

Southern California Dredged Material Management Team (SC-DMMT)  
August 26, 2009  
Meeting Notes

**I. Participating Agencies /Attendees:**

**Morning session:**

- a. Jorine Campopiano (EPA)
- b. Jack Gregg<sup>†</sup> (CCC)
- c. Larry Simone<sup>†</sup> (CCC)
- d. Mike Lyons<sup>†</sup> (RWQCB – Los Angeles)
- e. Allan Ota (EPA)
- f. Susie Santilena<sup>†</sup> (Heal the Bay)
- g. Kathryn Curtis (POLA)
- h. Matthew Arms (POLB)
- i. Janna Watanabe (POLB)
- j. John Amick (City of Long Beach)
- k. Philip Lopez (City of Long Beach)
- l. Josh Burnam (Anchor QEA)
- m. Steve Cappellino (Anchor QEA)
- n. Claudio Fassardi (Halcrow)
- o. Larry Smith (USACE – Planning)
- p. Dan Swenson (USACE- Regulatory)
- q. Corice Farrar (USACE- Regulatory)
- r. Mo Chang (USACE- Navigation)
- s. Keith Ayers (USACE- Navigation)
- t. Charles Dwyer (USACE- Navigation)
- u. Chris Miller (City of Newport Beach)
- v. Tom Rosmiller (City of Newport Beach)
- w. Joe Ryan (USACE- Coastal Engineering)
- x. Stephen Brown (USACE- Navigation)
- y. Jack Word<sup>†</sup> (NewFields LLC)
- z. Bill Gardiner<sup>†</sup> (NewFields LLC)
- aa. Wanda Cross<sup>†</sup> (RWQCB – Santa Ana)

<sup>†</sup> participating via teleconference.

**II. CSTF Meeting: Draft Coordinating Principles and Procedures**

- A.** Revised version, incorporating CSTF comments, was discussed. No additional edits to language were suggested; however, issue of expanding access to select NGO's (e.g., Heal the Bay) or general public was discussed and will be resolved at subsequent meeting prior to finalizing document.
- B.** CSTF joint dredging application was discussed.

- C. Coordinating Principles and Procedures to be discussed again during CSTF meeting held as part of next SC-DMMT meeting on Sept. 23.

### III. Project Review and Determinations

#### A. Mission Bay Dredging Project (O&M) - SAP results report

- a. **Discussion:** Tier II results were discussed, primarily grain size and suitability for beach nourishment. One issue was whether the 170 (0.090 mm) or 200 (0.075 mm) sieve is appropriate cut-off for distinguishing between sand and "fines" (silt and clay). The Corps uses the Unified Soil Classification System and a 200 sieve. A second issue was the inclusion of the deep end of the beach transects to calculate average fines contents of the receiver beaches.
- b. **Determination:**
- Appropriate cut-off for distinguishing between sand and "fines" (silt and clay) to be discussed during a subsequent teleconference call.
  - Suitability of different composites was also deferred to a subsequent teleconference call. While EPA did not object to the Corps' determination that material is compatible with beach placement, EPA's preference is that finer grained material be placed in the nearshore below MLLW.
  - No agency raised any issues regarding sediment chemistry.

#### B. Lower Newport Bay Maintenance Dredging Project (Regulatory, possibly future O&M) – Tier III requirements.

- a. **Discussion:**
- i. Based on bioassay results, there was concern on part of the City of Newport Beach and Newfields that the list of analytes for bioaccumulation analysis (clams and worms tissue testing) was too burdensome and not as expected, namely testing for As, Cd, Cu, and PCBs and not some expected other metals. They sought guidance from EPA and SC-DMMT about rationale of selection for this project and for future predictability. They petitioned for altered bioaccumulation testing requirements.
  - ii. City and Newfields also sought guidance on interpreting body burden once data are available: would statistical significance comparison of results from test tissue and reference site or control, be sufficient, or would additional comparison to some external values for bioaccumulation be required?
  - iii. Do 5 replicates need to be run for reference site for each analyte on each animal?
- b. **Determination:**
- In-progress testing using one replicate for each of the analytes on EPA's list tested for each prescribed composite location on

each animal (worm and clam) will continue. Results will be reported to SC-DMMT for review when they become available. If concentration of contaminant in tissue for each location is greater than concentration in control or reference site tissue, then the remaining 4 replicates will be run for the analyte at the relevant location(s) and for the relevant animal(s). For high exceedence values, Newfields will proceed with replicates; for clear-cut low values, Newfields will recommend no further testing. However, for concentrations at or near reference (or control) values, then Newfields will seek direction from SC-DMMT.

- For values that go forward for full replicate testing, the standard Green Book analysis will apply: reference on full composite as compared to Environmental Residue Effects Database (ERED), or other data deemed appropriate by SC-DMMT.
- Need to run 5 replicates for reference site for analytes needing full 5 replicate testing, as determined above in first determination.

**c. Determination:**

- Newfields will calculate holding time remaining for tissue to ensure analytical chemistry can be run and time for review of results from first replicates.
- SC-DMMT will reconvene either in interim time or at next SC-DMMT meeting to evaluate results from first replicates to determine which analytes, composites, and animals need further replicates. Agencies need at least 1 week for review.
- EPA will investigate whether trophic trace analysis was conducted for LA-3 designation.

**IV. Agency only discussion:**

- a. No separate agency discussion took place.