

Southern California Dredged Material Management Team (SC-DMMT)  
August 24, 2011  
Final Meeting Notes

**I. Participating Agencies /Attendees:**

- a. Michael Lyons<sup>†</sup> (RWQCB – Los Angeles)
- b. Allan Ota (EPA)
- c. Dan Swenson (USACE-Regulatory)
- d. Crystal Huerta (USACE-Regulatory)
- e. Larry Smith (USACE-Planning)
- f. Jack Gregg<sup>†</sup> (CCC)
- g. Thomas Kwan (EPA)
- h. Susie Santilena (Heal the Bay)
- i. Bryant Chesney (NMFS)
- j. Kathryn Curtis (POLA)
- k. Maureen Spencer (Santa Barbara County Flood Control)
- l. Seth Shank (Santa Barbara County Flood Control)
- m. Jenn Leighton (PAORE)
- n. David Innis<sup>†</sup> (RWQCB, Region 3)
- o. Andrew Martine?<sup>†</sup> (Anchor QEA)
- p. Jack Malone<sup>†</sup> (Anchor QEA)
- q. Andrea Krumpacker<sup>†</sup> (Westin Solutions)
- r. Matt Arms (POLB)

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

**II. Announcements:**

- a. **SAP/SAPR Guidelines:** have been circulated for review by SC-DMMT and CSTF. Discussion to be held at next SC-DMMT meeting, to be followed by public comment process.

**III. Project Review and Determinations**

**a. Santa Barbara Flood Control Atascadero Creek Long Term Routine Maintenance and Goleta Slough Dredging – SAP – Project  
Proponent: Santa Barbara County**

**i. Corps comments (POC: Crystal Huerta):**

- 1. The SAP should state that testing will be completed every 3 years. Testing should include chemical and grain size per the previous special condition located in previous permits.
- 2. The Corps had concerns regarding the dredged material containing higher than 25% fines passing the 200 sieve because the receiver site has a higher percentage of sand

and less fine grain material. This finding was also brought up by EPA. The District responded by requesting that they get their permits and possibly modify the permit in a year if need be.

3. Table 2 in the SAP displays approximate sediment removal volumes. Is this yearly volumes?
4. CCC requested 6 or 8 yrs of data needed and that impacts related to dredging was not available. The District responded that Chambers group did the initial monitoring. The District commented that the monitoring and beach profiling data were separate from the SAP and would be submitted. The Corps agrees with this request and has the same need in order to complete better compliance with the Permit.
5. There was a clarification that the Sediment Removed vs. Volume Utilized for Beach Replenishment graph was not an average but the maximum sediment removed that year. The District should provide averages in the revised SAP.
6. There were two questions raised during the meeting regarding sampling: 1) Is the number of core samples and their locations accurate and 2) What are the guidelines in selecting the Core samples? The revised SAP must include a map that is to scale depicting locations where the proposed core samples are to be taken.
7. EPA (Allan Ota and Thomas) stated that the SAP needs to include bathymetry and dredge quantities. The Corps agrees with EPA's comments. The revised SAP must include bathymetry and dredge quantities.
8. EPA also stated that sampling maps were needed displaying typical core locations. In addition site specific beach data was needed as well as receiver site information. The SAP was missing Ph data that needed to be analyzed. Thomas will provide a write up as part of the notes. The revised SAP must include a map that is to scale depicting locations where the core samples were taken and include missing data such as Ph.
9. NMFS (Bryant Chesney): Deferred to EPA, Corps, and RWQCB regarding the SAP. NMFS expressed concerns regarding the potential impacts to sensitive habitats immediately offshore. NMFS also requested that the District update their table summarizing the various disposal events (e.g. 2009, 2010, 2011). Also, NMFS requested that disposal events from other activities (e.g. BEACON project, SB Harbor mtnce dredging) also be conveyed in the summary table to more accurately depict the extent of sediment disposal in the Goleta area. Lastly, NMFS

indicated that the District provide the information in one document, as opposed to pointing to a number of various environmental documents that may already have become outdated. NMFS has had difficulty obtaining requested information for ESA and EFH purposes. As it currently stands, NMFS has been pressed to complete our consultation responsibilities without all the information that was requested to analyze impacts.

10. USACE (Larry Smith) stated that the SAP should be a standalone document.
11. Crystal Huerta will submit the draft SAP/SAPR guidelines to the District.
12. A Revised SAP to include additional clarifications on testing methods, core and phased analysis, should be submitted to the Corps and the SC-DMMT for review.

**ii. EPA comments:**

1. **Disposal Options - Receiver Site:** Physical and chemical characterization of the receiver site (Goleta Beach) must be included in the SAP to ensure dredged material is appropriate for beach replenishment. Grain size distribution at or near locations where replenishment is targeted should be included. The 25% threshold seems arbitrary and contrary to established suitability procedures developed by SCoup. Having grain size information about beach receiver sites may actually increase the volume of sandy materials for beach nourishment.
2. **Analytes List:** EPA recognizes that the SAP includes grain size distribution of the sample locations and the importance of the chemical constituents being tested. The analytes list should be more comprehensive to be consistent with DMMT approved SAP's. Given the rate of sedimentation in the area and the proximity of the creeks and creek basins to urban development, pyrethroids should be included in the analytes list. Sediment sampling analytes should include the following:
  - i. PAH's
  - ii. Phtalates
  - iii. Phenols
  - iv. PCB Congeners
  - v. 2,4'-DDD
  - vi. 2,4'-DDE
  - vii. 2,4'-DDT
  - viii. Ammonia

- ix. Pyrethroids
- x. Keep in mind that analytes may be deleted if they are “non-detect” after several testing episodes.

**3. Maps of Area, Sampling Locations and Historic Data:**

Maps showing creeks and basins pertinent to this SAP should be included and indicate any potential point of sources of pollution. If available, include past sampling locations, sediment characterization, and detailed locations of dredging activity.

- 4. Routine Maintenance SAP:** EPA understands that SBCFCWCD is developing this SAP as part of an updated Maintenance Program. EPA also understands that there are concerns about the potential delays in reviews of SAPs. Since the DMMT has been in operation, reviews are usually timely and offline reviews (from DMMT cycle) by the agencies may also be conducted if absolutely necessary. EPA understands that this SAP has been prepared to permit future maintenance dredging of Atascadero Creek, San Jose Creek, San Pedro Creek, Los Carneros Creek Basin, and Tecolotito Creek Basin over a 10 year timeframe. A conceptual SAP can be approved in advance with regard to analyte list, chemical testing requirements (i.e., detection limits, etc.), and compositing scheme based on general principles (i.e., contiguous portions of project area; expected similarity of grain size, etc.; exposure to same influences of hydrography, potential pollutant sources and discharges; and similar design depths). With this conceptual SAP approved, then for each upcoming dredging episode, the only submission for review would be a current pre-dredge bathymetry survey and proposed sample core locations. Review of proposed sampling map should not take more than one week to review, and probably as quickly as 24-48 hours, depending on staff workload at the time.

**iii. RWQCB comments:** see e-mail attachment.

**IV. Other issues:**

- a. **Discussion topic: Distinguishing between CSTF and DMMT agenda items/projects (Susie Santilena, Heal the Bay):**
  - i. Susie raised this issue after prior questions arose regarding particular projects being CSTF or SC-DMMT projects.

- ii. Susie provided a strawman proposal (see e-mail attachment).
- iii. Kathryn Curtis of POLA mentioned that p237 of the CSTF long term strategy discusses this issue.
- iv. Dan Swenson of Corps Regulatory proposed that all dredging and sediment disposal/beneficial reuse projects located within Los Angeles County and within tidally-influenced waters be assumed to be CSTF projects, unless a specific reason is provided on why this would not be the case (in which case the reasoning would be shared with CSTF and SC-DMMT members for comment).
- v. The group agreed to finalize this issue (if possible) at next month's meeting.