

Southern California Dredged Material Management Team (SC-DMMT)  
March 26, 2014  
Final Meeting Notes

**I. Participating Agencies /Attendees:**

- a. Brianne McGuffie (USACE-Regulatory)
  - b. Cori Farrar (USACE – Regulatory)
  - c. Stephen Estes (USACE – Regulatory)
  - d. Joe Ryan (USACE-ED)
  - e. Allan Ota<sup>†</sup> (USEPA Region 9)
  - f. Larry Simone<sup>†</sup> (CCC)
  - g. Loni Adams<sup>†</sup> (CDFW)
  - h. Alan Monji<sup>†</sup> (RWQCB – San Diego)
  - i. Darren Bradford<sup>†</sup> (RWQCB – San Diego)
  - j. Kim Garvey (Moffatt and Nichol)
  - k. Ken Kronschnabl<sup>†</sup> (Kinnetic Laboratories)
- <sup>†</sup> **participating via teleconference.**

**II. Announcements:**

a. The Corps announced that the Oceanside dredging projects would commence in a few weeks. The Corps coordinated with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) on the snowy plover.

**III. Project Review and Determinations**

**a. Dana Point Harbor Maintenance Dredging Project (Cori Farrar):**

**i. Corps (Regulatory) comments:**

- 1. Asked about background levels of arsenic in dredged material even if sandy material and asked if they appear higher than other soils in SoCal
- 2. In response to CDFW’s comments 1 and 2: indicated these issues would be addressed during the permit application evaluation and response to public notice would be a good opportunity to bring forward these and other concerns not directly related to the suitability of dredged material for disposal.
- 3. Agencies agreed the results supported the suitability determinations of the proposed disposal/reuse locations for the dredged material disposal.

**ii. Corps (Engineering) comments:**

- 1. Asked the anticipated start date of construction
- 2. Asked about potential equipment and contract for dredging and means of transport to beach, route for pipeline given constraints for unconsolidated

material, formation material, and need to avoid rocky reef offshore and local lobster fishery.

**iii. EPA comments:**

1. Followed on CCC comment 1 and asked if there were photos and logs of the cores.
2. Likes the way sampling areas were depicted in the presentation; preferred figures to what was in the draft report. Specifically, EPA would have liked the following included in the report: slide 3; slide 6 on DPH Sample;
3. Re: Table 13, need clarification on how the individual core samples related to the “subarea” designations, i.e. would have helped to have this clarification in the table heading labels; “outfall” column is most problematic [in terms of contamination levels].
4. Is there any intent to separate between top and bottom strata of FG1-5 and -8 during construction, i.e. to dispose top and bottom strata separately/differently?
5. Confirmed CG-1 area for disposal on Baby Beach
6. For RG comment 1: EPA concurred with Kinnetic that arsenic levels don’t approach level of concern for human health at this site

**iv. USFWS comments (transmitted via email dated 20140326):**

1. Comments from Carol Roberts: “Concerned the Bulk Sediment Chemistry table (Table 13) did not accurately reflect total chlordanes in Sample FG1-5. The total provided at the bottom of the Chlorinated Pesticides section for that sample did not include the 22 ug/kg dw of technical chlordane detected in the sample. With that included, the total chlordanes concentration for that sample is 31.9 ug/kg dw, more than 5 times the ER-M for that chemical group. While this is of concern, the composited material from this and adjacent sites did not result in decreased survival nor elevated bioaccumulation in the Tier III testing. Therefore, I have no objections to the disposal options identified in the Report.”

**v. CCC comments:**

1. Asked if there would be a concern about refusal and lack of sample at the Pilgrim Moorage area.
2. No additional concerns

**vi. CDFW comments:**

1. Expressed concern for avoidance of rock reef in disposing of material in intertidal or nearshore.

2. Asked for consideration of surf zone area and monitoring or surveys of benthic organisms in disposal areas, and for snowy plover

**vii. County of Orange Dana Point Harbor Department (Represented by Kim Garvey of Moffat & Nichol) comments/response to agencies' questions or comments:**

1. Response to Corps RG comment 1: levels of arsenic would be below action level of concern for human exposures;
2. Response to Corps ED comment 1: possibly could start in late 2014, but more likely to start in fall 2015 for dredging; would avoid grunion season in Feb.
3. Response to Corps ED comment 2: Dutra did work via hydraulic (anchored) pipeline for discharge onto Capistrano Beach.
4. Response to EPA comment 1: logs and photos are available. Weren't able to get much friable material, gravel. Details are available in Appendix D of report; SG 1-1 through 1-4
5. Response to EPA comment 4: The entire volumes at FG1-5 and -8 are proposed for LA-3, even though strata were sampled separately.
6. Response to EPA comment 5: Preference is to place all sandy material directly onto Capo Beach and Baby Beach upper/dry beach. However, less coarse grain material (e.g. CG2A and FG1-SCD) could be placed in the nearshore if not suitable for upper part of the beach. Direct beach placement would be in a swale on a beach and material would be mixed with slightly finer grained sands.
7. Response to FWS comment 1: Kinnetic based their calculations on the reference below, which cites that technical chlordane is not part of total chlordane. *Pesticides in the Hydrologic System, Pesticides in Stream Sediment and Aquatic Biota: Distribution, Trends, and Governing Factors*. Lisa H. Nowell, Paul D. Capel, Peter D. Dileanis, CRC Press, Dec 28, 1999 - Technology & Engineering. We call total chlordane the sum of alpha and gamma chlordane, cis-nonachlor, trans-nonachlor and oxychlordane. Carol Roberts confirmed that this interpretation was correct in a subsequent email.
8. Response to CCC comment 1: it is formation material near the Pilgrim Moorage area and is not expected to be contaminated.