

Southern California Dredged Material Management Team (SC-DMMT)  
October 27, 2010  
Meeting Notes

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

- a. Jorine Campopiano<sup>†</sup> – EPA
- b. Allan Ota<sup>†</sup> - EPA
- c. Ken Wong – USACE
- d. Larry Smith – USACE
- e. Bill Paznokas<sup>†</sup> – DFG
- f. Leah Butler<sup>†</sup> - EPA
- g. Larry Simon<sup>†</sup> - CCC

See Attachment A for the October 27, 2010 meeting sign-in sheet.

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

**A. Berth 243-245 (Gambol Industries)**

- a. **POC:** Spencer MacNeil (Regulatory)
- b. **Purpose of Discussion:** Review draft SAR
- c. **Discussion:** See notes provided by Kathryn Curtis of POLA. Attachment B.

**B. POLB Middle Harbor – Tentative Fill Plan**

- a. **POC:** Antal Szijj (Regulatory)
- b. **Purpose of Discussion:** Announcement indicating availability of POLB's Middle Harbor Tentative Fill Plan. POLB has scheduled a CSTF meeting on November 17, 2010 to discuss the fill plan. Specifics follow. Date: Wednesday, November 17, 2010. Time: 10:30am to 12:00pm. Meeting location: 5th Floor Training Conference Room, Port of Long Beach Administration Building, 925 Harbor Plaza, Long Beach, CA 90802
- c. **Discussion:** None.
- d. **Determination:** None.

**C. Ventura Harbor Maintenance Dredging**

- a. **POC:** Kirk Brus (Planning)
- b. **Purpose of Discussion:** draft SAP
- c. **Discussion:** EPA offered the following comments: **Dredging:** (1) Volume table (dredge volumes, overdepth volume, and volume per composite area);

---

\* 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.

(2) bathymetry maps; (3) overview map coupled with individual composite area maps, as necessary to ensure readability of bathymetry; (4) composite maps to indicate sample locations, point sources, etc. ; (5) DMMT to review proposed sampling locations after new map(s) are prepared. (6) Sampling depth should be restricted to project depth plus two foot overdepth. (7) the extra foot of overdepth should be kept separate and analyzed separately.

**Beach nourishment:** (1) Revise beach nourishment section to be consistent with SCOUP protocol. For example, beach transect depths appear inconsistent with SCOUP protocol for So.Cal (+13 - -33 feet). Typically we see +12 to -30 feet. (2) Request chemistry of beach reference sites from composite transects; (3) Describe the need of the receiver site for the material and its consistency with existing BEACON Regional Sediment Management (RSM) Plan; (4) concerned that any material from the South Beach site may migrate downcoast into the Santa Clara River mouth and affect migration pathways for endangered species (Southern California Steelhead). NMFS should be consulted. Corps not in agreement with a number of EPA comments.

- d. **Determination:** None. Corps to follow up with EPA, CCC, & RWQCB outside of SC-DMMT.

#### D. Marina Park

- a. **POC:** Jason Lambert (Regulatory)
- b. **Purpose of Discussion:** Announcement indicating availability of POLB's Middle Harbor Tentative Fill Plan. POLB has scheduled a CSTF meeting on November 17, 2010 to discuss the fill plan. Specifics follow. Date: Wednesday, November 17, 2010. Time: 10:30am to 12:00pm. Meeting location: 5th Floor Training Conference Room, Port of Long Beach Administration Building, 925 Harbor Plaza, Long Beach, CA 90802
- c. **Background:** Proposal to create an approximately 2.7 acre marina in Newport Bay. Dredging to -12 ft. MLLW + 2 ft. OD. 30,000 CY to be dredged below high tide line (bayward). 38,000 CY to be excavated above high tide line (uplands). Total dredge volume ~ 68,000 cy. Total volume proposed for beach nourishment ~ 53,000 cy. Remaining 15,000 cy for on-site fill. Uplands previously determined to be of marine origin, therefore suitable for beach nourishment. Approximately 5,000 CY below high tide line previously determined to not be suitable for ocean disposal by EPA & Corps (Swenson/Farrar). Preferred placement option is 48,000 cy to local beaches or nearshore placement.
- d. **Discussion:** Project proponent reviewed grain size compatibility of donor site to grain size profiles of 5 receiver beaches. All fines fall within grain size envelope; medium & coarse sand fall outside of grain size envelope. However, medium & coarse sand help retain sand in nourished areas.
- e. **Determination:** No objections from participating agencies. 48,000 cy approved for placement on beach or nearshore in areas proposed.

## **E. Santa Ana River Marsh**

- a. **POC:** Art Orozco (USACE – engineering)
- b. **Purpose of Discussion:** review of draft SAP
- c. **Discussion:** SC-DMMT offered the following comments: (1) Volumes missing from the SAP (request table with volumes, overdepth volume, and volume per composite area); (2) If material is proposed for off-shore disposal (LA-2,3), Tier III testing should be addressed in the SAP (phased approach or up front testing), including collection of additional volume of sediments for Tier III testing contingency during the initial round of sampling to avoid costs of a second mobilization; (3) If phased approach is implemented (with potentially significant period of time passing after previous sampling effort), we recommend that enough material is collected for full Tier III testing (for bioassays and associated sediment chemistry); (4) Composites as proposed are generally inadequate - need to be contiguous homogenous areas with uniform dredging depth; (5) Proposed sampling map is unreadable - better to have overview map (similar to what is presented in figure #2, AMEC Geomatrix draft SAP) coupled with individual composite area maps, as necessary to ensure readability of bathymetry, sample locations, point sources, etc.; (6) Map delineating beach nourishment site should be added; (7) EPA requests chemistry of beach reference site from one composite transect; (8) EPA does not agree with the rationale used in previous testing to determine beach compatibility (10% finer than the finest grain along transect) - prefer that SCOUP approach is used; (9) realignment of sampling locations in consideration of existing point sources as indicated on map during meeting; (10) Additional sampling locations needed to characterize dredging units; (11) Beneficial use options of placing material on the Least Tern Island should be explored (Corps-owned property; consult with FWS on best approach?)
- d. **Determination:** None.

## SC-DMMT

## Sign-In Sheet, October 27, 2010

PRINT NAME	ORGANIZATION	EMAIL
1. JEFF COTSIFAS	PER	cotsifas@pacificeconisk.com
2. John Bridwell	Gambel	J.bridwell@gambelmarine.com
3. KEW EHRBICH	JMBM	kae@jmbm.com
4. Steve Sotera	POLA	sotera@portla.org
5. Tony Gioiello	POLA	tgioiello@portla.org
6. Ken Mattiello	POLA	KMATTIELLO@PORTLA.ORG
7. David Walsh	POLA	dwalsh@portla.org
8. Spencer MacNeil	USACE	spencer.d.macneil@usace.army.mil
9. Larry Smith	USACE	lawrence.j.smith@usace.army.mil
10. Joshua Klein	AMEC Geomatrix	joshua.klein@amec.com
11. Kim Holland-Chaminsky	AMEC Geomatrix	kim.holland@amec.com
12. Jeffrey Devine	Ventura Harbor LAD USACE	jeffrey.d.devine@usace.army.mil
13. Kirk Brus	USACE	Kirk.C.Brus@USACE.ARMY.MIL
14. JASON LAMBERT	USACE	jason.p.lambert@usace.army.mil
15. MARIL READER	CITY NEWPORT BEACH	MREADER@CITYNEWPORTBEACH.CA.GOV.
16. Chris Webb	Moffatt & Nichol	cwebb@moffattnichol.com
17. Kim Garvey	Moffatt & Nichol	kgarvey@moffattnichol.com
18. Greg Dombrowsky	USACE	gregory.a.dombrowsky@usace.army.mil
19. Art Orzco	USACE	arturo.a.orzco@usace.army.mil
20. Erin Hardison	USACE-PD	erin.l.hardison@usace.army.mil
21. VICTOR ANDREAS	USACE	VICTOR.J.ANDREAS@USACE.ARMY.MIL
22. BOB STEIN	CITY OF NEWPORT BEACH	rstein@newportbeach.ca.gov
23. Joe Ryan	USACE-ED	joseph.a.ryan@usace.army.mil
24. JIM FIELDS	USACE-PM-N	james.a.fields@usace.army.mil
25. KENNETH WONG	USACE-PG	keneth.wong@usace.army.mil

# SC-DMMT

## Sign-In Sheet, October 27, 2010

PRINT NAME	ORGANIZATION	EMAIL
1. ~~~~~ via teleconference ~~~~~		
2. Allan Ota	EPA	
3. Sorine Compianso	EPA	
4. Leah Butler	EPA	
5. Bill Paznokas	DFG	
6. Suzie Santillina	HTS	
7. Kathryn Curdis	POCA	
8. Matt Arms	POCB	
9. Antal Szisj	USACE	
10. Brian Maston	Western Solutions	
11. Bill Gardner	Newfield	
12.		
13.		
14.		
15.		
16.		
17.		
18.		
19.		
20.		
21.		
22.		

**Los Angeles Region Contaminated Sediments Task Force  
Port of Los Angeles Berths 243-245, Gambol Industries Proposal  
Meeting Minutes from October 27, 2010**

**Attendees:**

Refer to COE sign-in sheet

**Gambol Industries – Alternative Design Proposal for Berths 243-245 Sediment Testing:**

Ken Ehrlich said the sampling approach was focused on evaluating the two disposal options Gambol favored: Gambol's alternative CDF proposal and POLB Middle Harbor. Mr. Ehrlich said they were just presenting their findings and were not intending to go over POLB's decision about which material they planned to accept at Middle Harbor.

Jeff Cotsifas provided an overview of the sediment sampling undertaken at the former dry dock slips (a draft sediment characterization report was provided to the CSTF prior to the meeting). Mr. Cotsifas indicated that CSTF comments at the April meeting had been addressed, including locating some cores in known hotspots (based on previous Port sampling), sampling under existing pier structures, and sampling the z-layer which would reflect the condition of the sediments remaining after dredging. The site was generally divided into five different dredge units for purposes of sampling. Dredge units 1- 4 were located within the two former dry dock slips and dredge unit 5 was located in the harbor channel just outside the slips, corresponding to the area where POLA's approved rock dike would be constructed. Results of the composited sampling in these various areas indicated that no constituents were elevated above TTLC levels (hazardous waste), but numerous ERM and ERL exceedances were noted throughout the site; with fewer exceedances in the z-layer samples. With regard to the z-layer sampling results, also composited, which included five constituents above ERM and additional constituents about ERL, it was acknowledged by the Gambol team that additional action may be required following the proposed dredging per the Gambol plan.

Jorine Campopiano raised the question of the composited z-layer samples, and Mr. Cotsifas indicated that all z-layer samples within a given dredge unit were composited, and that the DU-1 and DU-2 z-layer cores were composited together. Spencer MacNeil asked why DU-1 and DU-2 were composited together - whether this compositing of material from two DUs was something addressed in the SAP. Mr. Ehrlich noted that compositing the z-layer, including DU-1 and DU-2, was approved by the CSTF in the SAP.

Dr. MacNeil asked about the reported exceedances of the ERMs for PAHs and Dieldrin in the z-layer samples (DU-1/DU-2 z-layer composite) (Section 3.1.2, page 15); this seemed odd

considering these constituents were not above ERM's in the other samples [note the text in Section 3.1.2 specifies PAHs and Dieldrin exceeded ERM's, but the data in Table 3-1 indicates these constituents only exceeded ERLs; so this could simply be an error in the Section 3.1.2 text]. Mr. Cotsifas indicated that the vibracore met with refusal at several sampling locations, so didn't actually reach the z-layer depth horizon. He explained that they assumed the vibracore was hitting a more consolidated native layer when it met refusal, and that the z-layer in these area was assumed to be uncontaminated.

Regarding the z-layer composite sampling, Mr. Ota noted that some high-concentration constituents that don't have benchmarks need to be taken into consideration for future sampling if there will be dredging (e.g., TBT).

Mr. Ehrlich confirmed that Gambol's preferred disposal location was POLB Middle Harbor and second option would be within the CDF created in the southernmost dry dock slip under Gambol's proposed alternative for the site.

Ms. Santilena asked if this sediment had been accepted by POLB for the Middle Harbor fill; Mr. Ehrlich responded "No, but stay tuned".

Larry Smith asked that in those areas where there was refusal, the deeper material should not be referred to as z layer material; the material could still be clean but they should not be referred to as being part of the z-layer.

Mr. Mattfeld questioned whether the limited amount of composited samples in the z-layer was sufficient for a characterization or would more discrete sampling be necessary?

Mr. Cotsifas confirmed that the vibracore met with refusal in at least one location in each of the DU-1, 2, 4, and 5 dredge units; and, as mentioned, they think it is due to encountering native material, which they expect to be relatively clean. Mr. Cotsifas said the final report will specify though that these are not considered part of the z layer.

Mr. Mattfeld stated that compositing the z-layer samples blurs the picture somewhat. He noted that no DTSC staff was present and that they may have a concern about this as well. Dr. MacNeil asked Mr. Ota whether he thought the z-layer sampling was sufficient and he said the thought it would be OK because there are enough units being examined over a relatively small area. Mr. Cotsifas indicated that there was a precedent set in the Bay Area for compositing z-layer samples. Mr. Bridwell further indicated that because around 50% of the z-layer cores met with refusal, it is assumed to be native material in these areas.

Dr. MacNeil said ultimately, the Port is going to have to determine what they can live with. Mr. Mattfeld said they really need DTSC to weigh in on this – future remediation could affect pricing. Mr. Bridwell and Kathryn Curtis noted that DTSC does not have firm criteria (they are typically established on a case by case basis). Ms. Curtis also noted that Harbor TMDLs are coming on line, and the Port will ultimately have to comply with the contaminated sediments criteria established in the TMDL.

Mr. Ehrlich said Gambol will be overdredging and have always expressed a willingness to do that, with material going to POLB Middle Harbor or Gambol's alternative CDF.

Mr. Ehrlich noted that Gambol and Pacific EcoRisk had been talking independently to Michael Lyons at the Regional Board, as he couldn't make the CSTF meeting, and would continue to do so.

Mr. Wong asked whether there were any other specific comments to consider in revising the document. Larry Simon said he just wanted the z-layer clarified (as requested by others earlier) and would like a hard copy of the report. Mr. Ehrlich said Gambol will send him a hard copy. Ms. Santilena indicated that she had not yet been able to review the document and would submit comments to Mr. Wong following her review.

Mr. Wong requested that the Port and Gambol submit meeting notes for inclusion in the overall DMMT-CSTF meeting notes.



POLA Questions/Comments Regarding Gambol Agenda Item – DMMT/CSTF 10/27/10 Meeting

1. Based on the discussion and direction from the agencies at the April CSTF meeting, was a revised SAP submitted prior to the start of the field work? The changes to the SAP were fairly substantial, and don't appear to have been documented formally in a revised SAP. This has led to confusion regarding the sampling scheme as noted below.
2. Mr. Ehrlich stated in the October CSTF meeting that the z-layer cores were composited according to the approved SAP. However, the April SAP reviewed by the CSTF made no mention of analyzing z-layer samples at all. That sampling was requested at the April meeting. Based on concurrence by the CSTF to allow compositing of entire sediment cores within the dredge units (per the April SAP), Gambol apparently inferred that compositing the z-layer core horizons would also be acceptable. POLA feels strongly that compositing the z-layer samples results in an inaccurate picture of sediment conditions remaining after the proposed dredging. Were individual z-layer core horizons preserved for potential future analysis? If so, individual z-layer core segments should be analyzed separately.
3. The Gambol report fails to point out that around half of the cores failed to reach the z-layer depth, and therefore the z-layer sample results aren't representative. Gambol asserts that the refusal encountered at numerous sampling sites was an indication of the core reaching native material. Previous underwater surveys have indicated a large amount of debris in the sediment within the former dry dock slips and it is possible that the refusal encountered during this sampling was the result of encountering debris, not a native sediment layer.
4. When the vibracore met with refusal at a given site, were subsequent attempts in the same vicinity tried? This is common practice with sediment sampling in the Port, and minimizes the potential that the initial refusal was related to debris encountered.
5. The Gambol report indicates that refusal was encountered at SWM-DU3-02 at 10.8 feet, whereas POLA's previous sampling in that area (SWM-13) indicates the core extended to 13 feet. The importance of this is highlighted by the fact that the previous analysis of SWM-13 showed elevated levels of zinc above the TTLC in the 12-13-foot depth range, which is deeper than the Gambol core was able to go. This situation needs to be investigated further.