview of Project

- Maintenance dredging to provide safe vessel access and remove shoals that have accumulated along breakwater in King Harbor, South Redondo Beach Reach

- Outer Harbor: Depth -18 feet MLLW, ~45,500 cy (60,000 cy overdredge)
- Basin 3 Entrance Channel: -15 feet MLLW, ~800 cy (2,000 cy overdredge)
- 2 foot overdredge

- Proposed disposal option- Nearshore Placement site capacity

- In-harbor (up to 29,000 cy)
- Outer Harbor (up to 116,000 cy)

- SAP: presented to DMMT (July 24, 2019), approved (August 9, 2019), report presented (March 25, 2020), report revised and resubmitted (May 20, 2020), presentation (May 27, 2020).

#### Dredge Area

- Sediment samples were collected in the dredge areas and tested for chemical and physical parameters.
- Three vibracore samples were taken from each dredge site (in-harbor and outer harbor).
- Every core was divided into upper, middle, and lower sections. Each section was tested for geotechnical parameters and archived.

#### Placement Area

- Sediment samples were collected in the placement areas and composite tested for chemical and physical parameters.
- Five grab samples were taken from each placement site (in-harbor and outer harbor) and tested for geotechnical parameters (grain size compatibility for dredge materials).

#### Results of Sediment Samples

- Grain Size
  - Dredge materials meet grain size compatibility for nearshore placement. Majority of samples over 80% sand. Dredge materials meet compatibility requirements for outer harbor but not in-harbor due to the portion of fines not within 10% of in-harbor.
- Sediment Chemistry
  - No chemicals above ERM in Outer Harbor placement site or OH-A, OH-B, or OH-D dredge areas. Some elevated levels of pesticides (above ERM) at in-harbor placement site and OH-C and B3 dredge areas.
  - All samples are below RSL guideline values except for arsenic in all samples/locations. It is common naturally occurring metal in Southern California.
- Proposed Placement
  - Up to ~33,000 cy outer harbor and ~29,000 cy in-harbor.

#### History of Borrow site (Outer Harbor Placement Area)

- Extensive offshore sand reserves exist along the Southern California coastline and the areas have been studied since the early 1900s. See, Coast of California Storm and Tidal Waves Study, Los Angeles Region and Los Angeles County Regional Sediment Management Plan (CRSM) for recent studies.
- Borrow site previously approved by county and Corps as needed for beach replenishment, one of the most successful beach widening projects in Southern California (50 years stability) overcame shoreline erosion, widened beach to 250 feet when 1.4 million cy were dredged and placed on the beach. Placement at Borrow site occurred in 2000 (390,000 cy) and 2012 (82,000 cy) for marina Del Rey dredging projects.

#### Consideration of Direct Beach Placement

- Width of Redondo Beach is adequate to provide protection to nearby structures. Larger placement projects more successful to overcome shoreline erosion than smaller placement projects.
- There is no immediate need for placement at nearby beaches. South Redondo Beach Reach and Redondo Canyon Reach are considered stable.
- Sand dredged from King Harbor may contain stone intermixed with shoal material, as seen in 2004-2005 dredging event. Placement at the borrow site would need a more effective screening, prior to beach placement.

#### Biological Concerns Related to Redondo Submarine Canyon

- Screening would protect sediment with debris from being transported to Redondo Submarine Canyon, an ecologically sensitive area.
- Juvenile seabass habitat is primarily at head of Redondo Submarine Canyon (3/4 mi. away from placement site).
- Debris management to screen for stones, trash, and debris. This will reduce ecological impacts.
- Place dredged materials towards southern end of South Redondo Beach Reach.
- No impact to sensitive biological species such as broom tail sea bass identified within the in-harbor or outer harbor placement areas.

#### Summary in Response to Comments

- Placement options proposed in July 2019 were accepted by SC-DMMT in August and evaluated according to the approved SAP.
- There is a need for dredging at King Harbor but no need for sand placement at nearby segments of Redondo Beach.
- The outer harbor placement area/borrow site has been extensively studied, approved, and used by USACE and LA County for this purpose.
- The dredged sediment at the borrow site: reserves material for larger projects that would likely be more successful and result in less interruption to the public compared to multiple smaller projects, allows for better screening for debris and stones prior to direct beach placement, and allows for additional considerations to sensitive biological and ecological areas (Redondo Beach Canyon).

#### **Questions & Comments (paraphrased):**

- 1) USEPA, Allan Ota – The grain size data (composite data), the median grain size seems a lot smaller than the median grain size at borrow site. If this was a larger placement volume, I don't know that I could speak most expertly on this issue with regard to ecological impacts to the surrounding area. The grain size seems finer than what is already there.
  - a. WOOD, Kimbrie Gobbi – It is our understanding that the criteria must be 80% sand and be within 10% of the fines at the placement site. When we did our evaluation that seemed to be the case.
- 2) CDFW, Loni Adams - Are you putting a total of 65,000 cy dredged material in the outer harbor placement area?
  - a. Wood, Kimbrie Gobbi- We are proposing to place ~33,000 cy in the outer harbor and ~29,000 cy in-harbor. 62,000 cy total and splitting the material in the two placement options.

- 3) CDFW, Loni Adams – Offshore, north of the Topaz Groin was where giant seabass nursery ground was found. Have you looked into that and decided that the outer harbor placement area is not going to be part of that?
  - a. Wood, Kimbrie Gobbi – We found that the seabass were  $\sim\frac{3}{4}$  mi away from the northern boundary of the placement site. We are proposing to mitigate the effects on the juvenile seabass by placing material closer to the southern part of the placement site and limit the impacts, if any to the seabass.
- 4) CDFW, Loni Adams – Are they going to do a pre-construction survey before they do placement? Do another check?
  - a. Wood, Kimbrie Gobbi – It is typical to do another biological survey  $\sim$ 60 days before the dredging project occurs.
- 5) CDFW, Loni Adams – What are they going to be looking for in the biological survey?
  - a. Wood, Kimbrie Gobbi – In the placement area, due to raised concerns they will look for seabass, sensitive species of concern, and things included in the Chambers report (Appendix A of the revised SAPR).
- 6) CDFW, Loni Adams – Have they planned on taking the recommendations from the published paper Loni sent, and using one of the recommendations to dredge outside of the seabass spawning season. Is that possible?
  - a. Wood, Kimbrie Gobbi – I don't think that we considered that yet. We need to discuss it with the city to determine when the best timing will be.
  - b. CDFW, Loni Adams - If feasible, dredge outside of seabass spawning season. It is close by the area and could affect their spawning. They are a protected sensitive species (not listed).
  - c. Wood, Kimbrie Gobbi - Putting into consideration, try to target that time and environmental windows.
- 7) USACE, Larry Smith - What is the timeframe for seabass spawning?
  - a. CDFW, Loni Adams - I believe in the summer time. I will need to check again.
  - b. RWQCB Region 4, Emily Duncan – On the federal website, July - September is the timeframe for large seabass spawning.
- 8) USEPA, Allan Ota - Want to get clarity on the majority of the samples having greater than 80% sand, within 10% compatibility of the nearshore placement site. You are talking about the borrow sites themselves?
  - a. Wood, Kimbrie Gobbi -Correct
  - b. CDFW, Loni Adams - as long as the grain sizes are within 10% of one another, that is the standard of being acceptable.
- 9) CCC, Larry Simon – If the dredge material is suitable for beach or nearshore placement that is what the Coastal Act likes to see done. I want to give a heads up to the city that when they are applying for their coastal development permit, they will have to wrestle with the issue of why the material can't be screened and then placed on the beach.
- 10) USFWS, Carol Roberts – Where is the Regional Sediment Management Plan?
  - a. Wood, Kimbrie Gobbi - Sent email with access to the document.
- 11) CDFW, Loni Adams – How are you going to screen for garbage? Pre and post construction?

- a. Wood, Kimbrie Gobbi – It will be included in the Dredge or Debris Management Plan. Some use a grid to screen material, they basically place a grate on dredge to prohibit large materials from coming through, which includes trash and debris.
- 12) CDFW, Loni Adams – Are you going to monitor for debris, besides the screening?
- a. Wood, Kimbrie Gobbi – Yes, it will depend on the permit specifications and there may be some additional monitoring that will have to occur.
- 13) USEPA, Allan Ota – What size grate will be used to the screening of stones and so forth?
- a. Wood, Kimbrie Gobbi – That information has not been determined yet, I believe we will need to collaborate with the dredger.
- 14) USACE, Larry Smith – The objective for today was concurrence with the findings of the SAP Report and what the proposed suitability for placement and disposal options that have been selected. Are there any objections to the proposed sites?
- a. USEPA, Allan Ota – Acceptable, given the relatively small volume going to the outer site, even though the median grain size seems smaller. As long as resource agencies do not have big issues with it, management practices will be implemented to keep the material further from the head of the canyon.
  - b. CCC, Larry Simon - Abstain, the material is suitable physically and chemically. I will leave it to my commission colleagues to work with city to decide what is best for disposal options.
  - c. USACE, Larry Smith- It will get worked out during the permit process (in regards to Larry Simon’s comment).
  - d. RWQCB Region 4, Emily Duncan - Agree with Allan’s comments and also Loni’s.
  - e. USFWS, Carol Roberts - No objections to the plan.