

Southern California Dredged Material Management Team (SC-DMMT)
May 22, 2013
Final Meeting Notes

I. Participating Agencies /Attendees:

- a. Brianne McGuffie (USACE-Regulatory)
- b. Bonnie Rogers (USACE – Regulatory)
- c. John Markham[†] (USACE – Regulatory)
- d. Antal Szijj[†] (USACE – Regulatory)
- e. Joe Ryan (USACE-ED)
- f. Larry Smith (USACE-Planning)
- g. Allan Ota[†] (USEPA Region 9)
- h. Bill Paznokas[†] (CA-DFW)
- i. Michael Lyons (RWQCB – Los Angeles)
- j. Janna Watanabe (POLB)
- k. James Vernon[†] (POLB)
- l. Shelly Anghera (POLB, Anchor QEA)
- m. Andrew Martin (POLB, Anchor QEA)
- n. Matt Arms (POLB)
- o. Kendrick Okuda (City of LA)
- p. Julie Allen (City of LA)
- q. Ken Redd (City of LA)
- r. Iftekhar Ahmed (City of LA)
- s. Hampik Dekermenjian (CDM Smith)
- t. Carol Roberts[†](USFWS)
- u. Dave Walsh[†] (POLA)
- v. Wing Tam (City of LA, Sanitation)
- w. Shahram Kharaghani (City of LA, Sanitation)
- x. Jenny Newman (RWQCB – Los Angeles)
- y. Liz Crosson[†] (L.A. Waterkeeper)
- z. Kirsten James – (Heal the Bay)
- aa. Andrew Jirik[†] (POLA)
- bb. Alan Monty?[†] (RWQCB-San Diego)

[†] participating via teleconference.

II. Announcements: none

III. Project Review and Determinations

a. Port of Long Beach RGP 28 –Maintenance Dredging (John Markham):

i. Corps (Regulatory) comments:

1. John Markham; RGP usually last 5 years, with potential extensions to 10 years and its up for renewal.
2. Would like figure to show widths of shoals to determine best method of knock-down.
3. Concerned with areas in need of knock-down that are potentially several thousand feet long, created as a result of prop-wash. Why only 1 SAP sample for each area?
4. Wouldn't use of "drag pipe" sampling method suggested by EPA level out the knock-down areas?
5. Bri McGuffie: final summary at end of meeting: specify methods for knock-down, determine an annual limit, tweak sampling protocol for knock-down areas, make requested changes to drawings and tables, and provide water quality write-up to RWQCB knock-down method justification.

ii. Corps (Planning) comments:

1. RGP will need to specify methodology for knock-down work
2. Sampling across surface using more than one sample is better option for testing and analysis.
3. May have knock-down data from previous L.A. River Estuary project to share.

iii. USFWS comments:

1. Would z-layer be included and sampled? POLB says they are following the precedent for when to analyze z-layer; z-layer info is archived and tested later as needed. POLB said they would address this in their revised SAP.

iv. RWQCB comments:

1. Michael Lyons: Only 1 sample in shoal areas is proposed and difficult to see how 1 SAP sample would represent area.
2. Could do composite for some knock-down areas that have small volume CY (<700 CY) and are close together.
3. Is there enough room up against the wharfs for a beam method to be used for knock-down areas?
4. Need comparative impacts 'white-paper' between knock-down methods that could be used to determine water quality issues.

v. EPA comments:

1. Alan Ota: Need to have discussion on limit of using knock-down method. It does not require SAP analysis, but large use of the method could have large effects.

2. Need to specify volume to be mechanically dredged and volume moved via knock-down method.
3. RGP should include a limit of material for knock-down method
4. Agrees method of knock-down is important to specify due to water quality concerns.
5. Should consider more than 1 SAP sample for shoal areas to better represent areas proposed for sediment removal.
6. Consider storm-drain locations for sampling needs.
7. If the high spots are in a thin, distributed area, a 'pipe-dredge' could potentially be used to drag through area over high spots to gather samples.
8. On Tables 1 and 2 of handout, "Project" depth should be "permitted" depth.
9. Make contours easier to see on drawings and possibly use a different color to depict knockdown areas.

vi. POLB comments (Matt Arms, Andrew Martin, Shelly Anghera):

1. The POLB has established a newer minimum draft clearance so removing shoals at this point is of essence to meet requirements. Would like to increase allowed volume limit to reduce backlog of high shoaling areas and disposal opportunities. Have applied with SAP early to complete work asap after updated RGP is approved. Old volume limit on RGP was 40,000/year and new is 150,000/year. They propose to use knock-down method in addition to mechanical dredging based on volume and need for RGP.
2. Currently there is a proposed number in mind for the knock-down method "per event" but not an annual limit. However, the POLB is open to the discussion.
3. Knock-down areas are about 5,000 CY at each of 13 areas.
4. Andrew- There are 7 sites that would be candidates for knock-down; mechanical dredging is only proposed for Pier J. There are at least 6 other areas in need of 'knock-down' sediment removal.
5. SAP: For one site, POLB are proposing 4 samples for composite for materials to be placed in Middle Harbor placement site. All other project areas would be 1 sample for only Alutriate testing (\$1,500 for each sample).
6. POLB will update figure to show more details as suggested by Alan Ota (EPA). Also color code better to show area in knock-down areas.
7. Knock-down would be 'sweeping', 'bucket', or 'beam leveling' which could be specified in the updated RGP.

Specifically the method for areas next to the wharf face would need to be determined by POLB Engineer.

8. Proposing only 1 SAP sample for many of the shoal areas because actual volume of proposed dredge are small. Because sediment that would be removed is only surface material, they proposed only 1 sample. A composite scheme could be employed.
9. Shelly Anghera: Vibracore samples (\$15,000 to mobilize) are not an option for each knock-down area due to cost. Or use Ponar or Van Veem to grab about 6-12 inches across surface of areas.
10. Would be comfortable sampling more over top 2 feet of knock-down areas.
11. Summarize: Knock-down okay to move forward. All would like more samples in areas. This SAP would be guide for how sampling would be conducted for knock-down areas in the future.
12. Andrew: May have data from SF project discussing water quality issues from knock-down methods.

b. Middle Harbor Slip 3 Borrow Site (John Markham; POLB):

i. Corps Regulatory Comments:

1. John: Would slope expose new material or sloughing?

ii. EPA Comments:

1. Alan: Could project expose new materials from mudline in last 7 years? POLB: that area has been under construction for last two years and disturbed, with native material below 57'.
2. Okay to proceed without further sampling.

iii. POLB Comments:

1. Janna W.: Can accommodate up to 1 million CY 3rd party borrow sediment, but need good material to complete the fill with good compacting. Have good characterization of material down to -50 feet MLLW.

iv. Anchor QEA Comments:

1. Andrew: Dredge -55 MLLW plus 2' overdepth. Few exceedances from testing with low contamination. Below 55' begins native material with no reason to believe it

would be contaminated. Is best option to use for potential fill material based on geotechnical borings.

2. Use of slip will be maintained at 100' top slope offset from wharf face and sloped (3:1) down to avoid draft of vessels, designed by Moffat&Nichol, approved by CSTF.
3. Timeframe is critical to be able to cap Middle Harbor slip fill asap.

v. California DFW Comments:

1. Bill P.: What is circulation like in this area? Would deep 30' hole (-55 ft. to -85 ft.) promote anaerobic conditions or make difficult for reestablishment of organisms? Anchor QEA: area is not one with organic inputs and has high boat traffic.
2. Okay to proceed without further sampling.

vi. USFWS Comments:

1. Okay to proceed without further sampling.

c. Machado Lake Ecosystem Rehabilitation:

i. RWQCB Comments:

1. Michael Lyons: Dredge material was placed in POLB Middle Harbor for Phase 1 fill by various users. CSTF is not approving group for placement; POLB decides on accepting fill.

ii. Corps Planning Comments:

1. An alternative to consider for Machado material is to blend hot-spot material with suitable material.

iii. LA RWQCB Comments:

1. Jenny: Would extend schedule if a proper disposal site can be identified.

iv. POLB Comments:

1. Matt: Approving group for take of sediment. Current status is determining how fill will be constructed for each placement Phase. Have anticipated projects and not sure how much room is available for Machado material. Cannot take hazardous waste, anything w/Deed restrictions, and cannot go against the advice of POLB engineers. POLB and City of LB needs come before other outside sources. Cannot know/decide until at earliest this Fall 2013.
2. Concerns: freshwater fill to marine; toxic hotspots; mass material volume, poor quality of Machado, available capacity.
3. Capacity at Middle Harbor is unlikely large enough for all of the anticipated material from Machado, which is

estimated to be between 200,000—500,000 cy of material. At best, capacity would be available for part of Machado dredge material.

v. Heal the Bay Comments:

1. Supported TMDLs for Machado Lake and are active in partnering because many agencies in same watershed.
2. Does anyone know of upcoming projects that could take Machado dredged material? POLA (Dave Walsh): no current project at port that could accept material; Pier 500 is on-hold and 5+ years down the road so not an option.

vi. City of Los Angeles Sanitation Comments:

1. Shahram K.: Machado Lake has not been dredged for 30 years; TMDL requires depth for water quality; dredge to maximum depth possible; proposed 3-year project to 2016 in phases. Would like to find solution for location of disposing dredged material.
2. Dredging 200,000 CY would reach -6'; 500,000 CY would reach -8-9'.

IV. Other issues: none.