

Notes for Wednesday June 24, 2015

Southern California Dredged Material Management Team (SC-DMMT) Meeting

US Army Corps of Engineers - Los Angeles District

Participating Agencies /Attendees:

- a. Stephen Estes (USACE-Regulatory)
- b. Crystal Rogers (USACE-Regulatory)
- c. Gerardo Salas (USACE-Regulatory)
- d. Eric Sweeney (USACE-Regulatory)
- e. Larry Smith (USACE-Planning)
- f. Melissa Scianni (EPA)
- g. Brian Ross (EPA)
- h. Jim Volz (OC Public Works)
- i. Kasey Nielson (OC Public Works)
- j. Brian Leslie (Moffatt Nichol)
- k. Kim Garvey (Moffatt Nichol)
- l. Theresa Stevens[†] (USACE – Regulatory)
- m. Michael Lyons[†] (RWQCB – Los Angeles)
- n. Carol Roberts[†] (USFWS)
- o. Larry Simon[†] (CCC)
- p. Marc Brown[†] (RWQCB-Santa Ana)

[†] participating via teleconference.

Project #1: 10:00-10:45

- 1) Project name: POLA Maintenance Dredging
- 2) Applicant name: ERB
- 3) Project type (Regulatory/Navigation): Navigation
- 4) Corps Project Manager name: Larry Smith
- 5) Meeting type (DMMT/CSTF): DMMT & CSTF
- 6) Purpose/topic (e.g., SAP, SAPR and/or suitability determination): Update on progress including minor revisions to dredge areas
- 7) Presentation? (y/n): N
- 8) Documents provided (emailed or a link): TBD
- 9) Time needed (45 min or more?): 30 minutes

Larry Smith notes:

This item discussed proposed changes to the dredge area for the ongoing maintenance dredging project in the federal navigation channels in the Port of

Los Angeles (POLA). A Memorandum for the Record (MFR) was prepared and distributed to the members of the SC-DMMT prior to the meeting accompanied by a spreadsheet of dredge volumes based on the original 2013 pre-project survey and the final 2015 pre-project survey. The MFR described six expansion areas adjacent to previously identified dredge areas plus two new areas, not immediately adjacent to previously identified dredge areas. Each of the six expansion and two new areas were presented by the Corps along with the recommended disposal alternative. The rationale for modifying the dredge areas is that new or relocated sediments were detected in the 2015 survey. Failure to remove high spots would have resulted in the reclassification of the Main Channel at a decreased depth leading to potential access issues for the Port of Los Angeles.

Area A' is on the south edge of Area A and adds 2.8 KCY of dredged sediments. Area A was determined to be suitable for nearshore placement. The additional volume is also considered to be suitable for nearshore placement and increases the volume for this area to a total of 54.4 KCY.

Area D' is the small area located between Areas C & D and adds 1.4 KCY of dredged sediments. Areas C & D were determined to be suitable for nearshore placement. The additional volume is also considered to be suitable for nearshore placement and increases the volume for Area D to a total of 5.9 KCY.

Area F' is on the north edge of Area F and adds 1.0 KCY of dredged sediments. Area F was determined to be suitable for nearshore placement. The additional volume is also considered to be suitable for nearshore placement and increases the volume for this area to a total of 8.7 KCY.

Area H' is on the north edge of Area H and adds 0.3 KCY of dredged sediments. Area H was determined to be suitable for ocean disposal at LA-2. The additional volume is also considered to be suitable for ocean disposal at LA-2 and increases the volume for this area to a total of 1.1 KCY.

Area Q' is the small area located between Areas Q & R and adds 2.0 KCY of dredged sediments. Area Q was determined to be suitable for ocean disposal at LA-2. The additional volume is also considered to be suitable for ocean disposal at LA-2 and increases the volume for this area to a total of 8.5 KCY.

Area R' is on the south edge of Area R and adds 14.5 KCY of dredged sediments. Area R was determined to be suitable for ocean disposal at LA-2. The additional volume is also considered to be suitable for ocean disposal at LA-2 and increases the volume for this area to a total of 20.5 KCY.

The two new areas (Areas FF' & GG') are both located in the Main Channel adjacent to the cruise ship terminal. The two new areas are located between two areas determined to be suitable for nearshore placement (Areas F & G), but

cross channel from an area determined to be suitable for ocean disposal, but not nearshore placement (Area H). The Los Angeles District has determined that the sediments in the new areas are likely to be closer in nature to Areas F and G than they are to Area H and thus are suitable for nearshore placement. The new areas are designated by double letter and prime (') in the two attachments.

Area FF' is located just south of the entrance into Slip 93 and adds 1.4 KCY of dredged sediments. This additional volume is considered to be suitable for nearshore placement.

Area GG' is located at the south end of the cruise ship terminal and adds 0.5 KCY of dredged sediments. This additional volume is considered to be suitable for nearshore placement.

Discussion on the areas focused on the two new areas with questions regarding the size of the two areas, prior sampling results (there was none). The small size and volume of the two new areas (FF' and GG') were cited as reasons for allowing nearshore placement for both of these two new areas. There were no major issues raised during the discussion.

DETERMINATION: The USEPA, RWQCB-LA, and the Coastal Commission concurred with the Corps' suitability determinations as described above.

Project #2: 10:45-11:45

- 1) Project name: Lower Santa Ana River Maintenance Dredging
- 2) Applicant name: County of Orange
- 3) Project type (Regulatory/Navigation): Regulatory
- 4) Corps Project Manager name: Gerry Salas
- 5) Meeting type (DMMT/CSTF): DMMT
- 6) Purpose/topic (e.g., SAP, SAPR and/or suitability determination): SAPR and suitability determination
- 7) Presentation? (y/n): yes
- 8) Documents provided (emailed or a link): will be emailed
- 9) Time needed (45 min or more?): 45 minutes

Comments:

Brian Leslie: Meeting objectives: Present results of FSAP and Compatibility Determination for Lower Santa Ana River Dredge Material. Approximately 1.1 million cubic yards (MCY) over 3.5 miles of the SAR to restore invert elevations. Ten Composite Areas (A through J) received full chemistry & grain size on horizontal composites. Sites I and J used hand auger; the remaining used direct push. This deviation occurred due to site conditions. Stiff clay was located with lots of fines (70% fines). Some sample depths were not met due to stiff clay.

Chemical results indicated all samples below ERL with exception of some analytes (4,4'-DDE, Total DDT, and bis-(2-Ethylhexyl)phthalate; all samples below ERM; all samples below CHHSL's, except arsenic.

Proposed receiving beaches include Newport Beach (on-beach, nearshore), Huntington Harbour (on-beach), Seal Beach -East Beach (on-beach), and Surfside-Sunset Beach (on-beach). Huntington Bluffs has been removed as a receiving location.

Newport Beach compatibility test were three transects sampled from backbeach to -30 ft. Composite grain-size envelope developed (•0.4 to 37.2% fines). Huntington Harbour compatibility tested five beaches; sampled at high, mid and low profile locations. Composite Grain-size envelope developed for Huntington Harbour (1.5 to 16.4% fines). Surfside-Sunset Beach Compatibility sampled two transects at each receiving beach. Composite Grain-size envelope for Surfside-Sunset (1 to 42% fines). Seal Beach –East Beach Compatibility sampling included two transects. Composite Grain-size envelope developed for East Beach (0.1 to 20%).

In summary, SAR dredge material (top layer) suitable for placement at all proposed receiving beaches (i.e. physically compatible with receiving beaches). Slight ERL exceedances of 4,4' DDE, Total DDT and bis-(2-Ethylexyl)phthalate. No ERM exceedances. Further study to confirm whether clay layer within dredge prism. Three scenarios may result:

1. Clay layer below dredge depth; no issue.
2. Clay layer indeed above design depth. In which case, possibly leave clay in place.
3. Clay layer indeed above design depth. In which case, possibly come back to DMMT and propose alternative disposal location such as LA-3, which would require Tier 3 testing.

Larry Smith: Suspects clay layer in overdredge.

EPA (Melissa Scianni)

1. A lot of vegetation present; ensure vegetation screened; possibly include an onsite monitor during placement.

Kim Garvey: I and J, down to F, would be removed/scraped and screened prior to placement.

2. What is deciding factor in placement plan?

Jim Volz: Most material going to Newport groin fields; Sunset Beach has Corps provide sand.

3. Ensure clay layer not end up on beach.

Jim Volz: City of Newport wants sand deposited near shore; not on dry sand. City also requiring a sieve.

4. More work to determine clay layer location. Present information not complete for approval.

Kim Garvey: Plan to conduct further testing; estimate 100-150k cy of total. If clay within or below dredge prism, allow tolerance of 6 inches (as Corps did in 2012), or not allow over dredge. If in prism, seek alternate solution or avoid.

5. Concerned contractor may hit clay layer. EPA wants the clay layer to be further defined (i.e. volume and location) with a supplemental effort. Does not want clay layer placed on beach. Can acoustic methods be used to find clay elevations?

Kim Garvey: 9 or 10 surface sampling locations may help understand where shoals shift. Try and locate “as-builts” from the Corps to look for post-dredge depths to confirm (or not) that the two previous Corps dredge projects indeed achieved design depths; no sediment samples from 1990; a few from 2003 Corps dredge. The Corps effort probably also resulted in a shallower dredge (i.e. same problem).

Coastal Commission: Also requires beach nourishment; sand must be suitable for beach nourishment.

Regional Water Quality Control Board, Mark Brown: Certification 401 issued in 2008; clay was not an issue; sand must be suitable for beach nourishment. Jim Volz requests a discussion separately re: mitigation, as the Corps mitigated approximately 1000 acres as Seven Oaks Dam.

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service: Sand material is fine; ensure sand and clay separated.

Summary: Larry Smith, EPA, Coastal Commission, Regional Water Quality Control Board agree non-clay material suitable for beach nourishment. Applicant agrees to return at a later date with additional testing (i.e. delineation of clay layer) and discuss results.

-
- - SC-DMMT final agenda and minutes are available at:
<http://www.spl.usace.army.mil/Missions/Regulatory/ProjectsPrograms.aspx>.
 -
 -