

**CSTF AQUATIC DISPOSAL SUBCOMMITTEE  
MEETING NOTES  
6-26-01**

Location: Port of Los Angeles Conference Center

Attendees:

Ying Poon	Everest	562-435-9308	<a href="mailto:ying.poon@everestconsultants.com">ying.poon@everestconsultants.com</a>
Mo Chang	Corps	213-452-3405	<a href="mailto:mchang@spl.usace.army.mil">mchang@spl.usace.army.mil</a>
Steve Cappellino	Anchor	562-624-2810	<a href="mailto:scappellino@anchorenv.com">scappellino@anchorenv.com</a>
David Moore	MEC	760-931-8081	<a href="mailto:moore@mecanalytical.com">moore@mecanalytical.com</a>
Doug Diener	MEC	760-931-8081	<a href="mailto:diener@mecanalytical.com">diener@mecanalytical.com</a>
Tom Johnson	POLB	562-590-4160	<a href="mailto:tjohnson@polb.com">tjohnson@polb.com</a>
Kathy Anderson	Corps	213-452-3829	<a href="mailto:kanderson@spl.usace.army.mil">kanderson@spl.usace.army.mil</a>
Carl Stivers	Anchor	206-287-9130	<a href="mailto:cstivers@anchorenv.com">cstivers@anchorenv.com</a>
Katheryn Curtis	POLA	310-732-3681	<a href="mailto:kcurtis@portla.org">kcurtis@portla.org</a>
Mitzy Taggart	Heal the Bay	310-453-0395	<a href="mailto:mtaggart@healthebay.org">mtaggart@healthebay.org</a>
Jack Gregg	CCC	(via conference call)	

Mo Chang opened the meeting at 10:10 am by requesting introductions from all meeting attendees. Mo then proceeded to provide a brief update of each of the current studies for the LA River Estuary Pilot Program. The following is an overview of each update, provided initially by Mo, with additional details provided by Steve Cappellino and Carl Stivers of Anchor Environmental.

Cement Stabilization Pilot Study

Due to problems finding a contract vehicle for the bench scale study with Moffatt and Nichol and ECDC, the project has been significantly delayed and it does not appear that the pilot study can be conducted during the 2001 fiscal year, as originally planned. Originally, the Corps had intended to use an existing contract with Moffatt and Nichol through their planning department. The Corps contracting department, however, rejected that contract, and they were forced to find a new route. After several other attempts through different departments, the Corps decided to have the study funded through an existing contract with MEC. That process is almost complete, however, the delay has been substantial and the new estimated completion date for the bench scale testing is mid-November.

Because the budgets for 2002 and 2003 have already been submitted, the Corps will now be forced to try and secure funding from other projects. Mo stressed that the Corps is committed to completing this project and that they would pursue any and all means to secure the funding, but he could not guarantee where it would come from. Because the Corps had intended on completing both the bench scale and the pilot study this year, Mo stated that a work plan for the pilot study had been drafted by Everest and sent to the CSTF for review.

Ying Poon then provided an update on the draft cement stabilization pilot study work plan. Processing and disposal locations have been selected at the Port of Long Beach's

Pier 1/Pier T facilities. However, given the project delays, they are not sure if these sites will be available when the study is actually conducted. A question was asked about when the Corps would know about project funding availability for the study. Mo responded that he would not know until the end of this fiscal year (end of September).

Mitzy Taggart expressed her disappointment with the Corps' handling of this matter, stating that it appeared to her that they were not giving the cement stabilization project the same priority as with the capping project. Mo again stated the Corps commitment to completing the project and assured Mitzy that they will be working hard to identify funding for next year.

#### Sediment Washing:

Steve Cappellino provided an update on the sediment washing study. A draft work plan was sent to the CSTF members for review last week. A summary of the proposed study follows:

- A preliminary scoping meeting identified five possible procedures for removing chlorides from dredge material (dilution, gravity washing, cake washing, counter current extraction, and additives).
- Based on an exhaustive literature search by Trudy Olin at WES, two of the procedures (cake washing and gravity washing) were selected for bench-scale testing based on their probability for success. Details on why the others were not selected are provided in the work plan.
- Two variations of each method will be tested – one to simulate hydraulically dredged materials and one to simulate mechanically dredged materials. Other procedures, such as water delivery methods (e.g., downward flow vs. upwelling), will also be evaluated.
- In order to complete the project on schedule, WES will need to begin the study immediately. As such, **the Corps needs to receive any comments on the draft plan by the end of the day Friday (6-29)**. Those comments should be directed to either Jim Fields or Steve Cappellino.

#### Sediment Blending:

Steve Cappellino also provided an update on the sediment blending bench scale study. A work plan is in development and is lagging about one month behind the sediment washing study. As such, CSTF members should expect to see a draft work plan for that study about a week before the next meeting.

Steve shared with the group some of the information that had been located so far in the literature review. The biggest item is that no projects have been found where dredge materials were blended solely to enhance the engineering properties of the material. Most projects were conducted either to dilute contaminants or to create artificial topsoil (by blending in organic wastes). Conversations with construction firms revealed that fine-grained materials are not typically blended prior to use. Rather, the material is layered between sand to create a suitable base. The costs to re-handle the material are usually too high compared to layering.

Aquatic Capping Monitoring Study:

Carl Stivers provided an update on the monitoring program and some technical issues that have arisen. MEC has been selected to conduct the field work and they are currently negotiating a contract with the Corps. As part of that process, a detailed field work plan was prepared, which revealed some technical issues. They are as follows along with the Corps proposed resolution for each:

- 1) Number of total and dissolved water column samples – a mistake was made during counting of the number of analyses for the cost estimate in that the number of water samples was not doubled to account for both total and dissolved samples for chemical analysis. As a result, the analytical costs are twice as high as previously estimated for the water samples. To bring the costs more in line with available budget, the Corps is proposing that the monitoring focus on dissolved samples, but also collect total recoverable samples during half of the monitoring events so that the relationship between the two can still be evaluated.
- 2) PCB congeners vs. Arochlor analyses – It was agreed that the Corps would run full congener analyses for PCBs without realizing that the cost was more than 10 times as high. Because the baseline evaluation for the LARE only included Arochlor analyses and congener results are not critical to fulfilling any objectives of the plan, it was proposed that this be changed back to Arochlor.
- 3) One week turn-around-time for chemical analyses – This was placed in the work plan when the goals of the monitoring included compliance with local water quality standards. Rapid return of the chemical analyses was needed to make adjustments in the field. Now that compliance is not an issue, the Corps is proposing that a less expensive standard turn-around-time be used.
- 4) Timed sampling after barge dumping – There may be logistical difficulties capturing both the 10 and 30 minute sampling events, even with two sample vessels. MEC feels that they can meet the work plan specifications, but that assumes that everything goes perfectly while in the field. If difficulties arise, the second sampling event may need to be delayed to the two times alternated for each event. In other words, sample the 10 minute event during one barge dump and the 30 minute event during the next barge dump. This is consistent with the original intent of the plan, which originally proposed alternating events except in the very latest draft.
- 5) TBT analyses in water – Carl stated that this was a typo and should not have been included in the study. Because it is also very expensive, the Corps is proposing to remove TBT analyses from the target analyte list.
- 6) Sediment Profile Cameras – Because it will not result in additional costs, the SPI contractor will be able to add an additional sample station to the transects around the NEIBP. A station will be added at 500 meters.
- 7) Filtering water samples within 30 minutes of sample collection – MEC may not be able to accomplish this and meet the 10 and 30 minute sample intervals (see #4 above). As a result, they may need to collect the samples and filter them later while back on shore. In all cases, this would be completed within a few hours.

The following questions were then addressed:

Jack Gregg:

- How many total and dissolved samples would there be with the proposed changes? Carl Stivers responded that, at a minimum, at the dredging site there would be 24 dissolved and 10-12 total (assuming 4 weeks of monitoring).
- What type of PCB analyses was conducted during the baseline sampling of the LARE? Answer was Aroclors.

Mitzy Taggart:

- Concerned that we may be looking at a 4 week dredging event because Heal the Bay was hoping to have more data than what would be generated by the minimum event time (they assumed closer to 8 weeks based on previous discussions). Mitzy asked about the possibility of adding additional events if the dredging lasts only 4 weeks. Mo stated that he would not know the final schedule until after the contract was negotiated. Because the next meeting would not occur until just before dredging is set to commence, the group agreed to hold a conference call to discuss the schedule with Heal the Bay and others to decide if additional sampling events are warranted.
- Wanted to know what the status was of the models? Carl stated that they were presented in the dredge design report that is currently in internal review at the Corps. Mo stated that he could forward the section discussing the models to the group to give them some info ahead of time. Carl agreed to send out the e-mail with "draft" marked on the file.

Next meeting was scheduled for July 24<sup>th</sup>, 10-12 at the same POLA meeting location.