<u>FINAL NOTES</u> April 18, 2025

Agenda for March 26, 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

Roll Call and Announcements: 10:00 – 10:05 AM

D. Cummings mentioned that the new DMMT Corps Hosts are still working on changes and updates to the meetings and DMMT principles.

Discuss next scheduled SC-DMMT meeting 10:05- 10:15 AM

Project #1: 10:15 – 10:30 AM
1) Project name: Chollas Creek Dredging at Naval Base San Diego
2) Applicant's name & affiliation: Damien Cie (NAVFAC COR or applicant) with consultants Eric Miller and Chris Clark (Miller Marine Science & Consulting, Inc. representing NAVFAC SW)
3) Project type (Regulatory/Navigation): Regulatory
4) Corps project manager who will attend: Robert Smith
5) Purpose/topic (draft SAP, revised SAP, SAPR): Draft SAP review & approval
6) Request for suitability determination? (y/n): No.
7) Documents provided (emailed, or FTP link): Sent under separate cover to SC-DMMT
8) Time needed (15, 30, 45 min?): 15 minutes

<u>Participants:</u>
USACE: D. Cummings, G. Holdridge, T. Stevens, R. Smith, V. Navarro, L. Smith, J. Ryan, L. Schaffer
EPA: M. Scianni, D. Michaels
CCC: J. Kelly, J. Smith
Santa Ana Waterboard: H. Shahrokhnia
CDFW: L. Hart
USFWS: C. Roberts, S. Vissman,
L.A. Water Board: V. Zara, E. Duncan

U.S. Navy (Applicant): J. Granade, K. Eastwood, D. Cie,

Miller Marine Science and Consulting (Consultant): E. Miller, C. Clark

Q and A:

EPA: questioned testing only one composite for chemistry for the entire area as if the area fails on biology, then the entire composite will failthe chemistry will also fail. We cannot divide up the composite based on chemistry results when a bioassay fails. The EPA recommends taking and archived archiving the individual cores, because if one chemical component or biological component failsthe composite has elevated chemistry then we can look at the individual cores, a more detailed look at the chemistry can be made to differentiate between suitable and unsuitable areas if biology passes. EPA also recommends to wait until chemistry is done to then coordinate with the DMMT and determine what tissue analyses should be done. Another question from the EPA was thatrequested more detailsclarification in the SAP about the biological tests (e.g., species to be used, test conditions, etc)on how the chemical data would be analyzed and how the data would be evaluated.

CCC: Provide the bathymetry to figure 7- to show how core locations were chosen.

USACE: fix figure to show where in San Diego Harbor this project will be located.

CDFW: Since this project would involve vibracoring, and in San Diego there is a Caulerpa outbreak, the applicant should coordinate with the Caulerpa team to conduct a survey before placing cores in area.

EPA: requested for SAP changes submitted via email.

All agreed to email approval once submitted changes are approved.

Agency Determinations:

Project #2: 10:30-11:15

1) Project name: Point Mugu Sand Management Investigation
   2) Applicant's name & affiliation: Captain Daniel W. Brown (NAVFAC/Naval Base Ventura County), represented by Nick Buhbe (Mission Environmental)
   3) Project type (Regulatory/Navigation): Regulatory
   4) Corps project manager who will attend: Theresa Stevens
   5) Purpose/topic (draft SAP, revised SAP, SAPR): draft 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

Participants:

USACE: D. Cummings, G. Holdridge, T. Stevens, L. Smith, J. Ryan, L. Schaffer
EPA: M. Scianni,
CCC: J. Kelly, J. Smith
Santa Ana Waterboard: H. Shahrokhnia
CDFW: L. Hart
USFWS: C. Roberts, S. Vissman,
L.A. Water Board: V. Zara, E. Duncan

U.S. Navy (Naval Base Ventura County) (Applicant): Capt. D. Brown, P. Meddaugh, V. Vartanian
Mission Environment Consulting (Consultant): N. Buhbe
Marine Taxonomic Services (Consultant): R. Mooney

Q & A:

USACE: Info from Broadbeach sampling (2 stockpiles from Calleguas) – 2016 upper Calleguas stockpile was shown. Navy taken samples from both upper and lower Callegues piles? (upland road upstream near Broad Beach, and another Magu downstream near farm road). Which will Navy sample?

Consultant: the lower stockpile has material from upper (upstream) location that has been moved- and we will only be sampling this lower stockpile.

CCC: Question about placement of receiving beach grain size envelopes. Lot of samples had high fines- as it was taken in 2023, which was a record setting wet winter – did this skew the data to fines?. In other areas, the 2023-2024 winters' fines correlate with elevation all over the place. 75% fines is likely not ok to place on the dry beach. 3 additional transects in subtidal 2 upcoast canyon- and 1 receiving in down coast of Magu Canyon to double check if the results were not a one-off temporary deposition of fines from winter storm.

Consultant: Area A and B fall within the grain size envelope (but only top 2 feet).

CCC: The grab samples in the Nearshore environment should indicate the grain size envelope and how it developed. In other instances, consultants r~~R~~emoved grab samples

from deeper transects in order to get more accurate idea of grain size. In sum, Nearshore – can have more fines. Material on beach- should have less fines.

Consultant: The supratidal grab samples were obtained from 12 foot contour from MLLW and had 60-70% fines.

CCC (J. Smith): ~~There were only a limited amount of grab samples.~~The level of fines at the 12 foot contour is very unusual Should obtain about two more grab samples in the Magu ~~lagoon~~ nearshore north and one south to get a better idea of grain size in near shore area currently (outside of extreme storm condition).

Applicant: The winters of 23-24 had a net erosional effect on the beaches and not depositional. Grain size is consistent both east and west of Callagues Creek and the result is that it is composed of mainly fine-sized grains.

EPA: Should add three grab sample to the testing transects as mentioned above to determine if grain size envelope is this big. If not planning to obtain more samples, this would need further discussion before placement as the current envelope is big. Biological testing not necessarily required if dumping- under ITM more flexible, agencies can decide what tests are required. If sandy, no biological testing is required if no ERM/ ERL exceedances. Chemistry analyses also would also be used to determine if biological testing is needed. No water quality column test is needed if placing sediments on beach. Biological tests on Calleguas must be discussed further on, as the ITM biological tests are standardized for aquatic sediments (marine or fresh water)~~marine materials~~ and not for upland~~fluvial~~ materials.

Consultant: Planning to hydrate sediments with seawater to then check for how they would react in marine environment. Source sediments (stockpile) characterized as having sulfides/organic material. The question would be how to acclimate these types of sediments to the marine environment.

EPA: Will make note to DMMT if Callegaus Creek sediments would be used, then what would ITM testing look like in terms of acclimation process and species used. Recommendations on biological testing- decision to do bio tests- worm test needed only. If bioaccumulation testing is needed – only one species needed. No water column needed.

Applicant: Water conditions in Calleguas Creek are well above intertidal- all freshwater sediments.

USACE: Test results not in yet, but past tests indicate presence of DDE and especially DDT- since other beach nourishment projects do not do ITM testing. DDT/DDE exceedances occurred in other similar projects- were bio tests done? DDT ERL exceedances in this project low- so no bio testing would be needed. ERM exceedances or many chemical exceedances – would require anthropod test. With low DDT ERL exceedances –typically bio testing is not needed as toxicity impacts not found in sandy material or slightly finer.

~~USACE: defer to Larry Smith~~

EPA: Either agree what to do now or put in SAP after chemical results are available for each site and then coordinate with DMMT on what bio tests required.

Consultant: will incorporate latter into SAP.

CCC: If sediment is composed mainly of fine material, placement would be more appropriate in the Surfzone and Nearshore. There would be some concerns if placement was made on the dry beach if it is finer.

Consultant: Should be ok with deep beach fill/ holding line, fine content in dune development and revegetation of dunes (based on biologists from Corps).

USACE: These are considered minor revisions to draft SAP- Nick and Navy provide T. Stevens with revised draft and she will send it out to agencies for final approval.

Applicant: Additional transects will be discussed and final decision put into the draft SAP.

Agency Determinations:

Project #3 11:15 -11:45

1) Project name: Pier J Deepening and Channel Widening
2) Applicant's name & affiliation: Port of Long Beach
3) Project type (Regulatory/Navigation): Regulatory
4) Corps project manager who will attend: Genevieve Holdridge
5) Purpose/topic (draft SAP, revised SAP, SAPR): Draft SAP
6) Request for suitability determination? (y/n): No

7) Documents provided (emailed, or FTP link): Draft SAP and presentation uploaded to the Ports ftp site. A separate email was sent with the documents.
8) Time needed (15, 30, 45 min?): 30 minutes

Participants:
USACE: D. Cummings, G. Holdridge, T. Stevens, R. Smith, L. Smith, J. Ryan
EPA: M. Scianni
CCC: J. Kelly, J. Smith
CDFW: L. Hart
USFWS: C. Roberts, S. Vissman,
L.A. Water Board: V. Zara, E. Duncan

Port of Long Beach (Applicant): L. Hornick, J. Morimoto, D. Porter
WSP USA Inc. (Consultant): K. Gobbi

Q & A:
EPA: Has this area been maintenance dredged before?

Consultant: This part of the POLB has been dredged before. In and around the access area has been recently dredged, just not recently chemically tested.

EPA: This dredging will be deeper and wider- how far? Add to one of the figures a delineation of where widening would be located.

Consultant: will do this- also not touch breakwaters.

EPA: Have you divided these composite areas by volume?

Consultant: Did divide areas by volume and will provide this information broken down.

EPA: need a core added to shallower area in Composite A as widening will be done there as well as in order to capture shoal there.

Consultant: can move C4 down to capture this.

EPA: SAP says will coordinate with DMMT on tissue list after chemistry results received. In the data analysis section, there is no discussion for benthic toxicity test (sp test). Please add sentences for this similar to the language used for the other bio tests.

CCC: Is it anticipated that the sediments would be beach compatible?

Consultant : We would compare the grain size envelope to the nearby beaches if sandy material is observed. However, only fines are seen thus far.

Applicant: email comments modifications to G. Holdridge- and then she will send revisions out to agencies.

All agencies appeared to have agreed with this.

Agency Determinations:
EPA: approved supplemental SAP, no further comments (email April 8, 2025)
USACE: no objection, deferred to EPA (email April 8, 2025)
CCC: no objection, but they had a comment: *I will note that it seems like the Port adjusted core locations to be within the breakwater which they frame as a consequence of our permit requirements though my understanding is that the sampling was authorized via a waiver and just describes the work as "Sampling of up to 12 seafloor sediment cores of 4 in diameter (removal of up to 0.1944 cy. of sediment total) using a vibracore method within the Pier J breakwaters." That language from the project description they provided so if there is concern about the updated core locations I can work with our South Coast District staff to see if the original core locations still fit within the waiver or if additional authorization could be provided quickly* (email April 4, 2025).
USFWS: no objection (email April 8, 2025)
R4LAWB: approved revised draft (April 16, 2025).

Project #4 11:45-12:15

1) Project name: Pier T Marine Terminal Redevelopment
2) Applicant's name & affiliation: Port of Long Beach (in partnership with Total Terminals International)
3) Project type (Regulatory/Navigation): Regulatory
4) Corps project manager who will attend: Genevieve Holdridge, Susan Gayagas
5) Purpose/topic (draft SAP, revised SAP, SAPR): Draft SAP
6) Request for suitability determination? (y/n): No
7) Documents provided (emailed, or FTP link): Draft SAP and presentation attached
8) Time needed (15, 30, 45 min?): 30 minutes

Participants:
USACE: D. Cummings, G. Holdridge, T. Stevens, L. Smith, J. Ryan
EPA: M. Scianni
CCC: J. Kelly, J. Smith

CDFW: L. Hart
USFWS: C. Roberts, S. Vissman,
L.A. Water Board: V. Zara, E. Duncan

TTI at Pier T (Co-Applicant): J. French
POLB (Co-Applicant): D. Porter, A. Rodriguez, L. Hornik
Moffatt & Nichol (Consultant): S. Anghera, R. Alamir

Q & A:

EPA: DU-4 material under wharf- are these native materials under the wharf or artificial fill?

Consultant: Need to research about Pier T construction- not sure.

EPA: Are all the materials all below the MHW? (yes). If you are removing material under the wharf and behind the rock dyke that is not native, this material is not eligible for ocean disposal (if it is construction material). Fill or excavated material vs. dredged material. Need additional information on this.

Consultant: Will look for additional information. Potentially dredged material fill- geotechnical investigation will also help provide information on the source of this material.

EPA: almost all volume from here- need chemical and grain size material tests- what in cut vs. in channel now. OTM test on what is available to be sampled now. Confirmatory chemical testing will be done on the inaccessible material when the geo-tech work is done if LA-2 disposal is needed.~~on cut testing chemical additional analysis if want to deposit in LA 2~~ Also need DU 1 figure concerning areas that were part of the clean-up project ~~cleaned~~ – graphic showing different elevations and different programs. Is -52 authorized depth?

Consultant: will provide image- and depth is -52. DDNP – goes down to -55- part of that project and has been characterized- so all to west of current proposed dredged area.

CCC: Is there a potential for beach nourishment from this material?

Consultant: all samples from the west basin were comprised of 60% course grained and not appropriate for beach thus far.

SAP revisions to Corps PM then out to agencies by April 2, 2025.

Agency Determinations:

EPA: approved supplemental SAP, no further comments (email April 3, 2025)
USACE: no objection, deferred to EPA (email April 3, 2025)
CCC: no objection, deferred to EPA (April 4, 2025)
LAWB: no objection, concurs with EPA (April 3, 2025)
USFWS: no objection (April 8, 2025)