

CSTF Implementation Committee Summary

5/5/04

Note that text in [brackets] was added after the meeting either where the notetaker is paraphrasing the speaker or where additional information seemed necessary for clarification of the statement.

COE	Josh Burnam	LB	Dennis Eschen
RB	Michael Lyons	ANCHOR	Steve Cappellino
CCC	Jack Gregg	EVEREST	Ying Poon
LA County	Lauri Ames	EPA	Steve John
POLB	Tom Johnson	POLA	Kathryn Curtis
COE	Kathy Anderson	POLA	Paul Johansen
COE	Jim Fields	POLA	Ralph Appy

Jack – It appears that statements made at the CSTF Management Committee meeting regarding the relationship of the CAD and TSR sites are contentious and many CSTF participants are beginning to retreat into their own corners. I propose we go around the table and share the views of the participants so that we can plan for the next round of facilitated discussions.

Kathryn

TSR site –

- Clarify: Is it regional? – (versus MDR or City of LB only?)

Ralph – likelihood of POLA using a CAD is low.

- (1) Is CAD even acceptable? Not needed by ports.
- (2) Cost effective Beneficial Reuse options are needed.
 - most BRs can be eliminated based on cost

Josh – HTB says CAD can go forward, if BR is going forward

- HTB okay if CAD is the last option of a 404 evaluation
 - Even if HTB does oppose – the Corp will still go ahead with a CAD if the science supports it.
- Larger obstacle is who and how to run a CAD site

Ralph – we originally started this process to get a workable solution and to remove the opposition at the CCC level

- POLA does not like that the likely location of a TSR is Wilmington.
- Why not looking for regional site in Santa Monica or Ballona.
- POLA is developing or working on draft on Environment Justice Policy in relation to all its projects in the Wilmington area.

Kathy – DMMP will be looking at TSR alternative sites at F3 stage.

Josh – TSR is a good concept.

- We are not trying to put this on the POLA alone.
- It seemed that Anchorage Road could work.
- It looked like sediments at Anchorage Road not being turned over (not reused).
- Seemed logistically like the best site.

Paul – other logistics like trucks, air quality, etc. need to be considered in siting a TSR

Steve J – we will look at one or more sites.

- Better to have more than one TSR facility anyway.
- EPA we are not focused on one site

Kathryn – has Corp identified any particular site?

Paul – need alternative evaluation with the criterion (what is a good TSR, what transport issues, etc.)

Steven J. – good

- May be different solutions (sites) for different agencies.

Ralph – any chance for Ballona as a TSR site [No] [the inferred problem is bringing contaminated sediments from the upper middle class neighborhoods to the lower middleclass/"industrial" neighborhoods]

Kathy – we are considering the use of a parking lot [near Ballona or Marina del Rey] for temporary storage or treatment of contaminated sediments

Josh – POLA has said they have 1.8 m cy of material that needs to be dredged and they cannot say at this time where that material is going to be used or disposed – how is POLA going to deal with it?

Kathryn – we are looking at reconfiguring Anchorage Road.

Josh – ideally each entity has its own TSR site.

[an example] we would like a setup where MDR could send 200,00 cy of contaminated sediments for burial in a POLA if capacity was available, [but we would not require POLA to take it, if it was a problem for the port].

Steven J. – the purpose of the Decision Tree is to document how the regulatory agencies make decisions.

Ralph – the Advisory Committee is the big success of the CSTF, [no one can take that away from us]

We are concerned about Mission Creep – it seems like Mission Creep is taking us beyond the scope of the CSTF (to clean sediments, etc.)

Jack – What do the ports want?

- Assurance of project progress
- Assurance of no HTB denial
- [How about assurance of balanced hearing in front of the CCC]
- I think that the commitment to semiannual planning meetings (to see where capacity can be utilized) by the Advisory committee is another big success of the CSTF.

Dennis – I do not believe that managing a potential CAD is a big problem..

- The City of LB would expect to use a majority of the CAD capacity.
- The City would need to revisit their offer to manage the CAD site as that decision had been made by a former City Manager and it has not been raised with the current City Manager.
- The City's concern is the linking of the CAD to TSR in the case that a regional TSR is not available when they need to dredge.

Josh - HTB has philosophical position that TSR must be developed in order to go along with a CAD.

Jack – We need some written strategy [that shows how we plan to] develop both the options - TSR and CAD

- [We need the written strategy since] we all want assurances .

Michael – Need to lay out a timeline for TSR development.

- You are never going to get approval to use the CAD unless you can show TSR will be coming on line [in a reasonable time].

Josh– We want regional long range planning – we will not make you do something that is not feasible.

Ralph – We will deal with our excess dredged material somewhere, perhaps at Anchorage Road.

Steven J. – We are offering flexibility on a regional basis for all parties.

Michael – I can understand the Ports frustration. They want to know the specifics for the TSR [design and management before they can determine their position on it]

Kathryn – We need to know the acreage required, etc.

Josh – Pilot project – needs \$ to get going so it can answer questions about TSR costs – then each dredging entity can determine for themselves what a TSR would cost. Maybe more than one pilot is required.

Ralph – The Advisory Committee should be the place to sort out when more capacity is needed.

Josh – My fear for the Advisory Committee is it will go – nothing new; nothing new; nothing new; then catastrophe.

Kathryn - We are looking at reconfiguring Anchorage Road and design of other potential port fill projects.
- We do not expect to go into catastrophe mode.

Josh – as a constructive solution [suggestion]
- Could POLA install a hydro-cyclone [for separating and reusing coarse grained materials from dredged materials] at Anchorage Road to help convince the public that ports are serious about Beneficial Reuse; and as a pilot demonstration.

Kathryn – We are considering testing and reusing clean materials at Anchorage Road to create a higher berm and increase capacity.

Tom -
- I am uncomfortable that the CSTF is expecting the ports to provide land for a regional facility.
- [Contrary to statements at the CSTF Management Committee, the POLB does not just consider building a TSR site] a cost of doing business.
- Are we solving other people's problems?

- My management will have a problem with going upland if it is not consistent with POLB plan.
- No guarantee that we will get permits for these proposed projects where we expect to have fill capacity.
- We are still scrambling to find temporary upland sites for current projects [POLB is already going to upland rehandling in temporary locations, but has not identified a fixed location]..
- We cannot say we will step up and provide land for a TSR.
- Want to see long term projections of how much contaminated sediment will come from outside sources

Jack – You (POLB) should not have to do that planning alone. That is why we need a facilitated discussion with everyone bringing their issues to the table [so that we can find a fair sharing of the burden]

Michael – The ports have more options for reuse (fill projects) now than the City and County. That situation may change over time.

Dennis – You cannot link the use of CAD by the City of Long Beach to creation and use of a TSR, if the City cannot set up TSR on its own. [Note Dennis later provided this information on the reasons for this statement, see below]

- We object to linkage of CAD and TSR sites
- We propose that instead of linking use of the CAD site to development of a TSR site, that we link use of the CAD site to [enhanced] source control.

Dennis (later support for above statements):

Why I don't believe there is a feasible TSR site in Long Beach:

I do not believe there is a possible TSR site in the City of Long Beach outside of the Port of Long Beach because there is not water accessible industrial land in the City. In the DMMP we did identify a site about 4 miles inland adjoining the LA River at Compton Creek, where material could be pumped, but that site was sold to development. Except for the that location on the west bank there is only a narrow sliver of land between the River and the 710 Freeway. It is enough for a pipeline, but with the 710 being studied for expansion, even that land may disappear. The exception is north of the Compton Creek site, the Southern California Edison ROW, which might be an opportunity, but SCE is seeking approval for uses that would maximize their return on the land. With high freeway visibility, an ugly industrial process is never going to be approved.

The east bank of the River is almost all residential. There is one exception near downtown. I am trying to buy the undeveloped and underdeveloped portions of that for wildlife restoration projects, and I am currently competing with a housing developer at a price of \$12 per square foot.

Except for the developed tourist area downtown, the impact of shoaling on that tourism being the primary reason we are concerned about dredging in the first place, the rest of the ocean front is public beach backed by residences. Through the jetty the inland water area of Alamitos Bay is accessible. That is completely surrounded by residential except for our small boat marina. An interim TSR could possibly be set up in a parking lot there in the winter, but the parking is needed May through October. The "oil fields" area Jim Fields referred to is accessible by a pipeline up the San Gabriel River. However, that is actively being pursued by the State Resources Agency as a wetland restoration/wildlife protection area as part of the Bolsa Chica - Anaheim Bay - Los Cerritos wetland complex.

There is also an industrial complex on the SG River adjoining that, but it contains two power plans (on owned Los Angeles Department of Water and Power and the other private) they may or may not have space available for this type of use. (A proposal to demolish unused storage tanks for a Home Depot on the site is receiving huge political opposition). Further up river is all residential or the City's El Dorado Regional Park.]

Michael – We probably cannot give you credit for source control (it's already required).

Dennis – What if we take the incremental cost of TSR over CAD {and apply that money to additional source control efforts?}

- also City of Long Beach will [contribute to the solution by reusing clean sand from other CSTF participants]

Ralph – part of the problem is our fault.

- we do need to show how we will deal with the 1.8m cy
- [Maybe?] we can provide a plan showing how the Anchorage Road site will be used
- [We are really concerned about community opposition to projects near Anchorage Road and have had to deal with community concern by evaluating the effects of our projects through additional environmental sampling].

Steven J. – if we had the info about how you will use your capacity, it would help us in the long range planning

- As we get closer to the project implementation, the financial projections become more certain
- [Nevertheless we can all be more assured of the outcome now], if the ports can be more forthcoming.

Ralph – Politics (e.g. LA mayor) can quickly change the available solutions for the CSTF.

Paul – [

We need to lay out the [best available current?] plan [for reuse or disposal of dredged materials]

[But we also need to see] the regulatory commitments.

Steven J. – We are looking at something more robust than one TSR site.

Ralph – We need a good objective solution that is based on a good analysis that looked at all the possible solutions [because several environmental groups are very concerned about every proposed project that might impact the neighborhoods surrounding the Port].

Steven J. – [We need to carefully evaluate the potential environmental impacts of any proposed TSR site]

Josh - Mark Gold at HTB – still seems to believe that CSTF can be successful.

- there 2 differing philosophical points of view by the environmental groups–Some groups are opposed to development fill due to AQ issues; HTB prefers to keep the fill out of the Bay.
- need to continue to document the basis for our decisions.

Jim – we are looking at a lot of sites for TSR pilot: Seal Beach NWS, Energy islands, Alamitos Bay.

Jack - What issues should be discussed at the next CSTF Management Committee meeting?

Jim– I would like to hear any other alternatives for handling of contaminated sediments

Unknown speaker- How do you make decision about siting a TSR

- Come up with criteria for siting a TSR
- Come up with a list of sites to be evaluated against the criteria.

Steve Cappellino – Consider that the TSR facility could be mobile (i.e. on a barge)

- the hardest part of the planning is where to put the TSR, so perhaps a mobile TSR would solve that question.

For next Meeting (5/25)

POLA – Present port plan for Anchorage Road (possibly)

Issue paper on constraints related to a TSR site near the neighborhoods surrounding the ports (possibly)

All – Review the Decision Tree.

Lauri – Potential temporary TSR locations identified by LA Co.