Southern California Dredged Material Management Team (SC-DMMT)
November 20, 2013
Final Meeting Notes

I. Participating Agencies /Attendees:

a. Cori Farrar (USACE – Regulatory)
b. Daniel Swenson (USACE – Regulatory)
c. Brianne McGuffie (USACE-Regulatory)
d. Antal Szijj† (USACE – Regulatory)
e. John Markham† (USACE – Regulatory)
f. Theresa Stevens (USACE – Regulatory)
g. Larry Smith (USACE – Planning)
h. Kirk Brus (USACE – Planning)
i. Kenneth Wong (USACE – Planning)
j. Blake Horita (USACE – Planning)
k. Jim Fields (USACE – Planning)
l. Jeffrey Devine (USACE – Geology Section)
m. Allan Ota† (USEPA Region 9)
n. Bill Paznokas† (CA-DFW)
o. Michael Lyons (RWQCB – Los Angeles)
p. Mark Adelson† (RWQCB – Santa Ana)
q. Peter von Langen (RWQCB – San Luis Obispo)
r. Jack Gregg† (CCC)
s. Larry Simone (CCC)
t. Carol Roberts (USFWS)
u. Loni Adams (CDFW)
v. Matt Arms† (Port of Long Beach)
w. Kat Prickett (POLA)
x. Rachel McPherson (POLA)
y. Kathryn Curtis (POLA)
z. Carlos Quintana (POLA)
aa. Ed Han (POLA)
bb. David Walsh (POLA)
cc. Barry Snyder (AMEC)
dd. Tyler Huff (AMEC)
ee. Janna Watanabe (POLB)
ff. James Vernon (POLB)
gg. Chris Miller (City of Newport Beach)
hh. Doug West (City of Newport Beach)
ii. Chris Osuch (Anchor QEA)
jj. Adam Gale (Anchor QEA)
kk. Susan Brodeur (County of Orange)
ll. Kim Garvey (Moffatt and Nichol)

† **participating via teleconference**.

II. Announcements: None.

III. Project Review and Determinations

a. NRG Intake Structure Demolition Project (Port of Long Beach, PM John Markham):

i. Corps (Regulatory) comments:

1. What is potential source of high mercury levels? The Port stated high mercury levels (and other contaminants) are observed most often in portions of the Port that have not been dredged in recent years and that have poorer tidal circulation such as dead-end slips.

ii. Corps (Planning) comments:

1. None.

iii. USFWS comments:

1. None.

iv. RWQCB comments:

1. None.

v. EPA comments:

1. Where in the cores was mercury identified? The Port stated there was little stratification of cores or pockets of differential material to suggest a possible concentration of mercury; rather, it was distributed through the cores;
2. Why was barium at such high levels (505 mg/kg in dry weight composite sample, and 422 ug/L in composite elutriate)? Similar to the mercury findings, the Port stated this is likely legacy (older) contamination, as this site has not been dredged for years. The adjacent Pier S site was used as an oil and gas processing facility from the 1930s to 2000, and between 1951 to 1969 was used for disposal of oil and gas drilling waste in shallow impounds, or "sumps." This adjacent land use may be responsible in part for the elevated mercury and barium levels.
3. No objections to this proposal.

vi. Cal DFW comments:

1. There is a large population of lobsters surrounding and within the intake, but given the dredge method (clamshell) the lobsters will likely vacate the area.

2. No objections to this proposal.

vii. Port of Long Beach comments:

1. Estimated volume is 3,500 cubic yards, to be removed using clamshell, temporarily stockpiled upon Pier S or other contained upland location in Port to dewater, and then transported to an upland landfill rather than to Middle Harbor fill areas as previously proposed. Intake structure would be demolished and removed in early 2014;
2. Test sediments contained some trace metals and total PCB congeners above ERL guidelines, and mercury above ERM guidelines (~1.5 x ERM) throughout all samples. In addition, the site water and effluent elutriate tests show very few detectable chemicals of potential concern, and show that the analytes that are above ERLs are not seen in significant quantities in the elutriate sample, indicating that the analytes are non-soluble.

b. Phase I of the POLB Maintenance Dredging Project (Port of Long Beach, PM: John Markham):

i. Corps (Regulatory) comments:

1. No objections to this proposal.

ii. Corps (Planning) comments:

1. None.

iii. USFWS comments:

1. None.

iv. RWQCB comments:

1. None.

v. EPA comments:

1. Were Z-layer samples taken at the Pier J Turning Basin site? If so, were these analyzed? The Port stated that Z-layer samples were collected from each station within the Pier J Turning Basin, but were not analyzed. The samples were archived should further investigation be necessary;
2. No objections to this proposal.

vi. Cal DFW comments:

1. No objections to this proposal.

vii. CCC comments:

1. No objections to this proposal.

c. Regional General Permit 54 – To Review Results of Sampling & Analysis (PM: Cori Farrar): Attended by Chris Miller, City of Newport; Doug West, Newport Harbor Commission; Chris Osuch, Adam Gale, Shelley Anghera†, Jack Malone†, Steve Capellino† of Anchor QEA (City of Newport Beach):

i. Corps (Regulatory) comments:

1. Sought clarification of dredging area and requested that figures clearly show delineate bulkhead to pierhead lines.
2. Suggested table a more in-depth discussion of z-layer for another call to address CDFW and other agencies' concerns.
3. Confirmed testing of grain size would occur at each project site to determine suitability for beach or ocean disposal.
4. Clarified that in the mapped "green" areas, the proposed RGP would restrict dredging to -7 ft MLLW with 1 ft overdredge; boat dock owners would need to apply for an standard individual permit if seek greater dredge depths.
5. Composite core at 4-12 shows elevated [Hg], applicant could do more testing and may find it is suitable for ocean disposal or not and would they dispose of it at a landfill? What about trying to get rid of hot spots of contamination?
6. Suitability for beach nourishment is pending grain size analysis for any given site, and further consideration is needed given exceedences of ERMs for [Hg] at COMP-5 and [DDE] at COMP-3: more testing or more restrictions would be required.
7. Composite samples allow for testing at lower cost and are faster than Tier III testing on individual cores; however, new areas that haven't been dredged before are showing exceedences in ERLs and ERMS; Corps and EPA may require further testing depending on results of Tier III analysis in order to determine suitability for beach nourishment.
8. Requested and received confirmed from EPA that the determination of sediment suitability for offshore disposal has been made and concur with proposed areas and procedures outlined in SAR.
9. Additional safeguards in the form of further testing at the site level in certain areas is likely the way to handle elevated concentrations and beach nourishment.
10. Mention of Public Notice and EFH coordination for regulatory SIP process.

ii. Corps (Planning) comments:

1. In response to CDFW comment 1, indicated the absence of burrowing shrimp in Newport Bay due to high silt content of sediments.

iii. USFWS comments:

1. None.

iv. RWQCB comments:

1. Want to ensure concentrations of metals at lower depths would be known to avoid new exposures of potential hot spots
2. Questioned z-layer analysis in areas with higher contaminant levels but received answer that those areas of concern were excluded

v. EPA comments:

1. Need to clarify that target dredge depth for areas where results indicated -8 MLLW to -12 MLLW had elevated levels of certain contaminants, ocean disposal would only be approved for dredging to -7 MLLW with overdepth of ≤ 1ft (would leave approx. 6" coverage) under proposed RGP54 unless further site-specific characterization and further determination of suitability.
2. Re: z-layer discussion, explained there is an evolving program in San Francisco Bay where NOAA through EFH consultation has focused on z-layer habitat as related to federally listed species; cautioned that z-layer suitability could arise as an emerging issue in SoCal, depending on location, species, and in cases with evidence of historical contamination of deeper layers of sediments that could be daylighted through dredging that haven't previously been exposed; this issue is one separate from the determination of sediment suitability for ocean disposal.
3. Sought confirmation that grain size is tested at the site level.
4. In reference to Corps-RG comment 5 and Other comment 4, clarified the key is that there is only 1 core in the area and if proposed to dredge deeper, higher resolution. sampling (areal and vertical samples) would be needed
5. Confirmed that in mapped "green" areas, sediments -8 ft MLLW (-7 ft MLLW and 1 ft overdredge) were characterized and are suitable for ocean disposal.
6. Beneficial reuse would need to consider human exposure thresholds.

vi. CDFW comments:

1. In referred to areas dredged to -8 MLLW (see EPA comment 1), concerned about potential exposure of organisms to elevated contaminants; asked if that would be covered by Regional Board; expressed concern about exposures of burrowing shrimp or other benthic organisms to contaminants since they can burrow 2 to 3 ft below the surface; concerned that organisms would be exposed to potentially contaminated surface and layers not normally exposed to. [CDFW will investigate further whether shrimp are present in the Bay.]
2. CDFW would look closely at any impacts to the beach through sand replenishment activities.

vii. CCC comments:

1. In mapped "green" areas, would prefer to exclude the area from the RGP or to restrict to -6 ft MLLW plus 1 ft overdredge.
2. Expressed concern about -7 ft MLLW plus 1 ft overdredge and wanted to follow-up internally with that depth due to z-layer discussion.

viii. Other (Anchor and City) comments:

1. Anchor Q.E.A: concerned about need to develop a remediation-type strategy for surface layer, i.e., z-layer left after dredging even if it relatively clean.
2. City: At private boat docks, it is not the City's responsibility to remove the sediments.
3. City: in reference to CCC comment 1, -7 ft MLLW plus 1 ft overdredge is an established program under RGP 54
4. City: in reference to Corps-RG comment/question 5, City doesn't know what any given marina or boat dock owner would do; they may choose to dredge to the RGP-allowed depth of -7 ft MLLW plus 1 ft overdredge.
5. Anchor: in ref. to Corps-RG comment 7, ERMs don't directly relate to human health for determining suitability for beach disposal. Contaminant patterns and distribution of contaminants and broader scale is role of compositing scheme for RGP; expected exceedance of [Hg] to be okay if $\leq$ 1.0 mg/kg threshold from EPA; grain size testing at site is used as smaller spatial scale to determine if site-specific sediments meet requirements for beach nourishment.
6. City will review RGP 54 and will propose procedures for accommodating uncertainty in sediment data as want to maximize ability to accommodate beach replenishment.

d. Sunset/Huntington Harbour Maintenance Dredging and Waterline Installation Project (County of Orange and City of Huntington Beach):

i. Corps (Regulatory) comments:

1. Re: EPA comment 2: SC-DMMT Draft SAP Guidelines specify that known sources of contaminants should be indicated on figures and considered in strategy
2. Re: CDFW comment 1: Please delineate all areas of concern on a figure and send it to everyone in this SC-DMMT session
3. The selection of the contaminants for Tier III will be made after results of bulk chemistry, etc. are provided to the Corps and EPA and other programs
4. Need to archive cores for chemistry composites in case additional testing of cores is required; composites are not always sufficient for making determinations for disposal options
5. If ERMs and ERLs or SQGs for human exposure are exceeded, need to do a more focused analysis; Tier III testing scheme will be based on results of Tier II analysis and volumes of material proposed for disposal
6. Re: Other Comment 3: the DMMT will look at where the sources are located to determine appropriateness of composite proposal

ii. Corps (Planning) comments:

1. Re: the waterline areas, if the proposal is to just sidecast the trench material and then return it to fill in trench, then testing may not be necessary.
2. Re: Regulatory comment 3: Preliminary results will be distributed to the SC-DMMT

iii. USFWS comments:

1. Following the meeting, Carol Roberts of the USFWS reviewed and commented on the SAP:

   a. For purposes of clarification, the composite samples that undergo chemical analysis should be representative of the individual cores from which they are derived, from the mudline down to the bottom of the overdredge depth. Adequate material should be collected from each individual site to provide for the collection of that composite sample as well as to archive enough material for subsequent physical and chemical analyses on an individual basis, as appropriate.

b. The Service supports analysis of polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs) as both Arochlors and congeners (as currently called for in the SAP) because the results generated have independent utility important for assessing the material disposal options, particularly in regards to placing material on the SBNWR. Over the course of the many projects discussed on Wednesday, there was discussion suggesting only Arochlor analysis was required, but both are important in this instance.

c. As additional contaminants are evaluated, we have growing concern about the presence of polybrominated diphenyl ethers (PBDEs). Because analysis for these constituents would be helpful in making a determination of the appropriateness of placing materials on the SBNWR, they should be considered for inclusion in the list of chemicals for analysis.

d. Some of the Laboratory Reporting Limits are elevated relative to thresholds of concern for fish and wildlife. We ask that all estimated values below those reporting limits be provided in the results for our consideration, as the Method Detection Limits identified appear to address our concerns in this regard.

e. The SAP indicated that the results will be used to evaluate the biological importance of the potentially bioaccumulative contaminants. The Service has staff capable of assisting in making this determination for fish and wildlife, and we would appreciate receiving the results for review in this context.

f. To further enhance the ability to determine the appropriateness of placing dredged materials on the SBNWR, sampling and analysis of representative material from the receiving area would be appropriate (as is done for ocean disposal). Kirk Gilligan, Refuge Manager, can provide additional guidance on this aspect.

2. Corps' USFWS comments:
    a. Concerned about potential disposal of sediments at FWS Refuge so would want to ensure testing is complete and may want additional testing done.
    b. Will review SAP and draft comments for inclusion in SC-DMMT notes.

iv. RWQCB comments:

1. WDR may be required not just a 401 certification; target sampling to fulfill requirements of WDR.

v. EPA comments:

1. Not comfortable with composite strategy; need to separate Bolsa Channel and Marina area. Only if grain size and chemistry were similar and had same sediment source, would compositing be okay.
2. Inquired about land uses around entrance channel; SAP figures need to show locations of storm drains and fuel dock; need to understand the way sediments settle out. Please revise figure or and a new one to SAP.
3. Need to check in with SC-DMMT or at least Corps and EPA (copy CCC) for approval before compositing SH/BC and ST for Tier III analysis.
4. RE: Corps PD comment 1: confirmed that if just sidecasting with dredge, unless there is known contamination, testing is not necessary.

vi. CDFW comments:

1. Concerned about eelgrass and area next to refuge due to possible impacts to sensitive habitats; want to see avoidance f impacts to sensitive habitats if possible; noted that near Warner Bridge, there are remnant mudflats of concern and she will share via email.
2. RE: Corps PD comment 1 and EPA comment 4: the drainage area for the harbor is Wintersburg Channel and is urban with sources of contaminants, so DFW wants the trench sediments tested.

vii. CCC comments:

1. Concerned about boats and bottom paint contamination in marina.
2. Concerned for Tier II testing the compositing SH/BC-1 & 2 with SH/BC-3 & 4 because of potential sources of contaminants.

viii. Other comments:

1. Moffatt & Nichol RE: EPA comment 1: for 2001 project, in 1997/1998 the SAP was similar to what is being proposed and ultimately combined for Tier III.
2. Moffatt & Nichol RE: EPA comment 4: confirmed the plan is to trench within 100 ft swath and expect only 3 inches of material below -10 ft MLLW; acknowledge they may not need testing, but will test because want flexibility in disposal options for remaining dredged sediments.

3. Moffat & Nichol: will provide figure(s) with storm drain outlet information and a memo clarifying individual analysis and how they made the preliminary determination to lump SH/BC 1-4 together.

e. Berths 212-224 Yusen Container Terminal Improvements Project (Port of Los Angeles, Theresa Stevens): Summary-Approximately 27,000 cy of material [total] would be dredged. Approximately 21,000 cy of dredging at Area A would deepen Berths 214-216 to -53 feet MLLW, and approximately 6,000 cy of maintenance dredging at Area B would restore the depth at Berths 217-220 to -47 feet MLLW; Area A cores were about 9 feet long and Area B cores were about 4 feet long; an additional 2 feet of overdredge depth would occur in both dredging areas. Based on composited sediment test results showing some exceedence of ERLs and no exceedence of ERMs, low potential for bioaccumulation, the Port has suggested all the material is suitable for ocean disposal at LA-2.

i. Corps (Regulatory) comments:

1. Stevens-Could Area A sediments be handled separately so that top layer unsuitable material is disposed at the CDF and suitable clay material is disposed at LA-2?

ii. Corps (Planning) comments:

1. Smith-Chemical test data needs to be presented in the body of the SAPR, not in an appendix.

iii. USFWS comments:

1. None.

iv. RWQCB comments:

1. Lyons-Same comment as Stevens above regarding surface sediments. Board is not likely to approve of LA-2 disposal. Port asked if top layer of Area A were taken to CDF and clay in Area A was not contaminated, would the Board approve Area A and Area B disposal @ LA-2. Lyons-no for Area B due to ERL exceedence; if EPA issued a suitability determination, Board may still not allow LA-2 disposal; recommended retesting A and B sediments to be sure bottom layer is clean. Does EPA have no concerns about bioaccumulation evidence in clam and amphipod tests? Ports need to regroup and figure out Regional Sediment Management, and until this is done, Ports will be held to a higher standard.

v. EPA comments:

1. Ota-EPA disagrees that area A and B sediments have similar chemistry, and disagrees with the consultants suitability determination for area A based on amphipod survivorship being approximately 20% less than area B, differences in pyrethroid and PCB levels; for OD Area B sediments are suitable, Area A sediments not suitable based on composite results; recommend retesting upper and lower layers of Area A and manage the material separately; confirmatory testing-rerun Tier 2 chemistry, metals, PCBs, pyrethroids, PAHs.

vi. Other comments:

1. The material in Area A had approximately 2 feet of unconsolidated material on top of a clay deposit below. Amphipod test results for Area A may be a result of the species preference for larger grain size sediment (i.e., not clay). Port concerned about LA-2 no longer being available as a matter of policy, even though it has not officially been closed by EPA; and the inconsistency between Regional Boards.

f. Berth 24 Cabrillo Beach Boat Launch Ramp Maintenance Dredging Project (Port of Los Angeles, Theresa Stevens): Summary-based on test results showing the material is primarily silt and not compatible with Cabrillo beach sand, the Port proposes to dispose of the material in the Berths 243-245 Confined Disposal Facility (CDF).

i. Corps (Regulatory) comments:

1. Swenson-There is no policy on percentage of sand when beach nourishment is proposed, rather dredge and receiver sites must be compatible for grain size.
2. SAP approved during April 2013 DMMT but not beach compatible.

ii. Corps (Planning) comments:

1. Smith-Chemical test data needs to be presented in the body of the SAPR, not in an appendix.

iii. USFWS comments:

1. None.

iv. RWQCB comments:

1. Lyons-RWQCB needs eelgrass mitigation plan or something from NMFS as to Port approach in order to take the item to the Board.

v. **EPA comments:**
   1. None.

vi. **Cal DFW comments:**
   1. Adams: If eelgrass transplants are used for eelgrass mitigation, DFW approval letter is required.

vii. **Other (POLA) comments:**
   1. In Table 3-1, Grain Size results, highlight Total Silt and Clay and Total Sand rows to avoid confusion on percentage totals.
   2. In Tables 3-2 and 3-3, provide individual analytes, not just total chemicals (e.g., individual PCB congeners analyzed as well as Total PCBs)
   3. CSTF approves of disposal of the sediment at the Berths 243-245 CDF.
   4. POLA plans to bring final permit for to the Water Board in March 2014.
   5. No agency objections.

g. **Morro Bay Harbor Sampling Analysis Plan Report (Kirk Brus):** The SAPR Report and Suitability Determination w/Appendices were provided to the SC-DMMT for review and comment on Friday, November 15, 2013.

i. **Corps (Regulatory) comments:**
   1. Dan Swenson communicated as a general comment, for the future, that the existing Morro Bay placement dredged material area Figure/Map in the Slide 2 Power Point, also identified as Figure 1 (Location of Morro Bay Harbor and Receiving Beaches), page 4, in the SAPR Report, be shown more clearly the location of the dredged material areas, by enlarging the Figure 1 placement dredged material areas, and/or using polygons to identify these areas, for example. The USACE concurred that Figure 1, page 4 of the SAPR Report, correctly identified the approximate location of the two, placement of dredged material areas, and that Figure 1, page 4 of the SAPR Report, would be enlarged to see more clearly the approximate location of the placement dredged material areas on the Figure 1.

      Postscript to November 20, 2013 SC-DMMT meeting:

      Figure 10 on page 25 of the SAPR report shows a Plan

Sheet generated from the USACE LAD on the location of the Primary Placement Area Nearshore immediately off of Montana De Oro State Beach and the Alternate Placement Area in the surf zone along Morro Strand State Beach. The USACE will enlarge this Plan Sheet on Figure 10 to more clearly show both Placement Dredged Material Areas from this Plan Sheet.

ii. Corps (Planning) comments:

1. Larry Smith (USACE-Planning) communicated that the Figures 2 thru 9 in the SAPR report show the vibracore sampling locations were difficult to read relative to the boundaries of the Composite Areas probably due to the bathymetry lines/layer. The USACE concurred and responded that it would provide Figures clearly showing the boundaries of all of the Composite Areas relative to the location of the vibracore sample locations.

iii. USFWS comments:

1. None.

iv. RWQCB comments:

1. Peter stated that the PowerPoint Slide 2, Morro Bay Placement Dredge Material Areas Figure, that the arrow identifying the nearshore area off of Montana De Oro State Beach was actually a rocky reef habitat area, and that the arrow need to be higher up to identify the nearshore area off of Montana De Oro State Beach. Kirk Brus (USACE LAD) responded that Figure 1 (Location of Morro Bay Harbor and Receiving Beaches), page 4, in the SAPR Report, correctly identified the approximate location of the two, placement of dredged material areas, the nearshore area off of Montana De Oro State Beach with the arrow higher up, and that the PowerPoint Slide 2 Figure had a problem with the resolution including the arrow approximating the location of the nearshore area off of Montana De Oro State. Kirk Brus also communicated that there are 2 placement of dredged material areas for Morro Bay, the nearshore placement dredged material area off of Montana De Oro State Beach is the primary, placement dredged material area, and that Morro Strand State Beach is the alternate. It was also communicated that depending on the type of dredge and what dredge areas have to be dredged annually in Morro Bay determines the placement dredged material area, and Kirk reminded everyone the dredging occurs annually in Morro Bay. Typically, when a

hopper dredge is used in Morro Bay, material is placed in the nearshore off of Montana De Oro State Beach, and typically when a hydraulic dredge with a pipeline (to transport dredged material from a dredge area to its placement dredged material area, sometimes also referred to as receiver beach, disposal area or discharge point) is used in Morro Bay, material is placed on Morro Strand State Beach.

2. Peter Von Langen communicated he remembered seeing a pipeline on Morro Strand State Beach during 2010. USACE concurred that a hydraulic dredge discharges material using a pipeline was used during a part of the 2010 dredging in Morro Bay, and typically almost all of the pipeline is placed on the dry part of the beach.

v. EPA comments:

1. Allan Ota (USEPA, Region 9) asked about a few of the vibracores test results listed in Table 10 (Vibracore Sample Location Gradation Test Results for Specific Sample Depth Intervals Collected Below Project Depth or Overdepth, Morro Bay Harbor 2013 Sediment Investigations), and communicated that vibracore location MBHVC13-20 (Classification: Lean Clay with Sand (CL): LL=39, PL=19) in Area E – Navy Channel and vibracore location MBHVC13-23 (Classification: Sandy Lean Clay with Sand (CL): LL=37, PL=18) in Area F-Morro Channel, appeared not to support the 2013 summary discussion on the Suitability Determination or the SAPR Report results discussion on the sediment grain size. Jeffrey Devine (USACE-Engineering) responded that these 2 vibracores test results are below the overdepth, and that Table 10 (and any other appropriate Table in the SAPR report and Appendices) would be updated/corrected to clearly identify the location of the gradation test results relatative to the vibracore sample location, and the Corps responded that these tables would be updated. Allan Ota acknowledged the response provided by Corps.

vi. Cal DFW comments:

1. Loni Adams (California DFW) asked where is the dredged material placed on Morro Strand State Beach and how often is Morro Strand State Beach is used as a placement dredged material area, as there had been an initial discussion prior about the surf zone. The USACE responded that the dredged material would be placed on the

dry part of Morro Strand State Beach. Loni communicated that the pismo clams can exist in the surf zone, and she wanted to know the volume of sediment that is placed on Morro Strand State Beach. Kirk Brus cited Table 3, page 11, of the SAPR report, that the most recent and previous years dredged placement on Morro Strand State Beach was in year (late) 2009 thru (early) 2010 with a dredged volume of 135,170 cubic yards (CY) using a hydraulic dredge with a pipeline, and in year (late) 2001 thru (early) 2002 with a dredged volume of 211,500 CY using a hydraulic dredge with a pipeline, and that once every 6 to 8 years Morro Strand State Beach is utilized as a placement dredged material area.

2. Loni Adams asked if CEQA document would also be part of the USACE 6 year NEPA Environmental Assessment (EA) for Morro Bay Harbor maintenance dredging. Kenneth Wong (USACE-Planning) responded that there would not be CEQA document accompanying the USACE 6 year NEPA EA. Loni stated that she wanted to make sure that her agency received the USACE 6 year NEPA EA for Morro Bay Harbor maintenance dredging for review and comment. Kirk Brus responded and asked for clarification who would be the California DFW reviewer of the USACE 6 year NEPA EA as it was Kirk's understanding that Eric Wilkens (California DFW) is the representative for the region that covers Morro Bay based on current and previous coordination. Loni Adams responded that Eric Wilkens is the California DFW who represents the area covered by Morro Bay, and that Eric was tied up during the November 20, 2013, SC-DMMT presentation and was not able to participate. Kirk Brus responded that he would continue to coordinate with Eric Wilkens including the distribution of the USACE 6 year NEPA EA for Morro bay Harbor maintenance dredging when it is ready for distribution.

   Postscript to November 20, 2013 SC-DMMT meeting:

   The USACE wants to make a correction about the statement and discussion on the placement dredged material area on Morro Strand State Beach during the November 20, 2013 SC-DMMT meeting. Upon further investigation, the Corps actually discharges dredged material in the surf zone along Morro Strand State Beach in

past dredging events when Morro Strand State Beach is utilized, approximately once every 6 to 8 years.

vii. **CCC comments:** None.

h. **Los Angeles River Estuary SAP (Ken Wong):**

i. **Corps (Regulatory) comments:**

1. D. Swenson: Submit draft SAP to Dan Swenson by 1st week of December for circulation. Make edits and finalize through email. Arrange for conference call as necessary. Finalize SAP by end of 2nd week in December.
2. D. Swenson: break project maps into three components A, B, and C and improve bathmetry.

ii. **Corps (Planning) comments:**

1. K. Wong: Provided pre draft SAP presentation. Failed toxicity w/ minimal ERL/ERM exceedences a historical problem with sediments.
2. K. Wong: Response to EPA#1. Chem panel will include pyrethroids per DMMT meeting on July 26, 2013.
3. J. Fields: Response to EPA#2: major storm drains upstream of project area (perhaps show larger vicinity maps with indicating large storm drains).
4. L. Smith: Response to USFWS #2: Past sampling results show homogeneity throughout all samples within area B.
5. L. Smith: drop Aroclors from chemistry panel.

iii. **USFWS comments:**

1. C. Roberts: suggested breaking area B into two composites (1 from marina to bridge, 1 from bridge to downstream terminus of area B).

iv. **RWQCB comments:**

1. None.

v. **EPA comments:**

1. Ota: recommend adding pyrethroids to chemistry panel.
2. Ota: Need to show storm drains. Area B may need samples and plot contamination.
3. Ota: (Per Corps Regulatory # 1) will review draft SAP and provide input on sampling locations, compositing, etc.
4. Concerned about composite testing, especially in area B.

vi. **Other comments:**

1. None.

i. **North Energy Island Borrow Pit Cap Demonstration Project (Larry Smith):**

   i. **Corps (Regulatory) comments:**
      1. asdf

   ii. **Corps (Planning) comments:**
      1. Monitoring was conducted in October 2013 as part of the CSTF aquatic disposal/capping demonstration project. The demonstration project was constructed in 2001, so this year represents a 12-year monitoring event. The last previous monitoring event was in year 5 (2006). Lab work associated with the monitoring (sediment chemistry and benthic community analysis) is ongoing. Highlights from the field include a slight decrease in the cap thickness, a large increase in the new sediment layer on top of the cap, and an apparent reduction in benthic community both on the cap and in nearby unfilled borrow pit area relative to the adjacent bench. Monitoring reports will be distributed to the CSTF when available.

   iii. **USFWS comments:**
      1. None.

   iv. **RWQCB comments:**
      1. None.

   v. **EPA comments:**
      1. None.

   vi. **Other comments:**
      1. None.

IV. Other issues: none.