

Southern California Dredged Material Management Team (SC-DMMT)  
February 27, 2013  
Final Meeting Notes

**I. Participating Agencies /Attendees:**

- a. Dan Swenson (USACE-Regulatory)
- b. Cori Farrar (USACE-Regulatory)
- c. Brianne McGuffie (USACE-Regulatory)
- d. Jennifer Lillard (USACE-Regulatory)
- e. Shannon Pankratz (USACE-Regulatory)
- f. Susie Santilena (Heal the Bay)
- g. Brian Ross<sup>†</sup> (USEPA Region 9)
- h. Jack Malone<sup>†</sup> (Anchor QEA)
- i. Larry Smith (USACE-Planning)
- j. Bill Paznokas<sup>†</sup> (CA-DFW)
- k. Loni Adams<sup>†</sup> (CA-DFW)
- l. Alan Monji<sup>†</sup> (RWQCB-region?)
- m. Michael Lyons (RWQCB – Los Angeles)
- n. Chris Webb<sup>†</sup> (Moffatt and Nichol)
- o. Doug Shibberu<sup>†</sup> (RWQCB-Santa Ana)
- p. Peter Von Langen<sup>†</sup> (Central Coast RWQCB)
- q. Scott John<sup>†</sup> (USACE-PPMD)
- r. Jim Fields (USACE-PPMD-Navigation)
- s. Carol Roberts<sup>†</sup> (USFWS)
- t. Will Miller<sup>†</sup> (USFWS)
- u. Chris Miller (City of Newport Beach)
- v. Doug West (City of Newport Beach)
- w. Joe Ryan (USACE-ED)

<sup>†</sup> participating via teleconference.

**II. Announcements:**

- a. Larry Smith:
  - i. Channel Islands dredging completed.
  - ii. Ventura Harbor dredging initiated, to go on approx. 2 weeks, beach disposal.
  - iii. Oceanside Harbor: contractor in place, mid-April, 180k CY beach disposal, no suitable grunion habitat.
- b. Jim Fields:
  - i. LAR estuary high spot: proposal to drag (“knock down”) material (approx 300 CY) approx. 120 feet within federal channel.
    - 1. Brian Ross: if “like on like”, no need for SAP;
    - 2. Michael Lyons: no concerns.

### **III. Project Review and Determinations**

#### **a. Renewal of RGP 54 by City of Newport Beach (Cori Farrar), Strategy for renewal and proposed changes:**

- i. Corps comments: City of Newport Beach, Harbor Resources provided a presentation of proposed strategy for the reauthorization of RGP 54. City sought preliminary feedback from agencies on proposed changes and on how to approach the pending submittal of the Sampling and Analysis Plan. The following issues were raised and decisions on item 2 were deferred until the presentation of the SAP at the April SC-DMMT meeting:
  1. New Areas Proposed - The City proposed to expand the RGP 54 applicability to include areas of the harbor, including marinas previously outside the geographic scope of RGP 54. The City also would expand the depth of dredging from -7 ft MLLW to -10 ft MLLW (plus the standard -1 ft overdepth). The as-built baseline of the harbor is -15 ft MLLW in some areas and deeper in others and the federal navigation channel is at least -10 ft MLLW. EPA and the Corps affirmed the new areas have not been characterized and so will require thorough sampling.
  2. Testing depth - Discussion amongst agencies occurred on the topic of how deep to sample and test the sediment. Resource agencies expressed concern about the potential for contaminated soils left in the z-layer after dredging. CDFW indicated concern with potential exposures to animals living within 1-3 feet from the bottom elevation. EPA explained the need to characterize the sediments to be dredged and that characterization of the z-layer is a separate matter. EPA referenced practices in San Francisco Bay area. Corps clarified that at least need to sample and test to the dredge depth plus over depth (to -10 ft MLLW and -1 ft overdepth).
  3. Agencies requested figure(s) that clearly delineated the areas proposed for inclusion and exclusion.

#### **b. Broad Beach Restoration Project (Shannon Pankratz):**

- i. Corps comments: All agencies (EPA/CFWS/RWQCB/Corps) concurred the Ventura Harbor sand trap material is grain size/chemically compatible with the existing Broad Beach material, (except for the CCC that I don't believe was present on the phone). The appropriateness of any dredge site(s) and of any possible/necessary mitigation measures for removing any sand

from any littoral cells outside the Broad Beach area, would be addressed during the permitting process.

**c. Malibu Creek Restoration (Larry Smith): Grain size compatibility for beach discharge:**

i. Corps comments:

1. Project and sand layer characteristics (5% gravel, 22% fines, 73% sand) were described. Assumption made that receiver beaches were 90-05% sand based on historical data. Agencies determination that sands were marginally suitable for beach nourishment.
2. Additional information is needed for a final determination. This includes beach transects, to be conducted during PED. It also includes additional data on the sand layer behind the dam. Removal of the sand layer occurs during the second year of construction. No construction occurs during the winter rainy season. It may be possible to conduct additional, confirmatory sampling of the sand layer after the first construction season. Confirmatory sampling is needed to confirm grain size characteristics for the entire sand layer and to confirm the volume of sand available. Additionally, a mechanism would be needed to confirm that only beach-compatible sand is trucked to the beaches. That trucks carrying sands incompatible with beach nourishment do not take sands to the receiver beaches.
3. There was concern that the placement would be of a character different from existing that could affect the existing benthic community. Sand that is substantially different from that currently on the beaches could alter the benthic community structure. This will be evaluated when beach samples are taken and evaluated.

- ii. CA-DFW comments (Loni Adams): This sediment may or may not be suitable depending on where and how much is deposited as well as the results of the analysis for chemical and physical compatibility. We don't have enough information to make any decisive determinations regarding suitability for beach placements. The assessment of impacts on sensitive species and habitats as well as the beach and intertidal ecology may be appropriate as part of that determination. The method of sediment placement would be critical in determining impacts because it would not be placed naturally onto the beach from the creek.

**d. Morro Bay Harbor maintenance dredging (Kirk Brus): SAP review:**

i. Corps comments:

1. Brian Ross (USEPA, Region 9) requested that the previous (last history) SAP and SAP results (SAPR) including

locations of vibrocore, composites and cores be provided as part of the new SAP. Larry Smith responded that from the previous SC-DMMT discussion, inserting the previous SAP and SAPR as an Appendix to the new SAP was part of the new SAP format.

2. Peter Von Langen (Central Coast Water Board) initiated a discussion about elevated bacterial levels (i.e., fecal material) that were brought to their attention from the oyster farm located in the southern portion (back portion) of Morro Bay during the previous dredge at the Morro Bay State Marina (that was south of the federal Morro Channel). It was proposed that when the USACE dredges the Morro Channel (only when Morro Channel is dredged) that such bacteria level background reading be performed, which can be incorporated with water quality testing when it occurs. Per Ken Wong's recommendation, such a request for bacteria level reading can be added as an Environmental Commitment into the new 6 year Environmental Assessment (EA). This additional testing would also need to be added to the Specifications. Larry Smith added that such a requirement already exists when maintenance dredging occurs in Santa Barbara.
3. Peter Von Langen asked when does the USACE expect the FONSI (for the new 6 year Environmental Assessment on Morro Bay Harbor federal maintenance dredging) to be signed, and Kirk Brus (USACE) responded by September 30, 2013, as Peter was wanting to plan when it should expect/plan for the 401 Water Certification (WQC) request coming in from the UASACE. Peter clarified that in 2008 the Water Board also issued a Categorical Notice of Exemption besides the 401 WQC request. Larry Smith responded that typically the State Lands Commission (SLC) has interest about the dredged material placement (where it is being placed). Peter von Langen clarified that CEQA should be done by another agency beforehand so that we can issue the 401 Certification and the Central Coast Water Board does not want to be the lead agency.
4. Bill Pazonkas (California Department of Fish and Wildlife) asked when would this year's dredging occur, and Kirk Brus responded it would commence in May 2013, similar to last year's dredging start, which have been occurring a little earlier than usual. Typically, annual maintenance dredging occurs in June-July time period, and annually (typically) dredges the federal Modified entrance channel, transition area, and possibly the sand trap.

5. Peter Von Langen brought up when the last time Morro Strand State Beach (alternate placement of dredged material area) was used, and Kirk Brus responded in 2010, and stated that the primary, placement of dredged material area, in the nearshore off of Morro Strand State Beach is typically used annually during the federal maintenance dredging in Morro Bay federal channels. USACE stated that the type of dredge platform used is dependent on the placement (discharge) of dredge material area, such as, if a hopper dredge is in operation then typically a nearshore placement area used, and if a suction (e.g., cutterhead hydraulic with a temporary pipeline) dredge is in operation then typically beach (and/or surf zone) replenishment placement area is used, yet a combination of all dredge platforms (hopper; hydraulic cutterhead with temporary pipeline; clamshell/bucket) could be used in Morro Bay as has been the case with past dredging operations.
6. Ken Wong asked and requested the SC-DMMT concurrence that the material and discussion presented during the Morro Bay Harbor federal channel maintenance dredging pre draft SAP presentation was suitable for the draft SAP, and the SC-DMMT gave concurrence (no objection). It is hoped that for the March 2013 SC-DMMT agenda that a draft SAP will be available for review.

**IV. Other issues:** none.