

Southern California Dredged Material Management Team (SC-DMMT)
April 23, 2014
Final Meeting Notes

I. Participating Agencies /Attendees:

- a. Brianne McGuffie (USACE-Regulatory)
 - b. Joe Ryan (USACE-ED)
 - c. Jim Fields (USACE-PPMD)
 - d. Larry Smith (USACE-PD)
 - e. Madeline Esch (USACE-ED)
 - f. Jeffrey Divine (USACE-ED)
 - g. Kirk Brus (USACE-PD)
 - h. Ken Wong (USACE-PD)
 - i. Allan Ota[†] (USEPA Region 9)
 - j. Carol Roberts[†] (USFWS)
 - k. Larry Simone[†] (CCC)
 - l. Loni Adams[†] (CDFW)
 - m. Bill Patzoukas[†] (CDFW)
 - n. Michael Lyons (LARWQCB)
 - o. Alan Monji[†] (RWQCB – San Diego)
 - p. Katherine Curtis (POLA-Port of Los Angeles)
 - q. Ken Kronschnabl[†] (Kinnetic Laboratories)
- [†] **participating via teleconference.**

II. Announcements: The Corps announced that the Oceanside dredging project had started in mid-April with an expected completion date of May 2 or so. Extra measures had been added to monitor and avoid western snowy plover on the beach across the mouth of the San Luis Rey River.

III. Project Review and Determinations

a. Port of Los Angeles (POLA) Maintenance Dredging (Larry Smith):

i. Corps (Engineering) comments:

- 1. Review of Sampling and Analysis Plan Results. No significant solid phase or suspended phase toxicity. Some significant bioaccumulation, however none in that would be expected to cause adverse impact to the disposal site.
- 2. Response to CCC comment 1 and EPA comment 3: We are talking about 2 single cores so it would not be economically feasible to separate out the material. The justification will be included in the consistency submittal.

ii. EPA comments:

- 1. Slightly elevated DDTs and moderate PCBs. No toxicity issues. **Overall, looks good for ocean disposal at LA 2.**
- 2. Individual cores look ok in Table 12

3. Agree with CCC comment 1; need to clearly explain why you cannot reuse qualifying material.
4. LA-2 has an annual capacity; this should be noted. Significant modifications will be required if the capacity is exceeded.

iii. CCC comments:

1. Need more detail as to why the material present in two of the cores can't be isolated and beneficially reused. This needs to be part of your consistency submittal.

iv. Suitability Determination:

All sediments tested are suitable for ocean disposal at the LA-2 ODMDS, provide justification for not placing sediments in vicinity of cores 6 & 9 in the nearshore as part of the EA and CCD

b. LA River Estuary (LARE) Maintenance Dredging (Larry Smith)

i. Corps (Planning) comments:

1. Provided overview of project. No significant solid phase or suspended phase toxicity. Some significant bioaccumulation, however none in that would be expected to cause adverse impact to the disposal site. Three composites were done and showed some Arsenic; however, this is common as a naturally occurring element in District coastal areas. Individual cores were analyzed for PCBs per EPA's request. We are trying to determine if there was a hot spot, but it appears to be spread throughout.
2. Could be random non- point source from the LA Rivers. Does not appear to be coming from marinas or storm drains.

ii. Corps (Engineering) comments:

1. Response to EPA comment 2: Isolating area 14 would result in 18,000 cy of material and area 25 would be less than that.
2. Response to POLA comment 1: Alamitos Bay is also going to LA2 this year.
3. We will talk to the city of Long Beach about taking out areas 14 and 25 from the project.

iii. Corps (Project Management) comments:

1. Response to EPA comment 2: Those areas aren't terribly critical to navigation so we can get around them if necessary.

2. Response to CCC comment 1: POLB Middle Harbor Fill Site is full and Port of LA is full. We would need the City's input to use CAD site.
3. Response to POLA comment 1: This project would be completed this year.
4. Response to EPA comment 5: myself, Joe Ryan and Larry Smith.

iv. EPA comments:

1. Response to Ken Kroshnable's comment 1: These hydrocarbon numbers aren't that high.
2. Can a polygon characterized by sample areas 14 and 25 be removed from the project? Cores 14 & 25 show PCB levels that EPA does not feel is suitable for ocean disposal.
4. Response to POLA comment 2: We do not have a tally for LA 2. There is a 1 mcy cumulative limit per calendar year on the site for all disposal events.
5. Who is the point of contact for this project to discuss disposal?

v. CCC comments:

1. Why can't you just put the PCB materials somewhere else?
2. Response to CDFW comment 1: there would need to be interim caps in the CAD since it would take time to fill.

vi. CDFW comments:

1. Question to the LARWQCB: Would you consider disposal at a CAD sight?

vii. LARWQCB comments:

1. There are disturbing levels of PCBs.
2. Response to CDFW comment 1: Not sure but may be worth trying now. Could be considered restoration for a borrow pit.
3. Response to Corps ED comment 2: Let them (Alamitos Bay/City of Long Beach) know that the LARWQCB will not renew the permit for ocean disposal.

viii. Ken Kroshnable comments/response to agencies' questions or comments:

1. Response to Corps PD comments 1 & 2: The lab had interference of hydrocarbons in sediment samples, so some of the numbers may be over-estimated. It was not enough to warrant qualification but may explain the variability.

ix. Katherine Curtis (POLA):

1. We have YTI material for LA 2 but not until next year. We have approximately 20,000 cy of material.
2. Who is tracking LA 2 disposal?

x. Suitability Determination

All sediments, with the exception of sediments in the vicinity of cores 14 & 25 are suitable for ocean disposal at the LA-2 ODMDS.