

Southern California Dredged Material Management Team (SC-DMMT)  
March 24, 2010  
Meeting Notes

**I. Participating Agencies\* /Attendees:**

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

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

- A. **CSTF Projects:** Projects listed below were discussed at the CSTF portion of the meeting. Sign-in sheet for agencies and individuals participating in the CSTF meeting is attached (see Attachment A). Notes provided by project proponents are provided as attachments.
- a. Berth 243- POLA/Gambol Industries. See Attachment A
  - b. Marina del Rey - Larry Smith (USACE). See Attachment B

**B. Lake Machado Dredging**

- a. **Project Proponents/PMs:** city of Los Angeles/Ken Wong, Regulatory
- b. **Purpose of Discussion:** Brief review of SAPR to investigate disposal options for dredged material.
- c. **Background:** Machado Lake and the Wilmington Drain form an interconnected *freshwater* system receiving urban runoff from Dominguez Watershed. Accordingly, water quality in the lake is poor, and is listed on the 303(d) impaired waters list. Furthermore, because of continual sediment buildup, the lake has become increasingly shallow, which in turn allows for the unchecked growth of a shallow water invasive plant. Sediment buildup has also reduced the flood conveyance capacity of Wilmington Drain. Dredging is one component of a larger project that would reduce trash, improve water quality, enhance habitat, and restore flood conveyance capacity. Applicant proposes to dredge a total of 107,700 cy of dredged material from 6 areas (DMMUs 1-6) in Machado Lake, and 30,000 cy from 4 areas (DMMUs 1-4) in Wilmington Drain. **Machado Lake:** cores sampled to 8 ft. below substrate; dredge depth would extend to 4 ft.

---

\* 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.

below substrate; and 4-8 ft. layer would be left in place. 6 cores + 16 supplemental cores tested at the following intervals: 0-3 ft, 3-4 ft, & 4-8 ft. **Wilmington Drain:** cores sampled to 6.5 ft. below substrate; dredge depth would extend to 4.5 ft. below substrate; and 4.5 - 6 ft. layer would be left in place. 4 cores + 3 supplemental cores. tested at the following approximate intervals: 0-4.5 ft, & 5-6 ft

- d. **Discussion:** *In general* a number of substrate intervals within the dredge prism for both Machado Lake and Wilmington Drain exhibited exceedences (of varying degrees) of appropriate freshwater sediments and water quality guidelines for total DDTs, total PCBs, chlordane, and metals. Some intervals samples exhibited presence of PAHs, chlordane, or metals in the elutriate. Most substrate intervals in the Machado Lake dredge prism exhibited acute or chronic toxicity and bioaccumulation. Approximately half of the substrate intervals in the Wilmington Drain dredge prism exhibited some bioaccumulation; evidence of toxicity limited to one substrate interval. Some portions of the dredge prism for both areas meet the Title 22 criteria for hazardous materials. Based on the results, project proponent proposes to place dredged material in Class I, Class II landfills, Port of Long Beach CDF (Middle Harbor) or in the uplands for beneficial reuse.
- e. **Determination:** Since dredged materials would be disposed in the uplands (Class I & II landfills or uplands outside of Section 404) immediately adjacent to the lake, further DMMT review would focus on the
- i. Elutriate for discharge of return water from the dredged materials back into the aquatic environment
  - ii. Elutriate for exposed contaminants in the “leave layer”
  - iii. potential treatment options for treating return water (Genesis fluid treatment process mentioned as a possibility). A bench scale test/results of elutriate with the selected elutriate treatment process.
  - iv. appropriate containment strategies for dredged materials placed in the uplands adjacent to the aquatic environment

### C. Lower Newport Bay Maintenance Dredging

- a. **Project Proponents/PMs:** city of Newport Beach/Cori Farrar & USACE-Planning Div./Larry Smith
- b. **Purpose of Discussion:** Suitability determination for the disposal of approximately 853,000 cy of dredged material at LA-3 from following locations: Balboa Reach-BR, Harbor Island Reach-HIR, Lido Isle Reach South-LIS, West Lido Area B-WLB, Yacht Anchorage North-YAN, Yacht Anchorage South Upper portion-YAS-U, Yacht Anchorage South Lower portion-YAS-L, Upper Newport Channel-UNC, and Bay Island Anchorage/Collins Island-BICI.

- c. **Background:** Project entails dredging of federal areas and non-federal areas in lower Newport Bay. Dredging depths would vary by location, and would range from -10 MLLW to -20 MLLW. Approximate volume to project depth ~ 915,463 cy (814,881 cy proposed for disposal at LA3). Approximate volume of 2 ft. overdepth ~723,076 cy (519,616 cy proposed for disposal at LA3). Project SAP initially funded by the city of Newport Beach. Cori Farrar (USACE-Regulatory Division) original PM. Project has received federal funding for maintenance of federal areas. Therefore, in addition to Cori Farrar, Larry Smith (USACE-Planning Division) now involved with project. Reference April 29, 2009, September 23, 2009, and January 27, 2010 SC-DMMT meeting notes.
- d. **Discussion:** See Attachment C and D
- e. **Determination:**
  - i. The following composite areas are suitable for ocean disposal at the LA-3 Ocean Dredged Material Disposal Site (ODMDS): Balboa Reach-BR, Harbor Island Reach-HIR, Lido Isle Reach South-LIS, West Lido Area B-WLB, Yacht Anchorage North-YAN, Yacht Anchorage South Upper portion-YAS-U, Yacht Anchorage South Lower portion-YAS-L, Upper Newport Channel-UNC, and Bay Island Anchorage/Collins Island-BICI
  - ii. The remaining areas (Lido Isla Reach North, the Yacht Anchorage Middle (both upper and lower areas), Balboa Island Channel, West Lido Area A, and Newport Channel) are suitable for disposal within the POLB Middle Harbor Project.

**Los Angeles Region Contaminated Sediments Task Force**

**Gambol Industries Alternative Proposal at Former Southwest Marine  
Shipyard – Berths 243-245, Port of Los Angeles**

**Meeting Minutes from March 24, 2010**

**Attendees:**

Efrem Neuwirth – DTSC  
Kathryn Curtis – POLA  
Ken Wong – USACE  
Larry Smith – USACE  
Spencer MacNeil -USACE  
Michael Lyons - LARWQCB  
David Moore – Weston Solutions  
Andrew Martin – Weston Solutions (phone)  
Susie Santilena – Heal the Bay  
Ken Ragland – POLA (phone)  
Ken Mattfeld – POLA  
Tony Gioiello – POLA  
Dave Walsh - POLA  
Steve Otera – POLA  
Larry Simon – CA Coastal Commission (phone)  
Allen Ota – USEPA (phone)  
Jorine Campopiano - USEPA  
Todd Nottingham – PND Engineers  
Carl McNabb – PND Engineers  
Jeff Cotsifas - Pacific EcoRisk  
Tim Bazley, Blue Water Design Group  
John Bridwell, Gambol Industries  
Gwen Butterfield, Butterfield Communications  
Ken Ehrlich, Jeffer Mangels Butler & Marmaro LLP  
Steven Cheung, City of LA Mayor’s office  
Gordan Teuber - Councilwoman Hahn’s office  
Art Shak - USACE

## Gambol Industries – Alternative Sheet Pile Wall Design

Ken Ehrlich briefly introduced Gambol's proposal of an alternative structure for the Confined Disposal Facility at Southwest Marine, which was initially presented to the CSTF at the January 27, 2010 meeting. The objective of Gambol's proposal is to preserve as much water area in the slips as possible, in hopes of making use of them in a re-activated shipyard Gambol proposes to develop and operate. The structure proposed to contain contaminated sediments from the Channel Deepening project would replace the Port's previously permitted plan to fill both slips completely with both clean and contaminated sediments to be retained behind a rock dike barrier. Mr. Ehrlich indicated that there were two objectives for this CSTF meeting: to provide additional detail on the sheet pile wall design and to discuss Gambol's draft SAP for additional sediment testing in the portion of the dry dock slips that would remain open under their proposal. One of the concerns noted at the previous meeting, and in subsequent conversations with the CA Coastal Commission, was the longevity, durability and seismic stability of the vertical sheet pile wall proposed by Gambol.

Todd Nottingham, of PND Engineers, presented an overview of the open cell system design of the sheet pile wall, which was designed by PND. He indicated that the structure was a mechanically stabilized embankment with minimal permeability. The system has a design life of 50 years. Anodes are utilized to minimize corrosion over time and these anodes must be maintained. Mr. Nottingham also indicated that an epoxy coating could be applied above the water line to further minimize corrosion in more tropical, humid areas. Mr. Nottingham presented several slides of projects around the world where this open cell system design had been implemented.

Mr. MacNeil noted that the design life was stated to be 50 years but the technology had only been around approximately 30 years.

Ms. Campopiano asked who would be maintaining the system (Gambol or the Port) and Mr. Gioiello indicated that was unknown at this time.

Mr. Mattfeld asked whether the tail walls would be effective to retain the vertical sheet wall while the CDF was being filled and before the sediments had consolidated. Mr. Nottingham indicated that the tail walls generated sufficient lateral resistance by being driven into the substrate, that there was no need to wait for consolidation, and that consolidation of the fill behind the wall simply added strength to the system.

Mr. Lyons wanted clarification that there was no problem with putting contaminated material directly against the wall (i.e., with no buffer of clean material) and Mr. Nottingham indicated there was minimal permeability, so no problem.

Mr. Ota noted that there were no vertical profile figures of the sheet pile wall included in the SAP, and requested that they be provided.

Mr. Nottingham explained that the mudline would be dredged to -52 feet, resulting in 52 feet of the vertical structure below the water and 12 feet above the water.

Mr. Neuwirth asked if the existing piers in the vicinity of the dry docks would be removed and Mr. Bridwell indicated that approximately 200 feet of the south side wharf would remain, approximately 500 feet of the north side wharf would remain, and that the center pier would be completely demolished.

There was discussion and questions by several members of the group regarding the capacities of both the approved rock dike fill and Gambol's proposed sheet pile wall.

Mr. Walsh clarified that the Port's rock dike CDF has a capacity of approximately 458,000 cubic yards (cy). Excavation of a keyway for the rock dike would generate approximately 90,000 cy which is assumed to be unsuitable for ocean disposal and therefore would be placed in the CDF, along with 160,000 cy of contaminated sediments generated from the channel deepening project, leaving about 208,000 cy of capacity available for clean or additional contaminated sediments. The remaining 170,000 cy of the 208,000 cy capacity must be clean as it will be used to form a 10-foot geotechnical berm behind the rock dike and the 10-foot CDF cap.

Mr. Bridwell clarified that Gambol's sheet pile wall CDF could accommodate at least 200,000 cy of contaminated material, and could be sized to accommodate more if necessary (160,000 in the south slip CDF and 40-70,000 in the north slip. However, the Gambol CDF could not accommodate the 170,000 of clean fill proposed to be accommodated in the Port's fill configuration.

Mr. Stein indicated that the reason Gambol was proposing this design was to operate a shipyard at the site.

Mr. Walsh clarified that the clean material proposed to be placed in the Port's CDF was material that would be generated by the Channel Deepening project.

Mr. Bazley indicated that the Area 1 north/south sheet pile wall can be adjusted to accommodate material dredged in the open portion of the slips, if it is determined that they need to dredge additional material.

Mr. Mattfeld asked if PND would be doing the detailed design and Mr. Nottingham said that was correct. Mr. Mattfeld asked if the design process had started and Mr. Nottingham indicated that the design was still preliminary.

Mr. Simon asked where the remaining 170,000 yards of clean material generated by the Channel Deepening project would go under the Gambol scenario and Mr. Bridwell indicated that it would go to the ocean.

Ms. Campopiano asked if EPA had given a suitability call on that 170,000 yards of material going to the ocean and Mr. Walsh indicated that this needed to be verified.

Mr. Simon asked if there were any examples of the vertical wall system containing contaminated material and Mr. Nottingham said the only example was a site in Tacoma, WA where existing contamination was left behind the same wall structure design (i.e., it was not dredged and placed behind the wall but simply left in place when the wall was constructed).

Ms. Campopiano asked if the 170,000 cy of clean material was absolutely necessary in the Port's CDF design and Mr. Walsh replied that the CDF was designed with excess capacity for contaminated material, and the amount of clean material could be reduced to accommodate additional contaminated material.

Mr. Ota indicated that if the 170,000 cy was proposed to go to the ocean, the Port would need to write a memo to EPA describing this change in the project so they could issue a concurrence on the ocean disposal.

The Gambol points of contact for any additional questions regarding the sheet pile wall are Ken Ehrlich ([kae@jmbm.com](mailto:kae@jmbm.com); 310-785-5395) or Tim Bazley ([bazt@aol.com](mailto:bazt@aol.com); 310-548-3132).

#### Gambol Industries – Draft SAP for Berths 243-245

Mr. Cotsifas from Pacific EcoRisk provided a brief overview of the SAP. He explained that they had reviewed the previous sediment testing conducted by Weston Solutions as the site and focused attention on the previous sediment sampling results at the sediment horizon corresponding to the design depth in the slips. That design depth plus a 2-ft overdredge, is Gambol's target depth for dredging. The main question that the SAP was intended to answer is whether or not the resulting exposed sediment layer would contain unacceptable contaminant

concentrations. The SAP assumed ERM levels as the target cleanup goal and focused the proposed additional sampling in areas where contaminants had been encountered at or near the design depth.

Mr. Bridwell noted that Gambol was aware that additional dredging below the design depth could be necessary based on the results of the additional sediment sampling.

Ms. Curtis clarified that the previous Weston investigations on behalf of the Port had not assumed ERM as the target clean-up goal but rather had presented the data in terms of ERM exceedances because that is a typical screening benchmark by which to review sediment data. She also clarified that, following the last round of sampling in 2007, the Port was aware that there were areas at the site where elevated contaminant levels were encountered at the deepest core horizons sampled (i.e., the vertical extent of contamination had not been fully identified). However, Ms. Curtis explained that the previous sediment investigations had been intended to characterize the site in an iterative manner. When the slip fill was included in the Channel Deepening project, the Port had no need to move forward with additional sampling in the slips because the existing material would be buried.

Ms. Curtis raised the issue of additional evaluation at the two previous sampling locations in the northern slip where copper and/or zinc values exceeded TTLC, which characterizes the sediment as hazardous waste.

Mr. Lyons stated that the Regional Board's view was that hazardous waste is not going anywhere but a Class 1 landfill. He deferred to other agency experts to make the determination of exactly what was hazardous.

Ms. Campopiano asked which agency would make that determination and Mr. Lyons replied that it was likely DTSC.

Mr. Bridwell noted that this hazardous waste would also be an issue under the Port's CDF scenario. Ms. Curtis responded that it was the Port's understanding if the material was not disturbed but simply covered by the deposition of dredged material into the CDF, there wouldn't be any need to remove and dispose of it offsite.

Mr. Lyons stated that he wasn't sure that was the case. Mr. Ota stated that he thought EPA's position was it wouldn't be an issue if you didn't move it (i.e., burying it in the CDF would be OK); he will confirm that position. Mr. Neuwirth stated that DTSC's policy was the same as EPA's – if the material wasn't disturbed, it could be covered and sequestered in place. Mr. Lyons then concurred that this was probably the case.



In looking at Table 5-1 in the draft SAP, Mr. Ota requested verification that grain size analysis would be conducted, and Mr. Cotsifas confirmed that it would.

Mr. Neuwirth asked why PAHs and PCBs were omitted from the proposed chemical analysis and Mr. Cotsifas replied that the SAP focused on only the contaminants that had been encountered at elevated levels at or near the design depth in the slips.

Mr. Lyons made it clear that, as proposed, he did not consider this project a sediment cleanup; that the current SAP was totally inadequate for the purpose of developing a remediation plan; and that ERM was totally inadequate for determining sediment clean-up targets. Mr. Lyons stated that he was 99.9% sure that ERM is not a good screening level. He stated that the SAP was tailored only for the proposed redevelopment of the site under the Gambol proposal, and that chances were that additional work would be necessary at the site at a later time to complete the remediation to the agencies' satisfaction.

Mr. Ota concurred with Mr. Lyons and stated that he assumed Gambol would want to remove contaminated sediment to the agencies' satisfaction now while there was the opportunity for disposal in the nearby CDF. He also noted that ERM levels were not adequate as a clean-up target, and suggested ERLs as a possible target.

Mr. Neuwirth stated that after Gambol's proposed dredging scenario, DTSC would require a risk assessment (likely SQOs) which could result in the need for additional remediation/sediment removal.

Ms. Campopiano asked for clarification on DTSC's role in this sediment investigation and Mr. Neuwirth replied that the Port had entered into a voluntary cleanup agreement with DTSC for this site, so his agency had an oversight role.

Mr. Cotsifas raised the issue of dredging activities being excluded from the SQOs, but Mr. Lyons clarified that if you wanted to do a sediment cleanup, additional testing such as SQOs would be required. He noted that if this project was proposed as a sediment cleanup, the project would be tied up for a year or more to determine the appropriate clean-up level, and get agency buyoff on that number.

Mr. Lyons also stated that ERMs would not be an acceptable clean-up level because levels below ERM were not necessarily good. Mr. Ota confirmed that sediment at ERM levels was problematic and would require additional testing.

Mr. Wong stated that time was up and suggested either setting up a separate CSTF meeting to further discuss this project, or schedule it for the April 28, 2010 DMMT-CSTF meeting.

The Gambol point of contact for any additional questions regarding the SAP is Ken Ehrlich ([kae@jmbm.com](mailto:kae@jmbm.com); 310-785-5395). Additional questions on the SAP can be relayed to Mr. Ehrlich, Jeff Cotsifas at Pacific EcoRisk ([cotsifas@pacificecorisk.com](mailto:cotsifas@pacificecorisk.com)), and Kathryn Curtis at POLA ([kcurtis@portla.org](mailto:kcurtis@portla.org)).

DRAFT

ATTACHMENT B  
Meeting Notes  
CSTF/SC-DMMT Discussion  
Marina del Rey  
March 24, 2010, 11:30 am

The discussion started with a presentation of the preliminary results from sediment sampling and testing conducted at Marina del Rey for future maintenance dredge with beach or nearshore disposal at Redondo and/or Dockweiler State Beaches, or disposal within the POLB as part of the Middle Harbor Project. The results are preliminary and are for composite samples only. Analyses of individual cores are currently being performed. These analyses were delayed due to difficulties encountered in awarding the optional item in the sediment sampling task order. That option now has been awarded and the contractor directed to perform the analyses as quickly as possible. Results of those analyses will be distributed to members of the CSTF as soon as they are received.

Preliminary determinations from the composite samples are that all composite areas are physically incompatible with on beach disposal at either beach. Composite area 6 is very close to meeting the criteria for on beach disposal. This determination will be re-evaluated once the results of individual core physical analyses are completed. Composite areas 2, 3, 4, 5, & 6 are physically compatible with the nearshore disposal area at Dockweiler State Beach. Composite areas 4, 5, & 6 are physically compatible with the nearshore disposal area at Redondo State Beach. Composite areas 3, 4, 5, & 6 (not including 5 Bottom) appear to be environmentally compatible with placement in the nearshore disposal area at Dockweiler State Beach.

Heal the Bay expressed concerns that physical and chemistry analyses are not suitable for determining compatibility for beach and/or nearshore disposal and requested that bioassay testing be performed. The Corps and EPA feel that there is sufficient information available to make these determinations based on physical/chemical analyses. EPA added that in these cases they generally are more conservative in their assessment than where bioassay test data are also available. The Corps added that, in this case, only sediments clearly suitable for beach and/or nearshore disposal would go there. Sediments clearly unsuitable or of doubtful suitability would go to the POLB. Toxicity testing would only be conducted for sediments intended for the POLB which the POLB does not accept.

The issue of beach compatibility is an issue for Los Angeles County Department of Beaches and Harbors. They would like to see as much material placed directly onto beaches as possible to help offset increased erosion seen at these beaches over the past winter. There was some concern that area 6 samples were predominantly in deeper water along the boundary with area 5. Sample locations in the Preliminary Report will be checked to ensure that they are accurate.

EPA requested clarification on the reporting of chlordane in table 10 of the Preliminary Report. Chlordane is reported as alpha and gamma isomers only. Total chlordane was not reported. The Corps will request clarification from the contractor and will ask that total chlordane be reported for all composite samples as well as for individual core samples.

The Corps intends to call a follow-up teleconference with the CSTF to discuss the results of the individual core analyses and to make a final suitability determination. This information will be included in the Environmental Assessment (EA) to be prepared for the maintenance dredging project. Timing of maintenance dredging would coincide with the availability of the POLB Middle Harbor Project, which currently is November 2010. There have been reports indicating that this may be delayed until early 2011, which would delay the Marina del Rey dredging as well.

DRAFT

ATTACHMENT C  
Meeting Notes  
SC-DMMT Discussion  
Lower Newport Bay  
March 24, 2010, 1:45 pm

The Corps' Memorandum for the Record on the subject of Lower Newport Bay Maintenance Dredging Project was presented and discussed. The Corps has determined that a beneficial reuse option exists for a portion of the federal channel maintenance dredging sediments that allows the Corps to remove sediments with elevated levels of mercury. Those areas are Lido Isla Reach North, the Yacht Anchorage Middle (both upper and lower areas), and Balboa Island Channel. These areas contain approximately 325,000 cubic yards of sediment to project depth and 482,000 cubic yards of sediment including 2-feet of overdepth. The city of Newport Beach also identified two additional areas of federal channel that were not included in the evaluation report as being considered for the optional, beneficial reuse alternative. Those areas were the West Lido Area A and Newport Channel with approximately 200,000 cubic yards of sediment.

The optional beneficial reuse disposal site is within the POLB's Middle Harbor Project.

The city will be dredging an area known as the Rhine Channel, which is outside the federal navigational channel in Lower Newport Bay. They are hoping to also disposal of this material into the POLB. That project will need to be permitted by Corps' Regulatory and will be done so separately. The city may use the same dredge contractor as the Corps, if possible.

The Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board expressed concerns about the surface material left after dredging is completed and about monitoring during dredging. Channel depths are based on authorized dimensions used to construct the channels in the 1920's. Dredging to those authorized depths will remove all sediments accumulated since that date. The new surface layer will be the surface layer left exposed by initial construction. It is expected that this will remove all existing contaminants. However, this is a maintenance dredging project. The Corps does not have the authority to dredge deeper than the authorized depth, to chase potential contaminants, or to test sediments in the new surface layer.

Timing of maintenance dredging would coincide with the availability of the POLB Middle Harbor Project, which currently is November 2010. There have been reports indicating that this may be delayed until early 2011, which would delay the Lower Newport Bay dredging as well. An Environmental Assessment (EA) will be prepared for the maintenance dredging project.

The Corps determined that the following composite areas are suitability for ocean disposal at the LA-3 Ocean Dredged Material Disposal Site (ODMDS): Balboa Reach-BR, Harbor Island Reach-HIR, Lido Isle Reach South-LIS, West Lido Area B-WLB, Yacht Anchorage North-YAN, Yacht Anchorage South Upper portion-YAS-U, Yacht Anchorage South Lower portion-YAS-L, Upper Newport Channel-UNC, and Bay Island Anchorage/Collins Island-BICI. The remaining areas (Lido Isla Reach North, the Yacht Anchorage Middle (both upper and lower areas), Balboa Island Channel, West Lido Area A, and Newport Channel) are suitable for disposal within the POLB Middle Harbor Project. The EPA and Coastal Commission concurred with these determinations.

**Wong, Kenneth SPL**

---

**From:** Brandi Outwin [Boutwin@waterboards.ca.gov]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, April 21, 2010 10:32 AM  
**To:** Wong, Kenneth SPL  
**Cc:** CMiller@newportbeachca.gov; Joanne Schneider; Wanda Cross  
**Subject:** Santa Ana RB DMMT Comments on the Lower Newport Bay DredgingProject

Kenneth-

As requested, I am forwarding the comments from the Santa Ana Regional Board regarding the Lower Newport Bay Dredging project. Please note that the comments include information from interagency discussions that occurred subsequent to the March 24 DMMT meeting.

The Santa Ana Regional Board is generally supportive of the Lower Newport Bay Dredging project. The Port of Long Beach is providing a unique opportunity to dispose of contaminated sediments from the region, hopefully including contaminated sediments from Lower Newport Bay. However, the volume of material that will be accepted by the port will be limited. For this reason, the Regional Board is requesting that USACE limit materials going to POLB to only those most contaminated by mercury so that there will be sufficient capacity to dispose of sediments from other priority areas of the bay, including the Rhine Channel. Please note also that USACE will be required to submit a WDR application in addition to the EIS unless an existing WDR is determined to be applicable. The WDR expected to include post-dredging monitoring.

Could you please distribute this to the DMMT group with the minutes from the last meeting? Many thanks!

Brandi Outwin  
Water Resources Control Engineer  
Santa Ana Regional Water Board

p: 951.321.4585  
f: 951.781.6288

## Wong, Kenneth SPL

---

**From:** Brandi Outwin [Boutwin@waterboards.ca.gov]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, April 21, 2010 10:37 AM  
**To:** Wong, Kenneth SPL  
**Subject:** Re: SC-DMMT: revised agenda for March 24, 2010 meeting (w/correction)

Kenneth-

I forgot to include in the last email that rather than submitting a hardcopy of the EIS, USACE should submit 3 e-copies of the EIS on disc. Could you please add that to my comment?

Thanks!

Brandi Outwin  
Water Resources Control Engineer  
Santa Ana Regional Water Board

p: 951.321.4585  
f: 951.781.6288

DRAFT