

Southern California Dredged Material Management Team (SC-DMMT)
April 28, 2010
Meeting Notes

I. SC-DMMT Participating Agencies*

- a. Jorine Campopiano - EPA
- b. Mike Lyons – LARWQCB
- c. Larry Simon – CCC†
- d. Larry Smith - USACE
- e. Ken Wong - USACE

II. Project Review and Determinations^Δ

A. Berth 243- POLA/Gambol Industries: POLA/Gambol Industries has not submitted minutes.

B. Marina del Rey: See Attachment A.

C. Lake Machado Dredging

- a. **Project Proponents/PMs:** city of Los Angeles/Ken Wong, Regulatory
Purpose of Discussion: Beneficial reuse options for dredged material
- b. **Background:** See March 24, 2010 minutes.
- c. **Discussion:** Project proponent focused discussion on beneficial reuse options for dredged material. Approximately 13,200 cy (10,600 from Machado Lake, 2,600 from Wilmington Drain) of material with no exceedance of fresh water sediment quality guidelines are identified as "resuable". Dredged material with some exceedance of fresh water sediment quality guidelines are identified as "resuable for construction". Proponent proposes to discharge "resuable" material in or within the vicinity of Machado Lake for onsite reuse. "Resuable for construction" sediment would be transported to POLB Middle Harbor, LAUSD South Region High School No. 9, Gibson Interchange (SR-47/I-110 connector). Ken Wong indicated that discharge of "resuable" dredged material in or within the vicinity of Machado Lake could change the 404 permitting strategy for the larger restoration project of which dredging is one component; asked proponents to coordinate reuse options with the permitting team for the overall project. Mike Lyons indicated that transport and use of dredged material in the off-site alternatives above

* Participating agencies are composed of (1) core members that have permitting authority over dredging-related projects; (2) stakeholder agencies such California State Lands Commission, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, California Department of Fish and Game, and National Marine Fisheries Service.

† Agency representatives participating via teleconference.

Δ Decisions of the California Coastal Commission (CCC) are partly based on recommendations provided by its staff. Therefore, SC-DMMT determinations reflect the views of the CCC staff but not necessarily of the CCC.

would require some form of general permits from the Water Board. Proponent also inquired whether discharge of ground water from construction sites into Machado Lake. Per Ken Wong, discharge of groundwater does not qualify as discharge of fill. Therefore, 404 permit is not required for the activity. Per Mike Lyons, discharge of groundwater would require a permit from the Water Board.

d. Determination:

- i. Disposal of "resuable" or "resuable for construction" portion of the dredged material at POLB Middle Harbor would not affect CSTF scope of review of dredging at Machado Lake indicated above since Middle Harbor is already a permitted facility.
- ii. Due to the proposed placement of "resuable" material in or with the vicinity of Machado Lake, final SAPR should also focus on the suitability of "resuable" portion of the dredged material in addition to items listed in the minutes from the March 24, 2010 meeting.
- iii. Discharge of groundwater from construction sites into Machado Lake would be outside of CSTF scope of review since it is not associated with dredging operations or dredged material though permits may be required from some permitting agencies such as the LA RWQCB.

D. Los Angeles River Estuary

- a. **Project Proponents/PMs:** USACE/Larry Smith, Planning Div.
- b. **Purpose of Discussion:** suitability of proposed sampling
- c. **Background:** The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers is planning to perform additional dredging within the federal channel in the Los Angeles River Estuary. Disposal is proposed for the Middle Harbor Project within Slip 1 in the Port of Long Beach (POLB). The area proposed for dredging is within composite areas 3 and 4, as defined by previous sediment sampling and testing programs. The POLB has requested that new samples be taken to allow them to evaluate the proposed sediments as part of their design of the Middle Harbor Project. Environmental sampling is not required due to previous sediment sampling and testing programs and the proposal to dispose of sediments within a confined disposal site. The Corps will be conducting an additional sampling program to comply with the request from the POLB.

This sampling program will consist of five individual cores from each of the two composite areas (3 & 4). Individual cores within each composite area shall be combined to produce a single sample from the composite area for analyses. Two samples (one from each composite area) shall be analyzed for chemical and geophysical characteristics. In addition 3-5 cores will be taken from the shoal located adjacent to the federal channel.

The purpose of this is to identify what materials are present in this shoal for possible future use as beach nourishment materials. This is not meant to substitute for project-specific sediment sampling and analyses, but is intended to provide data on what types of sediment are present in the shoal and if use for beach nourishment is possible.

d. **Discussion:** None.

e. **Determination:** The sampling program was accepted as presented.

ATTACHMENT A

Meeting Notes
SC-DMMT/CSTF
April 28, 2010
Marina del Rey

The purpose of the item was to present results of the sampling and analyses of sediments conducted at Marina del Rey. Sediments were tested for suitability as beach nourishment at Dockweiler and Redondo Beaches and near shore disposal at sites located off of Dockweiler and Redondo Beaches. Funding to perform maintenance dredging will be limited and it is unlikely that sufficient dredging will be available to dredge the entire site. Corps' emphasis will be on dredging those portion of the site with sediments found to be unsuitable for beach or nearshore disposal. This is because we currently have a singular opportunity to dispose of these sediments within the Port of Long Beach (PLOB) Middle Harbor Project. Sediments that are suitable for beach or nearshore disposal can remain in place until additional funding is received.

Sediments were evaluated in a test program that included physical and chemical analyses. This follows past practice of evaluating sediments for beach or nearshore disposal endorsed by the USEPA, Regional Water Quality Control Board, and the Coastal Commission. Heal the Bay expressed their position of asking for additional toxicity testing for all beach and/or nearshore disposal projects.

The discussion of sediment suitability was conducted based on discussion of composite areas with little or no controversy. The discussion was based on a Memorandum for the Record prepared by the Corps presenting a preliminary suitability determination dated April 27, 2010, and distributed to the CSTF the day prior to the meeting.

Area 1 was determined to be physically incompatible with beach or nearshore disposal and to have contaminant levels of concern. This area was determined to be suitable for disposal within the POLB Middle Harbor Project only.

Areas 7N, 7S, 8N, 8S, 9N, & 9S were determined to be physically incompatible with beach or nearshore disposal and to have contaminant levels of concern. These areas were determined to be suitable for disposal within the POLB Middle Harbor Project only.

Area 6 was determined to be physically compatible with beach disposal at both sites and nearshore disposal at both sites. There initially was some concern expressed regarding single PAHs found in one of the individual cores. However, overall this was felt not to be a problem. This area was determined to be suitable for beach disposal at either beach site and nearshore disposal at either nearshore site.

Area 5 was discussed next, although final resolution was delayed until the remainder of the sites were discussed first. Area 5 was determined to be physically compatible with nearshore disposal at either of the two nearshore disposal sites. There was some concern expressed about the results of core 5a due to elevated DDT and chlordane levels. The final determination was that area 5,

with the exception of core 5a, was suitable for nearshore disposal at either of the two nearshore disposal sites. Core 5a was determined to be suitable for disposal within the POLB Middle Harbor Project only.

Area 4 was determined to be physically compatible with nearshore disposal at Dockweiler only. There was concern over the results of the chemical analyses for core 4b due to elevated lead, PAHs, DDT, and total chlordane. The final determination was that area 4, with the exception of core 4b, was suitable for nearshore disposal at the Dockweiler nearshore disposal site. Core 4b was determined to be suitable for disposal within the POLB Middle Harbor Project only.

Area 3 was determined to be physically not compatible with beach or nearshore disposal. However, the outer portion of area 3 represented by individual cores a, b, & d are compatible with nearshore disposal at Redondo. However, there was concern expressed over contaminants found in the composite and all individual cores. These were primarily copper, lead, PAHs, and total chlordane. This area was determined to be suitable for disposal within the POLB Middle Harbor Project only.

Area 2 was determined to be physically compatible with nearshore disposal at Dockweiler only. However, there was concern expressed over contaminants found in the composite and all individual cores. These were primarily copper, lead, silver, zinc, PAHs, DDT, and total chlordane. This area was determined to be suitable for disposal within the POLB Middle Harbor Project only.

Area 5 was subject to a lot of discussion owing to the location of core 5a. It is on the outside corner of the composite area and could be difficult to dredge as a single entity. Additionally, if dredging with beach or nearshore disposal is conducted first, leaving core 5a could result in a “speed bump” in the northern entrance that would remain a hazard to boating until dredging for POLB Middle Harbor disposal is performed once Slip 1 is made available by the POLB. Additional testing was discussed, but determined to be infeasible to address the issue without extensive and expensive additional testing. Details on how dredging will proceed will have to wait until funding has been established and a determination made as to which composite areas will be dredged and in what order they will be dredged. The final suitability determination discussed above was reached at the end of this discussion.