

Southern California Dredged Material Management Team (SC-DMMT)  
January 7, 2009  
Meeting Minutes

**I. Participating Agencies/Attendees\*:**

- a. Jorine Campopiano (EPA)
- b. Allison Dettmert† (sp??) (CCC)
- c. Jack Gregg† (CCC)
- d. Mike Lyons† (RWQCB - Region 4)
- e. John Markham (USACE- Regulatory)
- f. Allan Ota† (EPA)
- g. Bill Paznokast (CDFG - San Diego)
- h. Larry Simont† (CCC)
- i. Melanie Stalder (USACE – Regulatory)
- j. Ken Wong (USACE – Regulatory)
- k. Peter von Langent† (RWQCB – Region 3)

† Agency representatives participating via teleconference.

\* See attached sign-in sheet for project proponents/stakeholders in attendance.

**II. Determinations**

1. 4H Shell Mounds<sup>1</sup>:

- a. **Discussion Item 1:** Could SC-DMMT members potentially permit California State Lands Commissions' proposed alternative to place dredged material from the shell mounds (for both the pilot and larger project<sup>2</sup>) at Port of Long Beach's (POLB) Middle Harbor CDF?
- b. **Determination:** Alternative could be permitted with the following agency specific requirements:
  - i. CCC: POLB's Master Plan EIR needs to characterize the 4H dredged material (e.g., volume, chemistry, CDF sequestering techniques, etc.)

---

<sup>1</sup> Brief background: In 1996 ChevronTexaco decommissioned and removed four oil platforms in the Santa Barbara channel off Carpinteria. Left in place were 4 shell mounds (Hilda, Hazel, Hope, Heidi; each approximately 25 ft high, 225 ft. diameter, 80ft.-140ft. deep) composed of cutting & muds capped with dead shells from platform legs. Per CCC/SLC requirements, project entails investigation of dredging/disposal alternatives including leave-in-place. Based on 2002/2003 SAP results from all 4 mounds, EPA & Corps determined that the mounds were not suitable for ocean disposal. Testing (bioaccumulation in caged mussel left atop mounds) did not indicate bioaccumulation of chemical constituents associated with the shell mounds demonstrating that contaminants are not leaching from the mounds. SLC states POLB is willing to accept dredged material from the mounds (totaling approximately 100,000 CY) at POLB's Middle Harbor CDF.

<sup>2</sup> Pilot project entails dredging of Heidi (the cleanest and deepest of the 4H mounds) and disposal of the dredged material at POLB's Middle Harbor CDF. The larger project entails dredging of all 4H mounds and disposal at POLB's Middle Harbor CDF.

- ii. RWQCB (Region 3 & 4): Issuance of WDR would be required. WDR would also incorporate characteristics of 4H dredged material. Regional Board (or other regulatory entity) could issue Chevron a Cleanup Order to require removal of sediment.
- iii. USACE (Regulatory): Proponent needs to demonstrate that the CDF alternative is the LEDPA pursuant to 404(b)(1) guidelines in comparison to the No Federal Action Alternative since the alternative would most likely entail discharge of return water from the CAD or on-site processing of dredged material, as well as substantial incidental discharge from the dredging operation itself.
- iv. EPA: Details on dredging equipment and cycles need to be specified, as well as discussion of adaptive management strategies for dredging/sampling/transport. Use of appropriate equipment (i.e., environmental bucket) and carefully managed dredging cycles can reduce the environmental impacts of the removal of contaminated dredged material

c. *Discussion Item 2:* What potential conditions and/or BMPs would SC-DMMT members incorporate if permits were to be issued? (Note that one of the challenges to overdredge (a technique usually practiced in such cases) is the presence of the wellhead approx 5 feet below original mudline)

- i. CCC has recently developed cleanup criteria for bays and estuaries that may be applicable in part to the proposed project.
- ii. RWQCB Region 3
  1. sampling for organics, metals, DO, pH, turbidity
  2. sampling of return water may fit into conventional sampling methods and WQ standards
  3. use of line barges
  4. treatment of return water prior to release
  5. perform plume analysis, e.g., using "Niskin (sp?)" bottles attached to dredge equipment
  6. also need to sample remaining sediment from ocean floor, following shallow overdredge
  7. may not be required to retrieve entire mound— a small %age of total volume could be left in place with presumption that natural attenuation would reduce toxicity to near baseline levels
  8. monitoring results need to meet Table B of ocean plan???

iii. EPA

1. Do cores go below original mudline (answer: likely not)? If not, perhaps additional cores needed either before or after dredging at pilot site to calculate percentage of removal, as well as to assess abundance and toxicity of sediment remaining after dredging.
  2. Baseline monitoring - camera system capable of deposit thickness resolution of millimeters – ideal for detecting fine grain sediments deposited offsite.
  3. sediment profile imaging
  4. comparison of pre- and post-project monitoring results (i.e., against (clean) shallow and deep reference sites in proximity to shell mounds). We need to know what is left behind following dredging efforts.
  5. incorporate sensors- combined GPS and depth (pressure) sensors may be available and attached to mechanical dredging equipment to improve accuracy of cuts by this equipment
- d. *Action Item 1:* John Markham to forward electronic copies of Chevron's 4H Fact Sheet, and ChevronTexaco Alternative Evaluation to SC-DMMT members participating via teleconference.
- e. *Action Item 2:* Charlie Phillips (SAIC) to forward electronic copies of mussel bioaccumulation study to SC-DMMT members.

### III. Other SC-DMMT Discussions

1. Larry Smith was absent. Therefore, "reference survival criterion" discussion originally scheduled for the January 7, 2009 meeting will be rescheduled for the SC-DMMT February meeting.
2. SCRIPP PCB paper discussion rescheduled for SC-DMMT February meeting. *Action Item 3:* Jorine will forward copies of paper to SC-DMMT members prior to February meeting.
3. SC-DMMT members briefly discussed need to move regularly scheduled meetings (currently 1<sup>st</sup> Wednesday of the month) due to scheduling conflicts. Ken Wong suggested rescheduling be done via email so everyone can recheck their calendars. *Action Item 4:* Ken Wong will coordinate with Dan Swenson for rescheduling issues.

Kenneth Wong (USACE, Regulatory Division), January 14, 2009

Name	Title	Affiliation	Tel	Email
MADHU P. AHUJA	Sr. Engineer	CSLC 200 Oceanview, 12th Fl Long Beach, CA 90802	562.590. 5208	ahujam@slc; ca.80
Charlie Phillips	Sr. Scientist	SARC	858   826-7491	charles.r.phillips@sarc.ca
John Madelon	Project Manager	Comp Regulatory	on file	on file
Jorine Campopiano	Env. Scientist	EPA	213 244-1808	Campopianojorine@epa.gov
Ken Adams	Env. Sci.	USACE	213-452- 3290	ken@k.adams.usace
Rich Hill	Project Manager	Cherxon	(461) 654-7273	r.hill@cherxon.com
Simon Poulter	Permitting Consultant	Padure Associates, Inc	805-683-1233 ext 4	spoulter@padureinc.com
Melanie Stalder	Ecologist	USACE Regulatory	213 452-3294	Melanie.a.stalder@ usace.army.mil

