

Southern California Dredged Material Management Team (SC-DMMT)
May 27, 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. Ken Wong (USACE – Regulatory)
- g. Larry Smith (USACE – Planning)
- h. Dan Swenson (USACE- Regulatory)
- i. Phuong Trinh (USACE- Regulatory)
- j. Mo Chang (USACE- Navigation)
- k. David Zoutendyk[†] (USFWS)
- l. Lauren White[†] (USFWS)
- m. Josh Burnam (Anchor Env.)
- n. Steve Cappellino (Anchor Env.)
- o. Mark Sandoval (city of Long Beach)

II. Determinations¹

A. Ventura Keys & Ventura Harbor Dredging SAR

- a. **Discussion:** Discussion primarily centered on locations where dredged material would be discharged. Past permits have authorized discharge within Santa Clara River when flow is approximately 100 cfs so that addition of dredged material will not significantly increase turbidity. Maps unclear as to where exactly the discharge point at the mouth of the Santa Clara River is located. Dredged material is < 50% sand. EPA: proposed discharge may not qualify as beneficial reuse but disposal which may trigger Section 103 and a disposal site designation process. CCC staff: concern that discharge of material with high fines into the intertidal zone should only be done where the discharge is not adversely impacting coastal resources and that the conditions of this discharge (during high river flow, etc.) need to be better described. Otherwise these projects may set precedents for upcoming dredging projects that may adversely impact coastal resources.

* Participating agencies are composed of (1) core members that have permitting authority over dredging-related projects such as the EPA, USACE, RWQCB, and the CCC and (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.

¹Decisions 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.

b. Determination:

- i. SAR results approved. No further testing required.
- ii. Remove from text (p.6) statement concerning the insolubility of chrysene and claims of no effect to marine environment – inaccurate statement in that this constituent and other organic contaminants bound to sediments can be bioavailable and elicit toxic responses in solid phase bioassays
- iii. Global correction for both Ventura Keys and Ventura Harbor SARs - Since these dredged materials are proposed for discharge to the ocean, emphasis should be placed on comparison to environmental impact guidelines (e.g., ERL/ERM) and other appropriate ecological screening endpoints or criteria which are more relevant than human health-based screening values for aquatic placement of sediments – in particular, references to PRGs and MCLs for drinking water should be deleted.
- iv. Suitability determination will be made upon receipt of map clarifying discharge locations.

B. Mission Bay (USACE)

- a. Discussion:** Original EA prepared March 2003, but project lacked funding. Currently, project is funded by stimulus money & needs to be contracted by end of fiscal year. Thus, SAP needs to be proved before next DMMT. Past test results indicate clean sand. USFWS expressed concern about eelgrass which is present within the dredge footprint especially in the Mariner’s Cove area. USFWS also indicated that no formal consultation would be necessary so long as dredging and disposal of sediment takes place between September 16th and March 31st to avoid the California least tern breeding season. All eelgrass impacts should be mitigated according to SCEMP. Proposed project thus far:

Location	Dredge depth	Dredge volume	Number of samples	Number of composites
Approach	25'	148 key	3	1
Entrance	20'	244 key	5	1
Main	20'	258 key	10	2 (5 samples each)
Mariner’s cove	15'	116 key	6	1

b. Determination:

- i. Following items needed for further review and discussion
 - 1. recent bathymetry survey
 - 2. dredge volumes by area
 - 3. proposed sampling schemes

4. result of past sampling
- ii. Larry Smith has posted above items to in “Mission Bay” folder: <ftp://ftp.usace.army.mil/pub/spl/>
- iii. DMMT to teleconference on June 10, 2009 at 10 a.m. using the same call in number (866-600-5836) and pass code (5727844). Corps folks to meet in Planning Div’s conference room on 14th floor.

C. North Energy Island Borrow Pit (NEIBP)

- a. **Discussion:** city of Long Beach proposed to use NEIBP as a CAD as a last disposal option for contaminated sediments when other disposal means are not available or would create additional environmental impacts (e.g., air quality impacts from trucking contaminated sediments to landfills). NEIBP is a borrow pit created for the construction of North Energy Island. Capacity is approximately 5-7 million cy. City faces lawsuits from tenants for not dredging leased areas. City anticipates difficulty in finding disposal locations for contaminated sediments since POLB CDFs may not be available in time for the city’s use. City can truck contaminated sediments to landfills which entails air quality impacts, and resistance to truck traffic from community. Currently, city anticipates contaminated sediment from upcoming projects: Colorado Lagoon; Catalina terminal; and Alamitos Bay. Pilot CAD study involving 100,000 cy capped with clean sand shown to be successful in isolating contaminants. NEIBP-CAD site would primarily serve disposal needs of local dredging projects since it’s not economically sound to transport sediment from other locations.

b. Conclusions:

- i. Any proposed use of NEIBP needs to be accompanied by an Operations, Maintenance and Monitoring Plan (OMMP)
- ii. Approval process would need to proceed through CSTF.
- iii. City of Long Beach should form partnerships with other entities that may need to use the NEIBP such as the Corps of Engineers, and Los Angeles County Beaches and Harbors.
- iv. Proposed plan to use NEIBP as CAD seems technically sound, but additional information is needed - the responsibility and funding of operations, maintenance, monitoring of the CAD site (e.g., the OMMP).
- v. Beneficial reuse of material needs to be emphasized in any NEIBP-CAD plan, and beneficial reuse options need to be incorporated into any OMMP.

III. DMMT

A. Draft DMMT Coordination Principles and Procedures

- a. Revised draft to be sent out for review after meeting

B. SAP/SAPR templates

- a. Postponed until next meeting