

**Final Notes for Wednesday October 26, 2016**

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

US Army Corps of Engineers - Los Angeles District

**Announcements: 10:00 – 10:05**

Announcements. Update the pilot DMMT Tracking Sheet. Proposed out of cycle meeting to cover the November and December meetings. The proposed meeting is to be held on December 7<sup>th</sup> at 10:00 AM.

**Attendees:**

Melissa Scianni (USEPA)

Jessica Vargas (Corps)

James Vernon (POLB)

Shelly Anghera (Anchor QEA)

Erin Jones (Corps)

Tonia McMahon (Moffatt & Nichol)

Conor Ofsthun (Moffatt & Nichol)

†Michael Lyons (RWQCB-LA)

†Carol Roberts (USFWS)

†Allan Monji (RWQCB-SD)

†Chris Osuch (Anchor QEA)

†Larry Smith (Corps)

†Larry Simon (CCC)

†Ken Kronschnabl (Kinnetic Laboratories)

†Participating by telephone.

**Project #1: 10:05 – 10:30**

- 1) Project name: Port of Long Beach Proposed Outer Harbor CAD Site Feasibility Study
- 2) Applicant NAME & Applicant affiliation: Port of Long Beach
- 3) Project type (Regulatory/Navigation): Regulatory
- 4) Corps Project Manager name: Lisa Mangione
- 5) Meeting type (DMMT/CSTF): CSTF
- 6) Purpose/topic (e.g., SAP, SAPR and/or suitability determination): Feasibility Study Presentation
- 7) Presentation? (y/n): Y
- 8) Documents provided (emailed or a link): To be provided by Oct. 19<sup>th</sup>.
- 9) Time needed (15, 30, 45 min?): 30 min

Notes: James and Shelly presented the PowerPoint. The following questions, answers, and discussions occurred:

Larry Simone – CCC

- \* Where did the Port's future sediment management volume number come from? James gave a description of the type of capital and maintenance programs that are being evaluated at the Port.
- \* Will the Port need a master plan amendment for this project? James agreed that use of a CAD would require either an amendment to the PMP or it would be part of an upcoming PMP update. Timing of projects would likely determine the approach.
- \* How long will it take to fill the cells? James commented that it would be dependent on the size of the projects that would use the facility. Several very large projects are currently being evaluated.
- \* How long could the interim caps be in place before another event occurred? Could it be as long as 2-3 years between events? James said it could be an extended period of time.
- \* Were potential impacts associated with seismic events considered during the FS technical evaluations? This feasibility evaluation did not discuss seismic events, but the long term monitoring program (to be described in the future Operation Maintenance and Management Plan, OMMP) will likely include a survey to be conducted after the earthquake to examine fissures in the cap, similar to approach applied for the Hueneme CAD.

Michael Lyons – LARWQCB

- \* Remembered that during the NEIBP development program the Corps looked at potential for scour associated with wind/storm driven events – was that evaluated for this project? Shelly discussed the use of the WRAP model that has been calibrated for the Port and the data do not suggest there is potential for a storm related current. James added, due to the site location in the center of the Middle Breakwater, over a nautical mile from either Queen's or Angel's Gate, storm generated wave action is expected to be minimal.
- \* What if the cap fails? Will it be replaced? The O&M Plan will include cap performance monitoring and recommended cap improvement methods is needed.
- \* Is 1 meter thick enough for the cap? Is it possible that prop wash scour and anchor scour could present cumulative impacts that could result in greater than 1 meter of disturbance? If not an issue make sure to discuss in report. Shelly discussed the consideration of scars from anchors and prop wash. The literature and the frequent transiting of ships crossing the area would disturb sediments but they would settle back into the space that was disturbed. Their effects are not necessarily additive. Bathymetric surveys can be used to examine scour to confirm depressions are not left for extended periods of time. This discussion will be brought out of the appendix and into the main body of the feasibility study for clarity.
- \* When will the OMMP be developed and can you make sure it covers these types of issues? The next phase of effort on this project is to develop the OMMP and provide this type of detail.
- \* Is a 1-foot interim cap protective enough given the prop wash and anchor scour that may occur? The interim caps would be placed at depths deeper than the final elevation that was

evaluated, therefore, the prop wash will penetrate less. James evaluated the size of ships and anchors that were included in the feasibility and they are larger than those that are currently used or transit this part of the harbor. It was acknowledged that anchor scour may be an issue and we can look into including a thicker cap in the anchor placement zone.

Carol Roberts - USFWS

\* Will the potential San Pedro Bay Restoration Project impact this site? James described the section of breakwater being evaluated is the Long Beach Breakwater to the east of the Middle Breakwater near the site. It is not believed the restoration project would have any impact on the OHSPER.

\* For the chemical containment evaluation, the potential for chemicals to migrate through the cap into the surface. The surface was defined as the top 15 cm of the bioturbation zone. Why is the bioturbation zone limited to the top 15 cm? What about ghost shrimp? Shelly acknowledged that to establish cap thickness due to burrowers, the penetration is described in the report as being as deep as 0.9 m. However this is rare in the deeper outer harbor areas. For the chemical containment modeling, the goal was to evaluate the potential flux of contaminants from the capped sediments, through the cap into the “bioturbation zone”. This zone is expected to be highly mixed and homogenous because of the abundance of organisms at this depth that penetrate the top 10 cm of sediment. This particular evaluation was to estimate the total contribution to that surface layer using a very conservative steady state model. It did not analyze impact of deep ghost shrimp burrows which are expected to be rare.

Melissa – EPA

\* The modeling assumes specific sediment concentrations, what is the process if future sediments are higher than those that were modeled? The OMMP will define the process for approval for each project placed at OHSPER (it was briefly summarized in the presentation). Each project would be brought forward to the CSTF. If a project has higher chemical concentrations than were evaluated, additional modeling can be performed. It should be noted that hazardous material is not proposed for placement at the OHSPER site.

\* What are the next steps? Develop the OMMP, start the permitting process and PMP update or amendment.

Larry Smith – USACE

\* Clarified for the group that the deep draft standby area being evaluated to the east of the OHSPER is not a true anchorage area – just a holding area.

## **Project #2: 10:30 – 11:15**

- 1) Project name: Santa Ana River Marsh, Newport Beach, CA
- 2) Applicant NAME & Applicant affiliation: Corps, Erin Jones, Project Biologist
- 3) Project type (Regulatory/Navigation): Restoration (Corps Planning Division)
- 4) Corps Project Manager name: Erin Jones, Biologist; Damien Lariviere, PM
- 5) Meeting type (DMMT/CSTF): DMMT

- 6) Purpose/topic (e.g., SAP, SAPR and/or suitability determination): Draft SAP
- 7) Presentation? (y/n): Y
- 8) Documents provided (emailed or a link): To be provided by COB 10/21
- 9) Time needed (15, 30, 45 min?): 45 min

Notes:

- 1) EPA confirmed overdepth characterization at 1 foot overdepth
- 2) DMMT requested that we split project area into 2 sub-areas based on design depths, as opposed to 3 current designations of Areas A, B, and C
- 3) DMMT requested a figure showing both borings and bathymetry, and will comment on/approve boring locations based on this re-submitted map
- 4) DMMT requested that legends of figures be changed to identify "sub-areas" as opposed to current "composite areas" - "composite areas" was found to be mid-leading as we proposed only 1 chemistry composite
- 5) Discussion on composites for chemistry based on grain size - final decision is to make a determination in the field on adding a 2nd composite if visual inspections of borings find a significant layer of fines
- 6) it is assumed that volume of archived material would be sufficient to do bioassay testing if necessary
- 7) SC-DMMT requested full report from 2012 as an appendix. The Draft SAP only had grain size, the SC-DMMT also wanted to see sediment chemistry.
- 8) schedule for agency coordination and SEA will be revisited at the early Dec DMMT.
- 9) The DMMT members indicated they would be willing to review the draft SAPR out of standard meeting cycle.

**Project #3: 11:15– 11:30**

- 1) Project name: Port Hueneme Deepening SAP
- 2) Applicant NAME & Applicant affiliation: Civil Works
- 3) Project type (Regulatory/Navigation): Navigation
- 4) Corps Project Manager name: Joseph Johnson
- 5) Meeting type (DMMT/CSTF): SC-DMMT
- 6) Purpose/topic (e.g., SAP, SAPR and/or suitability determination): SAP approval
- 7) Presentation? (y/n): No
- 8) Documents provided (emailed or a link): To be provided
- 9) Time needed (15, 30, 45 min?): 15 minutes

Notes: The revised graphics were included in the SAP. The new graphics were acceptable to USEPA and that RWQCB concerns regarding potential hot spots left over from cleanup dredging were resolved in separate telephone conversations held prior to the monthly meeting, The SAP was approved by USEPA, CCC, and LA RWQCB.

- Agenda POC: Jessica Vargas
- SC-DMMT materials are available at:  
<http://www.spl.usace.army.mil/Missions/Regulatory/ProjectsPrograms.aspx>.
- Please arrive no more than 10 minutes prior to your scheduled meeting start time.
- Check in with our security office on the 11th floor.