

**CSTF Aquatic Disposal Subcommittee**  
**Meeting Notes**  
**5-22-01**

A meeting was held on 5-22-01 from 1:30 to 3:30 PM at the POLA Port Plaza Room. A list of the meeting attendees is attached.

- 1) **Introductions** -The first item on the agenda was to introduce a few new participants to the Aquatic Subcommittee meeting (see attached list for complete attendance).
- 2) **Update on Pilot Projects** - Steve Cappellino from Anchor Environmental provided an update on the status of the pilot projects.

Aquatic Capping: The project recently received approval from the CCC to proceed. The monitoring plan is in its final phase and all CSTF member comments should be addressed by the end of next week. The Corps will have its first meeting with the dredging contractor on Thursday, May 24<sup>th</sup>, to begin discussing the details of the project and again on May 30<sup>th</sup> to review the project drawings. The current schedule is to initiate dredging in early July and be completed within 30-60 days, depending on the contractor's production rates. There will then need to be a minimum of a 30-45 day consolidation period before capping can occur. Funding for the capping portion of the project will most likely need to be carried over to the next fiscal year.

Cement Stabilization Bench-Scale Study: After some contracting delays, the project should get moving quickly. Sampling should occur within the next few weeks and the study should be initiated shortly thereafter.

Sediment Washing Bench-Scale Study: A literature review and draft work plans for the three test options selected during the scoping meeting that was held a few months ago should be ready for internal review sometime this week. The goal is to send out revised versions of these work plans to the Aquatic Subcommittee members for review on or before June 18<sup>th</sup> so that they can be discussed at the next CSTF meeting scheduled for June 26<sup>th</sup>.

Sediment Blending Bench-Scale Study: A literature review is in progress and a draft work plan will be prepared as soon as the literature review process is completed. This project is about 30 days behind the schedule for the sediment washing study so the CSTF should expect to see a copy of this info for review prior to the July meeting.

- 3) **Assessment to the Environmental Control Measures** – Michael Lyons and Steven Bay provided the group an update on the Water Board's goal to conduct a research project aimed at studying the relationship between suspended solids and contaminant releases associated with dredging. An initial study was conducted for the Corps by The Chambers Group to begin evaluating this relationship. Michael stated that the Water Board wanted to proceed with their plans to fund a follow-up study to evaluate the issue in more detail. Steven Bay is currently drafting an RFP that should be available in about a month for Phase I, which consists of a detailed literature search. Katherine Curtis with the POLA asked if the Chambers report was available for others to review. Jim Fields mentioned that the Corps felt that the report lacked sufficient detail to be released in its current form. Several folks from Anchor Environmental provided the Corps with detailed comments that have since been forwarded to Chambers so that the report can be revised. Steven Bay asked to see a copy of the comments provided by Anchor to help him complete his review of the report. Jim will contact Chambers to see if they can forward a copy to Steven Bay, as he no longer had a copy.
- 4) **Local Sponsorship/CSTF Support** – Jim Fields informed the group that because the pilot studies were being funded using federal maintenance money, any dredging that is conducted has a local sponsor for the project. Typically, the sponsor is the one who generates the material (in this case it is the City of Long Beach who owns the LARE); however, the Jim feels that a larger group within the

CSTF should also provide joint sponsorship. Jim mentioned that the City of Long Beach is not comfortable assuming full liability for a CSTF project. Katherine Curtis with the POLA asked if this same issue would also apply to the cement stabilization pilot study since it would also involve dredging using the same source of funding. Jim responded that it would also require a local sponsor. There was an obvious lack of agreement among the group regarding this issue and no resolutions were achieved. There were no representatives from the City of Long Beach present at the meeting and all agreed that they could not adequately discuss the issue without the City present. As such, the topic was tabled for a later meeting.

- 5) **Monitoring Plan Review** – Prior to reviewing the group’s comments on the current version of the monitoring plan, Carl Stivers of Anchor Environmental recapped the chronological history of the drafts for the monitoring plan. In summary, several iterations of the document occurred prior to its delivery to the CCC. Since receiving the consistency determination, the document has been updated to include more recent information on project background and some minor Corps revisions.. That document was then released to the group for review. Larry Smith of the Corps had some last minute edits, which were not incorporated in the previous version so he edited the document and re-released it to the group. At that time, there were requests to provide a redlined version of the document as well as a copy that compared the most recent version to past versions. Maile Gee then suggested that everyone receive a copy of the document that compared the current version to the April 17 version, which is the one that was reviewed by the CCC. None of the other CSTF members were interested in seeing another version of the document so all agreed to proceed with the comment review.

Jim Fields mentioned that CCC and Heal the Bay had asked for additional time to review the current version of the plan and that they would be providing comments later by May 30. The group then decided that they could provide final comments on the plan now and allow it to move forward from their standpoint.

Tom Johnson from the POLB voiced a concern that the most comments have been from Heal the Bay and since they were not present at the current meeting, he did not feel comfortable granting final approval to proceed until he heard their comments and how they were to be addressed. The group then decided that they would provide their final comments now and when the Corps receives comments from Heal the Bay and CCC they will forward them around to the group for review.

The following comments were then presented regarding the latest version of the aquatic capping monitoring plan.

Bill Paznokas (California Department of Fish and Game): Bill had two comments: 1) suggests that diver surveys to evaluate bioturbation of the cap be required, rather than say that it will be considered; and 2) add a baseline diver survey monitoring event. Carl Stivers of Anchor responded by stating that the current version of the document actually includes video taped diver surveys, but not baseline monitoring. Baseline monitoring was not included because there have been recent benthic surveys of the NEIBP and because the final elevation and substrate composition of the cap will be drastically different than what is currently present. Carl also mentioned that the Corps’ evaluation regarding the issue of bioturbation was recently discussed in a white paper prepared for the CSTF. Carl offered to send a copy of the white paper to Bill, who had not been aware of its existence.

Maile Gee (CCC): Commented that she was unclear about the issue of the accuracy of the DGPS that was modified by Larry Smith and that the final sample location should be recorded. Larry confirmed that the exact location would be recorded for each sample taken. The accuracy issue is only related to times when positioning at a targeted station. Maile also commented that she did not feel that the CCC could provide approval of the entire plan because of the uncertainty regarding the final scope for the long-term monitoring portion of the plan. The group then agreed that the document would be reviewed to make sure that it contained sufficient language to clearly state that the long-term portion of the plan was dependent on the results of the implementation monitoring and that the final scope of the long-term monitoring portion would be decided at the CSTF level.

Steven Bay (SCCWRP): Provided the following comments –

- a) Concerned who would be conducting the evaluation of the monitoring data and if the CSTF would be involved – Larry Smith stated that the contractor conducting the monitoring would also conduct the standard evaluations of the data. Steve Cappellino added that Anchor and Everest would also evaluate the data as it related to the feasibility report that they will prepare. Steve also added that other members of the CSTF will be free to conduct other data evaluations as they saw fit for their specific interests.
- b) There is a typo on Page 15 related to the expected dredge volume.
- c) Regarding the expected chemical concentrations for the three sites (NEIBP, SEIBP, and LARE), the data should be presented rather than just referencing the Chambers results report.. Also, should add a discussion about how to differentiate between chemical migration upward through the cap and recontamination of the cap from surface sources. – Carl Stivers mentioned that this would be accomplished with detailed sectioning and chemical analysis of the post construction cores.
- d) Clarify how the plan will quantify the mass of material lost during placement in the NEIBP. Can this be accomplished using the SPI cameras? What about sediment traps? – Larry Smith mentioned that the SPI cameras can provide quantifiable results and that the need for sediment traps will be determined after reviewing the results of the MDFATE model.
- e) Commented that PCB congeners instead of Aroclors should be measured to make the data more useful.
- f) Commented that he still did not feel comfortable about using a grab sampler to collect the surface sediment for chemistry analysis as opposed to using the upper layers of the core. The issue is that the core might not provide sufficient volume for the targeted analyses. Steven stated that he has experience with labs that can meet the detection limits with the volume obtained from the upper layer of the core. – It was agreed to revise the monitoring plan to indicate that once the laboratory was chosen and their sample volume requirements were known, the need for separate surface chemistry would be reevaluated. The plan will also state that, if at all possible, samples from the surface of the cores will be the preferred method.
- g) Questioned why the Corps had not considered sonar profiling to monitor placement accuracy and thickness of the cap. – Larry Smith commented that he had experience with this process at the Palos Verdes project using the same material as in the SEIBP and that it was not successful. They were not able to differentiate between the cap and the contaminated material.

Steve Johns of EPA indicated they had no further comments on the Monitoring Plan.

The need for immediate finalization of the plan was discussed to keep the project on schedule. It was agreed that no more comments would be taken on the plan other than from CCC and Heal the Bay. Once the new comments from CCC and Heal the Bay are reviewed by the other CSTF members (and assuming there are no disagreements) the construction and immediate post-construction portions of the plan would be considered final and the ACOE/CSTF could proceed with contracting for the field monitoring.

Regarding the cost sharing for the field monitoring, Jim Fields stated that the Corps is planning to pay for all of the monitoring that will occur at the disposal location and that the CSTF would be responsible for all monitoring conducted at the dredging locations. A discussion then ensued about whether the CSTF should use the same contractor as the Corps or conduct a separate solicitation. The group decided that both portions of the monitoring would be conducted by the Corps contractor and that Michael Lyons and Jim Fields would need to work out the details of payment to the contractor.

- 6) **Plan Next Meeting** – The next meeting for the Aquatic Disposal Subcommittee was scheduled for June 26<sup>th</sup> at the same location from 10-12.