

**Notes for Wednesday April 22, 2015**  
**Southern California Dredged Material Management Team (SC-DMMT) Meeting**  
US Army Corps of Engineers - Los Angeles District

**Participating Agencies /Attendees:**

- a. Bonnie Rogers (USACE-Regulatory)
- b. Joe Ryan (USACE-ED)
- c. Robert Smith<sup>†</sup> (USACE – Regulatory)
- d. Antal Szijj<sup>†</sup> (USACE – Regulatory)
- e. Allan Ota<sup>†</sup> (EPA)
- f. Loni Adams<sup>†</sup> (CDFW)
- g. Michael Lyons<sup>†</sup> (RWQCB – Los Angeles)
- h. Bryant Chesney<sup>†</sup> (NOAA/NMFS)
- i. Carol Roberts<sup>†</sup> (USFWS)
- j. Larry Simone<sup>†</sup> (CCC)
- k. Alan Monji<sup>†</sup> (RWQCB)
- l. Adam Gale<sup>†</sup> (Anchor QEA)
- m. Shelly Anghera<sup>†</sup> (Anchor QEA)

**† participating via teleconference.**

**Topic #1: 10:00-10:15**

Introductions. Update on disposal and placement tracking sheet.

Comments:

Bryant Chesney: Defining and quantifying dredge and disposal area is fundamental to effectively tracking sediment management projects.

Bonnie Rogers: Should stick to collecting data already in post-construction reports so we are not collecting new information.

Allan Ota: Agrees that ‘area’ is important but we can improve the sheet as we go.

Joe Ryan: For CW projects area could be calculated.

**Project #1: 10:15-11:00**

- 1) Project name: Portofino Cove Maintenance Dredging
- 2) Applicant name: Portofino Cove HOA
- 3) Project type (Regulatory/Navigation): Regulatory
- 4) Corps Project Manager name: Cori Farrar
- 5) Meeting type (DMMT/CSTF): DMMT
- 6) Purpose/topic (e.g., SAP, SAPR and/or suitability determination): Tier I Evaluation with Confirmatory Chemistry Results

- 7) Presentation? (y/n): Y
- 8) Documents provided (emailed or a link): Emailed
- 9) Time needed (45 min or more?): 45 min

Comments:

Shelly Anghera: Compositing 4 core sample and compared chemistry to data in adjacent area.

Allan Ota: The grain size physically is definitely very similar to previously tested sections (Sediment Traps and Bolsa), as well as the metals fall in line with adjacent samples. The only different is the 4-4-DDE seems elevated but there is a flag on it so it may be okay. Everything else looks very similar. The PAH total numbers look different than the Sunset/Huntington Beach permit and numbers are different and maybe not be transcribed correctly.

Shelly: They may be different because two labs were used. There could be a transcription error only and she will look into it.

Allan Ota: Does not have a problem giving a Tier I concurrence on this testing.

Adam Gale: They have not submitted applications yet and would need consistency for use of LA2.

Larry Simone: The material is not beach suitable and so anticipates LA2 would be okay to use.

Carol USFWS: Carol emailed the Corps in advance that USFWS is okay with project suitability.

Cori: Has no concerns and concurs.

Bryant: No concerns with suitability but notes eelgrass was surveyed and is present there. There are eelgrass impacts expected for larger Sunset/Huntington Harbor Dredging Project. There is a question-mark as to how well the Mitigation Plan would offset the impacts to eelgrass. He is getting the various eelgrass surveys online and on EcoAtlas.org to see eelgrass.

Adam Gale: Did do an application eelgrass survey for this project and there is eelgrass and they will design project to avoid and/or mitigation if needed and would not rely on County's eelgrass mitigation plan.

Regarding Alan's comment on PAHs not adding up - In subsequent conversation, Anchor QEA provided the following input:

The Sunset/Huntington Harbour project (Kinnetic and MN 2014) included the analysis of 25 PAHs. For the Portofino Cove Marina project we analyzed the standard 18 PAHs recommended by the DMMT. In Table A-1 of Attachment A, we presented total PAH as presented in the 2014 report. The total PAHs values presented in Table 7 only sum the 18 PAHs that were analyzed as part of this investigation to increase the comparability of the results between the two projects. This resulted in a slight discrepancy between the two tables. Attached is the updated report; total PAH values have been flagged in Table 7 with a note that explains this difference.

**Project #2: 11:00-11:30**

- 1) Project name: Point Mugu Sand Management Program
- 2) Applicant name: US Navy
- 3) Project type (Regulatory/Navigation): Regulatory
- 4) Corps Project Manager name: Antal Szijj
- 5) Meeting type (DMMT/CSTF): DMMT
- 6) Purpose/topic (e.g., SAP, SAPR and/or suitability determination): Review of proposed programmatic permit to authorize removal of sand from base infrastructure and placement on beaches

7) Presentation? (y/n): N (USN participant will provide a summary and be available to answer questions)

8) Documents provided (emailed or a link): see attached

9) Time needed (45 min or more?): 30min

Participants: Antal S., Valeria Maramian

Comments:

Discussion: The proposed action includes periodic removal of wind-blown sand from facilities and infrastructure at Naval Base Ventura County, Point Mugu, and replacing it at various beach locations within Naval facilities at Point Mugu and Port Hueneme. Previously material would be removed to an upland location. No representative from the Navy was present to address specific question. EPA (Allan Ota) did not have any objection to the proposal but questioned the benefit of the plan in addressing the larger issues confronting these facilities, including beach erosion and sea level rise. The volumes of material being proposed would not materially address these issues. What is the Navy's long-term plan and would the Navy consider relocating facilities such as the flooded control facility depicted on Figure 9 of the submittal? The Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board (Michael Lyons) echoed EPA's concerns and also questioned the need for so many potential disposal sites for such a small volume of material. The adverse effects from transporting material longer distances (such as Port Hueneme) would likely outweigh the environmental benefit of placing the material there. Recommend keeping the disposal site as close as possible to the removal site. The 401 staff will likely deal with permitting issues. The California Coastal Commission (Larry Simone) indicated they would likely respond with a 'no objection' to the plan, but would be interested in the Navy's long-term plans for managing coastal erosion. Antal Szijj noted that a shoreline protection study report prepared by Moffatt and Nichol on behalf of the Navy in 2012 may address some of these larger issues and will try to obtain a copy from the Navy to circulate to the DMMT members. The comments received from the DMMT will be forwarded to the Navy and considered as part of the Corps' permit process (likely a regional general permit).

Summary: Just initial feedback. Will get back to everyone on their long-term management plan.

- 
- Agenda POC: Bonnie Rogers, 213-452-3372, [Bonnie.L.Rogers@usace.army.mil](mailto:Bonnie.L.Rogers@usace.army.mil).
  - SC-DMMT final agenda and minutes are available at: <http://www.spl.usace.army.mil/Missions/Regulatory/ProjectsPrograms.aspx>.