

Final Notes for Wednesday June 22, 2016

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

US Army Corps of Engineers - Los Angeles District

Announcements: 10:00 – 10:10

Announcements.

Update pilot DMMT Tracking Sheet.

Notes: Jonna Engle and Lauren Garske will join the Broad Beach discussion.

Bonnie: I will send the DMMT dredging distribution list. Michael Lyons will send me an Alamos Bay dredging bay tracking sheet.

Project #1: 10:10– 10:30

1) Project name: Port of L.A. Berths 226-236 Everport Container Terminal Improvement Project

2) Applicant NAME & Applicant affiliation: Los Angeles Harbor Department

3) Project type (Regulatory/Navigation): Regulatory

Attendees:

Present: Bonnie Rogers (Corps RG), Melissa Scianni (EPA).

Phone: Brian (POLA), Robert Smith (Corps RG), Carol Roberts (USFWS), Loni Adams (CDFW), Theresa Stevens (Corps RG), Michael Lyons (LA RWQCB), Larry Simon (CCC).

Notes: Port has originally proposed to dredge DMMU-B -53 +2 ft and the DMMU-A to -47 +2 ft, as well as dredging an in-between area. Port has now proposed to expand -47 ft. to south to capture the in-between area. Cores A-5 (-45 ft. only) and B-1 were taken near the in-between bump. The requested shift to the south is to avoid some discovered utilities. The new layout encroaches into the maintenance dredging area. Some of the previous area they want to dredge to -47 and some to -53. Had originally characterized A-5 the -45 ft core to -47 feet so they have that data.

Melissa: Requests a short memo describing the changes, the total volume of material and total that was not tested/characterized. Since material will go to LA-2 need a memo. The volume that was not characterized below the baseline that will go to LA-2 EPA needs to know if it is a small or large volume. Also describe the non-characterized material's historical information. Is the material expected to be the same as the tested material or different?

Brian POLA: Has a historical letter from geotechnical showing the material is native material.

EPA/CCC/CDFW/USFWS/RWQCB: Okay to coordinate that information by email.

Larry Simon: POLA needs to submit a consistency certification to Coastal Commission. With memo please also submit a graphic to match description.

Project #2: 10:30 – 11:00

- 1) Project name: Marina del Rey Maintenance Dredging
- 2) Applicant NAME & Applicant affiliation: Corps
- 3) Project type (Regulatory/Navigation): Navigation
- 4) Corps Project Manager name: Larry Smith

Attendees:

Present: Bonnie Rogers (Corps RG), Melissa Scianni (EPA)
Phone: Jeff Cole (Corps), Carol Roberts (USFWS), Michael Lyons (RWQCB), Larry Simon (CCC), Larry Smith (Corps).

Notes:

All areas are compatible for beach or nearshore placement, material is close to within the envelope.

Melissa: What happened with material in Sand-trap Area 6?

Larry: It's difficult to sample in the sand-trap with core placement because it is so shoaled in.

Jeff Cole: The area has been shoaled in for a very long time.

Larry Simon: What's schedule for submitting CD?

Larry Smith: EA is ready to go out so once get suitability determination thereafter. Probably will submit coastal consistency request first week of July. The EA will address the trash monitoring requests through special conditions. Hoping for a Negative Determination from CCC.

Michael Lyons: Looks good. Isn't there a lot of Chlordane found in the past?

Larry Smith: It's slightly less than last time but is a problem in the area. Area 6 is lower in concentration meaning it's probably not coming from downcoast.

Loni Adams: Are you placing it in the nearshore or onshore?

Larry Smith: It goes out to bid to low bid and is decided based on low-bid. If a hydraulic cutter-head dredge then material will be pumped onto the beach, if a clamshell/scow operation then the dredge material will be placed at the nearshore placement site.

Loni Adams: There are sensitive resources on-shore, snowy plovers and nesting in the area.

Larry Smith: There is a foraging area on beach for snowy plover and any pipeline used for beach disposal would have to stay 50 feet outside that area, including a snowy plover pre-construction survey.

Loni Adams: What about grunion and eelgrass?

Larry Smith: Work will be well outside the grunion season. Its open coast sandy bottom with no eelgrass or historical eelgrass.

Loni Adams: When was last recent biological survey?

Larry Smith: Way back when they first started using the site and conditions have not changed.

Melissa: Looks suitable for nearshore placement or on the beach.

Larry Simon: Looks suitable.

Michael Lyons: Looks suitable.

Carol Roberts: Looks like avoidance measures are incorporated for plover so all good.

Additional notes:

Reference was made to May 2016 SC-DMMT discussion regarding chemical analyses results. The SC-DMMT concurred that additional toxicity testing is not required.

The SAPR was distributed last Friday and the geotechnical appendix was distributed Tuesday. All areas were suitable for beach or nearshore placement. However core 04-05 was found to lie 2% outside the fine end of the beach compatibility curve. This core represents approximately 3350 cy of sediments. It was determined that this small a quantity, this close to the compatibility curve will not result in substantial quantities of fines placed on the beach and will not create noticeable problems on the beach or in the nearshore.

The Corps has determined that all sediments proposed to be dredged are suitable for beach and nearshore placement. Questions from Coastal Commission (CCC) included timing of the CCC permit. The Corps' response was that the Draft EA would be published for public and agency review the first week of July and would include the CCC and 401 WQC applications. The Draft EA would also address measures to detect and remove trash and debris from the dredged sands. Water Board asked about chlordane. Chlordane levels at this site appear to be elevated, however this year's results are lower than prior sampling. Water quality monitoring will still include water

samples to analyze for dissolved chlordane as a precaution. Chlordane was speculated as coming from the marina as opposed to Ballona Creek or longshore transport.

CDFW asked about snowy plovers and eelgrass in the nearshore. Measures will be included to ensure no impacts occur to wintering snowy plovers. There are no records of eelgrass in the nearshore nor are conditions suitable for eelgrass in the nearshore. Dredging/placement will occur outside the grunion spawning season.

CDFW asked about dredge methodology. The dredge methodology will be determined by the low-cost bidder for the job, we cannot artificially constrain the methodology in order to ensure a competitive bidding process.

USFWS concurred that proposed measures would protect snowy plovers from potential impacts from beach placement.

The EPA, Water Board, and Coastal Commission concurred with the Corps' suitability determination that sediments to be dredged are suitable for beach and nearshore placement.

Project #3: 11:00 – 11:30

- 1) Project name: Seaside Lagoon Enhancement Project
- 2) Applicant NAME & Applicant affiliation: Stephen Proud; City of Redondo Beach
- 3) Project type (Regulatory/Navigation): Regulatory
- 4) Corps Project Manager name: Pam Kostka

Attendees: Present: Jon Moore (Noble consulting) and Harry Finney (Applied Environmental Technologies). Phone (see above).

Notes:

Bonnie (Corps): Has the SAP been amended since the previous DMMT meeting?

Answer: Yes, the SAP presented at this meeting has been amended to match the suggested format that was provided by the DMMT. The new SAP clarifies the testing procedures, identifies personnel, and provides improved graphics which show sampling sites and the 4 zones of work to be completed.

Bonnie (Corps): What are you going to do with the material?

Answer: Jon Moore emphasized that the project deals with legacy sediment. The sediment was placed to create King's Harbor in 1963. Approximately 2,200 cubic yards of material would be dredged for this project. The project would remove the concrete swim platform, quarry stone revetment, and dredge sand adjacent to the revetment. The concrete and other swim lagoon materials would be removed to an offsite location and recycled. The quarry stone revetment would be recycled and reused as much as possible and any excess would be removed offsite and recycled. The dredged sandy material would be reincorporated into the new open beach so long as the sampling shows the material is appropriate for beach nourishment. Harry mentioned that previous sampling found no issues.

Bonnie (Corps): What is the purpose of the project?

Answer: The purpose of the project was stated as re-purposing the recreation site. The site would be converted from a closed lagoon to an open beach. The open beach would be a multipurpose recreation site for swimming and small craft launch (kayaks, stand-up paddleboards, etc.). One of the reasons for the re-purposing of the recreation area is due to the closing of the nearby power plant. The closed lagoon had used the power plant cooling water as a heated water source. The closed lagoon has water pumped in from the power plant overflow where it is chlorinated and placed in the lagoon. When the water is removed from the lagoon it is de-chlorinated and then discharged into the ocean. The SAP includes 4 sampling locations as well as grab samples from the lagoon area.

Carol (USFWS): Concern was raised about the chlorination of the lagoon and its affect going forward with opening the beach to provide harbor access. Answer: Jon clarified that the water is de-chlorinated prior to being released from the lagoon. Once the swim lagoon is closed the water will no longer be chlorinated. The swim lagoon may operate for another two years until construction on this project can begin.

Larry (CCC): If the sampling is done this year would it still be valid in two years when construction can begin? Answer: Yes, sampling is valid for three years.

No other issues were raised with the SAP as presented. Agency personnel present for the meeting signaled their approval for the consultants to move forward with the SAP.

LUNCH 11:30 – 12:30

Project #4 12:30 – 1:00

- 1) Project name: BROAD BEACH RESTORATION PROJECT, SAMPLING AND ANALYSIS PLAN ADDENDUM No. 4 RESULTS REPORT (Upper Calleguas Creek Material)
- 2) Applicant NAME & Applicant affiliation: Broad Beach Geologic Hazard Abatement District (BBGHAD)
- 3) Project type (Regulatory/Navigation): Regulatory
- 4) Corps Project Manager name: Bonnie Rogers

Attendees:

Tonia McMahon (M&N), Jackie Branyon (M&N).

Phone: Bryant Chesney (NOAA), Jonna Engle (CCC reviewer of Broad Beach Project), Lauren Garske (CCC reviewer of Broad Beach Project), Michael Lyons (LA RWQCB), Loni Adams (CDFW), Larry Simon (CCC), Melissa Scianni (EPA).

Notes:

Larry Simon: How do results exceedance of ERL compare to Lower Calleguas Creek previous results?

Tonia: Much lower than Lower Calleguas Creek.

Did not observe any visible discrete layers that would have warranted separate samples. Will send revised SAPR with revised average sediment type and addressing all comments from today. Native material at Broad Beach average is 0.25 mm and Upper Calleguas material is much coarser. But the Upper Calleguas material is more well-distributed than quarry material. Upper Calleguas has a very low percentage of fines.

Jonna: The CDP conditions states the D50 needs to be between 0.25 mm and maximum 0.5 mm. Tonia: Also a maximum of 1% can be 4.74 mm, and no more than 10% 2.0 mm, and no more than 10% 0.074 mm fines. Therefore there is a gap between what the CDP requires and the Upper Calleguas material. Benefit of Upper Calleguas material is it's a good color match and not angular like quarry sand. It would be a beneficial reuse project and much reduced emissions.

Bonnie: Is there a microscope angularity characterization report of the Upper Calleguas material?

Tonia: Have not but they can. One top foot of sediment was removed before testing. And lower 6 inches of cobble was removed. Total volume is estimated at 200,000 CY.

Larry: Does removing top foot really remove Arundo roots in sediment.

Tonia: Cannot answer but will check with the biologists.

Bryant: Would there be a biological interaction on the beach?

Larry Simon: The risk associated with roots and plant material on the beach.

Jonna: Not sure how prolific the plant is and the risk.

Bonnie: The rhizomes can multiply and persist and the roots are not shallow so definitely need to look into it more.

Bonnie: Can you get the Corps permit number? If permits are in hand then coordinations have been completed, but if not, then it would need to go through the permit process.

Tonia: Will share the permit and Biological Opinion.

Jonna: Is there an entity that already has claims on the sand?

Tonia: Not sure but there has been discussions to allow BBGHAD to use it.

Jonna: Need to consider how Arundo could get to into Trancas accidentally. Would the BBGHAD submit a CDP amendment request? And have you considered sieving it to get it to meet the current condition?

Tonia: Possibly, this is the first step. The BBGHAD is considering sieving as an option.

Larry Simon: Would it be possible to run an experiment to determine what happens.

Bonnie: There is a lot of information about Arundo and in-house information that would probably tell us the likelihood of it reproducing on the beach.

Melissa: Looks suitable from a chemical standpoint.

Michael Lyons: Looks good and surprised at the low chemistry. As for grain size, would defer to coastal commission.

Larry Simon: Agree chemical suitability is good.

Jonna: Idea is to match the existing beach profile for the ecology of the beach. It's a balance since it's in a high-value resource area. There is major concern for all habitats including the beach infauna.

Bryant: Do not have a concern with chemical standpoint.

There is concern of the effects to invertebrates but coarser material is a concern the material could impact offshore rocky habitat, increasing risk to rocky reef. The 2015 profile data of beach showed accretion not erosion and the average beach width gained 65 feet; very different than what was used in the modeling. Has raised these concerns in Technical Assistance letter to Corps which have not been addressed.

Jonna: Could result in habitat conversion with larger grain size because it's a steeper beach (moving from dissipated to reflective beach).

Bonnie: Agree chemistry looks okay but there is concern for Arundo transport and need more information.

Michael: Did quarry material meet grain size envelope?

Tonia: Quarry material is large from 3 quarries.

Bryant: The proposed project is 300,000 CY but Upper Calleguas only has 200,000 available. Where would remaining material come from?

Tonia: There will be a shortfall for initial fill and one quarry would make up for the difference.

Jonna: But lawsuit has to be addressed first, right?

Bryant: Timing has a big influence on the infauna. How would material be slowly placed?

Tonia: The plan is not to place 200K then 100K later, but that all issues will be resolved before the initial placement is conducted. The BBGHAD understand sieving has been considered but is not proposed at this time. The BBGHAD believes there are many benefits to the environment from the Upper Calleguas Creek sediment and request that the Coastal Permit requirement of 0.6 mm be allowed to be adjusted to a larger size of 0.78 mm.

Jonna: Changing 0.6 mm to 0.78 mm would be a big process.

Larry: There would need to be an Amendment to the CDP to adjust the number. Agencies are referring to CDP for more guidance regarding material.

Jonna: Alternatively to an Amendment, the compromise would be to sieve the material to meet the size 0.6mm.

Larry Simon: It sounds like the agencies are not prepared to state the material is suitable for the beach today. More discussions regarding grain size and Arundo. The next step would be to have the BBGHAD and CCC and agencies discuss the grain size suitability further.

Bonnie: Could be okay with the material if Arundo is not an issue and the material could be sieved.

Larry Simon: It's chemically clean. Need to come to an agreement regarding how to modify the D50 number or sieve the material. Have to find out if issue can be resolved and come back to get agency determinations.

Bonnie: Summary is look into Arundo infestation and the issues of using sediment and transporting to the beach. Second is review further the grain size compatibility with the beach. Also estimate if you have to avoid Arundo zones how much material is left. Also keep in mind the grain size needs suitability approval by the Corps and Coastal Commission.

Larry Simon: There should be a calculation to determine the amount of sand available for the project after the material is sieved.

Jonna: All the modeling was conducted with the grain size of about 0.6 mm.

Tonia: Does not expect modeling would detect a noticeable difference from 0.6 mm to 0.78 mm.

Jonna: And it does not look like the model predicted what is actually occurring, the accretion.

Tonia: Accretion is an anomaly though.

Bryant: Uses 2009-2014 data that provides an excellent control which is not 30 years of data.

Tonia: That's correct but the first phase I analysis for project showed erosion from the 1940s.

Bryant: Not arguing against the long-term trend but what matters is the rate of sediment movement. The event that is the complete opposite can have a larger impact to marine organisms.

Tonia: Agree that the modeling approach needs to be updated. Modeling is not currently underway but would occur during the project (not before placement).

Jonna: What's the approval role of the DMMT? Concerned the DMMT is approving material.

Bonnie: DMMT itself has no statutory authority and only facilitates reviews for projects.

Larry: There is no permit authority vested in the DMMT.

Michael: The criteria is the material is within a certain percentage of grain size.

Bryant: Not an expert on the beach ecology issues but would be good to learn more about the angularity. Know it is a problem.

Bonnie: Would it be easy enough to provide the microscope images of angularity?

Tonia: Yes can provide the angularity information.

Jonna: Special Condition requires specifics regarding angularity and roundness.

Tonia: Also a SAP is required prior to all placed material.

Bonnie: Following resolution of other issues, then applicant can present final information to DMMT.