Southern California Dredged Material Management Team (SC-DMMT)
Nov 30, 2011
Final Meeting Notes

I. Participating Agencies /Attendees:

a. Michael Lyons† (RWQCB – Los Angeles)
b. Allan Ota† (EPA)
c. Shannon Pankratz (USACE-Regulatory)
d. Melanie Stalder (USACE-Regulatory)
e. Theresa Stevens (USACE-Regulatory)
f. Erin Jones (USACE-Planning)
g. Jack Gregg† (CCC)
h. Bill Paznokas† (DFG)
i. Susie Santilena (Heal the Bay)
j. Eric Lopez (City of Long Beach)
k. Brian Leslie (Moffat & Nichol)
l. Chris Webb (Moffat & Nichol)
m. Peter Gadd (Coastal Frontiers Corporation)
n. Cesar Espinosa (County of Los Angeles, Beaches and Harbors)
o. Shelly Anghera (Anchor QEA)
p. Steve Cappellino (Anchor QEA)
q. Brian McNeal (AIS)
r. Lawrence Jackson (City of Long Beach)
s. Onofre Ramirez (City of Long Beach)
t. Matt Arms† (Port of Long Beach)

† participating via teleconference.

II. Announcements: none.

III. Project Review and Determinations

a. Broad Beach Project

i. Corps comments (POC: Shannon Pankratz)

1. SAP Results report approved by agencies.
2. Heal the Bay stated the proposed borrow area may impact a MPA. Consultant will follow up to see what the specific MPA designation and restrictions are for the area so as not to conflict with existing MPA, but noted there is currently no existing habitat within the borrow area. DFG will verify the specific type of designation of this particular MPA.

(SANDAG had obtained an exemption for a previous project borrow site in relation to a MPA).

3. Discussion occurred regarding approvals for the riprap revetment previously authorized through emergency permits as a temporary structure. Heal the Bay further commented that it may be more beneficial (as far as beach replenishment) to have dunes fully constructed as sand. Heal the Bay also commented that there were studies suggesting armoring of coastlines increases the frequency of the need for sand replenishment, as well as causing scour on nearby beaches. The County was solely concerned with public beach access through the dune areas, as well as that the public would not be allowed to access the dune habitat areas themselves. (The consultants mentioned that the homeowners want the dune habitat areas designated as ecological sensitive areas (without public access on the dunes themselves).

b. Colorado Lagoon Dredging Project

i. Corps comments (POC: Melanie Stalder**):**

1. Suitability confirmation of lagoon sediments for disposal at Port of Lang Beach Middle Harbor.
2. Project Proponent: City of Long Beach, Eric Lopez, Project Manager
3. Purpose of Discussion: The City of Long Beach has re-tested the sediment in Colorado Lagoon for the appropriateness of disposal in an in-water facility. The purpose of the meeting is to gain agency concurrence that the Colorado Lagoon sediment is at a level considered non hazardous and is appropriate for disposal at Middle Harbor without treatment.
4. Background: At the time the City was developing the Colorado Lagoon dredging project the only option for sediment disposal was at an upland facility. During the initial testing of the sediment it was found that the concentration of lead was above Title 22 standards and would considered a hazardous waste according to State standards. Treatment prior to disposal in an upland facility would be required. The confined disposal facility at the Port of Long Beach Middle Harbor is now available to accept dredged material considered contaminated but not hazardous. The previous WET tests are not appropriate for determining the appropriateness of disposal for in-water placement (Middle Harbor). New sediments tests to

determine eligibility for disposal at Middle Harbor were done using the Effluent Elutriate Test (EET) method. Results show the concentration of lead is not at a level considered hazardous for in-water disposal. Therefore, no treatment of the sediment would be required prior to disposal at Middle Harbor.

5. Discussion:
    a. City (also see attached memo and responses from EPA, RWQCB, and Coastal Commission staff): Current funding will only allow dredging of the west arm of the Lagoon. A determination of "non-hazardous without treatment" prior to disposal would free up monies that could be used to dredge the rest of the lagoon as mandated by the Colorado Lagoon TMDL. In Addition, if geotechnically suitable, the material could be placed at a higher elevation within the disposal site which would be less expensive and allow for more material to be accepted into the disposal site. Additional funding for the project from other sources may be pulled if only a partial dredge is done.
    b. EPA: No issues with the disposal site. Initial results of the new testing looks good. Would like to wait until the results from the 28-day test are completed.
    c. POLB: The port would like affirmation that the sediment would remain non-hazardous with a change in sediment treatment. Suggest changing the determination of" non-hazardous" to "suitable for disposal" at an in-water facility.
    d. RWQCB: The Board will more carefully review the memo sent by the City before making a determination and will check to see if the proposed change in procedure would require an amended 401 (see attached RWQCB response).
6. Conclusion: An additional memo will be provided showing the levels of lead in the sediment along with the concentrations deemed hazardous and contaminated according to State and Federal regulations. Agencies will review the new memo and make their determination on the appropriateness of in-water disposal at Middle Harbor without treatment.

c. Santa Ana River Marsh

i. Corps Comments (POC: Erin Jones):

1. The Corps proposed that sediments from dredge areas D&E, which were found suitable for upland disposal only, be placed on adjacent property currently used by West Newport Oil Company. Placing material in this location would save on the costs of hauling to a landfill, and may allow for the Corps to dredge a portion of the City of Newport Beach's Seminuk Slough (at the request of the City).
2. The DMMT requested more information, including the exact disposal location and chemical characterization of soils at the West Newport Oil Co.'s site. The DMMT also indicated that the adjacent property was slated for a housing development (Newport Banning Ranch), and that influences of future land use and clean up should be investigated. It was also suggested that the Corps look at the draft EIR put out by Banning Ranch for more information.
3. The Corps will investigate further, to follow up at a later DMMT meeting if this disposal area is considered further.

d. Inner Cabrillo Beach (ICB) Accreted Sand Removal Project/Outer Cabrillo Beach (OCB) Nourishment – Sampling and Analysis Plan review

i. Corps comments (POC: Theresa Stevens)

1. Project would address ICB Bacterial TMDL and is required by the RWQCB. It would increase circulation and involve excavation of approximately 50,000 cy of sand to -2 feet MLLW. Sand would be placed on OCB for the purpose of beach nourishment, provided grain size test results show compatibility.
2. Approximately 5 acres of ICB would be impacted during excavation and approx. 7 acres of OCB would be impacted during sand placement.
3. Project test procedures were based on requirements of RGP 67 and Inland Testing Manual. But since RGP 67 expired, the project will be evaluated under Corps SIP procedures. PN comment period will start Dec 9, 2011.
4. ICB cores will be photographed, tested for grain size and bulk sediment chemistry; if stratified bulk testing would be done on each strata.
5. OCB sediment samples will be along the beach and perpendicular to the beach out to -30 feet. These will be tested for grain size and bulk sediment chemistry.

6. List of analytes and detection limits proposed for testing is similar to that proposed for the recent Ventura Harbor sediment dredging project.
7. Discussion:
    a. Heal the Bay (HTB):
        i. Wanted to know the worst case scenario for sediment disposal if chemistry comes back and disallows beach nourishment. Where would the material go? Port will get back to DMMT on this.
        ii. Asked for bacterial sampling/testing before transfer of material to OCB. Port will get back to DMMT on this after consulting with AMEC and RWQCB about appropriate testing protocols and "shelf life" of bacterial once placed on a high energy beach.
        iii. Asked for restrictions on public access to OCB during sand placement, and asked for WQ testing following sand placement on OCB. Port will get back to DMMT on this with a plan for access restrictions, and testing approach.
    b. DFG : Indicated there is info on "shelf life". Port will check with LA county sanitation on this since it was an issue from a 2006 sewage spill.
    c. CCC:
        i. Asked for restrictions on public access to OCB during sand placement, and asked for WQ testing following sand placement on OCB. Port will get back to DMMT on this with a protocol and approach.
        ii. Asked for information on improved circulation via sand excavation approach.
        iii. Questioned additional 2-foot depth of sample cores. Port indicated this approach was conservative and based on dredging procedures even though the excavation would not be done w/ a dredge.
    d. RWQCB: Clarified a permit (WDR and/or 401 certification) would be required.
    e. EPA:
        i. Analyte list for PCBs and phenols: detection and reporting limits seemed too high. Port indicated they would use lower limits to be provided by EPA.

f. USACE: The Corps had many of the same questions raised by other agencies and will review additional information as it is submitted by the Port prior to future SAPR presentation at the DMMT.

e. Berths 167-169 Shell Liquid Bulk Terminal Maintenance Dredging – Sampling and Analysis Plan Report

i. Corps comments (POC: Theresa Stevens)

1. Project involves maintenance dredging of approx. 3000 cy to -40 MLLW with -2 foot overdredge allowance.
2. Previously sampled in 1999; previously dredged in 2001 (approx. 6000 cy) – disposal at Anchorage Road due to elevated PAH- similar results this year.
3. Anchorage Road now closed to new material. This material would go to Berths 243-245 CDF.
4. SAP originally presented at May 25, 2011 CSTF meeting.
5. Based on DMMT/CSTF comments from May 25, Port did re-sample sediment to evaluate to Z layer (which is 6 inches below the overdredge depth).
6. Chemical analyses were performed on two site composites, and PAHs on individual cores and analysis of Z layer composites.
7. Elutriate analyses were performed on site composites.
8. Site access was an issue and made collection difficult.
9. Area A = Cores 1-2; Area B = Cores 4-5
10. No hazardous waste criteria exceeded-well below.
11. No elevated chemical elutriates except TBT but levels were well below CA toxics rule criteria.
12. Z layer samples had elevated DDT and PCBs relative to material above it which resulted in Port conducting supplemental sampling further below Z layer (to refusal depth or native material) to see what was going on.
13. Material below proposed overdredge depth of -42 MLLW and below the Z layer was less contaminated than the material that would be dredged and disposed of at the CDF.

ii. EPA:

1. Asked if an additional foot of dredging could take place to get all the contaminated material out (ie, beyond approved design depth). Corps and Port indicated this would constitute new dredging require an EIS; further the proposed dredging would remove contaminants above the Z layer.

iii. Conclusion: All agencies, including Corps were satisfied with the results of the sampling approach, the findings in the SAPR and the proposed disposal site.

IV. Other issues: none.