

Notes for July 28, 2021
Southern California Dredged Material Management Team (SC-DMMT) Meeting
US Army Corps of Engineers - Los Angeles District (7 pages)

Attendance (WebEx):

Stephen Estes (Corps Regulatory)
Nickie Camisa (Corps Regulatory)
Lia Protopapadakis (Corps Regulatory)
Theresa Stevens (Corps Regulatory)
Gerry Salas (Corps Regulatory)
Larry Smith (Corps Planning)
Kirk Brus (Corps Planning)
Lily Schaffer (Corps Engineering)
Luis Sepulveda (Corps Engineering)
Victoria Jurado (Corps Engineering)
Joe Ryan (Corps Coastal)
John Goertz (Corps Coastal)
Allan Ota (USEPA)
Juliette Chausson (USEPA)
Carol Roberts (USFWS)
Emily Duncan (RWQCB)
Maher Zaher (RWQCB)
Loni Adams (CDFW)
Jessie Lane (CDFW)
Andrew Brown (OCSD)
Dickie Fernandez (OCSD)
Janna Morimoto (POLB)
James Vernon (POLB)
Dylan Porter (POLB)
Harmik Aghanian (Arcadis)
Adam Gale (Anchor QEA)
Steve Cappellino (Anchor QEA)
Andrew Martin (Anchor QEA)
Ken Kronschnabl (Kinnetic Labs)
Jorge Tomas (Pacific Maritime Group)
Walt Jellison (Pacific Dredge and Construction)

Announcements: Allan Ota (USEPA) reminded the SC-DMMT that the London Convention requires USEPA to track dredged material disposal volumes at ocean dredged material disposal sites (ODMDS). Data and information on disposal operations in 2020 are due soon.

Newport Bay Bridge Pump Station and Force Mains Replacement Project

Presentation provided to the SC-DMMT.

Discussion:

1. Comment from Loni Adams (CDFW)- How did you decide on the dredging alternative moving forward? CDFW would prefer a feasible alternative that has the least environmentally damaging impacts, which we consider to be microtunneling on the south alignment, not dredging. There is eelgrass and eelgrass habitat that would be impacted by dredging.

Response from Harmik Aghanian (Arcadis)- The alignment south of the Pacific Coast Highway (PCH) bridge was chosen because we found that the original preferred alignment north of the PCH bridge, and the alignment underneath the bridge, were not feasible. Two alternatives (dredging and microtunneling) for the south alignment are still being analyzed. The microtunneling alternative may still be a viable option as we are in the planning phase and have not yet settled on the dredging alternative. We are approximately two years from construction but want to ensure that dredging is a viable option. We received CDFW's preferences during the EIR process.

2. Comment from Allan Ota (USEPA)- Some of the areas with refusal occurred well short of - 19 feet Mean Lower Low Water (MLLW). That indicates the possibility of large amounts of shell hash, which would not be suitable for the LA-3 ODMDS. Nearshore placement may be a better option.

Response from Ken Kronschnabl (Kinnetic Labs)- Yes, the sediment seemed dense, so we may be underestimating the amount of shell hash.

3. Comment from Allan Ota (USEPA)- As for sidecasting the dredged material, you will need to backfill the dredged area, so this alternative may be a good option.

Response from Ken Kronschnabl (Kinnetic Labs)- Yes, but we are also anticipating a surplus of dredged material.

4. Comment from Loni Adams (CDFW)- Please coordinate with the CDFW in the future to discuss the two alternatives you are considering, because the CDFW is concerned how the alternatives may impact the Marine Protected Area (Upper Newport Bay State Marine Conservation Area) adjacent to the Project pipe alignment.
5. Comment from Harmik Aghanian (Arcadis)- Is the Corps planning to dredge this area as part of the Lower Newport Bay Maintenance Dredging Project?

Response from Larry Smith (Corps)- Due to funding restraints, we are primarily focused on dredging the federal channel. This area most likely would not be dredged; however, we are not certain at this point.

6. Comment from Carol Roberts (USFWS) and Larry Smith (Corps)- Due to the recent Caulerpa discovery near the Entrance Channel to Newport Bay, an infestation-level Caulerpa survey should be conducted rather than a reconnaissance-level survey.
7. Comment from Juliette Chausson (USEPA)- Were there any challenges or deviations to holding time?

Response from Ken Kronschnabl (Kinnetic Labs)- We do not think there were any challenges or deviations.

Port of Long Beach Channel 2 Sediment Management Project

Presentation provided to the SC-DMMT.

Comments:

1. Comment from Juliette Chausson and Allan Ota (USEPA)- On the sampling map, please describe the bathymetry around the core locations. We want to ensure the locations are representative. The figure only shows the -50-foot contour, so more details would be helpful.

Response from Andrew Martin (Anchor QEA)- The bathymetry is relatively uniform. Mostly between -49 and -50 feet MLLW. The northeast corner is a little deeper, probably due to tug scour. We can update the figure.

2. Comment from Larry Smith (Corps)- Please add a compass rose and scale bar as well.

Response from Andrew Martin (Anchor QEA)- We will do that.

3. Comment from Juliette Chausson (USEPA)- What dredging equipment would be used?

Response from Janna Morimoto (POLB)- We have yet to finalize the details but most likely a mechanical clamshell dredge.

4. Comment from Juliette Chausson (USEPA)- Most projects have 2 feet of allowable overdredge. Does the mechanical clamshell dredge allow for less overdredge?

Response from Larry Smith (Corps)- Usually 1-2 feet of overdredge is allowed due to errors in dredging precision, but this is a calm, protected environment, so 1 foot of overdredge should be possible.

5. Comment from Allan Ota (USEPA)- If this project would include ocean disposal, we would want to see 2 feet of overdredge allowance. However, since the project is to remove

contaminated sediment and cover the newly exposed surface with clean sediment, this is less of an issue.

6. Comment from Allan Ota (USEPA)- Where will the clean cover sediment come from and has it been characterized?

Response from Andrew Martin (Anchor QEA)- The source has not yet been identified. Appropriate tests will be conducted on the sediment.

7. Comment from Carol Roberts (USFWS)- When might we see the development of these aspects of the project?

Response from Janna Morimoto (POLB)- As we transition into the design phase, we will have more information available. Are the details needed to approve the SAP moving forward?

Response from Carol Roberts (USFWS)- No, the SAP is still okay.

8. Comment from Emily Duncan (RWQCB)- We are happy to work with the POLB on this as more details become available.
9. Comment from Larry Smith (Corps)- POLB should reach out to the California Coastal Commission (CCC) since they are not on the call today.
10. Comment from Loni Adams (CDFW)- Where will you place dredged sediment?

Response from Janna Morimoto (POLB)- Two options: CAD site or POLB landfill.

11. Note: Following the SC-DMMT meeting, POLB provided the USEPA with a revised figure showing detailed bathymetry and requested concurrence on the sediment sampling locations. The USEPA suggested minor changes to the sampling locations, which POLB accepted. The USEPA also noted that if equipment and conditions allow for a 1-foot overdredge allowance, that would be acceptable. POLB will include this into the project design and bid specifications.
12. Note: Following the SC-DMMT meeting, POLB also followed up with the CCC. The project will likely be subject to a Harbor Development Permit, evaluation under CEQA/NEPA, and demonstration of compliance with the Port Master Plan. The CCC has no comments to provide on the SAP at this time.

City of Newport Beach Confined Aquatic Disposal Facility Construction Project

Presentation provided to the SC-DMMT.

Comments:

1. Comment from Carol Roberts (USFWS)- How often does this area need to be dredged? I am trying to get a sense of when the CAD will accumulate enough sediment to require dredging and the CAD's capacity to cover dredging in the future.

Response from Adam Gale (Anchor QEA)- Between 2018-2020, about 40,000 cubic yards accumulated. About a 2- to 3-inch difference per year. The proposed CAD final surface elevation has been designed to -20 feet MLLW as compared to the currently authorized design depth of -15 feet MLLW. The City of Newport Beach may want to deepen Newport Harbor at some point in the future, although there are no plans to do so right now.

2. Comment from Carol Roberts (USFWS)- So barring some change, the differential will remain approximately 5 feet?

Response from Adam Gale (Anchor QEA)- Correct.

3. Comment from Carol Roberts (USFWS)- Can the northeast corner of the proposed CAD maintain structural integrity due to its proximity to the federal channel?

Response from Larry Smith (Corps)- The federal channel is overbuilt for the types of vessels that traverse that area. We just need enough room over the CAD for clear vessel passage.

Response from Allan Ota (USEPA)- The side slope is less steep than the standard. They are trying to minimize any potential for sloughing.

4. Comment from Allan Ota (USEPA)- We are happy to see the progress of this project. It can solve the issue of contaminant loading. The design of the CAD to accommodate the sediment with higher concentrations reduces the volume of highly contaminated sediment from approximately 500 kg to approximately 100 kg, which is substantial.

5. Comment from Larry Smith (Corps)- An overdredge allowance is usually required for navigation dredging but should not be required in the CAD.

Response from Adam Gale (Anchor QEA)- Understood. It just provides some flexibility to achieve the desired depth. It can be removed, but it does provide flexibility.

6. Comment from Carol Roberts (USFWS)- Caulerpa surveys will be needed due to the recent Caulerpa infestation in parts of Newport Bay.

Response from Adam Gale (Anchor QEA)- Understood. The final EIR recognized the presence of Caulerpa. A survey will be conducted as required by permits.

7. Comment from Loni Adams (CDFW)- The CAD area has up to 24.1% fine material, and you are recommending either ocean disposal or nearshore placement. Is the latter still being considered?

Response from Adam Gale (Anchor QEA)- Yes.

Response from Loni Adams (CDFW)- The percentage of fine material seems a little high for that.

Response from Adam Gale (Anchor QEA)- A grain size envelope was developed, and the percentage of fine material is within that envelope.

8. Comment from Allan Ota (USEPA)- USEPA is okay with what was presented but requests the final volumes and a map of the areas to be dredged.

Response from Adam Gale (Anchor QEA)- These are shown on slide 5 of the presentation.

Response from Allan Ota (USEPA)- Those were good as an overview but we are requesting more specificity.

Response from Adam Gale (Anchor QEA)- We will include a Kriging map with core locations.

9. Comment from Carol Roberts (USFWS)- Allan, any thoughts on using 1.5 mg/kg instead of 1.0 mg/kg?

Response from Allan Ota (USEPA)- We accept 1.5 mg/kg for ocean disposal.

10. Comment from Larry Smith (Corps)- Is the City of Newport Beach planning to dredge federal channels at their own expense?

Response from Adam Gale (Anchor QEA)- I cannot comment of the financial commitment as that would need to be a separate discussion with the City.

Response from Larry Smith (Corps)- The Corps is looking into potentially dredging other areas of Newport Bay, but none of these areas have been confirmed. The City may choose to do some of this dredging. We are focusing on areas without mercury issues.

Suitability determination:

Allan Ota (USEPA)- We have made a preliminary suitability determination, but final ocean disposal approval requires the other information requested today and will be reviewed during the permit process.

Larry Smith (Corps)- The CCC is not on the call today so they will need to be followed up with.

Maher Zaher (RWQCB)- We are providing our preliminary concurrence here and the final concurrence would come as part of the permitting process.

Gerry Salas (Corps)- Corps Regulatory is also providing a preliminary suitability concurrence.