

Agenda for October 22, 2025

Southern California Dredged Material Management Team (SC-DMMT) Meeting

(SLO, Santa Barbara, Ventura, L.A., Orange, San Diego Counties)

US Army Corps of Engineers - Los Angeles District

Microsoft Teams [Need help?](#)

[Join the meeting now](#)

Meeting ID: 993 951 869 121

Passcode: r9ou3gj7

Dial in by phone

[+1 503-207-9433,,973676935#](tel:+15032079433,,973676935#) United States, Beaverton

[Find a local number](#)

Phone conference ID: 973 676 935#

For organizers: [Meeting options](#) | [Reset dial-in PIN](#)

Agency Roll Call:

Max Roseman- Corps Lead for October meeting

Genevieve Holdridge- Corps Notetaker for October Meeting

Larry Smith- mentioned that Water Division Director, Tomas Torres (torres.tomas@epa.gov) or Deputy Regional Administrator, Cheree Peterson (peterson.cheree@epa.gov) from USEPA can make a suitability determination on Ocean Disposal if needed while USEPA staff (Melissa Scianni) are furloughed.

Joe Ryan- coastal engineering

Libby Lee- on for Emily Duncan LAWB

Jeremy CCC- on (Jules not on today)

Leslie- CDFW-on

NMFS, USFWS, EPA are furloughed.

Announcements and Questions: When are Corps to be furloughed?- Regulatory going to keep working though Oct. 31- but this may change. Planning has funding for 3 months (e.g., through December).

Roll Call and Agency Announcements: 10:00 – 10:10 AM

Project #1: 10:10-10:40 AM

- 1. Project name:** Pier J Deepening and Channel Widening
- 2. Applicant's name & affiliation:** Port of Long Beach (**Consultant WSP, Kimbrie Gobbi**)
- 3. Location (Lat/Long, City, County):** 33.737323, -118.183628, Long Beach, CA
- 4. Project type (Regulatory/ Navigation):** Regulatory
- 5. Corps project manager(s) who will attend:** Genevieve Holdridge
- 6. Purpose/topic (draft SAP, revised SAP, SAPR):** SAPR
- 7. Request for suitability determination? (y/n):** Yes
- 8. Documents provided (emailed, or FTP link):** FTP Link
- 9. Time needed (15, 30, 45 min?):** 30 Minutes

Notes:

Summary: POLB indicated that WASSS was preferred for sediment disposal with LA-2 as a second option. Sediments are suitable for both based on chemical and bioaccumulation tests.

Q&A:

USACE: What species were used for bioaccumulation tests? Also, where in WASSS would the sediment be stored?

POLB/Consultant: (As described in SAPR.) Sediment stored in South Lobe of WASSS.

CCC: Would beach nourishment be considered for this project?

POLB/Consultant: They did not consider it in depth because it would be difficult to separate the sand from finer sediments when dredging, the lithology indicates that they were too many fines (>10%), and also the color of the sand is darker than potential beach sites. Overall the quality of sand is not high enough. (The core logs have the Munsell colors.)

CCC: D50s are on finer side in the context and CCC agrees that sand from this project would not be high on the list for beach placement, but it could be used for beach placements at some beaches, for example Peninsula Beach. Email from EPA stated that

the EPA preferred that the sediment was not placed in LA 2 (would need more alternatives analysis)- but WASSS was ok. Port prefers to place the sediment in WASSS.

USACE: An option for beach placement is at Peninsular beach, though there could potentially be issues with eelgrass if the sediment was placed there. Previous eelgrass surveys show sparse eelgrass beds off of Peninsula Beach that could be affected by beach nourishment at this site. USACE Planning has reference grain size information for Peninsula Beach.

POLB/Consultant- Is the SAPR approved or does it require revisions? The Port made it clear it would prefer to store the sediment for its own beneficial reuse.

CCC- Would prefer that the POLB includes an analysis on the suitability determination of the sediment for Peninsula Beach nourishment to consider the sediment for beach for review by CCC and coordinate via email.

POLB/Consultant: will provide analysis and coordinate via email.

WB: Also good with this.

Corps: agrees

(EPA had deferred final decision to CCC and WB).

Project #2: 10:40- 11:10 AM

- 1. Project name:** Port of Hueneme Berths 4 and 5 Dredging
- 2. Applicant's name & affiliation:** Oxnard Harbor District
- 3. Location (Lat/Long, City, County):** 34.1485, -119.2047, Oxnard, Ventura County, CA
- 4. Project type (Regulatory/Navigation):** Regulatory
- 5. Corps project manager who will attend:** Crystal Huerta
- 6. Purpose/topic (draft SAP, revised SAP, SAPR):** SAP
- 7. Request for suitability determination? (y/n):** No
- 8. Documents provided (emailed, or FTP link):** FTP Link
- 9. Time needed (15, 30, 45 min?):** 30 min

Notes:

Anchor QEA- Port of Hueneme Berths 4 and 5 Dredging. Wharf deepening project

Chris Osuch and Jack Malone presenting

Oxnard Harbor District- Reg PM Crystal Huerta

Presentation addressing the SAP

Summary of Presentation:

- JM: Introducing Chris
- Deepening 4 and 5
- Dredging material will be characterized by beach placement
- Proposed sampling locations at Berths 4 and 5
- Physical and Chemical Analyses discussed

Q&A:

USACE: can you address EPA- comments to DMMT?

(EPA, Melissa Scianni's comments from 10/20: *Here are my comments on the Port Hueneme SAP. BLUF- I think the SAP needs changes and should be resubmitted. Since I won't be at the meeting, and this is CWA 404 disposal rather than MPRSA disposal, I defer to the other DMMT agencies for approval and review of the revised document.*

What is the current authorized depth? -35' MLLW? Do they have approval from the Corps to dig a trench and place material within the federal channel? What is the plan for material that is not suitable for unconfined aquatic disposal? Berth 5 is adjacent to an area in the federal channel that had contaminated sediment. It is possible that some of the material in Berth 5 will be unsuitable for the trench or placement on top of the CAD. Since this is in a known area of contamination, EPA requests that individual cores be analyzed for the Berths. Even though the volume is not that large, they should consider doing separate composites for Berth 4 and 5. It is likely that Berth 5 is more contaminated and mixing that material with Berth 4 could result in the entire volume being found unsuitable (e.g., if the amphipod test fails. The Corps 2016/17 data and core locations for Hotspot 3 needs to be added to Appendix B. DMMT needs to see how elevated the chemistry was in the unsuitable area adjacent to Berth 5).

Consultant: The EPA is referring to past dredging projects including the federal deepening project and other, prior instances that were not suitable for beach replacement. The sediment material for Wharf 1 was determined to be suitable for near shore, and Wharf 2 maybe have suitable sediment. The sampling strategy we used was based on volume and geography with regards to where dredging would occur. Agreed to add two stations to address EPA comments including dividing areas 4 and 5 into two dredge units, place an additional station between stations 1 and 2, move the other sample sites a bit to provide better sampling resolution, and archive materials from individual cores.

USACE: Are you planning to place sediment in the trench with capping if the sediment is not suitable for beach/nearshore placement?

Consultant: The trench placement is a backup plan, but with no cap or place it in CAD site.

USACE: The sediment on ocean floor surface has not been suitable in the past, but underneath may be more suitable. The CAD is armored with boulders correct? To protect material from Navy large vessels moving through area.

Consultant: Regarding ocean floor surface, the EPA mentioned hotspot 3 (near Berth 5) and four other hotspot areas holding former disposed dredged material, were all removed in either 2009 or 2021. All hotspot/unsuitable material was subsequently removed (dredged) and then placed in the CAD site and covered with clean material. The anchoring in the CAD area is only located in the lower left portion of the CAD, it does not cover the entire area. Clarification on hotspot- shows Cad site- which holds former disposed dredged material. 2009 removed all hotspot removed – to -35 feet 4 and 5 dredged and unsuitable mat placed in Cad and covered with clean material. Another fed channel hotspot 3 (with four other areas) was investigated in 2016 and the pcb concentrations were found to be too high based on ecological risks potential. These contaminated sediments were dredged in 2021 and placed in CAD and covered with clean materials.

CCC: The EPA requested that the individual cores to be analyzed- will you be providing this higher resolution analysis?

Consultant: As the hotspots/unsuitable material have been removed and managed, prefer to analyze the composite cores first, and if elevated concentrations (e.g. of pcb) are observed, then plan to analyze the individual cores.

USACE: It is recommended to test all cores for contaminants of concern for the pcb issue, in order to make sure issue is resolved. It is not clear how deep the pcb contamination goes. (It would not be necessary to run the full suite of tests on each individual core).

Consultant: With three stations in each composite and two composites would be analyzed, it is already intensive. Further, all areas that were found elevated of certain contaminants have been managed in 2009 and 2021 (it was dredged down to design depth of -35 and thus all contamination associated with pcb was removed). Wharf 1 has already been determined to be suitable, only necessary additional analyses needed to determine if Wharf 2 would be suitable.

CCC- We should coordinate with EPA on this. Anchor should provide written responses to EPA comments to all DMMT members and a revised SAP.

USCE: What is timeline on that to provide comments and revised SAP. For 404 disposal the EPA usually defers to WB and CCC.

CCC/Consultant/USACE and WB: All agree that Consultant will revise figures, address EPA's comments, and update Appendix B and submit to the agencies for review.

Wrap Up & General Discussion: 11:10- 11:15 AM

Attendance list:

Roseman, Max E CIV USARMY CESPL (USA) named the meeting SC-DMMT Meeting For October 22, 2025.

Holdridge, Genevieve S CIV (USA) and 26 others were invited to the meeting.

Granade, Jan S (Steve) CIV USN NAVFAC SW SAN CA (USA) (Guest) and Vartanian, Valerie CIV USN NAVB VCTY PT MUGU CA (USA) (Guest) were invited to the meeting.

Chat:

Susim Gedam - Port of Hueneme

Leslie Hart, CDFW

Larry Smith, USACE Planning

Caleb Lodge, USACE engineering

Jeremy Smith, CCC

Loriana Tonner, Port of Long Beach

Libby Lee, LA Regional Water Resource Control Board

Kimbrie Gobbi, WSP

Lucia Ayala, Port of Hueneme

Giles Pettifor, Port of Hueneme

Joe Ryan, USACE engineering

luis sepulveda, USACE engineering