Southern California Dredged Material Management Team (SC-DMMT)
March 28, 2012
Final Meeting Notes

I. Participating Agencies /Attendees:

a. Allan Ota† (EPA)
b. Dan Swenson (USACE-Regulatory)
c. Antal Szijj† (USACE-Regulatory)
d. Loni Adams† (DFG)
e. Larry Smith (USACE-Planning)
f. Larry Simon† (CCC)
g. Bill Paznokas† (DFG)
h. Doug Shibberu† (RWQCB-Santa Ana)
i. Kathryn Curtis† (POLA)
j. Jana Watanabe (POLB)
k. James Vernon (POLB)
l. Steve Cappellino (Anchor QEA)
m. Jeffrey Devine (USACE-Engineering)
n. Jeffrey Cole (USACE-Navigation)
o. Carol Roberts† (USFWS)
p. Jack Malone† (Anchor QEA)
q. Joe Ryan (USACE-Engineering)
r. Alan Monji† (RWQCB-region?)

† participating via teleconference.

II. Announcements:

a. **Draft SAP for Channel Islands Harbor (POC: Larry Smith):** To be reviewed "out-of-cycle" (i.e., not at a SC-DMMT meeting). SAP has been provided for review and comment. We are asking for comments by April 6, 2012. Sampling is based on previous sampling events, using the same composite areas. Previous sampling was in 2007. A copy of the 2007 report was forwarded to EPA. A draft EA will be prepared and distributed in April/May. This will include the Coastal Consistency Determination and 401 Certification request. Dredging is likely to take place in September/October of this year. The draft EA will cover five years (three cycles) of dredging with dredging approximately once every two years, during calendar years 2012, 2014, and 2016. Sand trap depth originally stated as -35 ft should be corrected to -33 ft + up to 2 ft overdepth.

    i. **EPA comments (POC Allan Ota):**

        1. This SAP was submitted to the SC-DMMT one day prior to the scheduled meeting and there was a request to provide

comments in offline review (out-of-cycle of SC-DMMT schedule).

2. The estimated volume table was blank and a placeholder value of 494,000 cy was inserted in this section. The historical dredging volumes from 2006 to present range from 741,000 to 1,346,900 cy, so the placeholder volume is probably too low. The results of bathymetric survey should be submitted to the interagency review team to confirm that the number of cores and locations of the cores relative to shoals is appropriate for the volumes of test composite areas.
3. The test composite areas and number of cores is the same as previous testing, but it is noted from a follow-up e-mail that Area F will not be sampled in the upcoming sampling effort due to very low volumes (about 200 cy).
4. The 2006 sediment chemistry data suggests that the bulk of the project area may be suitable for beach nourishment, but there appears to be some potential problem areas (fine grain sediment layers?) where there are substantial elevations of DDTs (26.2 and 23.3 ppb - well above ER-L values; half of ER-M values for CI-E-U cores) and PAHs (4,380 ppb - above ER-L value for CI-C-L core). These values would not be considered trace levels, and if these levels appeared again, further testing (i.e., bioassays) may be considered for these order of magnitude concentrations, or these dredging polygons (based on individual cores) would have to be managed separately from the rest of the project. Contingency testing (i.e, bioassays) may have to be considered for this project.
5. The SAP describes core sampling, but it is noted from a follow-up e-mail that Area D and small portion of Area C is dry beach. The SAP proposes a land-based drill for these areas but surface grabs are considered due to high mobilization costs for three proposed core locations. Surface grabs may be sufficient because it is reasonable to assume these sand traps outside of the main channel are collecting sands from littoral drift, but this should be confirmed by submitting geotechnical (depth-stratified) data from previous sampling efforts.
6. A final SAP must be submitted to SC-DMMT to complete this project file to date.
7. EPA Region 9 conditionally concurs on this SAP. In addition to suggested edits, bathymetric survey results should be submitted to confirm appropriate locations of sample cores (i.e., relative to shoals).

III. Project Review and Determinations

a. POLB Western Anchorage Project (draft SAP):

i. Corps comments (POC: Antal Szijj)

1. POLB proposes to dredge approximately 600,000 cy of material from the Western Anchorage Sediment Storage Site (WASSS) to supplement 3rd party material with high proportion of fines, and to provide the top layer of the Middle Harbor CDF. The WASSS includes material placed from previous dredging/excavation operations in the mid to late 90's with the intention of utilizing it at a later date. Material would be dredged from the "north lobe" of the WASSS and extend below the fill layer and into native sediments in order to generate the required volume of material.
2. Testing of the fill material in 2007 found contamination levels generally below ERLs. Current SAP would provide updated testing results in accordance with Sediment Management Plan for Middle Harbor CDF, including native sediments below the fill layer.
3. EPA: It would be helpful to have a figure with the sampling locations superimposed on the site bathymetry depicted on Figure 1 in appendix A.
4. CCC: POLB should verify whether any additional review is required by the local CCC to address excavation of native sediments below the fill layer. Also need to be sure POLB maximizes the opportunity to dispose of contaminated sediments in the CDF. Dredged material from Marina del Rey that is suitable for beach nourishment needs to be used for that purpose and not placed in the CDF.
5. USACE: Middle Harbor EIR/EIS and ACOE permit anticipated up to 1.2 million cy of material would be required from WASSS depending on the volume and quality of material generated within the project and from 3rd party sources. No additional ACOE permitting or modifications to the permit are required. ACOE would issue a notice to proceed once testing results verify the material is suitable for disposal in the Middle Harbor CDF.
6. DMMT: No further comments, no objections to proceeding with testing under proposed SAP. Live long and prosper.

b. POLB cooling water intake work (pre-SAP discussion):

i. Corps comments (POC: Antal Szijj)

1. Unscheduled discussion regarding removal of a decommissioned cooling water intake;
2. POLB: POLB proposes to remove a decommissioned intake structure which contains approximately 2,000 cy of accumulated sediments. Assuming it is suitable, material would be placed in the Middle Harbor CDF. Does DMMT need to review the SAP for such a small project or are the results sufficient?
3. DMMT: No objections to POLB proceeding with sampling.

c. Oceanside Maintenance Dredging Project:

i. Corps Comments (POC: Larry Smith):

1. Sediment chemistry is very clean with no ER-M exceedances. Most of the organic compounds are non-detect. Total DDT for one composite was slightly above ER-L, but well under ER-M. Grain size shows all composites meet Corps' requirements. Four individual cores were slightly finer than allowed. However, the sediment represented by these cores is very small in volume and shouldn't have an effect on overall beach suitability. Corps has determined that sediments are suitable for beach and nearshore disposal. We have requested concurrence with that determination by April 6, 2012. Corps will be providing Coastal Consistency Determination and 401 Certification application this week. We are trying to expedite this project so that beach disposal does not occur after Memorial Day.

ii. EPA Comments (POC Allan Ota):

1. This project involves proposed dredging of about 494,000 cy, including overdredge depth, from three composite areas, Del Mar Channel, Oceanside Channel, and Entrance Channel.
2. Project documents submitted for review included a SAP, spreadsheet containing sediment chemistry data, and a geo-technical report containing sediment grain size data. This last document was submitted in the morning of the scheduled interagency dredging review team meeting, and review by the entire team was not possible. There was only preliminary discussion during the meeting last week.

3. The sediment chemistry data appears to show low concentrations for the required analyte list. All metals concentrations were below the NOAA ER-L screening levels. Of the organics, only one compound category in one test composite, Total DDT, was slightly above ER-L screening level (and well below ER-M value), and this is not considered significant from a toxicity standpoint.
4. The grain size data appears to show that the bulk of the sediments have a sand composition of 80% or more (weighted average) and would be considered beach-compatible. There are three cores where the fines content is at least or greater than 30% and there is one core which is about 60% fines (weighted average). Important note: use of weighted average instead of fine grain and coarse grain limits may be misleading in evaluation of beach compatibility.
5. General comments include: (1) a final sediment testing report must be submitted to the SC-DMMT to complete this project file [review of preliminary data was provided to help this project stay on schedule]; (2) sediment grain size data plots should include fine-grain and coarse-grain limits of the individual core data to compare with the grain size envelope of the receiver beach [use of only weighted average data can be misleading for evaluation of compatibility for beach nourishment]; (3) minor edits of Table 5 to correct Channel Entrance core identifiers as "C" (instead of "B"); and (4) correction to SC-DMMT notes, III.c.i.1., seventh sentence - replace "disposal" with "placement". This last point is to emphasize consistent terminology to distinguish disposal as waste from beneficial re-use (sand for beach nourishment). I know I may have missed this in previous meeting notes, but we should be more consistent with our terminology and emphasize our policy of beneficial re-use over waste disposal wherever possible.
6. A follow-up e-mail confirmed that the four cores in question (item #4 above) represented a small portion of the overall project volume.
7. Overall, based on the sediment chemistry data, grain size data, and volumes associated with four cores (item # 4 above), EPA Region 9 concurs that these project sediments are compatible for beach nourishment.

IV. Other issues, discussions:

a. **Draft SAP/R Guidelines (POC: Dan Swenson):**

i. Discussion focused on the following topics:
    1. Options and needs for submittal of electronic data. Kathryn Curtis from POLA will provide information on CSTF database. Allan and Dan will check on database being developed by San Francisco DMMO.
    2. Format and content of previous sediment testing data to be included in SAPs. Doug Shibberu has provided an suggested additional table.
    3. Guidance on composite sampling.
ii. Please submit any additional comments by April 6, 2012, after which the draft will be revised and circulated for public notice.