

Southern California Dredged Material Management Team (SC-DMMT)
Joint morning session with Coastal Sediment Management Workgroup (CSMW)
June 27, 2012
Final Meeting Notes

I. Participating Agencies /Attendees:

- a. Michael Lyons[†] (RWQCB – Los Angeles)
- b. Doug Shibberu[†] (RWQCB-Santa Ana)
- c. Carol Roberts[†] (USFWS)
- d. Jack Gregg[†] (CCC)
- e. Larry Simon[†] (CCC)
- f. Mark Johnson[†] (CCC)
- g. Allan Ota[†] (EPA)
- h. Larry Smith (USACE-Planning)
- i. Dan Swenson (USACE-Regulatory)
- j. Mo Chang (USACE-Navigation)
- k. Kathryn Curtis[†] (POLA)
- l. Peter Von Langen[†] (Central Coast RWQCB)
- m. Shelly Anghera (Anchor QEA)
- n. Andrew Martin (Anchor QEA)
- o. Steve Capellino[†] (Anchor QEA)
- p. Ken Kronschnabl (Kinnetic Laboratories)
- q. Bill Paznokas[†] (DFG)
- r. Loni Adams[†] (DFG)
- s. Susie Ming (USACE-PPMD)
- t. Matt Arms[†] (POLB)
- u. Antal Szijj[†] (USACE-Regulatory)
- v. John Markham (USACE-Regulatory)
- w. Luann Lum[†] (VAFB) Luanne Lum (VAFB)
- x. Rhonda Cardinal[†] (United Launch Alliance)
- y. Syd Brown (CA Parks and Recreation)
- z. Clif Davenport (CGS)
- aa. John Dinger (USACE San Francisco District)
- bb. Chris Potter (CA Resources)
- cc. Jon Warrick (USGS)
- dd. Heather Schlosser (USACE-Planning)
- ee. Steve Aceti (CalCoast)
- ff. Jim Haussener[†] (CMANC)
- gg. Nate West (USACE-Planning)

[†] participating via teleconference.

II. Joint session with Coastal Sediment Management Workgroup (CSMW):

- a. Overview presentations were given on CSMW, SC-DMMT, and CSTF.

- i. Response from Loni Adams (CDFG): As far as the SC-DMMT meetings, I believe that having a section of the meeting to discuss biological resources (maybe 15 minutes) would be more time and cost effective than having it separated from the main meeting and most of the regulatory permitting agencies. Since all parties are already on the phone that need to hear our concerns, this could save significant time and it could avoid the danger of forgetting how important the biological aspects could be as far as timing and sand placement is concerned. This method of incorporating discussions about biological resources may also increase efficiency for the sake of biological resource protections on a greater number of projects. I realize that the updated environmental assessments are the main scoping and commenting opportunity. However, the monthly teleconferences will be important in bringing up any missed opportunities or biological resources that may have been overlooked or recently observed at a site. The opportunity to discuss new or revised mitigation methods, recent biological studies and pilot projects looking at new ways to avoid or minimize impacts and ways to improve habitats could also be possible topics we may want to discuss with the agencies.
- b. Presentation on Tijuana Estuary and Fate Transport study given by Dr. Jonathan Warrick of USGS.
 - i. Response from Loni Adams (CDFG): My comment for the Tijuana study is that I am concerned about the report for the Tijuana Sediment Fate and Transport Study being generally used to support all project sites in California as far as sediment fates or biological resources. I believe that this pilot study that focused on sediment transport (not biological impacts) is a good beginning to better understanding sediment transport behaviors for sites that are similar to the Tijuana site. Additionally, based on the focus of this study, I would not be comfortable in making any assumptions that "very little or no impacts to biological resources were seen" for a study that did not have a focus on all potential effects on all species and ecosystems (including accumulated and long term effects) to biological resources (positive or negative effects). I had a similar comment for the 2006 Encinitas study report that was done after SANDAG's 2001 RBSP 1 project was completed. The Department's draft comment letter for the draft BIA discussed the Encinitas study in more detail. My general comment is that we really should have some additional biological resources impact based studies conducted for sand fill projects in the future that include mitigation methods, species, habitats and ecosystems as the main study focus.

- c. Discussion on the definition of “beneficial reuse.” Discussion to be continued in future meetings.

III. Announcements:

- a. **Marina del Rey:** still dredging areas 4 and 5, nearshore placement at Dockweiler Beach.
- b. **Lower Newport Bay:** still dredging, material now going offshore.

IV. Project Review and Determinations

- a. **POLB Middle Harbor project (POC: Antal Szijj):** POLB provided maps and current bathymetry within the Middle Harbor Phase 1 CDF. POLB has accepted approximately 1 million cy of contaminated sediments from 3rd parties for beneficial reuse and addition 1 million cy of material generated internally (mostly from dredging and wharf demolition associated with the Middle Harbor Redevelopment Project). POLB anticipates needing an additional 600,000 cy of material to complete the Phase 1 CDF including surcharge. Some surcharge material would be rolled over to the Phase 2 CDF immediately adjacent. Most of the material to date and up to -15 MLLW consists of fines with poor geotechnical qualities, therefore POLB will need to utilize coarser-grained material with the appropriate geotechnical qualities to complete the CDF. As anticipated in the EIR/EIS, the Western Anchorage Sediment Storage Site (WASSS) will provide the main source of this material. Some additional material from Marina del Rey dredging may also be utilized if the logistics can be worked out as fill is nearing the upper limit for use of bottom dump barges.

- b. **Western Anchorage (POC: Antal Szijj):**

- i. POLB Presentation on SAR results:
 - 1. 6 dredge units (DU 1-6) each roughly 5 acres in size were sampled with 2 cores each. Cores were taken down to approximately 10 feet below mudline to characterize the previously deposited dredged materials. It was decided that sampling into the native substrate below the fill was not necessary (even though it will be dredged and used as fill) as it was assumed this would be free of contaminants given its location in the outer harbor. This was specified in the SAP previously presented to and approved by the DMMT. Table 1 in the report apparently contains an error listing the project depth plus overdredge as -72 MLLW, which should be -77 MLLW. As shown in the SAR provided to the DMMT, higher than expected levels of contamination were

found, particularly in DU-5 and DU-6. This includes mercury, nickel and zinc in excess of ERM (DU-6), PAH's in excess of ERM (DU-5), total DDTs in excess of ERM (DU-4 and DU-6), total PCB congeners in excess of ERM (all except DU-2, which exceeded ERL). In addition many samples exceeded ERL for metals, PAH's, and total DDT.

ii. Discussion:

1. CCC/LARWQCB: The levels of contamination are a concern, particularly since they weren't anticipated. Ocean disposal of the material that ended up at the WASSS would not have been approved if testing had shown these results. Priority should be placed on removing as much of the contamination as possible and getting it into the CDF, particularly DU-5 and DU-6. Is it possible to identify hot spots more precisely using the existing samples and use that info to guide the dredge plan? There would be a concern about leaving exposed contaminated sediments behind once the Phase 1 CDF has all the material needed.
2. POLB: The cause for the levels of contamination is unclear (possibly hot spots that were missed in the testing of the source material). Volume of material available at WASSS is approx 1.2 million cy though the POLB will only need about 500,000 cy to complete Phase 1 CDF. The remainder, including all contaminated sediments can go into the Phase 2 CDF later on. The higher quality material from a geotech standpoint is in the lower native sediments that presumably are not contaminated, thus POLB plans to dredge to the design depths in each DU in order to ensure the proper quality of material is obtained. Sample cores were homogenized so there is no way to determine the location of contamination very precisely.
3. Carol Roberts (USFWS): Asked if it would be beneficial to retest legacy samples from DU-3 and DU-4 to get a better handle on the contamination levels there (particularly PCBs and DDTs).
4. Corps: No specific recommendations. The Corps will determine the need for retesting and any other recommendations in coordination with the RWQCB and CCC.
5. Conclusion: POLB will consult with project engineers and develop a more refined dredge plan to maximize the amount of contaminated material removed, beginning with DU-5 and DU-6, while still providing adequate volume of favorable material from a geotech standpoint. POLB will present the results at the next SC-DMMT meeting. No additional testing is recommended at this point.

6. Note: Subsequent to the June 27 SC-DMMT/CSTF meeting, POLB has proposed to use an alternative borrow site, rather than the Western Anchorage site (see e-mail dated July 6, 2012 from Antal Szijj to SC-DMMT and CSTF). POLB is seeking approval of this site (CDF Phase II site) and stating there is no need for additional testing. The Corps is requesting responses by Friday July 13.

c. Channel Island Harbor Maintenance Dredging (POC: Larry Smith):

- i. **Corps:** The Corps was seeking a suitability determination to place sands dredged from Channel Islands Harbor on the beach or into the near shore as described in the SAPR. The dredge area was originally divided into six composite areas. However, Area F did not have sufficient volume to warrant sampling and analysis. Area E was sampled and analyzed, however this area also has very little volume of material available for dredging. As a result both of these areas were removed from the suitability determination. If either or both of these areas require dredging during the six-year (three dredge cycle) project life, those areas will be sampled and tested for suitability prior to dredging. Consequently, the Corps has determined that sediments from Areas A - D are suitability for either beach or near shore disposal. EPA concurred with this determination, with some reservations concerning grain size, requesting they the finer sediments be disposed of in the near shore. This is not possible, as the project is dredged by hydraulic dredge with sands pumped to the disposal beaches, which currently do not exist, having been eroded.

California Coastal Commission staff expressed concerns that arsenic levels on the composite samples exceeded both federal and state health risk levels for residential and industrial uses. Arsenic values are less than ER-L values. Residential and industrial use do not correspond to a recreational beach user and are inappropriate comparisons. The state CHHSL values specifically include direction to use background levels in lieu of the calculated values. Background levels for the state are 3.5 mg/kg, approximately the same as the SAPR levels (2.5-4.6 mg/kg). Nevertheless the California Coastal Commission staff continued to insist that the sediments might not be suitable for beach disposal, lacking information on background levels of arsenic at the site. The Corps has agreed to take additional samples to determine background levels of arsenic. California Coastal Commission staff indicated that they would remove their objection if background levels are approximately the same at the beach disposal site as they are in the harbor sediments.

d. Vandenberg Air Force Base Harbor Maintenance Dredging (POC: John Markham):

i. Corps:

1. Based upon the low levels of metals (most below ER-L) and low to non-detectable levels of organics (e.g., PAHs, pesticides, PCBs, dioxins, organotins, furans) reported from the period 2001-2009, VAFB proposes to restrict their future sampling and analyses to (10) metals (including addition of silver and selenium), grain size, TOC, percent total solids, total sulfides, dissolved sulfides, oil, grease, and lipid testing, in the absence of accidental spills (e.g., fuel). As proposed, VAFB would continue to use the Point Pedernales upland disposal site.
2. Allan Ota (EPA Region 9) submitted the following comments upon the proposed revised SAP prior to the DMMT meeting, which were briefly discussed during the meeting:
 - a. It is EPA's understanding that the anticipated dredge cuts are expected to be relatively thin within the proposed dredging boundaries, such that Van Veen grab would be sufficient for sampling purposes;
 - b. RB has been satisfied with sampling protocol, relative to placement at upland site (previous dredging episodes);
 - c. Overall contaminant levels have been low, and the sediments had been determined by RB to be suitable for placement at upland site (Point Pedernales).
3. Larry Simon (CCC) stated that VAFB should analyze the practicability of beneficial re-use of the dredged material, in support of their (2008) CDP renewal.
4. Jack Gregg (CCC) inquired about the thickness of the proposed dredge material and the proposed dredge method.
 - a. Corps response: Clamshell dredge, attached to a crane. Sediment thickness is highly variable, depending upon strength of prior winter season(s), # of years in between dredging events, and location within the harbor. Sediment depth immediately prior to dredge events is generally several feet, and is greatest along the face of the dock. For example, in 1999, after 10 years of accumulation, the average depth was 4.0 feet (min. 2.0 feet, max. 8 feet). The seafloor beneath the accumulated sediment consists of bedrock.

5. Bill Paznokas (CDFG) and Larry Simon (CCC) requested information regarding:
 - a. The presence/absence of eelgrass (*Zostera* sp.) within the proposed dredge footprint and vicinity.
 - b. The presence of giant kelp within the proposed dredge footprint and vicinity, and the performance of the giant kelp mitigation site (aka 'breakwater bed').
 - i. Corps response: This information was provided in email dated July 2, 2012.
6. SC-DMMT members agreed to the proposed changes under the revised SAP.

V. Other issues: none.