

Southern California Dredged Material Management Team (SC-DMMT)
July 23, 2014
Meeting Notes

I. Participating Agencies /Attendees:

- a. Bonnie Rogers (USACE-Regulatory)
- b. Joe Ryan (USACE-ED)
- c. Larry Smith (USACE-Planning)
- d. Theresa Stevens[†] (USACE-Planning)
- e. John Markham[†] (USACE-Regulatory)
- f. Jeff Cole[†] (USACE)
- g. Mark Delaplaine[†] (CCC)
- h. Brian Ross[†] (USEPA Region 9)
- i. Loni Adams[†] (CA-DFW)
- j. Michael Lyons[†] (RWQCB – Los Angeles)
- k. Bruce Shoppee[†] (Audobon, Ventura)
- l. Chris Webb (Moffatt and Nichol)
- m. Brian Leslie (Moffatt and Nichol)
- n. Janna Watanabe (Port of Long Beach)
- o. James Vernon (Port of Long Beach)
- p. Bob Moore (Port of Long Beach)
- q. Carol Roberts[†] (USFWS)
- r. Barry Snyder (AMEC)
- s. Kat Prickett (POLA)
- t. Keith Merkel[†] (?)
- u. Kendrick Okuda (City of LA)
- v. Peter von Langen (Waterboard)

[†] participating via teleconference.

II. Announcements:

1. Channel Islands Dredging: Dredging of Channel Islands Harbor will begin approximately October 1 and will require approximately 100 days to remove roughly 2.5 MCY of sediments with placement on Hueneme Beach. Measures for avoiding effects to western snowy plover will be included and implemented if the Contractor needs to go onto Hollywood Beach (adjacent to the dredge site) for any reason (e.g. set land anchors for the dredge). These measures were worked out in consultation with the Ventura office of the USFWS during the NEPA process. The current EA covers six years of dredging and this is the second dredge event to be completed under that EA.

2. POLB: the Corps is initiating a Recon Study for implementing a project in the POLB to improve shipping efficiencies. This could include deepening of some of the federal channels within the Port, including the Main Channel, Cerritos

Channel, and channels leading to individual terminals. This would likely be a three-year process, in keeping with the new Corps' 3x3x3 policy.

3. Coastal Commission (Mark Delaplaine) announced that Jack Gregg has left the Commission to work for the SF RWQCB.

4. USEPA (Brian Ross) announced that the San Francisco DMMO website is up and active. The site provides information on dredge projects in SF Bay. The website can be found at www.dmmosfbay.org

5. POLA Maintenance Dredging: This project has been modified to include nearshore placement of 111 KCY at the Cherry Avenue nearshore placement site. The remainder of the sediments would still be disposed of at LA-2. This change was coordinated with USEPA, LA RWQCB, and CCC to ensure that there was concurrence on the revised suitability determination. The project will also include a pre-dredge survey of the placement site for eelgrass and Caulerpa. Surveyors will also note any other resources observed during the surveys. The placement site lies between -15 and -25 ft MLLW. Due to elevation restrictions on placement, placement shallower than -17 ft MLLW is considered to be unlikely.

III. Project Review and Determinations

1. Broad Beach SAP Results review (Bonnie Rogers): M&N explained the sand source material is coarser than the on-site beach sand, such that it should stay for a long time on the beach.

i. Corps (Regulatory) comments:

1. Is any quarry material grains cut at the quarries? M&N replied that it is only sieved, sorted, and stockpiled.
2. Why is Gillebrand twice the price? M&N thinks its because it is a set price and sorted more.
3. If Gillebrand does not contain fines and is more expensive it is much less suitable for beach material. M&N agreed that it is the least suitable of the three options and would be the first to drop out.
4. Asked for a graph that shows the fines/medium/coarse sizes labeled on the profile to better see the distribution of grain sizes, with less focus on the D50 grain size. M&N said they could provide it.
5. Could the material be further sieved and sorted to better match the beach profile on-site? M&N completed a memo for CCC explaining that further processing of the material would interrupt the company's process and they would likely do it for one customer. Mark Delaplaine asked for a copy of the memo and M&N will send to him.

2. Maintenance Dredge Phase II Knockdown Dredge Sediment Characterization (John Markham): Maintenance dredging is required at the Port of Long Beach to return navigation channels and berth facilities to permitted depths. Under Phase II of the recently renewed Maintenance Program, the Port proposes to conduct knockdown dredging at five locations to move an estimated 5,074 cubic yards (cy) of sediments which have accumulated above the permitted depths (SAPR, Figure 1). The knockdown process moves sediment accumulations in high spots into adjacent low areas and is used for sites with low volumes of accumulated sediment.

i. Corps Regulatory Comments:

1. Question: Potential sources of endosulfan I found in the F204 and F208 composites? Response (Port): A fruit produce company (Pacific Banana) used to occupy the same berths, but is not known to have used liquid insecticides during their tenancy. Alternatively, this compound may have been derived from Los Angeles River watershed, as hydrologic modeling during peak storm flows shows development of a circular current that enters outer harbor after striking breakwater.
2. See Appendix A of SAP for knockdown sampling criteria and dredging guidelines. These can be further modified to account for circumstances where CCC and/or CMC thresholds are exceeded, as with Endosulfan I at Berth F208.
3. Agreed with Regional Board and USEPA recommendation to take water samples at dredge location, from bottom of water column ~4 hours following knockdown operation and, if exhibiting elevated endosulfan I levels, ~24 hours.

ii. EPA Comments:

1. USEPA has concerns about concentration of Endosulfan I at Berth F204 (10 times Criterion Maximum Concentration). Consider control measures if feasible. Response (Regional Board): Silt curtain would not be appropriate as knockdown occurs on bottom of water column.
2. ,Given small volume of proposed knockdown dredging (~170 cubic yards) and short distance (~50 feet) sediment would travel, control measures may not be necessary. Agreed with Regional Board and Corps' recommendation to take water samples at dredge location.

iii. RWQCB Comments:

1. At Berth F204, RWQCB recommends taking water samples at dredge location, from bottom of water column ~4 hours following knockdown operation and, if exhibiting elevated endosulfan I levels, ~24 hours.

3. Vandenberg AFB Harbor Dredging Project (John Markham): United Launch Alliance, L.L.C. (ULA) proposes to dredge shoaled sediments from the small harbor at the south end of the base to restore the harbor to permitted depth, dry the sediment at the adjacent wharf, and place the dredged material at an upland disposal/re-use site located at Point Pedernales. Current permits (Corps, Regional Board, CCC) allow up to 10,000 cubic yards to be dredged from the harbor annually. VAFB/ULA will continue to evaluate potential options for beneficial re-use. VAFB/ULA requests to exclude % solids, %total organic carbon (TOC), and dissolved sulfides in future testing.

i. Corps Regulatory Comments:

1. asdf

ii. Corps Navigation Comments:

1. asdf

iii. EPA Comments:

1. Question: What is sediment composition? EPA recommends inserting sediment grain size results into SAPR in future submissions. Response (VAFB/ULA): Comp1 and Comp2 were 31-43% fine sand and 26-36% silt. Comment noted.
2. Question: Are there beach renourishment options? Response (VAFB/ULA): The Base, along with Corps Regulatory and CCC evaluated re-use options under renewed permit(s), and found these alternative disposal sites to be impracticable based upon cost and logistics. In addition, given the relatively small volume of dredged material ($\geq 10,000$ cy) and the relatively high %age of silt, renourishment may not be appropriate.
3. Comment: EPA agrees to eliminate % solids and dissolved sulfides in future testing, but recommends retaining TOC.

iv. California DFW Comments:

1. Question: Did similar high oil & grease levels (mean 140 mg/kg) show up in past sediment analyses? Answer (VAFB/ULA): No. The harbor is used infrequently (e.g., once per year) only by the M/V Delta Mariner to deliver flight hardware, therefore contamination due to human

factors is extremely unlikely. The oil & grease may be due to a natural oil seep in the vicinity.

v. RWQCB Comments:

1. Question: Could the oil & grease be derived from the adjacent macrocystic kelp beds? RWQCB requested laboratory results to investigate. Response (VAFB/ULA): Possibly. Lab results were provided to all DMMT members present.

4. Inner Cabrillo Beach Eelgrass Mitigation Project (Theresa Stevens):

vi. Corps Regulatory Comments:

2. Theresa Stevens provided an brief overview of the constructed and pending projects which require eelgrass mitigation, and the Ports' proposed combination of those mitigation requirements into one larger project. The combined mitigation requirements for past and pending projects is approximately 0.6 acre. The project would excavate or dredge approximately 10,000 cy of sand from a shoaled area adjacent to the breakwater and place it in an adjacent subtidal area thereby creating an approximately 3-acre shallow subtidal area on which to introduce eelgrass. The shoal is believed to be a result of blown sand from Outer Cabrillo Beach. AMEC, POLA staff and Merkel Associates gave a presentation of the proposed action which included discussion of sediment sampling and analysis (bulk chemicals and grain size), the target acreage vs. SCEMP requirements and rationale for combining several eelgrass mitigation projects into one larger restoration effort. AMEC and POLA indicated sediment sampling would be taking place in the next week or two and exact test locations would be determined after Merkel completes the survey maps. The project would be executed concurrent with the approved Berth 24 dredging project in October 2014 so as to utilize the dredging contractor who would already be mobilized. AMEC/Merkel indicated excavation/dredging may extend to -8 feet and sediment cores would all extend to -8 feet. The Corps discussed a path forward for new permits or permit modifications depending on whether the permits/projects which generated the mitigation requirement have expired. The Corps also gave a brief overview of the POLA mitigation banking effort in response to a comment by Merkel Associates. The proposed eelgrass restoration is not a part of the ongoing

mitigation bank process and this eelgrass restoration effort is not being proposed as a mitigation bank. AMEC asked if chemical testing would be needed given the source of the sediment, and next steps. Theresa Stevens mentioned an email reply from FWS (Carol Roberts) which indicated FWS reviewed the document (SAP) and had no comment.

vii. Corps Navigation Comments:

3. Larry Smith asked EPA if they thought oil and grease needed to be added to the chemical constituents test list. EPA said no because PAH and TRPH are being tested. Wanted confirmation on actual size of backfill area.

viii. EPA Comments:

4. AMEC indicated there was uncertainty regarding the sediment quality; specifically whether it would be suitable for eelgrass establishment due to low total organic content (TOC). Merkel confirmed low TOC is an issue at this location, but the methods have proven successful elsewhere but acknowledge the risk. EPA said sediment chemistry and grain size testing needs to be completed because 2011 project (the accreted beach project) didn't complete sediment test procedures and the water quality in the area is historically problematic. Grain size testing would be helpful for EFH consultation. There may be a problem with blown sand filling in the area next to the breakwater after dredging, like has happened in the past and which created the shoal. Blowing sand could reduce the amount of eelgrass area created and the project could adversely affect already existing eelgrass in the vicinity.

ix. California DFW Comments:

5. A biological assessment of the excavation and fill area is recommended due to type conversion that would result from the project.

x. RWQB Comments:

The SAP is adequate. A 401 certification would be required.

IV. Other issues: none.