



**CSMW/Southern California – Dredge Material Management Team (SC-DMMT)
Joint Meeting Minutes
June 27, 2012
10:00 AM – 12:30 PM
District Conference Room
Los Angeles District Corps of Engineers
915 Wilshire Blvd.**

ACTION ITEMS:

- Sara Flores – to follow up with Clif Davenport on potential areas for aerial photographs.
- **John Dingler – provide dates for SF Coastline public meetings.**
- **Chris Potter** - Future agenda items/presentations for:
 - July meeting
 - **Revisit Crescent City RSM status; literature search and data collection efforts**
 - Curt Storlazzi – fine sediment in Santa Cruz Harbor
 - RBSPII discussion
 - Brad Damitz or Phil King - economic analysis of the Southern Monterey Bay study
- **Chris Potter**– Still need representation from
 - SWRWCB
 - Ocean Science Trust
- Chris Potter – follow up on Klamath Dam removal process monitoring
- **Susie Ming** – Upload links to CSMW from Jon Warrick
- **Susie Ming** – Add Eric W and Anne Sturm to beneficial use discussion on June 25th. - DONE
- **Chris Potter/John Dingler** - Suggestions for CSMW forum for Del Norte discussion with new executive director.
- **John Dingler** to find name/owner of that dredge.
- **Lesley Ewing** – send CALTRANS contact info to Jon Warrick for use in Tijuana Study
- Nate West – Conversion of USACE reference database for incorporation into CSMW’s searchable Access Database. ONGOING – draft webpage complete; completion expected in a few weeks.
- **Chris** – Follow-up with SWRCB regarding classification of clean sediments as pollutants in CA – ONGOING - Jon Bishop and Dominic Gregorio (new state water board ocean wetlands)
- **Susie Ming** to coordinate with Brenda Goeden and the DMMO for future combined meeting.
- **Brenda Goeden** – Review Redwood City case study.
- **Clif Davenport** – send contact info for local coastal permits (SD Co.) to Jon Warrick and Kristin Goodrich.



- **Chris Potter/Susie Ming/Heather Schlosser** – Will reconvene the PPR sub-committee to discuss the RSM Top Ten Recommendations.

COMPLETED ITEMS:

- **ALL** - Provide Jon Warrick comments on paper by COB Friday 25may12 .
- **ALL** – Provide to Sara Flores any areas for the potential pilot project areas for aerial photographs

❖ **Welcome and Introductions (Chris Potter, Susie Ming, and Dan Swenson)**

❖ **Presentation/Discussion: CSMW and CA Sediment Master Plan (Susie Ming)**

- Susie Ming gave an overview of the CSMW and CA Sediment Master Plan (CASMP)
 - The CASMP evolved from the CSMW
- Regional Sediment Management Plans (RSMPs) are a big undertaking
 - RSMPs have been completed for several regions and several more are underway and will be completed in the future

❖ **Presentation/Discussion: SC-DMMT (Dan Swenson)**

- SC-DMMT original goal was to coordinate disposal of dredged material
- Participants include Core Member Agencies including the Corps, CA Coastal Commission, as well as other Regulatory
- SC-DMMT Authority doesn't provide for decision-making
 - Agency Reps. can provide follow-up after meetings

Comment: There has been much comment about details of environmental resources at meetings, which concerns DFG

Response: The DMMT tries not to address both issues when the focus is on dredging

Comment: Attendance from environmental resource agencies is appreciated to cover details of env. issues

❖ **Presentation/Discussion: Contaminated Sediment Taskforce (CSTF) (Larry Smith)**

- Mission
 - Mission of task force is management of dredging and disposal of contaminated sediments in the Los Angeles region.
- Long-Term Management Strategy started in 2005
 - Contains several goals w/ much detail
 - MOU signed in 1999 to create structure of CSTF

Comment: Was task force meant to last in perpetuity?

Response: No, but no funding remains. Funding lasted for 5 years.

Comment: Funding accomplished the original goals of the Task Force as well as creating the Long-Term Management Strategy. Functioning well w/out funding remaining.

Comment: Much work is being done on contaminated sediments in Port of LA through the TMDL context.

Comment: The DBW could provide funding.

Comment: Was originally designed for LA Co.?

Response: Yes.

Comment: Is there a requirement to examine if a project contains beach quality sand?

Response: No.

Comment: Several communities have SCOUPs to get beach quality sand placed

Comment: What's required w/ regard to 401/404 applicants?

Response: Requirements could be placed in applications

Comment: Example is in Encinitas where the applicant paid for the testing/permit process and the City used sand mitigation fee funds to place sand on beach south of Ponto. Focus could be placed on Cities and Counties with sand. Identifying links between regional opportunistic sand programs and entities with sand could be done.

Comment: Checklist could be created for applicants.

Comment: Ocean Resources Protection Plan of ~10 years ago looked at this but it never went anywhere.

Comment: Applicants could look at this.

❖ **Presentation/Discussion: Tijuana Estuary and Fate Transport (Jon Warrick)**

- 34 M tonnes of fine sediment goes into CA coastal oceans every year
 - <0.5% of global total
- 38% of coastal CA is dammed, restricting up to 25% of sediment
- Tijuana Fate & Transport Project
 - Study done in Tijuana Estuary Reserve to monitor fine sediment nearshore dispersal
- Project Goals
 - Conduct beach nourishment w/ high fines content, monitor, then assess numerical modeling tools to predict fate of fine sediment
- Raw data is available to public
- 2008 Study contained 3 placements but 2 unsuccessful; 2009 placements successful
- Swash fine sediment concentrations measured
- Turbidity of coastal waters measured
- Results: Deltares numerical model of fine sediment dispersal
 - Results are depth-oriented

- Maximum fine sediment concentration measured
- Model results reflected field results relatively well, meaning that the model could be used for predicting future fine sediment dispersals
- Time of exceedence measured
- Likelihood for ecological impact also measured
- Based on 40,000 CY discharge
- Publications available online
- Next Steps
 - Techniques and model could be used at future sites

Comment: any idea of long-term fate of the fine sediment?

Response: About 10% was deposited in thin layer on inner shelf, not much clay however. Most was deposited within project site, but it couldn't be detected as same grain size as native. Some deposited in 8-10 m water depth, and was measurable.

Comment: Regulatory concerned with effects of sand, will this be looked at?

Response: Sand movement wasn't really monitored.

Comment: There have been some projects where sand was monitored in nearshore.

Comment: Another pilot study could be done for sand.

Comment: Fine sediment dispersal based on ocean load capacity as well.

Comment: A concern could be when large volumes of sediment are in the nearshore, complicating monitoring.

Comment: Curt Storlazzi's monitoring paper is posted on the CSMW's library as well.

Comment: A complication is habitat impact events where the species can withstand sediment for differing levels and time durations; difficult to ascertain through monitoring.

Comment: Can work be extrapolated for differing sites with different wave climates, etc.?

Response: Yes, but water oscillations and movement is relatively universal/constant. In 2008, winter wave pattern changes changed sediment movement.

❖ **Discussion: Beneficial Use Definition (Susie Ming)**

- Issue arised in an RSM effort at Imperial Beach where sand couldn't be placed in nearshore due to dredge limitations.
- Question that came up was how can we use definitions for beneficial use differently? Can we re-define closure depth?
 - EPA requests possibly a one-size-fits all rule
- Meeting of Technical Committee members was recently held to discuss way forward
 - ERDC is monitoring nearshore berms



- Beach profile change data is available up and down the CA coast
- Regulatory notes that fate of sand is important too (i.e. Tijuana Study didn't measure/monitor fate of sand, only fine sediment)

Comment: Is material always measured for suitability for beach placement?

Comment: EPA notes that definition of closure depth is important. Sediment size composition can determine whether it can be used beneficially.

Comment: Fine grained sediment can be used beneficially in many cases.

Comment: There are two items w/ regard to a subject placement activity, what's being placed (sediment grain size distribution and physical parameters) and what it's being placed for.

Comment: A literature search could be done as this isn't a new issue.

Comment: We're crossing a regulatory threshold from 404 to 103 in terms of purpose of placement.

Comment: There are cost implications of doing site designation, site monitoring, etc.

Comment: Would temporary borrow site placement be 404 or 103?

Response: Unsure and depends on the activity.

Comment: Regulatory recommends a letter be sent to Dave Castanon to answer question of 404 classification determinations.

Next Steps: White Paper and/or Proposal will be drafted by the CA Sediment Master Plan team. No timeline for next steps. Another discussion will also be held possibly with the Technical Committee and/or the CSMW.

❖ **Confirm date, location, and agenda for future meetings**

- Next meetings
 - July 25th in San Francisco
 - August 22nd Teleconference

Adjourn 12:30 PM

Next Meeting
July 25th
Lobby Conference Room
San Francisco Corps of Engineers Offices



CSMW/SC-DMMT ATTENDEES

Name	Organization	E-mail
Syd Brown	CA Parks and Rec	sbrow@parks.ca.gov
Mo Chang	USACE – SPL	Mohammed.N.Chang@usace.army.mil
Clif Davenport	CGS	Clif.Davenport@conservation.ca.gov
John Dingler	USACE – SF	John.R.Dingler@usace.army.mil
Susie Ming	USACE-SPL	Susan.M.Ming@usace.army.mil
Chris Potter	CA Resources	Chris.Potter@resources.ca.gov
Jon Warrick	USGS	JWarrick@usgs.gov
Dan Swenson	USACE – SPL	Daniel.P.Swenson@usace.army.mil
Larry Smith	USACE – SPL	Lawrence.j.smith@usace.army.mil
Heather Schlosser	USACE – SPL	Heather.r.schlosser@usace.army.mil
Steve Aceti	CalCoast	Steveaceti@calcoast.org
Jim Haussener	CMANC	Jim@cmanc.com
Michael Lyon		
Nate West	USACE – SPL	Nathaniel.R.West@usace.army.mil