

**MEETING NOTES**  
**CSTF – AQUATIC DISPOSAL SUBCOMMITTEE**  
**April 24, 2001, POLA**  
**10:00 – 12:00**

The following presents a summary of the meeting notes for the Aquatic Disposal Subcommittee meeting that occurred on April 24, 2001 at the Port of Los Angeles Meeting Hall. A list of the attendees is attached.

The primary topic of discussion at the meeting was to review comments from the California Coastal Commission (CCC) and Heal the Bay on the draft aquatic monitoring plan for the aquatic capping task for the LA River Estuary Pilot Dredging Project. Mark Delaplaine and Jack Gregg from the CCC attended the meeting via conference call.

The meeting commenced with Mark Delaplaine asking for an update on the project and the status of the monitoring plan as it relates to the May 9<sup>th</sup> CCC review meeting. Overall, the CCC has three main concerns:

- 1) The overall process and the fact that many details are still undefined. Mark mentioned that it might be possible for the Commission to conduct a phased review where the overall conceptual plan is brought before the Commission on the 9<sup>th</sup> for approval. Then, at the June meeting for the CCC, an administrative amendment would be presented containing additional details for tasks currently in progress. For this to happen, however, the Corps would need to agree to come back before the Commission with more detail to satisfy the current concerns.
- 2) The second, and most important item was the need for a commitment from the Corps to fund long-term monitoring. Mark clarified that this does not mean that the details of the monitoring plan would not need to be finalized, just the commitment that long term monitoring was funded.
- 3) The third item was the issue of barge dewatering during the cement stabilization pilot study.

The following is a series of comments and discussion that ensued following the above comments from the CCC:

Tom Wang – Using a phased review, can we meet a July 1 approval date?

Mark Delaplaine – CCC needs to hear from Heal the Bay before they could commit to any approvals. Procedurally, it could happen since the Commission is scheduled to meet again in mid-June and the topic could be included on the agenda.

Mitzy Taggart – Heal the Bay likes the idea of a phased review, but questioned if we could go back before the Commission with additional details during the June meeting.

Mark Delaplaine – Stated that we could do that if the Corps agrees.

Tom Wang – What is the timing for a June meeting and when would we need to notify the CCC?

Mark Delaplaine – Technically, they would need the information submitted by the 20<sup>th</sup> of May for the staff mailing; however, the topic could be added to the agenda at any time.

Tom Wang – What if there are more comments after the June meeting? How will they be resolved and still meet the schedule for a July 1 approval?

Mark Delaplaine – The Commission would just need to make a decision at the June meeting. They would assume that Heal the Bay and the CSTF would have voiced any concerns prior to that time. The dates for the June meeting will be the 12<sup>th</sup> through the 15<sup>th</sup>.

Mitzy Taggart – Stated that she does not agree with eliminating the public review process for the June CCC meeting via only an administrative review.

Tom Wang – Stated that this is a very different project because normally we would do all these steps in a linear fashion, but the schedule for this project is requiring that they be conducted simultaneously. Tom asked what else could be done to make everyone as comfortable as possible as we proceed.

Mitzy Taggart – Stated that the Corps could put all the details that have been discussed at the recent meetings in the EA.

Tom Wang – Stated that we do not have all the info ready yet (e.g., WES recovery modeling) and it will not be completed before the June 18<sup>th</sup> meeting.

Mark Delaplaine – Reiterated that the only major concern with the long term monitoring is the lack of a commitment from the Corps to fund it in the future.

It was then mentioned that a similar process occurred with EPA at the Palos Verdes capping project where they signed a commitment letter with the CCC to ensure that long term monitoring would occur.

Tom Wang – Asked if the Corps could see a copy of the letter that EPA signed to see if it contained acceptable language?

Tom Delaplaine – Stated that they would look for the letter, but the Corps may actually already be on the hook for long term monitoring through existing liability.

Mo Chang – Stated that he would talk to the Corps legal department to see what they could commit to due to the uncertain nature of their budgeting process.

Mark Delaplaine – Asked if the Corps is still considering dredging at the Marina Del Rey site for the cement stabilization pilot study. He asked because several individuals have voiced a concern about working during the least tern nesting season.

Tom Wang – Stated that the current plan is not to use the MDR site for the cement stabilization study.

### **Review of Heal the Bay Comments**

The group started by reviewing the list of items presented in Heal the Bay's comments that were lacking in the EA.

- Tom Wang stated that all items are either currently completed or would be by the June meeting except for the WES cap thickness model.
- Carl Stivers asked if it would be sufficient if Mike Palermo from WES wrote a memo about the project and its conservative assumptions related to the cap thickness?
- Mitzy Taggart stated that this would definitely help make the EA more complete.

The group then discussed the issue of equipment selection (comments 7 and 8).

- Tom Wang stated that the environmental impacts were a trade off between the clamshell and hydraulic dredges. One is better at the dredge site and one is better at the disposal site. If the cap source is far away, hydraulic is usually not an option because of the pipes.
- Mitzy Taggart stated that the EA suggests that the equipment was selected solely based on availability.
- Tom Wang stated that availability is only part of process and that there were other factors involved. The final EA will be clarified so as not to imply that it was only based on contractor availability.

The group then discussed the objectives of the monitoring plan.

- Mitzy Taggart stated that Heal the Bay felt it was important to define the questions and objectives of the monitoring plan to make sure that we are collecting all the needed information.

- The group started a discussion of the objectives and associated questions to be answered, but after a few minutes realized that this was too big of a task to complete within the remaining time for the meeting. It was decided that they should meet separately to finalize the list of objectives.
- Guangyu Wang asked the group why there were no objectives associated with biological impact.
- John Hanlon stated that it would be too difficult and costly to attempt to measure biological responses during this study. In addition, the lack of baseline information would make the data generated useless.
- The group decided that an objective could be added to the monitoring plan that states that we will evaluate biological impacts by reviewing the water quality data and not using actual biotic measurements.
- The group decided to have Carl Stivers, Mitzy Taggart, and Guangyu Wang prepare a draft of the objectives for all to review.
- A meeting date of May 2<sup>nd</sup> was set to get together and review the information.

### **Fish and Wildlife Report/Matrix**

John Hanlon handed out a matrix that had been prepared by one of his colleagues to summarize potential biological impacts associated with dredge activities. The information was originally developed for the POLB and POLA to show impacts to threatened and endangered species, but has since been revised to include other potential receptors. The group all agreed that the info could be useful as a reference for the EA and that it should be added as an appendix. John then asked the group to send him any comments that they might have.

### **New Business**

The next aquatic subcommittee meeting for the CSTF is scheduled for May 22<sup>nd</sup> at 1. This meeting will be later than usual because there is a management task meeting scheduled for 10-12 on that same day.