

**Final NOTES for Wednesday September 23, 2015**  
**Southern California Dredged Material Management Team (SC-DMMT) Meeting**  
US Army Corps of Engineers - Los Angeles District

**Attendees:**

Bonnie Rogers (Corps Regulatory)  
Gerry Salas (Corps Regulatory)  
Joe Ryan (Corps Coastal Engineering)  
Jon Moore (Noble Consultants)  
Kim Garvey (Moffatt and Nichol)  
Jim Volz (OC Public Works)  
Kasey Nielsen (OC Public Works)  
Ana Paine (Amec Foster Wheeler)  
Robert (Bob) Stein (City of Newport Beach)  
Kimbrie Gobbi (Amec Foster Wheeler)  
† Alan Monji (RWQCB – San Diego)  
† Allan Ota (EPA)  
† Larry Simone (California Coastal Commission)  
† Bill Paznokas (CDFW)  
† Michael Lyons (RWQCB – Los Angeles)  
† Loni Adams (CDFW)  
† Brian Leslie (Moffatt and Nichol)

† participating via phone

**Project #1: 10:15 – 11:00**

- 1) Project name: Semeniuk Slough Maintenance Dredging Project
- 2) Applicant name: City of Newport Beach
- 3) Project type: Regulatory
- 4) Corps Project Manager name: Gerardo Salas
- 5) Meeting type: DMMT
- 6) Purpose/topic: SAPR
- 7) Presentation: Yes
- 8) Documents provided: SAPR/ Preliminary dredging plan (via separate link to be provided by 9/16)
- 9) Time needed: 45 minutes (15 min presentation/ 30 min Q&A and discussion)

Note: Bob: originally tried to combine with Corps CW project but timing did not work out. Caltrans has large culvert that discharges into the Slough so working on cooperative agreement to join projects. First dewater before removing material. Plan to continue and replicate previous Corps sediment removal in slough (completed 2 years ago). Methods are same as previous Corps work. Three foot dredge prism to restore depths and circulation. Dewater with cofferdam and excavate and haul to disposal site. SAP was amended and sampling completed in 2011. Five samples were composited for testing. Originally evaluated for beneficial use but found to not be compatible for beach placement due to color and economic issues for placement nearshore. Results for a few DDT/PCB had low exceedances. Evaluated composite and individual samples for Chlordane because the composite exceeded ERM. The 4 out of 5 individual samples still exceeded for Chlordane. Remove 17,000 CY material. Material would be disposed at approved inland site.

Allan (EPA): Were bioassays conducted? Answer was no they were not. Grain is suitable based on size but what makes it incompatible? Answer is that dark color of grain kicked it out.

Bill Paznokas: Is there any eelgrass? Answer is it is a muted slough so it may not have eelgrass. Tidal influence controlled by a gate at the Santa Ana River.

Larry (CCC): How long? Answer is will take about 2 months of excavation starting Sep 2016. Has app been submitted? Answer is an application has not been submitted yet. They may need to followup with Marc Brown at waterboard.

Summary: The information provided looks okay as proposed to dispose of at an upland facility.

**Project #2: 11:00-11:45**

- 1) Project name: Lower Santa Ana River Maintenance Dredging
- 2) Applicant name: Orange County Flood Control District
- 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 - follow-up from June DMMT meeting
- 7) Presentation? (y/n): yes
- 8) Documents provided (emailed or a link): to be provided
- 9) Time needed (45 min or more?): 30-45 minutes

Attendees: Jim Volzs (OC Public Works), Kim Garvey (M&N), Kasey Nielsen (OC Public Works), Brian Leslie (M&N), Loni Adams (CDFW), Bill P. (CDFW), Larry Simone (CCC), Alan Monji (RWQCB), Allan Ota (EPA), Bonnie Rogers (Corps Reg), Gerry Salas (Corps Reg.), Joe Ryan (Corps CW).

Notes:

Kim (M&N): Dredging from river mouth to just upstream of Adams Ave (~3.5 miles). A maximum of 1 MCY would be removed. Multiple receiver sites identified for material. The purpose of this presentation is to followup on June DMMT where grain size and chemistry results were presented for upper sand layer.

Brian (M&N): Today's purpose is to review the SAPR Report Addendum 1& 2. Applicant wishes to receive approval of final SAPR to proceed with permitting. Looked at three datasets (USACE 1991 pre-SAR Mainstem construction 2002 pre-2005 SAR maintenance dredging, and 2015 pre-2016 maintenance dredge). Resolved information to common vertical datums (NAVD29) and compared to proposed dredge prism. In areas where clay was encountered the info was entered into the table provided. Green labels identify where clay was not found or below the dredge prism. Yellow labels identify where clay was found at the proposed dredge invert elevation; avoiding overdredge at these locations could avoid encountering clay layer. Red shows where clay is within dredge prism and would likely be encountered during dredging.

Bill P: Do you have a volume on the clay? Answer is about 150,000 CY total.

Allan Ota: Perhaps J composite area is close but still within the dredging prism.

Brian: Will encounter clay during dredging and so they are proposing to dispose of all this material at an approved upland location.

Kasey: Anticipate getting contractor in 2 to 3 months.

Kim: The dredging contractor will avoid clay to make sure only non-clay material goes on beach.

Bonnie: Would any clay get within the materials that would go to beach? Answer is that some clay could possibly get into the material but this minor amount would get mixed in and that would be okay. The operators would also be able to feel when they hit clay and avoid it.

Jim Volz: Possibly they could have a 3<sup>rd</sup> party monitor to be there during dredging.

Loni Adams: How would monitor see sediment and clay during operations? Answer is they would monitor dredging with operator. Loni wants to review final plan and conditions in permit regarding means and methods.

Jim Volz: At low tide there is only several feet of shallow water; therefore can observe the shoaling.

Larry Simone (CCC): They adequately identified areas where clay is. Later their permit will include the details of this information, possibly as a condition of the final permit. He is comfortable approving this conceptual plan for handling the clay layer.

The DMMT was asked if anyone else had concerns with the presented clay layer study results (Addendum 1). There were no further comments identified.

Topic Addendum #2: Use of excavated sand at proposed beach sites.

Brian: There are 5 beach sites at Balboa Island and one site at China Cove, all in lower Newport Bay where a total of 50,000 CY could be placed.

Loni Adams: Did you look at the proposed beach areas for biological compatibility? Answer is they did not but can to evaluate them. Loni noted the beach sites need to be evaluated for sensitive habitat/ eelgrass by the City of Newport Beach as part of the permit process.

Kim: All beaches are public and have public access.

Allan Ota: Regarding the North Bay front compatibility slide: Would you select specific river composite areas to go to specific beaches? Brian answer is yes they would select specific samples to go to specific beaches so the material is compatible.

Brian: Material that would be trucked would likely go to inland beaches, but they would incorporate selectivity of material.

Loni Adams: Why are you placing sand at these locations, because it is unusual? Answer is because these are recreational beaches that erode (there are existing degraded groins meant to keep sand on the beach), and there is no natural source of sand to replace the eroded sand. Loni: There is eelgrass growing there now especially in the Grand Canal. Should look at a natural method (eelgrass) to retain sand. Answer is this can be addressed as part of the permit process.

Summary:

Larry (CCC) the receiver sites will be handled during permit process. The Newport Harbor sites appear to be suitable (compatible with SAR material) for use but would be worked out later in the Coastal Development Permit process.

Bill Paznokas (CDFW): Compatibility appears to be okay but there would be other issues with placement that would be taken care of in another arena during permitting. Look forward to more information to address the details of the clay layer.

Allan Ota (EPA): No further comments. It appears the receiving beaches added (Newport Harbor) look generally compatible. Looks forward to seeing the management plan of dredging operations for clay layer considerations.

Note: Additional agency comments received via email:

1. From Carol Roberts, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Carlsbad: “I did want to point out that it appears that Oceanside is now a potential receiver beach for materials dredged from the Lower Santa Ana River (LSAR). The SAPR Addendum provided grain size profiles for the potential Orange County sites, but no profile information was provided for comparison between the LSAR materials and the receiving areas in Oceanside. Given we have grunion spawning and foraging in this area by the western snowy plover (*Charadrius alexandrinus nivosus*), the quality of the material, the methods for depositing them and the timing of the placement will all be important relative to potential adverse effects to those species. The Fish and Wildlife Service would appreciate having the specifics about the material, the methods, and the timing prior to any materials be deposited on or near any Oceanside beaches.”

Jim Volz: There is no discussion of Oceanside beaches being a potential receiver site with SAR sand that OC Public Works is aware of. Kim Garvey has a call into Ms. Roberts to see where she obtained information that Oceanside could be a receiver site. She may have been confusing this project with another project. Further from Kim Garvey: Corresponded with Carol; the confusion stemmed from a typo in Newport Harbor sediment investigation Addendum. Page 2, first paragraph should have referenced “City of Newport Beach”, not City of Oceanside.

2. From Bryant Chesney, National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS): “NMFS staff has previously observed eelgrass in the lower Santa Ana River estuary and eelgrass impacts may have previously been addressed during the environmental review process for older maintenance dredging events, so there may be formal surveys that have previously documented its presence...[G]iven our own previous observations, I asked one of my colleagues to visit the ocean terminus of the project to determine whether eelgrass was currently present in the lower Santa Ana River estuary...The methods used to determine presence are not sufficient to provide a reliable estimate of the area of eelgrass habitat in the project area, but a very rough estimate is in the 1-5 acre range. We are providing this information to alert you of its presence and to recommend that the applicant, USACE, and interested agencies consider the adverse impacts that may occur to eelgrass habitat as the proposal goes through the environmental review process.

Jim Volz: We also recently became aware of the possibility of eelgrass in the lower portion of the project and are in the process of developing strategies and its impact to the project. Since sediment transport analysis is an imprecise science and with the discussion of an El Nino winter, our plan is to wait until March to map the eelgrass beds. It is possible that the eelgrass will be removed during prolonged large flow rate releases from Prado Dam.

Conclusion: No changes were required for the two Santa Ana River SAPR Report Addendums (Clay Layer Investigation and Newport Harbor Sediment Investigation).

**Project #3: 1:00-1:45**

- 1) Project name: Port of Los Angeles Everport Container Terminal Improvements Project
- 2) Applicant name: Los Angeles Harbor Department (Kathryn Curtis and consultants (Environ) presenting
- 3) Project type (Regulatory/Navigation): Regulatory
- 4) Corps Project Manager name: Theresa Stevens
- 5) Meeting type (DMMT/CSTF): CSTF
- 6) Purpose/topic (e.g., SAP, SAPR and/or suitability determination): Follow up to August meeting, request for final suitability determination and discussion of beach/nearshore nourishment
- 7) Presentation? (y/n): No
- 8) Documents provided (emailed or a link): sent via email attachment
- 9) Time needed (45 min or more?): 45 minutes

Attendees: Theresa Stevens (Corps Reg), Kathryn Curtis (POLA), Brian Correa (POLA), Larry Simone (CCC), Jennifer Arblaster (Ramble Elviron), Michael Lyons (LA RWQCB), Bonnie Rogers (Corps Reg), David Moore.

Theresa: Followup from last meeting. Berth 226-236 (Everport Improvement Project) dredging and deepening. A pocket of potential beach quality sand was found and POLA conducted testing and have amphipod results.

Kathryn: Followup required for amphipod that was requested by EPA previously. They have clarification regarding which cores they are using for composite samples. This information was discussed via a call previously with Larry Smith and Joe Ryan.

David: The individual cores are very different from composite. Cores A1 through A5. Sample 5 aligns with composite more than others.

Kathryn: In conclusion this discussion revisits suitability in light of more detailed information on individual cores showing samples are not compatible for reuse. Beach reuse material is off the table now so the Ocean Disposal option is appropriate.

Summary: Needs to followup with Allan Ota (EPA). Michael Lyons, Larry Simone, and Corps approves the material is suitable for ocean disposal.

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