

Notes for August 25, 2021
Southern California Dredged Material Management Team (SC-DMMT) Meeting
US Army Corps of Engineers - Los Angeles District (4 pages)

Attendance (WebEx):

Stephen Estes (Corps Regulatory)
Lia Protopapadakis (Corps Regulatory)
Theresa Stevens (Corps Regulatory)
Amanda Wagner (Corps Regulatory)
Jim Mace (Corps Regulatory)
Jenny Aleman-Zometa (Corps Regulatory)
Emma Ross (Corps Regulatory)
Toni Nino (Corps Regulatory)
Leison Bernstein (Corps Regulatory)
Larry Smith (Corps Planning)
Kirk Brus (Corps Planning)
Kym Howo (Corps Planning)
Joe Ryan (Corps Coastal)
Lily Schaffer (Corps Engineering)
Luis Sepulveda (Corps Engineering)
Allan Ota (USEPA)
Juliette Chausson (USEPA)
Carol Roberts (USFWS)
Loni Adams (CDFW)
Cassidy Teufel (CCC)
Mouhsen Habib (City of Long Beach)
Jacquelyn Chung [Coastal Permit Specialist (CPS)]
Jorge Tomas (Pacific Maritime Group)
Scott Bodensteiner (Haley & Aldrich)

Announcements: Theresa Stevens (Corps) informed the SC-DMMT that the Sampling Analysis Plan/Results (SAP/R) Guidelines are now available at https://www.spl.usace.army.mil/Portals/17/docs/regulatory/2021_Corps-EPA_SAPR-G_FINAL-with-figures.pdf.

86 Linda Isle Dredging Project, Newport Beach, CA

Presentation provided to the SC-DMMT.

Discussion:

1. Comment from Allan Ota (USEPA)- The temporary retaining area for the dredged sediment is under the Pacific Coast Highway (PCH) Bridge. Is there enough space to accommodate the material? Will the return water enter the Bay at that location?

Response from Jacquelyn Chung (CPS)- Yes, there is ample space to temporarily place the sediment at that location. Return water would enter the Bay at that location and a silt curtain would be used to contain the sediment.

2. Comment from Allan Ota (USEPA)- At a minimum, there will need to be an analysis of sediment chemistry and under the Clean Water Act, there is some flexibility on bioassay testing, so perhaps amphipod testing will be enough.
3. Comment from Cassidy Teufel (CCC)- Does your client have ownership or rights to use the property for dewatering the dredged sediment?

Response from Jacquelyn Chung (CPS)- The client will need to obtain permission from Caltrans and the City of Newport Beach to use that area.

Response from Cassidy Teufel (CCC)- This might be a challenge if those entities are not amenable to the proposal.

4. Comment from Carol Roberts (USFWS)- Has the proposed upland disposal facility in Palm Springs approved the disposal of the material? This is relatively fine-grained material, not sand.

Response from Jacquelyn Chung (CPS)- Grain size and chemistry were provided to the disposal facility by the dredger. Some issues needed to be addressed, but they did not seem concerned about the material.

Response from Larry Smith (Corps)- Some facilities will not accept salty sediment, so I recommend checking on that as well.

5. Comment from Loni Adams (CDFW)- I visited the dewatering site recently for another project. The alignment of the upcoming Newport Bay Bridge Pump Station and Force Mains Replacement Project is nearby, and they are planning to excavate a trench. Eelgrass is also present in the area. In addition, the Upper Newport Bay Nature Preserve is north of the PCH Bridge. I am unsure whether the proposed dewatering area is completely dry and there is concern that some sediment may discharge into the water at high tide.
6. Comment from Jacquelyn Chung (CPS)- I was previously informed the dredged material would not be a good candidate for ocean disposal. Is that accurate?

Response from Allan Ota (USEPA)- Based on the chemistry data provided in the table, that is correct. Additional testing would be required before considering ocean disposal as an option. This would include bioaccumulation testing, which is a 28-day process. It may be worth doing the testing for ocean disposal if more residents have the same need as there would be shared costs.

7. Comment from Jacquelyn Chung (CPS)- It would also be advantageous to have a broader discussion on how to manage these types of sediment issues throughout Newport Bay.

Response from Stephen Estes (Corps)- I recommend contacting the City of Newport Beach Harbor Resources Division to begin those discussions. It could be a consideration for the next iteration of Regional General Permit (RGP) 54.

Response from Cassidy Teufel (CCC)- I agree that starting discussions on the next iteration of RGP 54 would be a good idea.

8. Comment from Allan Ota (USEPA)- Contacting the City of Newport Beach would be a good idea. They are developing plans for a CAD and you may want to check with them on whether the sediment from this project could be considered for disposal there.

Response from Jacquelyn Chung (CPS)- I spoke with the City and my impression was that the CAD option would not be available in the short term.

Response from Larry Smith (Corps)- I recommend contacting Chris Miller at the City of Newport Beach on that. They are currently pursuing permits for the CAD and it could be permitted shortly. The purpose of the CAD is to accommodate sediments such as are found in projects like this one as well as projects in the federal channels.

9. Comment from Carol Roberts (USFWS)- For the original project proposal, I recommend checking on the Newport Bay Bridge Pump Station and Force Mains Replacement Project, which was discussed at the SC-DMMT meeting last month, in case there is a conflict. If so, you may want to consider clamshell dredging instead of suction dredging.
10. Comment from Jacquelyn Chung (CPS)- Would the RGP 54 threshold of 18 ppb of DDT in the Z-layer be applicable under an individual permit application?

Response from Allan Ota (USEPA)- For cleaning up the dredge footprint, sampling would need to be conducted to determine the depth where the DDT concentration does not exceed 18 ppb. Since the RWQCB is not on the call, please check with them regarding permitting requirements.

11. Comment from Cassidy Teufel (CCC) and Larry Smith (Corps)- Caulerpa was recently found in Newport Bay, so it is considered an infested system. This changes the way Caulerpa surveys should be conducted in this location (the more extensive survey protocol should be conducted).

12. Comment from Allan Ota (USEPA)- To be clear, if you decide to pursue the proposed dredging project, as proposed, you should coordinate a draft SAP with the DMMT at a subsequent meeting.
13. Comment from Loni Adams (CDFW)- Are you sure the dewatering site is above mean high tide?

Response from Jacquelyn Chung (CPS)- Yes, from my understanding, it is. However, we may need to find another site based on the information provided today. Thank you for your comments and suggestions.

14. A meeting attendee stated the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) was not in attendance and the project proponent should coordinate with the respective RWQCB for review and comment on the project.