

## Agenda for April 22, 2026

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

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

US Army Corps of Engineers - Los Angeles District

---

#### **Reoccurring Meeting Information:**

Microsoft Teams [Need help?](#)

[Join the meeting now](#)

Meeting ID: 993 127 124 306

Passcode: qy3TY9HN

---

#### **Dial in by phone**

[+1 503-207-9433,,887974777#](tel:+15032079433887974777) United States, Beaverton

[Find a local number](#)

Phone conference ID: 887 974 777#

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

---

#### **Roll Call and Agency Announcements: 10:00 – 10:05 AM**

Genevieve Holdridge from the Corps hosted the SC-DMMT meeting and Robert Smith from Corps Regulatory took notes. Eric Sweeney was not present for this project. Genevieve stated that the SC-DMMT notes would be posted on our website once reviewed by the DMMT staff/agencies and she asked for announcements. Jeremy Smith said he would be out for a month on parental leave. Genevieve then reminded everyone that this DMMT would start at 10 (instead of 9 am) given there were only four projects but future DMMTs would be started at either 9 or 10 depending on the number of projects. She asked for comments and there were none. She then asked for a call of the attending agencies in attendance and received the following response:

Corps: Robert Smith, Kim Lyons, Kasey Sirkin, Joe Ryan, Tiffany Armenta, Genevieve Holdridge, Natalie Martinez, Brian Kim

Other agencies: Chloe Grotheist (USN)

EPA: Melissa Scianni

CRWQCBs: Alan Monji, Chloe Seifert, Emily Duncan, Hossein Shahrokhnia, Claudia Tenoria

NMFS: No NMFS POC was on this DMMT, but Andrea Dell'Apa provided comments on certain SAPs after the DMMT

No USFWS staff attended this DMMT.

CA Coastal Commission (CCC): Jeremy Smith, Jules Kelly

Cal. Dept. of Fish and Wildlife: Leslie Hart

Other persons: Peter Arth and Kasey Sk: Nautilus Environmental, Leslie Meyerhoff, Dan McCoy NV5, Greg Heuron from Coastal Frontiers Corp., Chris Osuch

### **Project #1: 10:05 – 10:35 AM**

- 1) **Project name:** San Clemente Offshore Sand Source Investigation-Phase 2
- 2) **Applicant's name & affiliation:** Greg Heuron, Coastal Frontiers Corp/Chris O'Day, Moffatt and Nichol
- 3) **Location (Lat/Long, City, County):** Anaheim Bay to Camp Pendleton, Orange County and San Diego County
- 4) **Project type (Regulatory/ Navigation):** Offshore Sand Exploration Only
- 5) **Corps project manager(s) who will attend:** Eric Sweeney
- 6) **Purpose/topic (draft SAP, revised SAP, SAPR):** Addendum to Phase 1 SAP
- 7) **Request for suitability determination? (y/n):** No
- 8) **Documents provided (emailed, or FTP link):** Emailed
- 9) **Time needed (15, 30, 45 min?):** 30 min

Gregory presented the project and discussed the project which is for the City of San Clemente and gave a project overview of the Phase II project (addendum to Phase 2 SAP) and various parameters including the review of 13 areas and 11 borrow area sites for San Clemente beaches identified for potential exploration. The sites included Surfside Sunset, Huntington Beach, Santa Ana River, Dana Point, Doheny, North Beach, San Clemente south, San Mateo Point, San Onofre, Camp Pendleton, and the Santa Margarita River. The Phase I exploration explored 6 sites and had determined that some of the material was unsuitable, promising, or suitable. The Phase 2 project which included both grain size and bulk chemistry analysis and totaled up to 47.4 mcy was presented as spanning over an area more than 3,380 acres. Chris O'day then presented the SAP which included a 20 ft. sampling depth with 2 ft. OD but that the project had not been fully laid out yet and wanted comments from the agencies. After his presentation Genevieve asked for comments.

Claudia from the CRWQCB asked about the core compositing and the total amount of disposal and Greg responded that the schedule for Phase II that there would be one composite sample for each beach site. The total yardage was shown on each borrow site

in the presentation. Greg also stated that the sites would be used for beach nourishment throughout Orange County and would greatly enhance those economies.

Genevieve then asked the agencies whether the SAP was approved and received the following response:

EPA: SAP approved

CCC- Jeremy had no further comment.

CRWQCB: Alan Monji and Claudia both approved the SAP

CDFW: Leslie had no comments

Genevieve then stated that the SAP was approved.

### **Project #2: 10:35- 11:05 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):** 34.148780°/-119.204912°, Port Hueneme, Ventura County
  - 4) Project type (Regulatory/ Navigation):** Regulatory
  - 5) Corps project manager(s) who will attend:** Crystal Huerta
  - 6) Purpose/topic (draft SAP, revised SAP, SAPR):** SAPR
  - 7) Request for suitability determination? (y/n):** Y
  - 8) Documents provided (emailed, or FTP link):** Submitted via FTP using DoD SAFE
- Time needed (15, 30, 45 min?):** 30 min

The Oxnard Harbor District and Jack Malone was the applicant for this action and Chris Osuch presented the SAPR for the Port of Hueneme Berths 4 and 5 Dredging project. Project was to complete the harbor-wide deepening initiative, ensuring safe navigation for deeper-draft vessels and increasing cargo efficiency. Dredged material was characterized to determine suitability for beach or nearshore placement, as well as unconfined open-water placement within a trench excavated in the Federal Channel or in the already-permitted confined aquatic disposal (CAD) site. Sediment that would be dredged to create the trench was characterized to determine suitability for beach or nearshore placement with total volume of 25,300 cy over 2.7 acres for Berths 4 and 5 and 36,100 cy over 3.3 acres at the Federal Channel trench.

Chris mentioned that grain size and bulk chemistry analysis was done with a bioassay for placement in the trench or the Confined Aquatic Disposal (CAD) and that the grain size was compatible for nearshore and beach sites and that the chemistry results indicated

that all values were less than the ERMs in the Corps SAP guidelines. Bioassay results for solid phase test results were also ok with survival rate of test species. Chris said that based on the results of testing, sediment from Berths 4 and 5 and the proposed trench are recommended as suitable for beach or nearshore placement. Also because sediment from Berth 5 has a slightly higher percentage of fine-grained material, it is recommended that this material is placed within the swash zone at Hueneme Beach (not above the high tide line on the beach) or at the Nearshore Placement Site and sediment from Berths 4 and 5 is recommended as suitable for placement within the harbor at the proposed trench or within the already-permitted CAD site.

Melissa from EPA asked whether dredging of the trench would be done if the Berth 4 and 5 material was all found suitable. Chris confirmed the trench would only be dredged if it's needed for a disposal site. Melissa noted that the grain size in Berth 5 seemed more suitable for nearshore placement and that the chemistry was also slightly elevated, although the toxicity all passed. Jules Kelly agreed with Melissa that the fines were high with ERL exceedances and nearshore disposal was ok with no direct beach placement. Genevieve asked about feasibility of disposal in the swash zone and Jack said it was feasible.

Genevieve asked if there were any questions then asked the agencies whether the SAPR was approved and received the following response:

EPA: No objections for SUAD for nearshore or swash zone placement.

CCC- Jules was ok with the SUAD and DMMUs were ok for only nearshore placement or placement below swash zone only.

CRWQCB: Chloe agreed with CCC

CDFW: Leslie had one comment all placement in the swash zone and that all work be done outside the grunion season.

Genevieve then stated that SAPR was approved with agencies comments noted above.

### **Project #3: 11:05 – 11:35 AM**

- 1) **Project name:** Point Mugu Sand Management Investigation - Phase 3 SAP
- 2) **Applicant's name & affiliation:** Captain Daniel W. Brown (NAVFAC/Naval Base Ventura County) with Jan Granade and Valerie from the Navy Base staff, represented by Nick Buhbe (Mission Environmental)
- 3) **Project type (Regulatory/Navigation):** Regulatory
- 4) **Corps project manager who will attend:** Antal Szijj/Genevieve Holdridge
- 5) **Purpose/topic (draft SAP, revised SAP, SAPR):** SAP

- 6) **Request for suitability determination? (y/n):** NO  
7) **Documents provided (emailed, or FTP link):** email  
8) **Time needed (15, 30, 45 min?):** 45 minutes

The Point Mugu Sand Management Investigation Phase 3 SAP was presented by Nick Buhbe for the applicant NAVFAC /Naval Base Ventura County. Nick mentioned that the history of the action was that there were two other SAPs approved in 2024 and 2025 and this was the third SAP. Previously a Tier 1 exemption was granted from testing also for certain related work. The SAP action is divided into the West Borrow Site and the Sands Island site actions. The project agenda was to confirm the survey for the new SUAD, review the Tier 1 determination, and approve the Sands Island sediment site. Also the SAPR will use a different coring method (described below) to achieve better penetration, and 1) verify that the Tier I determination materials are suitable for the receiver beach and 2) that materials below -44 ft MLLW are also suitable (physically). No new testing is proposed

The dredging program includes two sediment sources:

1. West Borrow Area which was previously sampled, U.S. Navy 2026), a 86.1-acre (ac) area with potential to generate approximately 1 million cubic yards (cy) of material (with a 2-ft overdredge allowance of approximately 275,000 cubic yards);
2. Sand Islands, a 8.2-acre upland stockpile with approximately 110,000 cy of material. Placement sites include two littoral and nearshore areas to the east and west of the mouth of Mugu Lagoon with two bird sites.

Beach placement is the preferred placement option for both sediment sources; nearshore placement will also be considered for the deeper strata of the West Borrow Area (if higher fines predominate). Beach grain size envelopes were recently characterized for these areas and are considered representative receiver site sediment quality (U.S. Navy 2026) The West Borrow Area has been the subject of prior investigations (U.S. Navy 2024 and 2026) and would be dredged with a hydraulic or hopper dredge. Materials would be transported to nearshore placement sites (by scow) or to the beach via pipeline (as slurry) and distributed within the intertidal zone using mechanical means.

Nick opened the presentation going over the prior testing information and DMMT determinations and the latest request to reapprove a new Tier 1 exemption for the West Borrow area and then Sands Island. Everyone agreed to discuss the West Borrow area first and then the Sands Island SAPR approval.

West Borrow area: Jeremy said the Tier 1 exemption was ok and he had no issues with chemistry, but grain size may have issues.

Sands Island SAPR approval: Jeremy said that grain size was still an issue and he needed to talk to the CCC. Melissa asked if the material was below or above MHW. The Navy is not sure of the elevations. Melissa asked that the SAP be updated to say the top layer of soil with vegetation present will be removed prior to testing. Nick said they would make this change to the SAP, he also confirmed that, if needed, they will use the previously approved hydration methods for the soil-phase test. SAP should also clearly state that individual cores will be archived. Jeremy said he had similar issues as EPA. Claudia asked about Ormond beach and prior land use. Steve mentioned that the Navy had to do 12-inch lifts awhile back with compaction. Genevieve requested that the Navy resubmit a revised SAP for Sands Island with the top layer being discussed (veg layer issues) and asked if there were any questions and whether the document was approved and received the following response:

EPA: Approved discussion on top layer to be added to a revised SAP to be re-submitted.

CCC- Jeremy agreed with EPA with core archiving and submittal of a revised SAP.

CRWQCB: Claudia requested more cores, and she needed to talk to site remediation.

CDFW: No comment.

Genevieve then stated that the Corps gives deference to the agency's comments noted above. The revised SAPR was then sent out on April 28, 2026 to the agencies and EPA, CCC, NMFS, and CDFW approved the revised SAPR.

#### **Project #4: 11:35 AM - 12:05 PM**

- 1) **Project name:** NWS Seal Beach - Maintenance Dredging SAPR dated March 26, 2026 (for April 2026 DMMT presentation) and SAPR then revised on April 23, 2025 (Phase 3)
- 2) **Applicant's name & affiliation:** Captain Kyle Caldwell (NAVFAC/NWS Seal Beach), represented by Nick Buhbe (Mission Environmental)
- 3) **Project type (Regulatory/Navigation):** Regulatory
- 4) **Corps project manager who will attend:** Gerry Salas/Antal Szijj
- 5) **Purpose/topic (draft SAP, revised SAP, SAPR):** SAPR and revised SAPR
- 6) **Request for suitability determination? (y/n):** Yes.
- 7) **Documents provided (emailed, or FTP link):** email
- 8) **Time needed (15, 30, 45 min?):** 45 minutes

Genevieve originally reviewed this SAPR action in DMMT on April 22, 2026, with a DMMT review and then the SAPR for NWS Seal Beach - Maintenance Dredging SAPR dated March 26, 2026 (for April 22, 2026 DMMT presentation) then was revised by applicant/consultants on April 23, 2025 (Phase 3) and sent out again for review by Genevieve to DMMT staff on April 27, 2026.

The dredging program includes four geographic elements to maintain navigational access with a total dredge volume of 578,900 cubic yards (cy) with beach disposal at Surfside Beach and nearshore:

- Public Navigation Channel Outer Harbor Area (to an authorized depth of -20 feet mean lower low water [ft MLLW]; including a 2:1 side-slope external to the channel boundary [3,100 cy] and a 2-ft overdredge allowance [10,300 cy]; totaling approximately 29,800 cy);
- Outer Harbor Entrance maintenance dredging to -39 ft. (with a 2-ft overdredge allowance of 43,252 cy, totaling approximately 46,000 cy); and
- Entrance Channel maintenance dredging (to an authorized depth of -41 ft MLLW; including a 2- ft overdredge allowance of 241,500 cy and totaling approximately 501,700 cubic yards [cy]);
- Anaheim Bay maintenance dredging (knockdown to an authorized depth of -39 ft. MLLW [ with no overdredge calculated; approximate maximum 1,400 cy]), consisting of: Inner Anaheim Bay (1,000 cy); and Outer Anaheim Bay (400 cy).

The March 2026 DMMT SAPR included results of analyses characterizing these sediments for appropriate disposal following Inland Testing Manual (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency [EPA]/U.S. Army Corps of Engineers [USACE] 1998) and/or Ocean Testing Manual (EPA/USACE 1991) guidance. Materials deemed suitable for beneficial reuse could be used for local beach replenishment via placement in the nearshore environment or stockpiling in borrow pits. Materials deemed unsuitable for reuse (e.g., due to grain size compatibility), will be disposed of at local ocean dredged material disposal sites (ODMDS) or at an upland disposal location. Dredging of the first three elements would be undertaken with mechanical/clamshell or hydraulic dredging techniques and include a 2-ft overdredge depth. The fourth element, Inner and Outer Harbor Area sediments, consists of many disconnected bathymetric high spots, and 'knockdown' would be achieved with either or both physical (e.g., a dragged piling) or mechanical means (e.g., a clamshell dredge) (i.e., without transport to a distant disposal location).

Nick Buhbe (Mission Environmental) presented on this action also for the Navy and stated that the SAPR had been approved one year ago for Anaheim Bay and Seal Beach with changes in the layout and 2024 and March 2025. Also, there was an emergency dredging project in Anaheim Bay in 2025. Notes 1, 2, 3, and 4 were also developed:

[Note 1: the Public Navigation Channel Pacific Coast Highway (PCH) Approach Area (46,100 cy) has been withdrawn from the maintenance dredging program described in the SAP (U.S. Navy 2025); however, data were collected as part of this effort and was presented herewith to document findings of potential use to future stakeholders (e.g., the County of Orange).]

[Note 2: Since the publication of the SAP, the scope of this project has changed due to emergency dredging in the vicinity of the harbor entrance area (USACE Permit Number SPL-2025-00208 [USACE 2025]). A bathymetry survey was conducted following emergency dredging, and dredge volumes have been updated to incorporate the revised bathymetry data. Furthermore, additional bathymetry data may be collected to assess the degree of shoaling in the entrance channel; the USACE permit application will be updated accordingly with revised dredge volumes to best represent conditions. The source of shoaling material is primarily outside of Anaheim Bay adjacent to the Entrance Channel, and is not expected to qualitatively differ from maintenance sediments characterized herein.].

[NOTE 3: Emergency dredging was undertaken in the first half of 2026 in the vicinity of the boundary between the entrance channel and the outer harbor. While the project depths proposed in the SAP are retained for this area, the volumes of material proposed for dredging within DMMUs ABC, ABE, and ABF have changed as a result of dredging in these areas (USACE Permit Number SPL-2025-00208, USACE 2025). Up to 8,000 cy of material was authorized from DMMUs ABC (for LA-2 ODMDs placement) and up to 73,000 cy of material was authorized for DMMUs ABE and ABF (for nearshore placement). This SAPR references revised dredge volumes, since dredging has been completed and postdredge bathymetry survey data reviewed. The permit application will not request duplicative dredge volume authorization but may be updated with anticipated future bathymetry survey data.]

[NOTE 4: The dredge program also includes areas of the Huntington Harbor Public Navigation Channel west of PCH. While NOAA navigational charts have been reviewed and found to present the extent of the navigation channel with coarse specificity, historical information appears generally limited in this area. The SAP project description may have inadvertently included non-maintenance dredging in this area (a portion of DMMU ABA); the scope of the Navy's project is limited to maintenance dredging only. As a result of

unclear dredging history, DMMU ABA has been removed from the proposed project. However, DMMU ABA data collected as part of this effort is reported herein for posterity and future reference.]

Nick then discuss the SAPR results and in summary, sediments have been evaluated in accordance with applicable Greenbook and ITM protocols. The Tier I assessment indicated a history of potential pollutant loading in sediments and variable suitability for ocean or aquatic placement (i.e., considering the particle size distribution). Tier II assessments were undertaken on sediments potentially suitable for aquatic disposal with a conservative approach (i.e., without filtration to enable apples-to-apples comparisons with suspended particulate phase testing results). A full Tier III toxicological evaluation was undertaken (alongside evaluation of LA-2 ODMDS Reference Site sediments) to evaluate exposure risk at the placement site, in the water column, and bioaccumulation potential.

One of the six DMMUs (ABB – Public Navigation Channel Outer Harbor) elicited a California Toxics Rule Continuous Maximum Concentration (CTR CMC) exceedance for copper in the unfiltered elutriate sample. This exceedance was not of a high magnitude (<2X the CTR CMC), not associated with a bulk sediment chemistry concentration of concern (i.e., [copper]<ERL), not associated with water column toxicity (i.e., per ITM Tier III), and did not exceed California Ocean Plan water quality objectives applicable at disposal/placement sites. Considering the other Tier III testing results as well (solid phase and bioaccumulation phase test results), all limiting permissible concentration (LPC) criteria were met for DMMU ABB sediments, and the material is therefore considered suitable for ocean or aquatic placement.

Per the SAPR all other sediments (DMMU ABC [Outer Harbor], and DMMUs ABE, ABF, ABG, and ABH [Entrance Channel], all Greenbook/ITM testing indicated that LPC criteria were met, and materials deemed suitable for ocean or aquatic placement. With regard to beneficial reuse of sediments, the grain size distributions were evaluated and assessed for compatibility with local placement sites.

- DMMU ABC (Outer Harbor) sediments were found to be dominated by fines and incompatible with beach or nearshore placement and are thus suitable for ocean disposal.
- All other DMMUs sediments were found to be compatible with beach or nearshore placement within the San Pedro Littoral Cell in the vicinity of Surfside and Sunset Beach (to the southwest of NWS Seal Beach). In order for beneficial use to be maximized, placement as close to the shore as is feasible at the southwestern end of the Surfside SCOUP assessment area (Transect C in Figure 18) is recommended. Cumulatively, this assessment indicates that:

- DMMU ABB (Public Navigation Channel Outer Harbor, 29,800 cy) are appropriate for aquatic disposal in the Surfside/Sunset Beach nearshore.
- DMMU ABC (Outer Harbor) sediments (46,000 cy) are appropriate for ocean disposal at the LA-2 ODMDS.
- DMMUs ABE, ABF, ABG, and ABH (Entrance Channel) sediments (501,700 cy) are appropriate for aquatic disposal in the Surfside/Sunset Beach nearshore.

Melissa then said the SAPR needed additional tables (Appendix J, SD Fate Test, solid phase info) with edits and a summary table before she could complete the SUAD determination. Melissa also noted that the SAPR said the LPC failed for the SPP test of ABB comp, which is not accurate. There was a significant difference compared to control, but in that situation the STFATE model should be run to determine the LPC is passed. Since this composite is no longer proposed for dredging, it's not necessary to this additional analysis now. Melissa said the ABC composite may be suitable for LA-2 but she needed with the bioaccumulation and toxicity test result tables. Nick said he would get that data soon but was not sure about the bioassay data.

Genevieve asked if there were any more comments. Claudia she was not good with nearshore placement but maybe LA-2 but there were ERL exceedances (DDT, Chlordane). Hossein said he needed more time to review revised SAPR. Jules from CCC said they would wait to confirm with LA CRWQCB and need supplemental data.

Gerry Salas from the Corps asked about timeline/schedule and Nick said the dredging is needed soon by early 2027 and Chloe from the Navy said we need to stay on track and can we get an approval by next DMMT?

Gene said we could do email approval with SAPR revisions based on agency comments above and Claudia said she was ok with that and Leslie from CDFW had no comments. The meeting was then adjourned by Genevieve.