

Southern California Dredged Material Management Team (SC-DMMT)  
May 26, 2010  
Meeting Notes

**I. SC-DMMT Participating Agencies \***

- a. Jorine Campopiano – EPA
- b. Allan Ota<sup>†</sup> - EPA
- c. Mike Lyons – LARWQCB
- d. Larry Simon<sup>†</sup> – CCC
- e. Larry Smith - USACE
- f. Ken Wong – USACE
- g. Theresa Stevens – USACE
- h. Antal Szijj<sup>†</sup> - USACE

See Attachment A for the May 26, 2010 meeting sign in sheet.

**II. Project Review and Determinations<sup>Δ</sup>**

- A. Berth D44/ Eagle Aggregates (CSTF):** See Attachment B.
- B. Colorado Lagoon Restoration Project (CSTF):** See Attachment C.
- C. Los Angeles River Estuary (CSTF):** See Attachment D.
- D. Ventura Harbor Dredging (DMMT):** See Attachment E.

---

\* Participating agencies are composed of (1) core members that have regulatory 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.

<sup>†</sup> Agency representatives participating via teleconference.

<sup>Δ</sup> 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.

## SC-DMMT

## Sign-In Sheet, May 26, 2010

PRINT NAME	ORGANIZATION	EMAIL
1. Kenneth Wung	USACE	kenneth.wung@usace.army.mil
2. Allan Oja	EPA	
3. Jonne Campopiano	USEPA	campopiano.jonne@epa.gov
4. Larry Smith	Coops.	
5. Tracy Stoffbahn	Anchor OEA	tstiffbahn@anchoroea.com
6. Josh Burnham	" "	jburnham@anchoroea.com
7. Bob Logan	Kennedy/Jacks	boblogan@kennedyjacks.com
8. Bill Terry	Eagle Rock Aggregates	bterry@EagleAggregates.com
9. Dylan Porter	POLB	porter@polb.com
10. Nick Buthe	NAUTILUS	nich@nautilusenvironmental
11. ERIC LOPEZ	CLB-Comm. Dev.	Eric.Lopez@Longbeach.gov
12. Kim Garvey	Moffatt & Nichol	kgarvey@moffattnichol.com
13. Marty Stevenson	Kinnetic Labs	mstevens@kinneticlabs.com
14. Sandra Gonzalez	CITY OF Long Beach - Park Beach Marine	sandra.gonzalez@longbeach.gov
15. Larry Simon		
16. Rick Camann		
17. * via phone *		
18. Michael Lyons		
19. Kirk Brusk	USACE	Kirk.C.Brusk@USACE.Army.mil
20. Jeff Cole	USACE	
21.		
22.		

## MEMORANDUM

**27 May 2010**

**To:** Mr. Ken Wong (via email)  
Contaminated Sediments Task Force Coordinator  
USACE, Los Angeles - Regulatory Division

**From:** Mr. Nick Buhbe, Nautilus Environmental  
On Behalf of: Mr. Bill Terry, Eagle Aggregates

**RE: Meeting Minutes**  
**Contaminated Sediments Task Force Meeting, 26 May 2010**  
**Agenda Item 1. Eagle Aggregates SAP Review**

---

Attendees present on behalf of the Applicant:  
Mr. Bill Terry, Eagle Aggregates (Applicant)  
Mr. Nick Buhbe, Nautilus Environmental LLC (Consultant)  
Mr. Bob Logan, Kennedy/Jenks Consultants (Consultant)  
Ms. Teresa Stevens (USACE POC)

CSTF Members Present: Refer to Meeting Sign-in Sheet

The proposed project was introduced by Ms. Stevens, including summary project information (Berth D44 site in the Port of Long Beach, proposed dredge volume, sampling approach). Mr. Buhbe also presented project summary information, including a map of the 6 proposed coring locations revised to include a better indication of the vicinity of the barge wreck. Discussion regarding potential disposal sites included the Pier G slip fill (currently underway) and the Middle Harbor Redevelopment Project (proposed time frame: early 2011 through mid-2012).

Mr. Aaron Allen and Ms. Jorine Campopiano (EPA) noted the presence of contamination in the vicinity of the project site (several hundred meters outside of the proposed dredge footprint based on historical data), and recommended that the dredge prism be split horizontally into two characterization units, one inshore of the outer limit of the proposed advanced maintenance dredging and a second for offshore areas. Four core locations were recommended for the offshore area (for an overall project total of 8 locations); specific locations were discussed.

In addition, requested revisions to the SAP included:

1. Repositioning of proposed cores D1 and D2 to the west of their draft locations. Core D2 would be situated closer to the wreck location, but not so close as to risk potential refusal due to debris.



2. Updating Table 6 to include PCB congeners in addition to Aroclors;
3. Updating Table 6 to include specific phenol, phthalate, and butyltin species; and
4. Updating Section 3.7.3.2 to include a 1 percent dilution treatment.

Recommendations included collection of archive samples from individual core horizons in order to retain the potential for assessment of the vertical distribution of contaminants. Mr. Larry Smith (USACE) suggested that for individual core archives, that in the absence of observed strata greater than 2 feet in dimension, the -45 ft MLLW elevation should be used as a delineation boundary for a lower sediment stratum. This would potentially provide data which could inform decisions regarding advanced maintenance dredging at the site.

Additional discussion:

Mr. Larry Smith noted that the cross section of the dredge prism indicated vertical cuts and inquired as to whether or not side slopes were considered. Mr. Buhbe indicated that side slopes may be further engineered and that the SAP included excess volume to cover additional volume and/or sloughing from the side slopes during dredging.

Mr. Ken Wong inquired as to the rationale used to designate core locations. Mr. Buhbe replied that cores were designated such that they would be representative of the overall volumes of material proposed for dredging.

Group discussion regarding dredging in the vicinity of the wreck: For regulatory compliance purposes, it was noted that any wreck debris would need to be segregated through the use of a grate or similar device during dredging to preclude disposal of debris at the LA-5 ODMDS. This concern would be addressed through the inclusion of BMPs in the dredging permit. Cultural resource issues would also need to be investigated as part of the project review.

Eagle Aggregates and their consultants will incorporate the above-recommended changes to the SAP and provide a final copy to Ms. Stevens (USACE) forthwith. In addition, the EA team will maintain contact with permitting agencies and the Port of Long Beach regarding findings of the investigation in order to coordinate the project with ongoing CSTF efforts.

Meeting Minutes for Presentation of “Colorado Lagoon Dredge Sediment – Cement Stabilization Treatment Test Results”, 5/26/2010 SC-DMMT Meeting.

This presentation was a follow-up to the sediment test plan presented at the 9/23/2009 DMMT meeting. Testing was performed to evaluate treatment of dredge sediment from Colorado Lagoon (City of Long Beach) that is considered potentially hazardous due to soluble lead.

The initial plan was to evaluate cement stabilization/solidification treatment. However, the cement stabilization method failed and two additional rounds of testing using other methods were performed. Ultimately, a “Synthetic Metals Mineralization System” approach, conducted by ADT Environmental Solutions, successfully stabilized the material. Soluble lead content in the treated material was typically two orders of magnitude below the California Title 22 hazardous material criteria.

Discussion at the meeting included:

- Question about regulatory permitting process – Ken Wong (USACE) clarified that a regulatory permit is needed for the parts of the project not funded by the Corps.
- Question about if the ADT process addressed any other constituents besides lead – Marty Stevenson (Kinnetic) replied that the process would help with other cationic metals.
- Question asked if Port of Long Beach was okay with this approach (since dredge sediment slated for disposal at POLB Middle Harbor fill site) - Rick Cameron (POLB) responded that the Port would accept if so approved by the regulatory/permitting agencies.
- Larry Smith (USACE) asked about the POLB (Middle Harbor) percent fines requirements shown in the presentation. It was clarified that these were preliminary numbers used as guidelines for the treatment testing.
- Ken Wong (USACE) asked about the focus on lead. It was clarified that soluble lead is the only constituent which exceeds hazard levels. However, Ken asked that previous testing reports be provided to DMMT to understand the overall characterization of Colorado Lagoon sediments.

The dredge project specification would require that the dredge material shall contain  $\leq 2.5$  mg/L of lead, and not dictate a specific treatment method. In general, there was consensus that this would be an acceptable approach. However, it was noted that the selected supplier should have to demonstrate/prove their treatment approach, prior to full-scale field operations. If ADT is not the selected supplier, the DMMT will need to review the alternate method results.

Action:

- Provide previous sediment test results reports. Return/Call in to next DMMT meeting to discuss any issues based on DMMT members review of these reports.

## ATTACHMENT D

Southern California Dredged Material Management Team/Contaminated Sediments Task Force Joint Meeting, May 26, 2010.

### Los Angeles River Estuary Dredging

#### Discussion

Two composite areas from within the federal channel in the Los Angeles River Estuary (Areas 3 & 4) are being evaluated for dredging with early disposal within Slip 1 in the Port of Long Beach (POLB) as part of the Middle Harbor Project. The city of Long Beach is also requesting permission to dredge the entrance to Rainbow Harbor, which is immediately adjacent to the federal channel. Disposal would also be within Slip 1.

A complete sediment sampling and analysis program was conducted in 2007 for the entire federal channel in the Los Angeles River Estuary, including Areas 3 & 4. Sediments in Areas 3 & 4 were determined to be suitable for ocean disposal at the LA-2 ocean dredged material disposal site. The areas were not dredged with the remainder of the channel in 2008-2009 due to a lack of funding. Funding has been received and the Corps would like to proceed to complete dredging.

Confirmatory testing was conducted in 2009 in area 4 to test recent infill materials. The surface sediments were sampled and tested. They sediments were sufficiently different in composition and contaminant levels from the underlying materials that they were determined not suitable for ocean disposal.

The city of Long Beach tested the sediment from Rainbow Harbor entrance in 2008. Those materials were also suitable for ocean disposal. They are proposing disposal in Slip 1 to take advantage of cost savings from tying into the Corps' dredging project and a shorter trip from dredge to disposal site.

The remaining issue is how to comply with the Middle Harbor Project permit to allow disposal of the proposed materials into Slip 1 in advance of the actual start of the project. Regulatory requested that the POLB submit a package of information on the sediments in question in response to which Regulatory would issue a Notice to Proceed. Corps Planning agreed to provide this information to the POLB who would then forward it to Regulatory. City of Long Beach to do the same for Rainbow Harbor.

There was also concern that the infill sediments in area 4 not be allowed to remain on the surface in Slip 1. After some discussion it was determined to dredge and place area 4 sediments first, covering them with sediments from area 3 and the Rainbow Harbor entrance channel.

Additional testing of sediments was also discussed and it was determined that the test results in hand were sufficient to determine suitability for disposal in Slip 1.

#### Determination

First, no additional sampling or testing of sediments from the Los Angeles River Estuary federal channel composite areas 3 & 4 and the entrance channel to Rainbow Harbor is required. Second, all sediments are suitable for disposal within Slip 1 in the POLB. Advance placement in Slip 1 is approved provided dredging and disposal occur in the following order: area 4 first with area 3 and Rainbow Harbor following to cover area 4 sediments.

Note that Michael Lyons was not present or on line to participate in the original discussion. However, Michael called in after lunch and was brought up to date on the discussion and concurred with the determinations.

## ATTACHMENT E

Meeting minute notes for Ventura Harbor maintenance dredging – SC-DMMT meeting of May 26, 2010 (1 pm): Discussion and Comments on Ventura Harbor maintenance dredging pre- Sampling and Analysis Program (SAP):

### Discussion:

Item 1. Discussed that the SAP would include the field investigation, laboratory testing, and report preparation for defined portions of the Federal, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE)'s Ventura Harbor Maintenance Dredging Project (USACE project) to include: vibratory coring sampling, beach transect sampling, bulk sediment chemistry, geotechnical testing, caulerpa taxifolia and eelgrass surveys and mapping, and reports. Discussed in the SC-DMMT the Ventura Harbor maintenance dredging SAP description from Word.doc document titled Ventura Harbor maintenance dredging Sampling and Analysis discussion and discussed Figure 1 in the pdf.

Item 2. Discussed that the SAP is in support of the next six (6) year Ventura Harbor maintenance dredging Environmental Assessment (EA).

### Questions/Comments and Corps Responses:

Item 1. Question about the Federal dredge areas in Ventura Harbor. Corps Response was Areas G, H, I are Sand Trap (referenced Word.doc Tables for SAP Ventura Harbor maintenance dredging FY2010.doc, Table 2., that was also discussed in the SC-DMMT). Clarified that Areas G, H, and I are basically in the littoral transport area, north of the Jetty, and that the sill rock is in the general location of Area F. The Entrance Channel in Ventura Harbor is Areas A, B, C, D and E.

Item 2. Question on the list of Analytical Methods and Target Detection Limits on Sediment Samples (discussed Word.doc Tables for SAP Ventura Harbor maintenance dredging FY2010.doc, Table 3.) that it appeared not all the Constituents were listed, and that the Method/Sediment did not appear to be the same as previously cited. Corps response was that Mission Bay Harbor SAP Analytical Methods and Target Detection Limits on Sediment Samples list was referenced/cited for the Ventura Harbor maintenance dredging SAP; the Mission Bay Harbor SAP had previously gone through for review through the CSTF/ SC-DMMT. Corps will investigate further and coordinate with EPA to establish final table.

Item 3: Question about the depth of samples. Corps response was that chemical samples down to 2 foot overdepth and that the extra foot was to be archived and for geotechnical samples.

Item 4: Question about the doing reference chemistry as part of beach sampling at South Beach and McGrath State Beach and McGrath State Beach Nearshore (discussed Figure 2 pdf) as placement of dredged material areas (disposal). Corps response was that Ventura Harbor Federal dredge area is right adjacent to the placement of dredged material area(s), and, therefore, the material is the same in both areas, so there is no chemistry test required for these beaches.

### Determination:



The approach proposed for sampling and analyses at Ventura Harbor is approved, pending final resolution of Item 2 above.