



**IMPLEMENTATION COMMITTEE MEETING**  
**June 6, 2002**  
**10:00 AM TO 12:00 PM**  
**LOS ANGELES REGIONAL WATER QUALITY BOARD**  
**320 W. 4<sup>th</sup> Street LOS ANGELES**

**ATTENDEES:**

Steven John (EPA), Dennis Eschen (City of Long Beach), Ralph Appy (Port of Los Angeles), Jessica Morton (California Coastal Commission), Michael Lyons (Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board).

**ADVISORY COMMITTEE GUIDELINES**

Some revisions to the CSTF Advisory Committee guidelines have been made following the last meetings regarding the Port of Los Angeles Channel Deepening. Signatures of all participating agencies will be requested to indicate that they agree to the Guidelines. The changes will be circulated to all members and a final approval sought for the July Management meeting.

**MASTER DREDGING PERMIT APPLICATION**

The Master Dredging Permit Application has been approved for use by the Regional Water Quality Board and the Corps Regulatory (although the Corps Planning Department has not yet determined whether they will use the form for their applications). It will be used on a trial basis by the Port of Los Angeles on an upcoming project (not yet identified).

**NORTH ENERGY ISLAND BURROW PIT (NEIBP) MANAGEMENT**

The focus of this Implementation Committee meeting was to initiate discussions on the management, operation, and other issues of the NEIBP, where the CSTF/Corps pilot project confined aquatic disposal (CAD) site is currently located. This pilot site will be monitored for the next two years, after which a decision will be made as to its viability for becoming a permanent CAD site for future disposal of contaminated sediments in the Los Angeles area. Should it be decided that the site is an acceptable disposal site, many decisions regarding the site will need to be made. The following discussion assumes that the site is found to be an acceptable disposal site, although the participants recognize that this is not the current status of the site.

The NEIBP is state property entrusted to the City of Long Beach. The city attorney has opined (uncontested) that it is City property, with the City maintaining rights over the

site. The City estimates it will have a need for disposal options for Los Angeles River sediments (there is currently 4-5 million cubic yards that will need to be dredged in the near future), and plans on considering the NEIBP to fill that need.

The site is also under consideration for use as a multi-user disposal site for the region, but many questions remain regarding how the site should be managed. The following is a list of questions that came out of discussions at the meeting:

**What status should the site have?**

(e.g. 'Designated disposal site'; 'Approved disposal site'; 'Identified disposal site')  
The site can be officially designated a disposal site through the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers authority, with the appropriate studies. The site does not have to be designated as such to be used for disposal, however such a designation/approval/identification may reduce the amount of work necessary to gain approval for its use each time material is placed in it.

**Who will use the site?**

The City of Long Beach has expressed an interest in using the site, as has the Corps, in particular for Ballona Creek sediments, however the Ports of Long Beach and Los Angeles, and Los Angeles County Dept. of Beaches and Harbors have not weighed in on whether they would like to retain the possibility of using the site.

**How will the site be used?**

Once the interested parties are identified, an agreement will need to be reached as to what share of the site may be used by each party. This leads to a number of other questions, such as:

Will there be a tipping fee system?

Will the site be divided into allotments per party? On a percentage basis?

Should the site be allotted not on a party specific basis but on percentages of dredged materials produced by site?

**Who will manage the site?**

This responsibility can be broken down into three main areas:

Operation – Who controls the use of the site, including dredging operations, permitting for use, long term planning, etc.

Maintenance – Who will monitor the site; make necessary cap repairs, alterations, etc.

Liability – Who will be responsible if a problem comes up.

The management of the site does not necessarily have to be undertaken by the owner (City of Long Beach), and these responsibilities could be shared.

**What type of material will be placed in the site?**

The upper and lower thresholds of acceptable material need to be defined. It was generally agreed that only contaminated sediments should be placed in the NEIBP, but

the type and degree of threshold levels need to be defined. (Should they be numeric? Is anything unsuitable for ocean disposal but not actually hazardous waste acceptable?) Also, a question was raised as to whether the site should receive materials from restoration projects (such as material from Ballona Wetlands).

**What type of capping is appropriate?**

How the site is managed should address the type of cap material and the cap design (both physical and temporal). Source material for the cap could be taken from a nearby clean pit, such as the South Energy Island Burrow Pit (SEIBP), or could be 'material of opportunity'. The thickness of the cap will need to be determined, as will the time of placement of the cap. Should there be a temporary cap over contaminated sediments if, for example, more than one project is using the site over a season, and then a permanent cap within a designated time period and before the storm season? This will need to be managed so that the design is most protective of environmental effects and best use of the pit is made so that it is not filled primarily with cap material.

**What will the hydrological effects on the site and surrounding areas be as the pit is filled?**

Some modeling has by the Corps been done suggesting that erosion could occur in the pit during a storm when it is filled. The effects this would have on a cap are unknown. There is also some suggestion that the pits in their current configuration remove some of the energy from waves and thereby reduce beach erosion on nearby beaches. The City of Long Beach expressed interest in examining this issue further. (A similar study was recently conducted on the SEIBP, which showed no impact on the beaches if the pit was filled.)

**What is the capacity of the site?**

The City of Long Beach estimates the site can contain 9-11 million cubic yards. This number is not yet finalized and will be necessary to determine the life of the site.

**Who will review the placement of materials in the site?**

Some interest was expressed in allowing the CSTF Advisory Committee to review all projects that apply to use the site.

**What is the current benthic community in the site (and what will the effects of filling and capping be?)**

The material in the NEIBP is similar to material coming out of the Los Angeles River, and may contain contamination. While the benthos has not been characterized in the pit, visual reports describe it as not as highly diverse or rich as the surrounding communities outside of the pit. Placing material in the pit will increase the elevation, and may provide cleaner material for habitation (with the placement of a cap.)

**Who will write the management plan for the site?**

Suggestions include using the CSTF Implementation Subcommittee to write the administrative sections, and the CSTF Aquatics Subcommittee to write the technical sections, including performance criteria, level of monitoring, etc.

**NEXT STEPS**

The above questions need to be addressed when all appropriate parties are present. The Ports, Los Angeles County Dept. of Beaches and Harbors, Heal the Bay, and the Corps should be present at the next meeting. The next meeting date is not yet determined.