Southern California Dredged Material Management Team (SC-DMMT)
April 29, 2009
Meeting Notes

I. Participating Agencies/Attendees:

a. Jorine Campopiano (EPA)
b. Jack Gregg† (CCC)
c. Mike Lyons† (RWQCB - Region 4)
d. Allan Ota† (EPA)
e. Bill Paznokas† (CDFG - San Diego)
f. Larry Simon† (CCC)
g. Cori Farrar (USACE – Regulatory)
h. Ken Wong (USACE – Regulatory)
i. Erin Hardison (USACE – Planning)
j. Jodi Clifford (USACE – Planning)
k. Larry Smith (USACE – Planning)
l. Dan Swenson (USACE- Regulatory)
m. David W. Smith† (EPA)

† Agency representatives participating via teleconference.

II. Determinations[1]

A. San Diego Harbor Channel Maintenance Dredging SAR

a. **Discussion:** Tier II & III results for dredged material not suitable for beach nourishment (Areas 6, 8, 10-14). Areas 11, 12, & 13 very silty. Most constituents < ERL. Constituents exceeding ERL were below ERM. No water column toxicity. No benthic toxicity. PCBs were non detect in Areas 1,2,3,6,8,10, and 14 and elevated in Areas 11,12,13. Bioassays indicated the accumulation of PCBs in Areas 10,11,12, and 13. EPA: bioaccumulation results should be from steady-state conditions, and 28-day exposure may not yield steady-state conditions. Therefore, the tissue concentrations need to be multiplied by a factor of 1.7 to obtain steady state concentrations. Though the results may be well below FDA levels, thresholds for ecosystem impacts may be well below FDA levels. PCB holding time is 14 days if samples are frozen. However, project cores stored at 4°c since October 2008. PCB may not exhibit substantial degradation.

b. Determination:

i. Dredged materials from areas 6, 8, and 14 suitable for disposal at LA-5.

[1] Decisions of the CCC are partly based on recommendations provided by its staff. Therefore, DMMT determinations reflect the views of the CCC staff but not necessarily of the CCC.

ii. Retest individual cores from Areas 10, 11, 12, & 13 for PCB to increase resolution. Retesting of cores exceeding PCB holding times acceptable.[2]

iii. Prepare a site map of the composite areas (Areas 10, 11, 12, 13) with the individual core sample locations clearly identified, and ideally, orient the map so the outboard area near the Navy Pier 12 can be identified as well.[3]

B. Lower Newport Bay Maintenance Dredging SAP

a. **Discussion:** See attached detailed notes from EPA and Corps. In general, increased resolution of composites needed since in a number of cases a single composite would characterize large areas or dredge volumes. Variations and suggestions for constructing composites discussed. Substrate not found to be suitable for ocean disposal would most likely not be dredged. Tests by individual cores in areas where Hg was found to be present.

b. Determination:

i. SAP would need to incorporate changes indicated in the attachments.

ii. Once revisions have been incorporated, DMMT will again review the SAP and may request additional revisions as needed prior to approval.

III. DMMT

A. Draft DMMT Coordination Principles and Procedures

a. Substantial discussion concerning relationship between CSTF & DMMT as it relates to public participation.

b. "Core membership" used to denote agencies that have direct permitting authority over dredging projects. Participating agencies with no direct permitting authority such as DFG can participate regularly on the DMMT.

c. DMMT determinations as it relates to the CCC reflect only the determinations of the CCC staff and not the CCC itself.

d. DMMT by majority vote decided a firm two week deadline for submission of agenda items. That is, project managers & DMMT participants must submit agenda items exactly two weeks prior to scheduled DMMT meetings.

e. Suggested edits to the Coordination Principles and Procedures need to be submitted to Dan Swenson by May 13, 2009.

B. SAP/SAPR templates

a. Parties responsible for SAP/SAR templates to bring draft versions of assignments for discussion in the next DMMT meeting.

---

[2] Allan Ota in e-mail (attached) received April 29, 2009.

[3] Ibid

ATTACHMENT 1: EPA COMMENTS FOR LOWER NEWPORT BAY

* Annual limit of LA-3 is 2.5 million cy, this project's volume is 1.12 million, and that is with the assumption of only one foot of overdepth. The SAP should acknowledge the annual cap and provide additional details on project timing and other on-going projects in the OC area.
* One-foot of overdepth does not appear to be practicable for the project. As proposed at the DMMT meeting, the document should be changed to two feet of overdepth (1 paid, 1 unpaid). Volumes and tables in the SAP should be updated to reflect this new depth.
* All sediment testing must go down to project depth +2. Core tables and SAP language must be changed to reflect this.
* Beneficial use discussion is absent from SAP, and assumes ocean disposal, need at least a paragraph describing practicability of beneficial use. It was noted during the DMMT meeting that if material does not meet ocean disposal criteria, it will not be dredged. This should also be reflected in the SAP.
* OK to streamline the testing program by skipping the suspended particulate phase (water column) tests where proposed.
* Acute bioassays must include a worm in addition to the amphipod for all proposed composites.
* Balboa Reach - Two additional cores should be added to shoaled areas on the south side of the channel, one to the east of core 8, and one to the west of core 6, for a total of 10 cores.
* Harbor Isle Reach - Three additional cores should be added to shoaled areas: one on the north side of the channel southeast of core 12. Two cores on the south side of the channel should be added: one northwest of core 13 and one southeast of core 15, for a total of 10 cores.
* Lido Isle Reach - The North and South sides of the channel should be split into two composites, one representing the -10 project depth, and the other representing the -20 depth. Volumes for each of these comps should be calculated. Three additional cores should be added to the south side of the channel in the shoaled areas northwest of core 23. One core should be added on the Southwest side, for a total of four additional cores.
* Balboa Island Channel - One additional core should be added in the shoaled area between cores 44 and 45
* Upper Newport Channel - One additional core should be added in the shoaled area of the south east corner of the project.
* Yacht Anchorage - Add another composite in Section I such that there will now be 5 composites: composite shown in Figure 9 is OK; split into upper and lower composites in the area shown in Figure 10; and split into upper and lower composites in the area shown in Figure 11.
* Linda Channels - These two areas should be broken up into two composites, one representing cores 76 and 77, the other representing 78-81. One additional core should be added in the entrance channel west of core 77. Two additional cores should be added in the other composite, one between points 78 and 79 and one between 80 and 81.
* Hg Sampling -. EPA requests to work with the applicant on a sampling strategy for Hg. In areas that have a history of Hg ERL exceedences, individual cores should be

tested for Hg. Additionally, EPA proposes that any composite whose composite result exceeds the ERL for Hg, will be required to have the individual cores tested.

* As always, archives of all cores should be kept for subsequent testing.
* EPA can fax over copies of additional core locations if that would help.

ATTACHMENT 2: CORPS COMMENTS FOR LOWER NEWPORT BAY

Comments on Draft Dredged Material evaluation for the Lower Newport Bay - Sampling and Analysis Plan (NewFields LLC, April 2009)
Provided by Corps of Engineers – Regulatory Division

Below are comments provided by the Corps Regulatory Division. In addition, we request that your results be provided in the format shown in the attached Excel spreadsheet.

Page(s)	Paragraph	Comment
1 1 46	2 Table 1-1 Table 2-1	Revise Tables and associated text to reflect 2 foot overdredge depth allowance instead of 1 foot OD.
2		Add new subsection that includes a brief discussion on beneficial reuse; it should be included even if reuse isn't being proposed (see EPA comments for details).
36-44		Add new additional figure(s) which overlay historical testing sites and areas with proposed testing sites and composites and/or provide a crosswalk table. The area names differ between prior evaluations and the proposed project. It is also difficult to discern the overlap of testing sites to determine to what extent the historical data are representative of areas proposed for dredging.
36-44		Reference the figures most appropriate to show areas discussed.
36-47	Various Table 2-2	Benthic testing will be required for all areas. Worm bioassay results were last provided in 2003. Given the change observed in the Bay's sediment grain-size composition and the OTM testing standards, worm bioassay tests will be required in addition to amphipods for all the areas (see EPA comments for specifics).
45 47	1 and 2 Table 2-2	Composites – the agencies believe several of the areas need a higher resolution of testing than proposed. - For Linda Isle, change 1 composite to 2 composites. The cores from the sampling stations in the inner marina can be combined as 1 composite and the cores from sampling stations in the outer two intersecting channels can be composited together as 1 other composite. - For the Yacht Anchorage (YA), change 4 composites to 5 composites as follows: o YA-North is fine as 1 composite, unless City wants to have higher resolution between upper and lower horizons to isolate o YA-Middle should be 2 composites, 1 lower horizon and 1 upper horizon o YA-South should be 2 composites, 1 lower horizon and 1 upper horizon o Note: SC-DMMT agency indicated that arsenic should be evaluated in sandy material, if such material is observed and proposed for reuse
49	Table 2-3	Add 1 additional sampling station northwest of station 16 at the shoaling area (-7 ft MLLW elevation).
Appendix A	Figs 1-12	Locations of outfall structures or other potential contaminant sources should be identified on the figures.

ATTACHEMENT 3: Allan Ota email for San Diego Harbor Channel Maintenance Dredging

From: Ota.Allan@epamail.epa.gov
Sent: Wednesday, April 29, 2009 5:41 PM
To: Swenson, Daniel P SPL
Cc: Ross.Brian@epamail.epa.gov; Hardison, Erin L SPL; Jorine Campopiano/R9/USEPA/US@EPA "Wong, Kenneth SPL" <Kenneth.Wong@usace.army.mil> "Smith, Lawrence J SPL
Subject: San Diego Harbor - analysis of archived individual core sediment samples
Importance: High

Dan, Ken, and Larry,

An addition to the meeting notes for today:

Just got word that it is OK to attempt the individual core analysis for PCBs on the unfrozen sediment samples (stored at 4 degrees C), with the assumption that this constituent class would not be degraded significantly since collection. If the archive samples had been split vertically (and remained separate), we would recommend that "top" and "bottom" subsamples be analyzed; otherwise, proceed with the individual cores themselves.

In the meantime, please prepare a site map of the composite areas (Areas 10, 11, 12, 13) with the individual core sample locations clearly identified, and ideally, orient the map so the outboard area near the Navy Pier 12 can be identified as well. We suspect that there may be a common shoal between the two project areas with the same contamination issues.

By the way, I thought the meeting was fairly productive. Ken, thanks for your work on the meeting notes.

****

Allan Ota
Oceanographer / Regional Ocean Dumping Coordinator Dredging and Sediment Management Team
(WTR-8) U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 9
75 Hawthorne Street
San Francisco, CA 94105
==========
415-972-3476 office
415-947-3537 fax
ota.allan@epa.gov
==========