

Southern California Dredged Material Management Team (SC-DMMT)  
June 22, 2011  
Final Meeting Notes

**I. Participating Agencies /Attendees:**

- a. Michael Lyons (RWQCB – Los Angeles)
- b. Allan Ota<sup>†</sup> (EPA)
- c. Leah Butler<sup>†</sup> (EPA)
- d. Dan Swenson (USACE- Regulatory)
- e. Larry Smith (USACE-Planning)
- f. Jorine Campopiano (EPA)
- g. Jack Gregg<sup>†</sup> (CCC)
- h. Ken Wong (USACE-Planning)
- i. Josh Burnam (Anchor QEA)
- j. Mark Sandoval (City of Long Beach)
- k. Chris Osuch (Anchor QEA)
- l. Cherry Oo (Corps-Regulatory)
- m. Melanie Stalder (Corps-Regulatory)
- n. Thomas Kwan (EPA)
- o. Eric Lopez (City of Long Beach)
- p. Kim Garvey (Moffatt and Nichol)
- q. Julian Serafin (Corps-Planning)
- r. Jackie Zaldana<sup>†</sup> (EPA)
- s. Susie Santilena<sup>†</sup> (Heal the Bay)
- t. Marty Stevenson<sup>†</sup> (Kinnetic Labs)
- u. Erin Jones (Corps-Planning)

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

**II. Announcements:**

- a. **San Diego Maintenance Harbor Dredging:** The San Diego Harbor Maintenance Dredging is proposed to occur beginning in fall/winter 2011. Dredging would occur within the Federal Navigation Channel's approach and entrance channels. Approximately 550,000 cubic yards of material would be dredged. Sediment sampling was performed within the dredge area in October 2008. The Corps requested to use this sediment sampling data, which will be slightly older than three years old at the time of dredging, to develop the upcoming Supplemental Environmental Assessment. The Corps believes that any sediment that has shoaled in the area since the October 2008 sediment sampling would be clean, sandy material from the ocean. The Corps is not aware of any spills in the area since the original sampling. The agencies present at the DMMT meeting agreed that the Corps could use the October 2008 sediment sampling data, with EPA requesting written documentation of the Corps rationale for why this data is sufficient. This rationale is supplied

above. If anyone has questions, contact Erin Jones (Corps Planning Division, 213-452-3864, erin.hardison@usace.army.mil).

### **III. CSTF Meetings:**

#### **a. Colorado Lagoon Contaminated Sediment Removal – Project update, new treatment proposal**

##### **i. Project proponent: City of Long Beach**

**b. Corps comments:** Background: The lagoon sediment is contaminated with a variety of metals and organic compounds. None are above Federal standards for hazardous waste. Only lead is above Title 22 standards and is considered a hazardous waste according to State standards. Treatment prior to disposal is required. Cement stabilization tests failed to meet the performance target for soluble lead. Synthetic Metals Mineralization System (SMMS) was found to reduce soluble lead to below performance target of 2.5 mg/L.

##### **i. Our understanding is as follows:**

1. Project goes out for bid shortly. Contractors would be required to perform a field demonstration to show their sediment treatment process has been successful.
2. The contract would require field demonstration testing for the first 200 CY dredged and treated from each arm of the lagoon.
3. The contract would require confirmatory testing for the second 200 CY dredged and treated from each arm of the lagoon and one test for 4,000 CY of sediment from each arm thereafter.
4. Contractors would also be responsible for the treatment of discharge water produced from any de-watering of the sediment on-site. The method would be up to the contractor.
5. Transportation of sediment to the Middle Harbor of the Port of Long Beach (POLB) will be done by truck or barge. The Coastal Commission is concerned about impacts to eelgrass in Marine Stadium and prefers the trucking method. The Corps Planning Division prefers the barge method due to air quality impacts of trucking (note: Corps Regulatory Division has not yet made a determination on the issue as part of its permit process). POLB prefers to accept material by barge.
6. The City is currently working to update their 401 and CDP to the new dredge volumes.
7. EPA expressed concerns over the possible transfer of lead contaminants from the disposal site into nearby marine communities. City of Long Beach Marinas explained the

procedure by which contaminants are accepted and used as fill material. The material would be encapsulated within the Middle Harbor CDF by clean sand and dikes to prevent transfer to other areas.

8. EPA suggested lead treatment could be special condition on Corps permit; however, Corps staff indicated this would likely not be a condition, as it relates to water quality. RWQCB staff indicated the treatment would be a condition of the 401 certification. Disposal at the Middle Harbor CDF is covered by separate 404 and 401 authorizations which also include water quality monitoring at the disposal site.
9. POLB is required to obtain a Notice to Proceed for each discharge from an individual source into Middle Harbor, as a condition of their 404 permit.
- ii. Conclusions: There were no objections to the dredged material treatment proposal or requests for additional information. Corps permit and grant processes are still pending.

c. **EPA comments:** none provided.

#### **IV. Project Review and Determinations**

a. **Alamitos Bay Marina Basin 4 Maintenance Dredging – Requesting “Tier I exclusion”**

i. **Project Proponent:** City of Long Beach

ii. **Issue discussed:** should this project be listed as a CSTF project? Although the group, including the applicant, agreed to consider the project as a CSTF project, the larger question of what criteria should be used to determine whether a project is a CSTF project was not resolved.

iii. **Corps comments:**

1. Status: project is delayed. Dredging currently scheduled for after Labor Day in basin 4.
2. Original sediment testing occurred in 1999, 2003, and 2007. SC-DMMT approval for ocean disposal was granted in 2008. Final permits were obtained in 2011.
3. The Corps determined that per the 1994 joint Corps-EPA memorandum (attached), retesting (starting with Tier I: existing information) would only be required three years after issuance of the final Corps permit (dated April 21, 2011), unless some event occurred in the interim which

would cause the Corps to consider the existing sediment testing data to be invalid (e.g., large storm events/seasons, known contaminant spills, etc.). In this case, the Corps is unaware of any such event which would warrant additional sediment testing at the present time.

- iv. **Coastal Commission comments:** Agreed that conditions have not changed significantly and that no new sediment testing is required.
- v. **RWQCB comments:** Agreed that conditions have not changed significantly and that no new sediment testing is required.
- vi. **EPA comments:** EPA acknowledges the 1994 joint Corps-EPA memorandum presented to the SC-DMMT by Dan Swenson, but reminds the group of the value of confirmatory sediment testing in projects where substantial changes are suspected in sediments due to unusual seasonal rain and/or flood events, regardless of whether the sediment testing data has exceeded a 3 year timeframe. For example, the Navy Pier 12 project in San Diego Bay was discovered to have substantial changes in the sediment chemistry character, probably due to major rain events resulting in additional sedimentation over a 3 year timeframe. In the case of this Alamos Bay Marina basin, no major rain or flood events have been recorded since 2007, but EPA is concerned with the dynamic nature of DDX's, PCB's, Organotins, Copper, Lead, Mercury, and Nickel concentrations when comparing the 1999, 2003, and 2007 data in the absence of dredging. EPA understands a lack of documentation from the 1999 and 2003 testing and differences in sampling methodology may contribute to the variability between the data.

The EPA requires some level of confirmatory evaluation before concurring on ocean disposal of sediments generated from the Alamos Bay Marina Basin 4 maintenance dredging. The intent of the evaluation is to determine whether conditions (bathymetry and/or proposed dredging volume) in the dredging area have changed substantially since the 2007 testing episode. Confirmatory chemistry evaluation may not be necessary at this time if it can be shown there has been no substantial sedimentation or substantial change in the proposed dredging volume. In this case, EPA recommends two options to the applicant which can verify the characteristics of the sediment is unchanged since the 2007 evaluation.

1. Demonstrate the volume of the sedimentation has not substantially changed since the 2007 evaluation. Possible approaches may include:

- a. Finding previous Alamitos Bay Marina bathymetry data, if available for any area of this water body, determining a sedimentation rate and calculating the change (increase or decrease) in proposed dredging volume. If no prior bathymetry data is available for Alamitos Bay, bathymetry datasets from nearby marinas or harbors, such as Huntington Harbor, Newport Bay, and Seal Beach, may be used if considered appropriate.
  - b. Perform a new bathymetry survey using the same or similar methods of the 2007 evaluation so that the dredge volumes may be compared without concern of dissimilar procedures.
  - c. The findings of either (a) or (b) shall be submitted to the SC-DMMT for review, and EPA would concur on ocean disposal if the findings indicate no substantial change in volume.
2. If option #1 (above) cannot be completed or the calculations indicate substantial sedimentation, then it would be necessary to confirm that concentrations of a subset of analytes tested in 2007 (DDx's, PCB's, Organotins, Copper, Lead, Mercury, and Nickel) are relatively unchanged since the 2007 evaluation. The method of analysis should be the same or similar to the 2007 analysis so that concentrations may be compared without concern of dissimilar procedures. Because any substantial changes would be limited to surface deposits, it would be sufficient to utilize one of two sampling approaches:
  - a. Surface grabs (ex. Van Veen grab)
  - b. Utilizing divers to collect samples
3. Note: The sediment chemistry analysis results shall be submitted to the SC-DMMT for review, and EPA would concur on ocean disposal if the findings indicate no substantial change in sediment character from 2007 testing episode.