

Southern California Dredged Material Management Team (SC-DMMT)
September 25, 2013
Final Meeting Notes (v2)

I. Participating Agencies /Attendees:

- a. Brianne McGuffie (USACE-Regulatory)
- b. Daniel Swenson (USACE – Regulatory)
- c. John Markham[†] (USACE – Regulatory)
- d. Antal Szijj[†] (USACE – Regulatory)
- e. Joe Ryan (USACE-ED)
- f. Allan Ota[†] (USEPA Region 9)
- g. Bill Paznokas[†] (CA-DFW)
- h. Michael Lyons[†] (RWQCB – Los Angeles)
- i. Carol Roberts[†] (USFWS)
- j. Richard Parsons[†] (City of Ventura)
- k. Janna Watanabe (Port of Long Beach)
- l. Nick Buhbe (Eagle Rock Aggregates)
- m. Steve Cappellino (Long Beach Archer)
- n. Shelly Anghera (Alamitos/ Archer)
- o. Charlene Angsuco (Archer)
- p. Elvira Hallinan (Alamitos)
- q. Matt Arms (Alamitos / Eagle Rock)
- r. Bill Terry[†] (Eagle Rock CEO)

[†] participating via teleconference.

II. Announcements:

III. Project Review and Determinations

a. Alamitos Marina Basin 5 & 7 Project (Brianne McGuffie - Regulatory):

i. Corps (Regulatory) comments:

- 1. Need to verify previously permitted amounts to verify thresholds are not exceeded.

ii. USFWS comments:

- 1. None

iii. RWQCB comments:

- 1. Authorization is needed to modify individual Alamitos Permits as amounts and location are different.

2. More basins (2,3,7) have to be dredged and RWQCB needs to verify that they are within the permitted amounts.
3. Anchor QEA to send history and status of basin dredging (received on 9/30/13)

iv. EPA comments:

1. None

v. Comments Anchor QEA:

1. A Tier I evaluation was performed to confirm results were similar to 2007 characterization. Results indicated that current conditions were not similar and after discussions with EPA, a full Tier III evaluation was performed to determine suitability for disposal at LA-2.
2. Preliminary bioassay testing indicated that sediment may not meet suitability criteria for ocean disposal so additional Tier III testing was not performed and material will be placed at POLB middle harbor fill site (MHFS).
3. Only Basin 5 will be going to MHFS at this time.
4. Following the meeting, Anchor QEA sent a memo outlining the rebuild status of the various basins. It includes information for each basin regarding construction date (actual or estimated), volume of dredged material (actual or permitted/planned, and then notes on suitability, and a brief summary of the status of the permits.

b. Archer Rowing Center (Brianne McGuffie - Regulatory):

i. Comments (Corps Regulatory)

1. Are there WQ concerns with the material being dispersed from Phase II of MHFS? Anchor QEA believes there is very little potential for sediment dispersal because the materials are being placed in a pit that is more than 20 feet below surrounding area.

ii. Comments Anchor QEA:

1. Dredged material will be transported by scow to MHFS (Phase II) rather than hauled by truck.

c. Eagle Rock Aggregates Terminal, dredging and disposal component (John Markham - Regulatory):

i. Corps Regulatory Comments:

1. What about suspension of material during disposal? Any BMPs such as silt curtain proposed?

Response: Based upon modeling of similar disposal operations within muted tidal areas, the vast majority of material drops to the seafloor, of which a portion is then resuspended. In such circumstances, the most important BMPs are associated with disposal method and timing. Specifically, both suspension and resuspension is minimized when the barge's hull is opened in slow increments while the barge moves forward slowly.

2. Corps Regulatory intends to process a minor permit modification to allow for disposal/re-use at this site.

ii. EPA Comments:

1. Based upon characterization of this contaminated material, the DMMT concluded in 2010 that it was not likely to be suitable for unconfined open water disposal, and that additional testing (solid phase toxicity, bioaccumulation) would be required if this option was pursued;

Response: Agreed, however this proposal is not considered open water disposal given the contained nature of the receiving area/borrow pit, muted tidal circulation, and beneficial re-use of the material;

2. Based upon chemical characterization of this material, it should be capped with clean material;

Response: Agreed. Under the Middle Harbor Project¹, this area will be converted to a container terminal (uplands). It is expected that the subject material would be covered within approximately 1.5 years.

iii. California DFW Comments:

1. None.

iv. RWQB Comments:

1. The Regional Board intends to process minor permit modification WDR/401 to allow for placement at this site (*see below).

v. Applicant/Consultant Comments:

1. Original proposal for disposal/re-use of 6,000 cubic yards at the Middle Harbor (MH) slip 1 (phase 1) site was approved by DMMT/CSTF in July 2010, and was subsequently authorized under Corps permit no. 2010-00602-JWM;
2. In summary, the Sediment Analysis Report (SAR) indicates grain size is approximately 60%-70% silt/clay, Effects Range Low (ERL) was exceeded for Cu, Pb, Ni, Zn, As,

¹ The Middle Harbor Project was previously approved by the Corps under a separate EIS/EIR (Permit no. SPL-2004-01053-AOA).

pesticides, PCBs, and PAHs, and Effects Range Medium (ERM) was exceeded for Hg. Elutriate testing did not indicate concentrations of metals and organics above California Toxics Rule Saltwater Criterion Maximum Concentrations due most likely to analytes bound to fine sediment;

3. Based upon logistical constraints, the applicant is now requesting permit modifications from the Corps and Regional Board, as well as DMMT approval, to allow for relocation of the disposal/re-use site from slip 1 (phase 1) to a borrow pit located adjacent to slip 1 (also phase 1), both located in the eastern portion of the Middle Harbor development. It should be noted that the disposal site would move from slip 1 behind a containment dike to a large borrow pit located in turning basin outside of dike (see attachments titled "2_L_4Sep13 USACE_Mod Request.pdf" and "2_Eagle Rock 4Sep13 Mod Req_Fig 1.pdf");
4. The phase 1 borrow pit is maximum depth ~85 feet MLLW, average ~70 feet MLLW (~20-25 feet deeper than adjacent areas), and has capacity of 200-300,000 cubic yards;
5. The proposed disposed material would be capped by subsequent disposal operations;
6. Due to its location, eastern end of Middle Harbor, the proposed disposal location experiences muted tidal flows (slower circulation);
7. Proposed disposal schedule for October or November 2013, following receipt of necessary approvals/permits.

vi. Other Comments:

1. No agency objections or postponements requested. No other comments received.
2. *Following the meeting, Michael Lyons indicated the Regional Board views the new disposal option as falling within the previously approved option, so no modification of the Waste Discharge Requirements would be needed.

d. Ventura Keys Maintenance Dredging and review of SAPR for connecting channel (Antal Szijj - Regulatory):

i. Corps Regulatory Comments:

1. City of Ventura has requested 5-year permit extension authorizing maintenance dredging of the Ventura Keys. Corps is proposing to extend permit to Sept 2018.

2. Annual dredge limit of 100,000 cy will remain. 5-year limit will be increased from 175,000 cy to 250,000 cy to allow for unanticipated flood-related debris inputs.
3. Units in Table 9 of SAPR need to be clarified.
4. Future SAPs and SAPRs should follow current draft guidelines. These will be provided to applicant.

ii. EPA Comments:

1. No specific objection to or endorsement of RWQCB's added testing requirements for this action, however in general Tier 3 testing will help to inform the results of Tier 1 & 2 testing going forward.
2. Report formatting should follow draft guidelines going forward. Graphics could be clearer and should depict bathymetry.

iii. California DFW Comments:

1. Special Condition II. G. in the existing Corps permit regarding grunion is outdated. Will provide updated language for Corps to consider prior to renewing permit.

iv. RWQB Comments:

1. Board approved reissuance of final WDRs and in response to concerns raised by Heal the Bay will require additional toxicity and bioaccumulation testing of connecting channel sediments (using new samples). This protocol will also extend to future dredging in the Keys under new WDRs (regardless of sediment chemistry results).
2. WDRs also limit 5-year cumulative total to 200,000 cy based on past dredge volumes.

v. City of Ventura Comments:

1. City will provide replacement page in SAPR with corrected Table 9.
2. City will be proceeding with Tier 3 testing per WDRs with a new report forthcoming (no specific time frame given).
3. Request Corps reissue permit with 250,000 cy limit (even though WDRs limit to 200,000 cy) in case need arises.

IV. Other: None.

¹ The Middle Harbor Project was previously approved by the Corps under a separate EIS/EIR (Permit no. SPL-2004-01053-AOA).