I. Participating Agencies /Attendees:

a. Dan Swenson (USACE-Regulatory)
b. Bonnie Rogers (USACE-Regulatory)
c. Shannon Pankratz (USACE-Regulatory)
d. Antal Szijj† (USACE-Regulatory)
e. Allan Ota† (USEPA Region 9)
f. Jack Malone† (Anchor QEA)
g. Larry Smith (USACE-Planning)
h. Larry Simon† (CCC)
i. Bill Paznokas† (CA-DFW)
j. Loni Adams† (CA-DFW)
k. Alan Monji† (RWQCB-region?)
l. Michael Lyons (RWQCB – Los Angeles)
m. Ken Kurtis† (Reef Seekers Dive Co.)

II. Announcements:

a. Corps Oceanside Harbor Project start date will be in March and will include dredging and beach disposal. Details will be distributed once we have them, including status of grunion protective measures.

III. Project Review and Determinations

a. Broad Beach Restoration Project:

i. Corps: the columns on the chlorinated pesticides table are not tallying vertically; if any sampled areas from Calleguas may be chemically suitable, it would still need to be demonstrated those cleaner materials could be separated out from the rest of the pile; any applicant requests for use of quarry material, along with Tier 1 testing results, would be evaluated if submitted.

ii. Coastal Commission: it should be demonstrated material taken from Ventura wouldn’t adversely affect adjacent southern beaches;
suggested to keep the chemistry tables in the same north/south format as the grain size tables for comparison.

iii. USFWS: use of Calleguas material is questionable for any chemical constituents above the ERLs; there is a marine protected area adjacent to Broad Beach and therefore only clean sand should be placed on Broad Beach.

iv. USEPA: the Ventura material is chemically compatible/clean for Broad Beach placement; agrees it should be demonstrated material taken from Ventura wouldn’t adversely affect adjacent southern beaches; the Calleguas chemistry table needs to be expanded, to include grain size/compatibility of the samples (highlight columns appropriate for grain size), as well as all layers sampled; the Calleguas chemistry tables should use the California health screening levels; comparisons should also be made to Broad Beach levels; need to be careful and look at all elevated constituents for beach placement vs. aquatic placement.

v. Water Board: the Calleguas material is not chemically compatible with Broad Beach, as the ERM is not their standard for beach placement (first cut is below the ERLs); however, this would be different for near-shore placement of dredged material.

vi. Coastal Commission/Water Board/USFWS/Corps: the Ventura material is substantially better than the Calleguas material; questioned the chemistry suitability of the Calleguas material, and further testing (Tier 3) and demonstration of the ability to remove the clean material from within the dredge pile may be required prior to a final suitability determination being made; reiterated the existing revetment was prior approved only as a temporary emergency measure, and the DMMT reviews do not constitute any approvals of the proposed Broad Beach Restoration Project itself.

b. Port San Luis Harbor District Maintenance Dredging (RGP 27) SAP Review:

i. Corps comments (POC: Crystal Huerta)
   1. The Sport Launch has its own pump and crew with a submersible pump with a capacity of 7 cy/hr. There is a diesel fueling station at Harford Pier which the District is not proposing to dredge.
   2. The District starts dredging at the beginning of March for approximately 2 months. Hydraulic dredging is used which is an electric pumping equivalent to side casting. Two sites are used (Fisherman’s Beach and Nearshore Beach).
   3. The District is authorized to dredge 250,000 cy/year but after reviewing past work approximately 25,000 cy/year was completed. The District is still requesting authorization for 250,000 cy/year in the chance that funding will become available.
4. Discussed Sediment sampling locations and referred to pg 9 of the SAP.

5. The Chemical Analysis has been completed and is shown on pg 14 with the SAP (grain size) and bathymetry. Both grain size and bathymetry surveys will be submitted to the Corps POC and submitted to all members of the DMMT.

6. The Corps presented the project as if additional testing was not needed as previous testing has been clean and consistent. Therefore, the Corps is proposing to reauthorize the existing RGP 27 without additional testing for 10 years.

7. The Corps will send the DMMT the following: 1) Presentation, 2) bathymetry surveys, 3) grain size surveys, and 4) revised SAP for additional testing requested by the DMMT.

ii. RWQCB Comments:
1. The addition of ERLs to the table as well as chisels is needed.
2. Concurrence with no further testing with a re-opener clause if petroleum is located.

iii. EPA Comments:
1. Material seems suitable with the exception of PSL-2 getting to 20% (However 80 %gravel).
2. Requesting a set of chemistry for the beginning of the next 10 year permit. Therefore, requesting Tier 1 with grain size and chemistry.
3. Requesting single composite samples. Therefore the composite samples would be required to consist of area 1 and areas 2 and 3.
4. Testing (SAP) should be completed prior to permit issuance

IV. Other issues:

a. Debris at Marina del Rey: Discussion was continued from the previous meeting.

i. Corps (Larry Smith) indicated debris management would be addressed in EA for next round of dredging at Marina del Rey, exact measures will be proposed based on dredging methodology, volume of dredged materials, and placement options and methodology;

ii. RWQCB (Michael Lyons): need new protocols in place, for example: doing pre- and post-project diver surveys;

iii. EPA (Alan Ota): debris captured on beach should be catalogued for use in identifying subtidal debris;

iv. Ken Kurtis: suggested underwater monitoring in vicinity of dredge operation as dredging occurs.