

DELTA LTMS MULTIPLE TECHNICAL WORK GROUP MEETING

**California Environmental Protection Agency
1001 I Street, Rooms 2 West and 2 East
Sacramento, California**

Thursday, October 30, 2008

9:00 am - 2:00 pm

MEETING MINUTES

Meeting Attendees

Tom Scheeler – Port of Sacramento
Cal Fong – Representing Port of Stockton
Bill Brostoff – USACE SPN
Robert Goulart – Contra Costa County
Phil Giovannini – CV Regional Water Board
Brian Ross – EPA
Cory Koger – USACE SPK
Kate Dadey – USACE SPK
Darryl Foreman – Land Planning + Entitlements
Gilbert Cosio-MBK Engineers
Steven Michelson – Environmental Risk Services

Steve Cappellino – Anchor Environmental
Bill Darsie – Kjeldsen, Sinnock, & Neudeck
Jack Malone – Anchor Environmental
Christine Boudreau – DCS
Gilbert Labrie – DCC Engineering
Al Paniccia – USACE SPN
Susan Ma – USACE SPN
Amy Simpson – DWR
George Nichol – ASCE Copri
G. Fred Lee-GFL and Associates

INTRODUCTIONS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

FUTURE MEETING SCHEDULE

- The next TWG meeting was scheduled for December 2 from 9 a.m. to 2 p.m. and will be a joint Protocols, Alternatives, and Permitting TWG meeting.
- The meeting location will be determined, but the preference will be for the CalEPA building.
- The January meeting date will be determined in December.

STATUS OF JPA

- Steve proposed an offline discussion of JPA routing after lunch when Kate is present.

MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE MEETING

- Bill and Al stated that there is currently funding for USACE labor and for contractor support.
- Management Committee meeting tentatively planned for early to mid-March.

CALFED BIENNIAL SCIENCE CONFERENCE

- Bill summarized discussions about the LTMS poster and noted that there were several presentations pertinent to the LTMS project.
- Susan explained that there was a session on Delta Vision and the Public Policy Institute of California (PPIC).
- Brian asked whether the LTMS posters would be made available on the website.
 - Bill will look into preparing the salmon tracking poster for inclusion on the website.
 - The LTMS poster has been added to the website.

PEAT CAPPING DEMONSTRATION PROJECT

- Steve stated that Walter has not responded to his request for an update on the status of the project.
- Tom stated that he had met with Walter and biologists from U.C. Davis, including Dr. Northrup. Tom remains interested in the project and the U.C. Davis researchers are producing a proposal for the work.
- Bill asked whether this type of capping project has precedent because it is a different type of beneficial reuse project than he is accustomed to seeing and Tom replied that these types of projects have been done in the past but this effort is more of a scientific study.
 - Brian related his recollection that evidence had been presented that for arsenic, capping would result in lower chemical concentrations in groundwater as a result of capping slowing the particular biogeochemical reactions that would occur with exposed peat.

- Brian asked whether the proposal would be presented to the LTMS group and Tom replied that he would like to see the proposal presented to the group for discussion so that the project could be crafted to satisfy everyone's needs and concerns.

DELTA SEDIMENT SAMPLING FOR SQO DEVELOPMENT (STEVE BAY SCCWRP)

- Fred Lee reported that he had seen a presentation about sediment characterization efforts led by Steve Bay (Southern California Coastal Water Research Project) in which only three sites were found to be "toxic" in the Delta.
- Steve C. volunteered to contact Steve Bay to obtain the information to share with the group and post on the website if possible.

DELTA REGIONAL MONITORING PROGRAM (RMP)

- Bill stated that several people including Tom, Jeff Wingfield, and EPA staff had attended a meeting about the RMP and that he envisions collaboration with the LTMS.

SAN FRANCISCO BAY LTMS ENVIRONMENTAL WINDOWS WORKGROUP

- Cal asked Bill if he had participated in a recent teleconference regarding coordination of specific dredging projects to resolve sensitive species consultations.
- Brian explained that perhaps 8-10 projects may have trouble finishing within the allowed windows, though he was not sure how much total sediment volume is involved.
- Tom asked why there were so many problems and Brian and Christine replied that generally the main causes are poor planning by project proponents and lack of availability of equipment for small project proponents. Brian added that the agencies are fairly flexible as long as project proponents have been diligent in attempting to plan and execute their projects.
- Bill explained that the Bay LTMS dredger's handbook will aid in planning dredging projects and that Anchor and DCS are developing it. Steve, Jack, and Christine briefly explained the concept of the handbook and its goals.
- Brian suggested not finalizing the handbook until after the Dredging 201 workshop so that feedback from workshop participants can be incorporated and inform the final handbook development.

SEDIMENT TESTING MANUAL UPDATE

- Cory Koger stated that Jeff Stevens from ERDC informed him that they are revising and merging the Inland and Ocean Manuals to form one national manual.
 - Brian stated that he is on that team and that this process will not change the way things are done in the Delta. The biggest change is to add additional flexibility to the OTM to be consistent with the ITM.
 - CATSMEOW is the current proposed acronym for the manual according to Brian, who claimed no responsibility for the acronym.

ACTION ITEMS

- Anchor will contact Steve Bay to obtain a copy of the sediment toxicity report.
- Anchor will follow up with Tom to finalize December TWG meeting date.

PROTOCOLS WORK GROUP ITEMS

SACRAMENTO DWSC SAP

- Cory sent the SAP revisions to Anchor, where the document is now available for review. Cory solicited additional comments from the LTMS group:
 - Phil stated that he does not expect to have additional comments and Bill B. asked for clarification that Phil does not want further revisions. Phil confirmed that he does not.
 - Al asked whether the proposed testing would be appropriate for reuse suitability determinations and Cory replied that it was designed to satisfy that requirement and that it also includes geotechnical testing.
 - Bill B. asked that Cory coordinate with him so that levee placement/reuse options can be incorporated into the EIS and alternatives development.
 - Cal asked whether ERDC is ready to accept task orders for the work and Cory replied that they are and are moving forward with a lab that is capable of performing the mercury testing at the levels required by the agencies.
 - Brian asked for clarification of which GO is being followed for the DWSC project and Cory replied that it is the Sacramento GO for maintenance (O&M) dredging. Phil added that the GO specifies the data and procedural requirements for addressing sediment beneficial reuse. Brian asked for clarification of his

- understanding that the GO itself does not authorize reuse, but that it does not exclude it as long as a separate approval is requested. Phil confirmed that the sediment is not “pre-approved” for beneficial reuse by the GO.
- Phil added that the intent of the draft maintenance dredging GO that is being developed is to include an approval framework for specific beneficial uses and geographic areas.
 - Brian added that the DWSC project is not authorized by the O&M GO and Phil concurred that the SAP was being developed to be consistent with the O&M GO as a guide.
 - Christine asked for clarification of whether this project could be used as a “pilot” to inform development of the beneficial reuse GO. Phil replied that the most crucial information for development of a beneficial reuse GO is the development of the list of potential placement sites.
 - With regard to the SAP, Brian explained that the graphical presentation of the project boundaries, including the dredge boundaries and the channel boundaries is crucial and should be incorporated into the final report.
 - Brian requested clarification regarding EPA Comment #4 pertaining to the Yolo Bypass area. EPA had requested increased sampling resolution but Brian thought that the USACE’s response was unclear. Cory replied that only a small volume of sediment will be removed from that area (10,000 CY) so that he felt that a single sample was sufficient. Brian accepted this clarification.
 - Brian asked about a specific comment regarding DDT isomers and Cory said that he is looking into it.
 - Bill B. summarized the discussion and requested confirmation from Brian that EPA is now satisfied with the response to comments. Brian confirmed that he is.
 - Bill relayed comments from Stacy Li at the CALFED Science Conference suggesting that aquatic placement of dredged sediments to create shallow fish habitat would be beneficial.
 - Tom added that such placement had been considered previously but initial agency responses had been unresponsive and that he advocates beneficial reuse of sediment but does not want to impact the overall project schedule by changing the placement plan.

- Brian stated that even stockpiled material could still potentially be reused but that EPA would continue to encourage direct beneficial reuse for the sediment rather than secondary reuse. He explained that levees are an obvious use but habitat creation and enhancement is also encouraged.
- Phil encouraged identification of potential reuse sites upfront as much as possible to streamline approval.
- Tom reiterated his desire not to adversely affect the project schedule but that it might be possible to incorporate aquatic placement into later phases of the overall project.
- Brian expressed concern from a process standpoint whether development of potential beneficial reuse sites should be project-driven or driven by larger strategic plans while acknowledging that such an approach might have the potential to slow the current project.
- Darryl asked whether the biological issues regarding benefits to sensitive species like Delta smelt are understood sufficiently with regard to shallow water habitat.
- G. Fred Lee stated that this has been a topic of interest but that Hg issues are a larger concern.

REVIEW OF AGENCY TELECONFERENCE AND MEETING TO DISCUSS EPA COMMENTS ON SAP

- Bill distributed copies of the notes from the October 6 2008 IWG teleconference.
- Brian introduced the overall issue and the role of the Ports in O&M projects versus in deepening projects. In both cases the USACE and Ports both have an interest in the process. Brian solicited discussion from the group.
- Tom described conversations that the Port has had regarding identifying general types of sediment sites within the Delta (e.g. upland levee backstop within the Delta) to form the framework for the NOI.
- Phil clarified that the general NOI under the existing O&M GO is designed to allow reuse flexibility for generic geographic areas and purposes.
- Brian asked how deepening sediments would be handled and Phil replied that it would be preferable to have O&M and deepening sediments addressed in a consistent fashion.

- Tom requested clarification of how the draft maintenance GO would handle beneficial reuse sites and testing/study requirements. Phil explained that the draft GO is being structured to facilitate flexibility in beneficial reuse sites.
- Brian requested clarification regarding the assertion that groundwater analysis would be handled through CEQA rather than through a new Beneficial Reuse GO and suggested that the GO be constructed to exclude material that could potentially affect groundwater adversely. Phil replied that this GO is still in the conceptual stage and could be developed to be as flexible as possible for certain pre-established categories of use and location.
- Brian and Tom asked Phil about specific information that would be required for the NOI for specific placement episodes under the GO. Phil replied that the LTMS group had previously discussed background studies to characterize the existing conditions (along levees for example) so that baseline data would be available to inform decisions about whether dredged material placement would be consistent with conditions at individual sites.
 - Tom asked about the scope of such a study versus existing data.
 - Brian pointed out that there might be short-term options available while the long-term characterization study is being done. He suggested that NOIs could be submitted utilizing existing data. Phil concurred and Tom suggested that the USACE, Ports, and DWR should meet and identify placement sites and develop an NOI.
 - Steve C. suggested that perhaps dividing the Delta into more manageable regions could facilitate analysis as an interim measure. Phil agreed that such an approach might be useful and that attention should also be paid to the size of the project (dredge volumes) so that smaller projects can be streamlined.
 - Steve M. stated that he had been meeting with agencies and dredging project proponents regarding development of NOIs and that there is sufficient funding available to conduct background studies in particular regions, for example 8 western islands in the Delta. The conversations were centered on reuse of stockpiled material.
- Tom proposed to draft an NOI and Phil encouraged frequent communication with the Water Board to refine the NOI as an iterative process. Tom reiterated that he is interested in avoiding site-specific attenuation analyses when the existing material has

already been characterized and Phil clarified that he has advanced that premise to the Board in framing the development of GOs.

ACTION ITEMS

- Tom will set up a meeting between the USACE, the Port, and the DWR to begin drafting an NOI and coordinate the effort with Phil.

ALTERNATIVE DEVELOPMENT WORK GROUP ITEMS

DREDGED MATERIAL MANAGEMENT ALTERNATIVES TABLE

- Steve presented the latest revision of the draft alternatives table for everyone to pick up and review individually. Only minor revisions had been made since it was last reviewed by the group.

DREDGED MATERIAL PLACEMENT SITES TABLE AND MAPS

- Steve introduced the draft placement site map that is being developed and explained the long-term goal of developing an interactive map that will display placement sites by class and history with information about capacity and sediment characterization. There was general discussion among the group of specific placement sites and notes and revisions were made on the maps themselves to be incorporated into subsequent versions.
 - Anchor has begun loading existing information including site locations and habitat mapping data from multiple sources including the USACE and DWR. We need to solicit comment and appropriate agency/stakeholder POCSs to reconcile placement site information including site names and locations and obtain additional GIS data.
- Gilbert C. suggested that Eastern Delta islands may all have need for sediment on levees but those levees are critical to the people who live there rather than for the DWR.
- Roberta expressed support for inclusion of eastern islands as potential placement sites, especially for projects like the Stockton DWSC.
- Bill D. acknowledged that for levee projects it may be less expensive to barge upland material that meets engineering specifications than it is to use dredged material, which may not meet engineering requirements. He explained that currently barging upland material is less expensive than either hydraulic or mechanical dredging. The difference

in cost is a result of the expense of permitting and environmental issues and constraints associated with dredging. Currently barging upland soil costs approximately \$15/CY.

- Gil Labrie pointed out that the Bay area currently has excess upland material that can be barged more cheaply than landfill disposal.
- Phil asked how the fill material is traded and brokered and whether there is a need for a database of available material and characteristics.
- Steve C. restated the overall goals of the LTMS in facilitating dredging, including development of placement sites which might include regions with levee sediment needs even if they do not have dredging needs.
 - Brian expressed desire to optimize beneficial reuse rather than develop new placement sites.
 - Steve M. suggested that using primary sites with easy access, like along the DWSCs, would make it most feasible for potential secondary beneficial reuse because rehandling would be easier.
 - Roberta advocated characterization of potential sites that are accessible and large enough to facilitate barge loading.
 - Phil asked what sites are in need of subsidence reversal and might be available for use.
- Gilbert C. stated that for levee stability, the zone of influence of subsidence is narrow so reclamation districts are not concerned with subsidence overall, only with levee subsidence.
 - Brian suggested that there is value in identifying placement sites and taking the opportunity to explore sediment management optimization that includes reuse rather than just focusing on dredging needs (i.e. focusing on placement sites only in close proximity to the dredge site) especially for deepening projects that could capitalize the increased expense of transporting sediment unlike typical maintenance projects.
 - Tom asked whether there are real opportunities to develop new sediment placement sites.
 - Gilbert C. and Steve M. explained that there are many issues to be resolved with individual landowners before they would agree to accept sediment on their land. These issues are likely to be ones that the Ports cannot resolve on their own, like

the ability for landowners to sell the sediment if necessary or move it around their property.

- Gil L. added that in the south Delta there is a great need to dredge but little money to fund the work. If there were also a federal project, it could make it easier to accomplish additional work.
- Brian asked whether the DWSC EIS could include development of such sites but Bill responded that their project timelines are challenging enough without adding additional uncertainty by including potential new reuse sites.
- Gil L. suggested that looking at Delta Vision reclamation district contacts might be useful in developing potential new placement sites.
- Steve C. asked whether the USACE had developed a list of particular sites for the Stockton DWSC project yet. Corey replied that they had not and Steve and Brian suggested that the USACE remain engaged with the LTMS to address their sediment placement needs.
 - Bill confirmed that the Stockton DWSC project will be more closely integrated with the LTMS than the Sacramento DWSC had been and Roberta concurred that the placement site information needs to be developed in a timely manner for use in developing the environmental documents.
 - Bill stated that they hope to present their Stockton DWSC information and bring Neil Hedgecock to the LTMS meetings. He also stated that he wants to talk offline with Anchor to integrate placement sites and reuse options.
 - Bill D. suggested that he and Gilbert can help demarcate regions on map for potential dredging need and reuse.

ACTION ITEMS

- Anchor will continue to develop sediment placement sites map and accompanying table of site information and solicit information and comments from group. Anchor will send the draft map to the LTMS group for comments.
- Anchor will work with USACE to add their potential placement sites to the map and table.

PERMITTING WORK GROUP ITEMS

- Bill asked about status of DDRMT formation with regard to Water Board issues. Phil reiterated his belief that creating the maintenance and beneficial reuse GOs will resolve the vast majority of the issues that the DDRMT was supposed to address without the need to develop another layer of bureaucracy.
- Roberta expressed strong support that the LTMS needs to remain funded.

Draft JPA

- Al, Bill, Kate, and Steve C. spoke offline to resolve minor comments and issues regarding the proper protocol for forwarding the draft JPA to the Management Committee.