

Southern California Dredged Material Management Team (SC-DMMT)
December 1, 2010
FINAL Meeting Notes

I. SC-DMMT Participating Agencies *

- A. Bill Paznokas[†] — CDFG
- B. Leah Butler[†] — EPA
- C. Jorine Campopiano[†] — EPA
- D. Allan Ota[†] — EPA
- E. Peter von Langen[†] — CCRWQCB
- F. Michael Lyons — LARWQCB
- G. Wanda Cross[†] — SARWQCB
- H. Larry Smith — USACE
- I. Ken Wong — USACE

See December 1, 2010 meeting sign-in sheet attached.

II. Project Review and Determinations

A. Machado Lake/Wilmington Drain, City of LA

- 1. POC: Ken Wong, Regulatory
- 2. Purpose of Discussion: General permitting concerns
- 3. Discussion
 - a. Machado Lake Ecosystem Rehabilitation Project and Wilmington Drain Multiuse Project are two separate projects
 - b. The City is assuming all material from the drain will be dried and trucked to a landfill
 - c. Material from the lake may be able to be used for LA School District project, Gibson Interchange, or Port of LA waterfront project (depending on timing)
 - d. For both projects, if all dredged material would be disposed of or reused in the uplands, the primary concern from CSTF would be return water during dredging
 - e. When using NWP 16, the quality of the return water is controlled by the state through the section 401 certification procedures
 - f. LARWQCB would prefer evaporation; however, City would prefer to return water due to concerns with depleting lake
 - g. LARWQCB indicated that the proposal would likely be reviewed under 401 certification procedures as opposed to WDR procedures
 - h. When dealing with Port projects previously, LARWQCB focused on turbidity and leaching of contaminants

* Participating agencies are composed of (1) core members that have regulatory authority over dredging-related projects; (2) stakeholder agencies such as 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.

- i. LARWQCB recommended comparing elutriate results with California Toxics Rule objectives, Machado Lake TMDLs, and the turbidity standard for settleable solids; however, additional discussion with 401 certification unit is recommended
 - j. If any standards are exceeded prior to dilution, treatment would be recommended to decrease contaminant levels
 - k. Dewatering plan would result in a discharge of fill material, requiring section 404 authorization
 - l. Permit applications to be submitted the following week
4. Determination: None

B. Morro Bay, City of Morro Bay

1. POC: John Markham, Regulatory
2. Purpose of Discussion: Draft SAP
3. Discussion
 - a. Areas of thickest cuts proposed determined sampling locations
 - b. Recommended to place one additional core on the south shoal in Dredge Unit 1
 - c. Based on data from previous sediment characterization, sediment anticipated to consist of approximately 50% sands and 50% fines
 - d. The City prefers to place material at an existing nearshore placement site used for Corps dredging
 - e. EPA expressed concerns about the content of fines and clarified that the existing nearshore placement site is used to place sediment from the Federal channel, which is sandier
 - f. As sediment may not be suitable for nearshore placement based on grain size, SC-DMMT recommended to characterize grain size and chemistry by individual cores to determine which areas may be used for nearshore placement, phasing bioassays for later
 - g. EPA stated that dredged sediment may not be used for beach nourishment if the sediment contains greater than 50% fines, which it considers as the regulatory threshold not to be exceeded
 - h. The project proponent discussed the possibility of placing dredged sediment in a nearby mine as an alternative sediment management option
4. Determination: None. Revise SAP to include additional core and phased analysis and submit the revised SAP

C. Lower Newport Bay, USACE

1. POC: Larry Smith, Planning
2. Purpose of Discussion: Placement alternatives
3. Discussion
 - a. Corps agreed to incorporate EPA's recommendations from previous meeting
 - b. As a result, cores 20, 21, and 22 would be considered suitable and cores 16, 16A, 17, 18, and 19 would be considered unsuitable

- c. EPA and LARWQCB are amenable to providing written concurrence that bioassays would not be required for this dredging episode, while bioassays would be discussed for future dredging episodes

D. Ventura Harbor, USACE

1. POC: Kirk Brus, Planning
2. Purpose of Discussion: Revised SAP
3. Discussion
 - a. EPA stated that reference sites are important to have scientifically; however, the issue was resolved through agreeing to disagree
 - b. Supplemental table, dated November 29, 2010, contained 0 cubic yards of overdepth; for consistency, SC-DMMT recommended to adjust design depths for Areas B, C, D, E, G, H, and I to allow for overdepth, and to calculate overdepths for those areas
 - c. Corps clarified that although Area G contains a larger available dredging quantity, it is a sand trap with the greatest amount of sand based on historical data
 - d. Due to discrepancies, SC-DMMT recommended that Table 1 in the SAP be revised to reflect recalculated depths in supplemental table
 - e. Corps clarified that the range of core lengths provided in Table 1 applied to the entire dredge area and are adjustable to field depths achieved during sampling
 - f. As only a narrative of grain sizes was included in the SAP on pages 3 and 4, SC-DMMT recommended that tables from the 2009 Ventura Port District SAP be included
 - g. Management options were briefly discussed for areas with 61% fines; see discussion from previous item regarding 50% fines
 - h. Fines would be left in place if they cannot be used for beach nourishment
4. Determination: With the incorporation of recommended amendments, the SAP may be finalized and submitted to the agencies

E. Newport Beach/Semeniuk Slough, City of Newport Beach

1. POC: Jason Lambert in the interim, Regulatory
2. Purpose of Discussion: Draft SAP
3. Discussion
 - a. Draft SAP was prepared using the Corps' scope for the Santa Ana River Marsh
 - b. Approximately 22,000 cubic yards of material would be dredged from the slough, which has never been dredged
 - c. Sediment characterization from 2002 were included as part of the SAP; however, testing locations were in Santa Ana River Marsh and not in Semeniuk Slough
 - d. Results from 2002 indicated that average grain sizes are approximately 40% fines in the Santa Ana River Marsh, while material becomes progressively finer towards slough
 - e. SC-DMMT recommended that the revised SAP include locations of previous testing locations in the Santa Ana River Marsh

- f. SC-DMMT recommended inclusion of a summary table describing previous results of sediment chemistry
 - g. SC-DMMT recommended archiving subsamples of individual cores until the end of the project
 - h. Rationale of proposed testing locations was through geographic coverage, SC-DMMT had no objections to proposed sample locations or core depths
 - i. The City prefers to use the dredged material for beach nourishment
 - j. As dredged material may contain greater than 50% fines, alternatives discussed included least tern island and ocean disposal; see previous section for discussion regarding 50% fines
 - k. Corps indicated that the least tern island would only accommodate 5,000 cubic yards and least tern would prefer sandier habitat
 - l. The City indicated that Tier 3 analysis for ocean disposal would occur if grain size analysis indicates material is unsuitable for beach nourishment
 - m. Suitability would be addressed during review of SAP results
4. Determination: SAP approved with recommended amendments incorporated; submit revised SAPs for Corps project and City project

F. SAP Template

- 1. POC: Ken Wong, Regulatory
- 2. Discussion
 - a. Ken requested that while he is on temporary reassignment to Planning that EPA and LARWQCB develop nomenclature instructions and a standard analytes list
 - b. EPA to provide comments to Ken by track changes
 - c. EPA recommended to include reference SAPs with correct formatting
 - d. Larry recommended to limit page sizes to 11" x 17"

SC-DMMT

Sign-In Sheet, December 1, 2010

PRINT NAME	ORGANIZATION	EMAIL
1. Jack Malone	Anchor QEA	jmalone@anchoragea.com
2. Carla Duncan	CDM	duncancs@cdm.com
3. Shelly Anghera	Anchor QEA	sanghera@anchoragea.com
4. Michael Lyons	LAHWCB	mlyons@waterboards.ca.gov
5. John Madden	USACE	john.r.madden@usace.army.mil
6. Larry Smith	USACE	lawrence.j.smith@usace.army.mil
7. Chris Miller	City of N.B	cmiller@newportbeachca.gov
8. Eric Guiltinan	AMEC Geomatrix	Eric.Guiltinan@amec.com
9. Art Orzco	USACE	arturo.a.orzco@usace.army.mil
10. Joshua Klein	AMEC Geomatrix	joshua.klein@amec.com
11. Kirk E. Brus	USACE	KIRKBRUS@USACE.ARMY.MIL
12. Bob Stein	CITY OF NEWPORT BEACH	rstein@newportbeachca.gov
13. Jason Lambert	USACE	jason.p.lambert@usace.army.mil
14. Jeff Cole	USACE	
15. Joe Ryan	USACE	
16. _____	Phone	_____
17. Wanda Cross	SAHWCB	
18. Allen Ota	EPA	
19. Leah Butler	EPA	
20. Susie Santillena	ATB	
21. Terine Compagnano	ATB	
22. Bill Patzowkas	DFG	

SC-DMMT

Sign-In Sheet, December 1, 2010

PRINT NAME	ORGANIZATION	EMAIL
1. Peter ???	Central Coast Water Board	
2. Lisa Rodgers	ICF-JS	
3. Alfred Mata	City of LA	
4. Lauren Tomita	Parsons	
5. Stephanie Bache	Parsons.	
6.		
7.		
8.		
9.		
10.		
11.		
12.		
13.		
14.		
15.		
16.		
17.		
18.		
19.		
20.		
21.		
22.		