

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

**I. Participating Agencies /Attendees:**

- a. Dan Swenson (USACE-Regulatory)
  - b. Crystal Huerta (USACE-Regulatory)
  - c. Brianne McGuffie (USACE-Regulatory)
  - d. Antal Szijj<sup>†</sup> (USACE-Regulatory)
  - e. Susie Santilena (Heal the Bay)
  - f. Allan Ota<sup>†</sup> (USEPA Region 9)
  - g. Jack Malone<sup>†</sup> (Anchor QEA)
  - h. Jack Gregg<sup>†</sup> (Coastal Commission)
  - i. Larry Smith (USACE-Planning)
  - j. Loni Adams<sup>†</sup> (CA-DFW)
  - k. Alan Monji<sup>†</sup> (RWQCB-region?)
  - l. Michael Lyons (RWQCB – Los Angeles)
  - m. Jim Fields (USACE-PPMD-Navigation)
  - n. Carol Roberts<sup>†</sup> (USFWS)
  - o. Joe Ryan (USACE-ED)
  - p. Maurine Spencer<sup>†</sup> (SBCFC)
  - q. \_\_\_\_\_<sup>†</sup> (SBCFC)
  - r. Mark Hereford<sup>†</sup> (Catalina Express)
  - s. Chris Osuch (Anchor QEA)
  - t. Tracy Stofferahn<sup>†</sup> (Anchor QEA)
  - u. Eric Lopez (City of Long Beach)
  - v. Tony Resendez (City of Long Beach)
  - w. Charlene Angsuco (City of Long Beach)
- <sup>†</sup> participating via teleconference.

**II. Announcements:**

- a. None.

**III. Project Review and Determinations**

**a. Carpinteria Salt Marsh (Crystal Huerta), SAP:**

**i. Corps comments:**

1. The District is required to complete a draft SAP to the DMMT per Special Condition 31 of their individual permit that expires February 28, 2015.
2. The District is authorized to desilt in Santa Monica Creek and Franklin Creek. Beach nourishment is not authorized until it receives approval from the DMMT as stated in Special Condition 31.

3. Historical sediment data would be updated by the District.
4. The District is proposing five sediment samples per creek as opposed to two per a creek.
5. (Swenson) The District should provide a comparison at both locations.
6. (Larry) Split up the Chemical and physical Parameters in Table 2.
7. PM (Huerta) will send the District the Draft SAP template.

**ii. Coastal Commission Comments:**

1. Not comfortable with the Beacon Report.
2. Will look back at the Goleta Slough SAP.

**iii. EPA Comments:**

1. Constituents should have the standard list of 41 (District commented to view section 5.1.1 in the draft SAP).
2. Would like to see a map of the composite area, bathymetry, and maps at locations where samples are proposed.
3. No issues with the sampling proposed.
4. SAP needs to provide a current map of shoals and clarify more dredging episodes with an up to date map.
5. Provide a transect for receiver site testing.

**iv. CA-DFW (Loni Adams) comments:**

1. What is the possibility for increased silt content (District stressed that they were not proposing increased silt content, the District also stressed that they were not proposing an increase of 25% fines on the Beach).
2. Requested that a Bio Assessment be completed and included in the SAP.
3. Where is the nearest Marine Protected Area and what are the possible impacts to the area?

**b. Alamitos Bay Marina Basins 5 and 7 Maintenance Dredging (Brianne McGuffie), SAP:**

**i. Corps comments:**

1. The basins were previously sampled and tested in 2007 and a Corps permit was issued in 2011.
2. The City decided to perform confirmatory sediment characterizations although site conditions have not changed since the time of the last sampling event in 2007. The only exception is that bioassay, bioaccumulation and toxicity testing were excluded from the new sampling regime.
3. Heal the Bay (HTB) was not comfortable with losing the bioassay or bioaccumulation testing since the material is proposed to go into LA 2.

4. HTB also asked whether there were any alternatives considered other than LA2 such as the POLB Middle Harbor CDF fill site.
  - a. Chris Osuch (Anchor QEA) stated that alternatives have not been considered since the material was previously determined to be suitable at LA2 site and area conditions have not changed.
  - b. Chris Osuch clarified that if sample results came back unexpectedly high, tier III testing (bioassay and bioaccumulation) would be performed.
  - c. Joe Ryan acknowledged that the middle fill site is full or nearly full and would likely not be able to accommodate material from Alamitos Bay basins 5&7, but may be able to accommodate the Archer Rowing Center material as it's such a small amount. However, applicants need to coordinate with POLB and should not assume the port will accept material.
5. EPA asked that some of the points be moved closer to the docks which is where the shoaling is likely to be more concentrated.
  - a. Chris Osuch stated the points were left as close to the initial sampling point as was physically possible in order to be consistent. He also stated the shoal hasn't changed since previous bathymetry.
  - b. It was concluded if the points are able to be changed, the SAP needs to be resent through the DMMT.

**c. Archer Rowing Center Dock Improvement (Brienne McGuffie), SAPR:**

**i. Corps comments:**

1. Approximately 740 cubic yards of material is proposed to be dredged from underneath a floating dock and disposed of at the POLB Middle Harbor CDF fill site.
  - a. Joe Ryan asked how the material would be transported as the fill site may not be accepting material via scow.
  - b. The City stated that they were planning on transporting by scow but could transport via truck if necessary.
2. Dan Swenson (Corps) pointed out that the SAR was submitted without having previously submitting a SAP to the DMMT for review.
  - a. Chris Osuch explained the samples were collected without SAP due to the timing mobilization issues.

It was more efficient for them to perform the testing since the deck boards and other dock components had to be removed in order to do a general site assessment.

3. Chris Osuch explained the dock pontoons obstructed some of the sampling locations and therefore only one z layer sample was accessible/obtained.
4. There was concern from all agencies re: the high total chlordanes and a question as to whether more z layer samples should be obtained.
5. It was inconclusive whether a hot spot was hit or if there is contamination throughout the area. The results could also be skewed due to the small sample area. The consensus was no more sampling would be required due to the small volume being removed; however it should be a factor in future large projects and planning in the area.
6. Chris Osuch inquired whether or not return water would be authorized as part of the dredging.
7. While the RWQCB said return water should be avoided, RGP 30 special condition #19 under "Dredging" states "when using a disposal barge or scow, no water shall be allowed to flow over the sides".

**d. LARE Channel Dragging (Bonnie Rogers/Dan Swenson), need for testing:**

**i. Corps comments:**

1. Small shoal (shallower than -10 ft MLLW) has developed and is interfering with navigation in federal channel, in particular for operations of Catalina Express ferry service
2. "Knock down" project would scrape approx. 800 CY (approx. 150 ft x 120 ft area, 1 ft thick layer) of sediment into downstream portion of federal channel.
3. Agencies agreed no sediment testing was required due to small volume of material to be moved, the fact that the material would be displaced onto adjacent material (expected to have the same characteristics), and expected low percentage of fines based on past sediment testing by Corps (2007).

**e. Oceanside Harbor Dredging (Larry Smith), status:**

**i. Corps comments:**

1. Approx. 180,000 CY to be dredged.
2. To start mid-late April, operations to continue for approx. two weeks.

3. Corps may add bacterial monitoring to contract depending on cost and timing.
4. Corps will monitor for grunion and modify operations if and as necessary to avoid impacts to grunion, if present.

**IV. Other issues:** none.