

Southern California Dredged Material Management Team (SC-DMMT)
July 27, 2011
Final Meeting Notes

I. Participating Agencies /Attendees:

- a. Michael Lyons[†] (RWQCB – Los Angeles)
- b. Allan Ota (EPA)
- c. Dan Swenson (USACE-Regulatory)
- d. Larry Smith (USACE-Planning)
- e. Jorine Campopiano (EPA)
- f. Larry Simon[†] (CCC)
- g. Thomas Kwan (EPA)
- h. Jacklyn Zalana[†] (EPA)
- i. Susie Santilena (Heal the Bay)
- j. Erin Jones (USACE-Planning)
- k. Bill Paznokas[†] (DFG)
- l. Wanda Cross[†] (SA-RWQCB)
- m. Bryant Chesney (NMFS)
- n. Cesar Espinosa (LACBH)
- o. Shannon Pankratz (USACE-Regulatory)
- p. Chris Webb (Moffatt and Nichol)
- q. Brian Lesley (Moffatt and Nichol)
- r. Peter Gadd[†] (Coastal Frontiers)
- s. Dave Walsh (POLA)
- t. Barry Snyder (Amec)
- u. Art Orozco (USACE-Engineering)
- v. Kathryn Curtis (POLA)
- w. Theresa Stevens (USACE- Regulatory)

[†] participating via teleconference.

II. Announcements:

- a. **SAP/SAPR Guidelines forthcoming:** will be circulated for review by SC-DMMT and CSTF, then by public.

III. CSTF Meetings:

**a. Marina del Rey Maintenance Dredging – SAPR - Project proponent:
Corps**

i. Corps comments:

- 1. The purpose of this portion of the meeting was to present the results of additional sediment testing on areas in Marina del Rey. This additional testing, including bioassay testing,

was a part of the Coastal Commission's concurrence with the Coastal Consistency Determination prepared for the overall project.

2. Three of the composite areas (Areas 4, 5, & 6) that were proposed for open water disposal (beach or nearshore disposal) were resampled and retested. The following preliminary data reports were distributed prior to the meeting: sediment chemistry, grain size distribution, core logs, results of suspended phase bioassay, and results of solid phase bioassay. Areas 4 & 5 were combined into a new composite area (4/5). This new area was sampled by vibracore. Area 6 was retained as a single area, but was sampled by surface grab due to its homogeneity and the difficulty in sampling this very shoaled area. Reference site was the Dockweiler Beach nearshore site, which was sampled by surface grab.
3. Sediment chemistry and grain size were similar to results obtained from the same areas in 2010. Jeff Devine (Corps' geologist) indicated that Area 4/5 results now indicated that this area is suitable for beach disposal, falling just within the Corps' suitability criteria for grain size distribution. Member agencies were not comfortable with the idea of placing these materials on the beach. The EA assessed nearshore disposal only for these materials, so beach disposal would not be allowed without additional NEPA documentation. These materials will remain nearshore disposal only.
4. Suspended phase bioassay test results were positive with all samples having LC-50 and EC-50 values of ">100%" and meet criteria of the Inland Testing Manual for open water disposal.
5. Solid phase tests also met criteria for open water disposal. Statistical analyses has not been completed for the test results, however none of the test sediment results exceeded the 20% difference between test and reference site that would indicate failure for the test species. The data also appear to be within ranges that would not be expected to be statistically different. Area 4/5 had the lowest survival at 88%, Area 6 had 100%, reference site was 98%, and lab control was 98%.
6. Sediment chemistry included pyrethroids, which are a new class of pesticide. The agencies supported testing in this case and accepted the list of individual pyrethroids tested.
7. There was extensive discussion related to physical compatibility criteria, which will have to be resolved later. There was no issue with the determination made for this

project with agreement to keep Area 4/5 as nearshore disposal.

8. All member agencies agreed that sediments were suitable for open water disposal.
9. A final report will be prepared based on the reported results and copies provided to members of the SC-DMMT and CSTF. Time frame is approximately one month.
10. Coastal Commission staff accepted the testing as meeting the condition imposed by the Commission. Coastal Commission staff will prepare an internal memo to the Commission detailing compliance once they receive the full report.

ii. Other agency comments: none provided.

b. Berths 302-305 – SAPR – Project Proponent: POLA

i. Corps comments:

1. American Presidents Line (APL) container terminal maintenance dredging at Berths 302-306.
2. Approx. 50K cy of dredging proposed (clamshell dredge).
3. Site history: Terminal Island water treatment plant previously discharged treated effluent into the harbor about 100 feet south of Pier 300 but this outfall has been relocated.
4. Approx. 50K cy of dredging proposed (clamshell dredge); of this approx. 30,500 cy is unsuitable for unconfined ocean disposal and approx. 19,500 cy is suitable for unconfined ocean disposal.
5. Proposed Disposal: Berths 243-245 CDF or Anchorage Road soil storage site (ARSSS, upland)-for unsuitable material; suitable material is proposed to be disposed at the Cabrillo Shallow Water Habitat Area (CSWHA).
6. Existing depth in Area A and Area B = -50' MLLW, proposed overdredge is -2' for a total depth of -52' MLLW at Berths 302-305. Berth 306 (Area C) is currently -55' MLLW; this area would also have approx. -2' overdredge depth and for a total of approx. -57' MLLW.
7. Maintenance dredging would take place over a period of 4-5 months. Dredging would commence in Fall 2011.
8. SAP was not presented to DMMT/CSTF as the testing was done in conjunction with the EIR/EIS for purposes of determining potential disposal opportunities to be evaluated. It was anticipated at that time that additional testing would be required in conjunction with project

permitting based on the overall project schedule. However POLA subsequently identified an opportunity to conduct the needed maintenance dredging at the site, in advance of completion of the NEPA/CEQA process for the project, through the ongoing Channel Deepening Project dredging activities. So, this report is being utilized to support the current permit applications.

9. SAP testing done in July 2010; SAPR dated April 2011 and revised July 2011.
10. All tests done in accordance with Green Book to determine suitability for ocean disposal, and included Tier 3 bulk chemical sediment test, solid and suspended particulate phase toxicology tests and bioaccumulation, as well as grain size analysis.
11. Individual sediment cores were composited, then these were combined from each area for an area-wide composite. Archives were kept for each composited core and each area-wide composite. "Z" layer was 2 feet beyond overdredge depth in all individual cores. Some Cores were individually tested due to concentrations of some metals exceeding ERM.
12. Area B and C (west) had potential "hot spot" in Cores C1 and C2-this material was classified as unsuitable for unconfined ocean disposal and would be disposed of at the CDF or the ARSSS. Area A and C (east) was classified as suitable for unconfined ocean disposal and will likely be disposed at the CSWHA.
13. Agency and Applicant Comments:
14. EPA indicated they are moving away from analyzing PCB Aroclors but instead were recommending congeners (trying to match SCCWRP's PCB congener list); POLA will not be held to new standards for this project. EPA was also concerned about reporting limits for bioaccumulation tests, they seemed high.
15. NMFS was concerned about the grain size of material already discharged at the CSWHA-too many fines. Needs standards and performance criteria for the CSWHA and a monitoring plan as outlined in their Channel Deepening consultation letter to Corps planning division.
16. POLA mentioned China Shipping sediment cap materials (from dredging surchargematerial) schedule is TBD, and depends on bathymetry at the CSWHA which will be monitored as the cap proceeds. Cap material has a high sand content and could be up to about 7' thick. This fill is going to be constructed differently than the previous SWH area (mechanical, bottom-dump dredging as opposed to

hydraulic dredging) to minimize unconsolidated fines ending up at the finished surface. There was a brief discussion of the scheduling and potential lag time between the proposed discharge associated with Berths 302-306 and the China Shipping cap material-this item remains unresolved and a schedule of activities will be provided to NMFS from the Port.

17. Larry Simon (CCC) asked how long the Berths 302-306 material would be exposed before the cap material was placed. Dave Walsh (POLA) indicated it would be no more than a few months and offered to provide additional schedule information. Dave said that a portion of the cap would be placed over this material then additional geotechnical evaluation would be done, followed by the remaining cap placement.
18. General and Agency Specific Recommendations:
19. The Port was asked to provide a graphic that shows the delineation between suitable and unsuitable in Area C.
 - a. Heal the Bay - deferred to EPA.
 - b. EPA - OK with SAP results and proposed disposal options.
 - c. NMFS - concerned about grain size in CSWH (more info to be provided, and possibly a follow-up conference call with Regulatory Division). The Corps concurs with this direction and additional coordination.
 - d. CCC - OK with SAP results and proposed disposal options provided the material placed at CSWH isn't exposed for too long. The Corps concurs with this direction and additional coordination.
 - e. CDFG - OK with SAP results and proposed disposal options, but had same concerns as NMFS on grain size and monitoring/performance criteria. The Corps concurs with this direction and additional coordination.
 - f. Regional Board - OK with SAP results and proposed disposal options.

ii. Other agency comments: none provided.

IV. Project Review and Determinations

a. Santa Ana River Marsh Maintenance Dredging – SAP – Project Proponent: Corps

i. Corps comments:

1. Final results of bioaccumulation tests for areas A, C, and F were discussed. Results determined, as expected based on grain size, chemical, and toxicity results, that areas A, C, and F are suitable for ocean disposal at LA-3. Previous DMMT meetings determined that Areas B and G are suitable for nearshore disposal, areas A, C, and F were not suitable for nearshore, and areas D and E are not suitable for nearshore or ocean disposal. The proposed project would not dredge areas D and E, which would require disposal at a landfill if dredged. The DMMT discussed that the exact contamination that caused areas D and E to fail the toxicity tests could not be pinpointed, and that these areas may require a re-test looking at different analytes to determine this.
2. The DMMT agreed that these disposal locations were appropriate given the sediment sampling results.
3. The EPA commented on the need for comparison of results to the Corps' ERED database, and to consider this for future reports as well. The Corps will contact the Contractor and request that conclusions be made regarding comparisons to the ERED database.
4. The EPA also commented that references to "BAP" in the results report should be changed to "SAP". Upon further review of the document, "BAP" refers to "Bioassay Analysis Plan" which can be found in Appendix C of the report.
5. Santa Ana RWQCB requested the electronic copy of the results report, as they could not access the FTP site. The Corps will re-send the report to Santa Ana RWQCB.
6. NMFS requested more information on the restoration of the SAR Marsh, which would be provided by the Corps. The Corps also provided NMFS a map showing how to access the SAR levee trail in order to observe the Marsh.
7. The DMMT also discussed the proposed dredging project, including the use of a small hydraulic cutterhead dredge with a pipeline and generator/pump to get material to the nearshore and to an offshore barge to fill scows that would transport material to LA-3. The Corps noted that this project is currently on-hold due to funding constraints and that it is expected to resume in 2012 or 2013. The expiration of the sediment sampling results was brought up, and EPA outlined that typically a 3 year expiration is enforced. EPA did say that, considering the minimal circulation in the SAR Marsh, they may be able to extend this expiration time frame if necessary. CDFG commented

that the proposed dredging method would cause significant turbidity. The Corps emphasized that once the project is resumed they would coordinate the EA, all project details, and environmental commitments (including sensitive vegetation surveys and water quality monitoring) with the resource agencies.

8. The Corps also discussed its in-progress Habitat Management Plan (HMP) for the SAR Marsh, which would consist of an evaluation of existing conditions and species, including threatened and endangered species. It would also include guidelines for how to manage the Marsh (including vegetation and wildlife surveys, dredging frequency, reporting, weeding maintenance, and site maintenance (IE fence repairs, trash removal)). The expectation is that the Corps would maintain ownership of the property, and an outside entity chosen by the Corps would use their own funding to manage the Marsh according to the HMP. The HMP is expected to be drafted internally; no public review would occur, though feedback may be requested from resource agencies. Santa Ana RWQCB suggested that the HMP examine sources of contaminants and/or toxicity, as shown in the sediment sampling results in areas D and E.
9. NMFS asked what kinds of habitats were present within the Marsh. The Corps described that habitat for three endangered species was created: cordgrass was established for the light-footed clapper rail (resident, nesting); pickleweed was established for the Belding's savannah sparrow (resident, nesting), and a sand capped least tern island for the CA least tern (no occurrence on the island since construction). The Corps outlined that weeds currently cover the least tern island and prevent them from nesting. A weeding contract is in place for the island to improve nesting habitat.
10. The Corps also described the Marsh as restoration and mitigation for improvements to the SAR River. The Marsh was restored in the early '90s, totaling 92-acres. Eight of these 92 acres were mitigation for the construction on the SAR River (OC Flood as local sponsor), while the remaining 84 acres was for restoration. Restoration of the Marsh was completed in 1992.

ii. Other agency comments: none provided

**b. Broad Beach Restoration – Revised SAP – Project Proponent:
Trancas Property Owner Association**

i. Corps comments:

1. Material sampled per prior approved SAP was generally too fine in grain size, though the chemistry was clean.
2. All present at the meeting and in teleconference approved the new SAP Addendum for further sampling in the Dockweiler and Venice investigation areas. It is expected that the Dockweiler areas may provide the most suitable material.
3. Moffatt and Nichol will follow up with the CCC, per Jorine's (EPA) comments, to make sure there would be no CCC issues with allowable levels of arsenic on the receiving beach.
4. Larry Smith mentioned the Corps has 2010/2011 single composites for chemistry and grain size near the addendum sampling areas.
5. For the proposed project, it was brought up in several comments that the applicant may need to have some mitigation in the form of a reef alternative.
6. Moffatt and Nichol mentioned in addition to the proposed dredging, they may have the opportunity to utilize some amount of removed sand from Area 6 (courtesy of the County); Jorine (EPA) commented that this area had been tested prior and was clean.

ii. Other agency comments: none provided.