

SC-DMMT meeting notes (April 2, 2008)

Group management and procedural issues:

Clarification of role and process: Environmental coordinator (EC) – coordinates projects coming out of Planning – Larry Smith will be POC for incoming Civil Works, and O & M projects

Ports have not been contacted yet

- Spencer MacNeil – deals with POLA

Concerns about process – potential extra role and burden on the current Corps regulatory staff – including oversight and coordination of projects that are handled by other regulatory staff (i.e., additional coordination role by Dan Swenson and Ken Wong); with focus on smaller projects - discussion – regulatory staff would continue to handle projects as they normally do; the idea is to ensure that applicants know who to distribute documents to (i.e., Corps, EPA, RB in most cases); we can exercise flexibility in how we set up the SC-DMMT; depending on the timing, scale of the project, and potential for problems or controversy, project review could occur as normally done (ad hoc) or can be discussed at one of the scheduled SC-DMMT meetings

Concern about funneling all projects through this interagency group – “bottleneck” effect

- comment by Mo Chang; short discussion – we can be flexible in how we review projects; for Civil Works projects with short-notice funding, we can review outside of the regular SC-DMMT meeting cycle, as needed; SAPs can be developed and reviewed ahead of time so the sampling and analysis can occur as soon as the funding appears

Add complexity to the process that did not exist before – consultation by FWS and other advisory agencies – misunderstanding that this group would force consultations that did not occur before; we just want to make sure that notices and other info for projects are distributed properly to all of the agencies – they can choose to review or not, as things are normally done at present

Questions and concerns about distribution of documents – should not a burden on Corps POCs, but instead applicants’ responsibility to distribute to appropriate agencies (i.e., Corps, EPA, and RB in many cases; CCC on big Civil Works projects) – not the responsibility of the Corps POCs

Documentation of meeting – currently EPA will handle meeting minutes

REVIEW OF PROJECTS ON AGENDA:

Lido Yacht Anchorage – discussion of SAR

- Newport Harbor
- SAP reviewed and approved
- Composite 3 going to upland

- Cores adjacent to Comp 3 were tested individually – upper and lower
- discussion with Josh B. – need for higher resolution stratified testing
- need to check PRG value (something to add to SAP/SAR template)
- further discussion needed (Allan needs to alert Brian while I am out on ocean surveys)

#### Port Hueneme – informational presentation

- Navy and Port – joint document submitted to CCC – proposed CAD within harbor
- Contaminated sediments from Navy and Port portions of harbor; hotspot near entrance
- Excavate pit in central part of harbor – pumped to beach – down to -70 feet – Navy and Port action; as well as placement of contaminated sediments into pit from hotspots
- Clean sediments from Federal Channel will be used as cap
- Cap expected to be at least 10 feet (allowance for additional 5 feet of deepening)
- Navy has prepared CD for CCC
- Navy may have prepared an EA
- Vertical stratified sampling and analysis of hotspots – test results may be available soon
- Supplemental EA to be prepared by Corps, as well as CD for CCC (May hearing)

#### Surfside-Sunset (Anaheim Bay - Huntington Harbor)

- shore protection project
- serves the Naval weapons facility
- sediment testing – grain size and chemistry only, based on previous history
- none of the sediment is beach-compatible with the proposed receiving beach
- no bioassay for this current episode
- no upland sites available for these sediments
- 750,000 cy estimated volume; but funding will not allow dredging of all of this project area (expected to be about 1/3 of this volume)
- 1998 last dredging episode (about 150,000 cy); inner channel sediments went to LA-2; question of whether bioassay was conducted
- no past bioassay data?
- individual core – geotechnical data to determine percentages of sand
- need to find documentation for the 50% threshold for beach nourishment
- Corps questions how the sand percentages were calculated, based on the geotechnical data
- Approach channel sediments – expected to be sandy
- Offshore borrow pits – cannot be used unless designated
- Need to review geotechnical data to identify sand in project that can be used for beach nourishment
- Need to perform bioassays for any material that needs to go to LA-2

#### San Diego Bay / Navy – main channel dredging for carriers

- review of overall project by Larry
- review of proposed sampling map