Southern California Dredged Material Management Team (SC-DMMT)
May 28, 2014
Final Meeting Notes

I. Participating Agencies /Attendees:

a. Gerry Salas (USACE-Regulatory)
b. Brianne McGuffie (USACE-Regulatory)
c. Bonnie Rogers (USACE-Regulatory)
d. John Markham (USACE-Regulatory)
e. Joe Ryan (USACE-ED)
f. Ken Kronschnabl (Kinnetic Laboratories)
g. Chris Osuch (Anchor QEA)
h. Doug Shibberu† (SARWQCB)
i. Bill Paznokas† (CA-DFW)
j. Larry Smith† (USACE-PD)
k. Allan Ota† (USEPA Region 9)
l. Carol Roberts† (USFWS)
m. Larry Simone† (CCC)
n. Loni Adams† (CDFW)
o. Bill Patzoukas† (CDFW)
p. Victoria Touchstone † (San Diego National Wildlife Refuge Complex)
q. Susan Brodeur† (Orange County Parks)
r. Katherine Curtis† (POLA-Port of Los Angeles)
s. Jack Gregg† (CCC)
t. Dylan Porter† (POLB)
u. Kim Garvey† (Moffatt & Nichol)
v. Shelly Anghera† (Anchor QEA)
w. Steve Cappellino† (Anchor QEA)
x. Josh Burnam† (Anchor QEA)

† participating via teleconference.

I. Announcements:

a. **POLB BMP Pilot Test, Middle Harbor, Berth D28 (Corps PM: John Markham)**
    i. At the request of DMMT/CSTF members, this topic was added to the main agenda, and is described as "Project #3" in these notes.

II. Project Review and Determinations

a. Sunset Huntington Harbor Maintenance Dredging and Waterline Installation Project (Corps PM: Bonnie Rogers):
Also presented to DMMT for Sunset November 2013 prior to results report. The 25% over dredge mentioned allows for any accumulation of sediment since the footprint survey. The hatched area in Main Channel East distinguishes ownership by the Cities of Orange and Huntington

Beach. Overall results of the material were low toxicity in Tier III composite testing. There are three site options to place dredged material, including Sufside/Sunset Beach for Beach Nourishment; Sea Beach National Wildlife Refuge for marsh restoration via raising the elevation; and LA-2 disposal site. The material would also be suitable for upland disposal. The dredge footprint has been revised to avoid two large eelgrass beds near the Entrance Channel, but other smaller eelgrass areas will be impacted. Therefore the project proposes planting of eelgrass over a 1 acre area near the Main Channel West by Tern Island.

i. **Applicant comments:**
    1. Comment: Kim Garvey noted that the material to be reused for beach nourishment at Seal Beach will be dependent on the City of Seal Beach allowing the action.
    2. Response: Jack Greg said to let him know if the City of Seal Beach is not okay with the sediment because he prefers all sediment to be reused. Corps suggested sediment could be potentially reused at Colorado Lagoon.

ii. **Corps (Regulatory) comments:**
    1. Comment: Corps asked how would the logistics work for reusing dredge material at the Wildlife Refuge? If the material would be stockpiled then its quality could be affected. The timing between the two projects would have to work out and the actions would be separately permitted. Corps noted that the timing would be challenging and ambitious.
    2. Response: Vicki Touchstone said they intend to complete the NEPA and CEQA this summer because they have funding from CCC to conduct this project new to the West Coast. CSULB and UCLA would monitor the area for 5 years. Approximately 10-13,000 CY of material would be needed to spray 8-10 inches across a 10 acre area at the Refuge and that material would come from part of the dredged Main Channel West area.

iii. **CDFW comments:** Loni Adams asked if turbidity from the dredging could enter Bolsa Chica channel and Kim Garvey said turbidity would be monitored.

iv. **EPA comments:** Alan Ota noticed in the results report that the ERED database information was not provided in table format but an updated table is not needed this time.

v. **CCC comments:** Jack Greg said the presentation opened a lot of questions about suitability because there are questions about the

control samples. Therefore he will review the report and provide comments to the applicant.

b. Alamitos Bay Marina Basins 2 and 3 Maintenance Dredging (Corps PM: Brianne McGuffie):

i. Corps (RG) comments:

1. Which areas in Basin 2 (slide 18) would be dredged?
2. Response: (Anchor): The dark grey areas on figure will be dredged; the lighter areas are below project depth and will not be dredged.
3. On slide 18, what is the northern limit of area not suitable for ocean disposal? How did you determine this?
4. A(Anchor): we took the halfway points between the two sample points (i.e. B2-DU2-04 15.28 and B2-DU2-05 118.18)

ii. EPA comments:

1. EPA wondered whether the previous data testing showed this area as a persistent hot spot; however, the previous testing was not compatible for comparison. EPA noted that we will need to look at future testing in this area.

iii. **Coastal Commission comments**

1. Due to the small size, the commission feels this can be mixed in for ocean disposal.
2. EPA follow-up comment: EPA is leaning that way too.

c. **POLB BMP Test, Middle Harbor, Berth D28 (Corps PM: John Markham):**

i. **Port:** Following bench testing of several different types and ratios of binding compounds on the efficacy of binding oily dredge material derived from Berth D28 of Middle Harbor[1], the Port selected Portland cement at a 3% by weight for the BMP pilot test on approximately 1,100 cubic yards of dredged sediment[2]

ii. Corps (Regulatory) comments:

1. If elutriate testing exceeds toxicity threshold(s) at a proposed knockdown dredge/drag beam site, what does the Port propose? Response (Port): Clamshell dredge and confined disposal (traditional methods).

iii. USFWS comments:

1. In an email response to the DMMT/CSTF notification, USFWS expressed concern regarding potential impacts

[1] Including coordination with Corps Regulatory (John Markham and Aaron Allen), Corps Planning (Larry Smith), and Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board (Michael Lyons)

[2] Initially referenced in *Los Angeles County Regional Dredged Material Management Plan Pilot Studies, Appendix B-2- Evaluation of Cement Stabilization Alternative* (USACE, November 2002)

upon piscivorous birds, including the least tern and other migratory bird species that may be impacted directly by the oil sheen or by adverse water quality conditions and associated reductions in prey base. Response (Corps): The use of standard WQ BMPs (e.g., use of adsorbent materials and physical (boom) barriers, monitoring of standard water quality parameters) generally limits the affected area to the immediate vicinity of the dredge and the disposal barge and does not affect the remainder of the available open water area(s) within the Ports. However, in this circumstance, the proposed additional BMPs associated with this pilot study were intended to provide an additional level of caution and to help inform the group should additional oily material be encountered during future dredging & disposal/re-use operations.With respect to least tern, the area in question (Middle Harbor) is approximately 3 miles from the Pier 400 nesting colony. Prior studies by the POLA show main foraging activities occurring in the outer bay, principally in shallow water adjacent to Pier 300 and off Cabrillo Beach as well as in deeper waters of the outer bay and beyond the outer breakwater. Based upon prior observations, it is unlikely that least terns would forage in the project vicinity given the ship traffic present, and the need to fly over restricted channels to reach the site when there are easier flight paths to outer harbor foraging areas with clearer water and better fish sources. Potential indirect adverse effects upon this particular species at this location may be difficult to measure (e.g., reduced visibility/access to prey species), though the Port did note that TSS were between 1.1 and 3.3 mg/L and thus remained quite low throughout the water column during disposal/re-use. With the exception of elevated copper in one of the sediment samples, chemical testing of the dredged sediment elutriate and standard water quality measurements (pH, DO, etc) within the water column at the discharge/re-use site were below Criterion Continuous Concentrations for metals and were non-detect for TPH and PAHs.

iv. CDFW comments:

1. What is likely source of oily material (free product or relict)? Response (Port): The oily sediment was found within and under an old rock dike, and is not likely to be an ongoing source. Extensive testing has been previously conducted at this location (in water and adjacent uplands), and no pipelines or tanks have been found, nor is there evidence to suggest that hydrocarbons are leaching from upland sources.

2. How much material remains to be dredged from this location? Response (Port): Approximately 35,000 cubic yards.
3. Has an OES report been submitted? Response (Port): CDFW and U.S. Coast Guard were notified approximately 1 year ago following first observations of oil sheen at this location (date to be determined). Following USCG inspection, the Port prepared an oil spill release and response plan. Following review of the plan, USCG advised the Port that additional notification would not be required, provided that the plan (and associated BMPs) was implemented as needed.
4. The Regional Board's Waste Discharge Requirements (WDRs) do not require monitoring for hydrocarbons, correct? Response (Port): Correct, but the Port tested the dredged material (post-mixing) and disposal site (water column) for metals, PAHs, and TPHs at the recommendation of the Board and Corps.
5. When does the Port want to resume dredging at this location? Response (Port): Following Regional Board's review & approval of the Technical Memorandum (May 22, 2014, Anchor QEA).
6. CDFW requested notification when dredging & disposal resumes, and would like to conduct an inspection of these operations. Response (Port): Comment noted.

v. CCC comments:

1. Was there an oil sheen at the disposal site? Response (Port): Yes, a light sheen of oil and discoloration was observed 9 minutes following initiation of disposal. The oil response team immediately mobilized to this area and used additional adsorbent oil booms to encircle the area and remove the residual from the surface (see Photo 18). Based on conversations with the oil response team, the sheen present during the disposal event was consistent with, or less than typical, daily operations on this project. In addition, the observed oil sheen was believed to result from the oil residue inside the barge (adsorbed to wood paneling along barge interior), not the surfacing of oil associated with the dredged material. Results of chemical testing of grab samples at near surface, mid-water, and bottom of water column were below Criterion Continuous Concentrations for metals and were non-detect for TPH and PAHs.