**FINAL NOTES**

**Agenda for April 23, 2025**

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

**San Luis Obispo,**
**Santa Barbara, Ventura, Los Angeles, Orange, San Diego Counties**

**US Army Corps of Engineers - Los Angeles District**

**Roll Call and Announcements: 10:00 – 10:15 AM**

**Project #1: 10:15 – 10:45 AM**
1) Project name: Buena Vista Audubon Society (BVAS) Restoration and Resiliency Project
2) Applicant's name & affiliation: BVAS and City of Oceanside
3) Project type (Regulatory/Navigation): Regulatory
4) Corps project manager who will attend: either Max Roseman or Robert Smith
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): TBD
8) Time needed (15, 30, 45 min?): 30 mins

**Attendees:**
Corps: S. Gayagas, R. Smith, T. Stevens, G. Holdridge, L. Smith, J. Hallemeier, D. Cheung, D. McCoy
EPA: M. Scianni
CCC: J. Smith, J. Kelly
CDFW: L. Hart

David Pohl, (Agent company?) presented overview of SAPR

**Q & A:**

Corps: Is there a map showing location where dredging will occur?

Pohl: Dredging would occur in open water and located in existing lagoon. The underwater area near/in wetlands to be excavated is a small area.

Corps: please place the dredging area outline on a map

EPA: Note, there is no core in submerged area.  Would sediments be different in submerged area vs. wetlands?

Pohl: Not much excavation /dredging in lagoon, it would be just to take it down to zero. There is no anticipated difference between sediments in wetlands vs. submerged land. Most sediment is generated in wetlands. A previous boring taken at the water's edge- and further in the wetlands revealed mostly sand below organic layer, which is what we expect to find now.

Corps: Would the excavated sediment/fill be placed on the beach? No- correct?

Pohl: Most of anthropogenic fill is located in the upper portion of site.  We distinguish between the (anthropogenic) fill material and other (natural) material.  Anthropogenic fill material will be placed in uplands- up to the bluff.

Corps: Was there asphalt found? Where is it located? The fill associated with the asphalt be not be used for project fill correct?

Pohl: Concrete is found in the upper portion near the water's edge would only be used for filling in uplands.

EPA: Remove the organic topsoil and plants etc.  and do not keep it the composited cores or test these.

Pohl: Not testing organics. We will only show the existence of the organics in the core logs, and what was tested will be shown.  Only sandy material would be kept and tested. The only exception would be the organic material in the reed area, which may be used as topsoil (in uplands) not in beach replenishment.

Corps: Where was clay?  In 2023, the data showed clay.

Pohl : There was a finer grain layer – we will make sure that if we find it, to characterize it as well : size and chemistry.

Corps: Would disposal site be 'seagaze'?

Pohl: The disposal may occur at both northern and southern placements sites.  Either or – based on what the city says.

Corps: This would be covered under existing beach nourishment permit?

Pohl: Not yet.

Corps: Would you provide the results with grain size curve – to indicate characterization?

Pohl: Yes

Corps: City of oceanside would not be a possibility?

Pohl: No

Corps: Disposal would be city (?)

Pohl: City provided comment on SAP and placement sites- city checked it and has been involved in the beach placement process.

Corps: The beach placement is not approved yet?

Phol: No- after the sediment is tested and results provided to the city, they will approve or not the beach placement.

Corps (Smith): Timeframe for doing work?

Pohl: Depends on funding and permitting. Permitting would probably take until next year. Likely fall 2026 or 2027.

Corps: The Corps dredges annually and places on the northern site/ beach- be aware south placement site is in more in need of sediment. Should double check with Oceanside- if can place in southern site this would be better as it is very narrow and need of nourishment if sediments comprise correct size and chemistry.

Pohl: Sounds good.

Corps: Will look into this.

Corps/ Phol: Will do.

CCC: City's scoop allows fines with a 20%cap. The CCC has flexibility if the material is finer. It would be great to compare with 2016 receiving data.

Pohl: As part of designed documents- 20% or less fines if more suitable will use some for stockpiling- and better material in area for staging. In design package place more suitable in one spot and finer in another. Material closer to lagoon is sandy.

EPA: Confirm that 2016 receiver data is most relevant/ or still relevant for receiver data?

CCC: Southern receiver site not much of beach left- 2016 data gives sense of what grain size did looks like. Data changes from month to month- not worried about the long-time lapse in this case.

EPA: OK. Depth to which you are sampling? Is it 2ft overdepth. Dredging typically has overdepth allowances since more exact elevations to which will sample since it is a wetlands restoration project. Because if depth too deep may skew results.

Pohl: Only go one foot below (1ft overdredge)

EPA: OK.

Pohl: We do not want to characterize material not excavated and will use for beach placement.

EPA: Since test based on strata not as much of issue- but if composite it would be an issue.

Pohl: Some will be field determined- seems that there are two different strata – but if find more than would break it down further.

Corps (host): edits SAP draft: Reg PM, see if edits needed to finalize SAP- email edits to agencies- EPA/CCC/Corps (reg/Environment) – no edits now from CCC and EPA.

Pohl: finalize it with Corps.

**Project #2: 10:45-11:15**

1) Project name: Buena Vista Lagoon Enhancement Project (BVLEP)
2) Applicant's name & affiliation: Kim Smith, San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG)
3) Project type (Regulatory/Navigation): Regulatory
4) Corps project manager who will attend: Susan Gayagas
5) Purpose/topic (draft SAP, revised SAP, SAPR): SAPR
6) Request for suitability determination? (y/n): Yes

7) Documents provided (emailed, or FTP link): TBD
8) Time needed (15, 30, 45 min?): 30 mins

**Attendees:**

Corps: S. Gayagas, R. Smith, T. Stevens, G. Holdridge, L. Smith, J. Hallemeier, D. Cheung
EPA: M. Scianni
CCC: J. Smith, J. Kelly
CDFW: L. Hart

Agent: K. Wise, C. Kinkade (AECOM), M. Forrest, S. Leonard
Applicant: K. Smith SANDAG

Presented by S. Leonard (AECOM) and K. Smith (SANDAG)

**Q & A:**

EPA: Will need the report before making a final decision- may have to discuss in a future meeting before accepting results

K. Smith: OK.

EPA: When will the document be shared?

Corps: Ask DMMT to provide review and end date – ask agencies if provide comment or approval outside of formal meeting.

EPA- potentially ok depends on results. Mixing clay 4ft with sand to put on beach or nearshore? What material would be going into pit? ITM testing needed for that – was that tested?

Leanard: The material has been tested.

EPA: What about basins not tested- is that the material going into the pit?

Leonard: Yes.

EPA: But no testing of basins- so we would need more discussion.

Leonard: The other basins were not tested.

EPA: We would need a follow-up discussion- maybe off-cycle.

Corps (Reg)- Do you need 2 weeks to review?

EPA: Yes.

CCC: 2 weeks is ok to review. Mud layer probably an issue so would need discussion.

Kinkade: May be a feasibility issue separating out the top layer. We tried to be conservative. We will look into top layer being weighted towards fines and if so we can place that material in the nearshore potentially. Our concern is that finer layer may be virtually impossible to separate out. Look into other strategies. However it has not been possible at other sites to take off the top layer. We are open to discussion.

EPA: We would like to discuss after looking at the full set of data.

Corps (L. SMITH): Have you looked at placement sites- and take into account the movement of sand around entrance?

Kinkade: Based on previous placement sites, discussions of subcells and localized area in Carlsbad may be an issue. Not yet done detailed sand transport modeling. Issue potentially of sand movement- so wait to see what experts settle on in terms of the sand transport northward or southward. We can potentially move footprint further south– based on historical regional beach sand project sites. City is interested in sand placement at different places. K. Smith works closely with the cities on the project and determining potential receiver sites.

Corps: Mixed clay and sand would not go on beach instead would be placed at nearshore or other areas.

Kinkade: We found that the sediments dissipated quickly, and the issue with the fines is that they are so fine, the dredge ends up mixing all sediments together and we would not be able to separate them. If identified contractor with capability to do so, we will work with them.

Corps (Lyons): Other restoration plan- did you have an early discussion with NMFS concerning wier removal and potential EFH /ESA issues?

Corps (Reg): SAP report will be sent out today.

**Project #3 11:15 -11:45**
1) Project name: Balboa Yacht Basin Maintenance Dredging
2) Applicant's name & affiliation: Chris Miller, City of Newport Beach
3) Project type (Regulatory/Navigation): Regulatory
4) Corps project manager who will attend: Gerry Salas
5) Purpose/topic (draft SAP, revised SAP, SAPR): SAPR
6) Request for suitability determination? (y/n): Y
7) Documents provided (emailed, or FTP link): TBD
8) Time needed (15, 30, 45 min?): 30 min

**Attendees:**
Corps: T. Stevens (also acting PM for G. Salas), K. Lyons, T. Armenta, G. Holdridge, L. Smith,
EPA: M. Scianni
CCC: J. Smith, J. Kelly
CDFW: L. Hart
WB: not on call (from LA)

Consultants: M. Brown (Anchor QEA) (presented), C. Osuch, A. Gale (all Anchor QEA)
Applicant: C. Miller, city of new port beach,

**Q&A:**

Corps (T. Stevens): 20% contingency is this part of the 2ft overdredge allowance?

Brown: It is part of total volume including overdredge.

Gale, Anchor: This was a snapshot in time when the survey was conducted- and includes 20% contingency in volume for permitting in order to allow flexibility in case more sediment comes into basin as permitting takes time.

Corps (Smith): Proposed placement in in the POLB? Since it is engineered fill – did they accept it as suitable for placement as structure fill?

Miller: POLB has copy of SAPR – POLB says volume is within amount needed – but not formal approval yet.

Corps: Do you have backup if POLB does not approve?

Miller:  We do not expect any issues with the material qualifying as they are not heavy organics. But we do not have a backup, and if we can't place here- then we are not sure what to do.

Corps: POLB just awarded contract. In the July/August timeframe they can accept material as schedule moves down so you have a few months before they would be able to accept material.

Miller: We are aware of POLB's schedule- and realize our constraints.

EPA: No questions/comments- defer to WB for water quality assessment on elutriate.

Santa Ana WB rep: no concerns or comments- we can make a suitability determination via email at a later time.

Corps (host): initiate contact with WBs- and Corps PM, CCC, EPA to request suitability determination (2 weeks) in email concurrence.

Brown: Sounds good

CCC: No questions or comments – defer to WB.

**ADJOURN**