

DELTA LTMS MULTIPLE TECHNICAL WORK GROUPS MEETING

Department of Water Resources*

1416 9th Street, Room 335

Sacramento, CA

Thursday, September 17, 2009

9:00 a.m. – 12:30 p.m.

MEETING NOTES

Meeting Attendees:

Christine Boudreau – Boudreau Associates

Bill Brostoff – USACE SPN

Steve Cappellino – Anchor QEA

Katie Chamberlin – Anchor QEA

Kate Dadey – USACE SPK

Nathan Evenson – DWR

Michael Hoover – USFWS

Bonnie Hulkower – USACE SPN

Misty Kaltreider – Solano County DRM

Gilbert Labrie – DCC Engineering

Tina Lunt – MBK Engineers

Susan Ma – USACE SPN

Jack Malone – Anchor QEA

Steven Michelson – Env. Risk Services

Glen Mitchell – USACE SPN

Al Paniccia – USACE SPN

Patty Quickert - DWR

Brian Ross – USEPA

Tom Scheeler – Port of West Sacramento

Brooke Schlenker – USACE SPK

Amy Simpson – DWR

John Wilusz - DWR

INTRODUCTIONS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

REVIEW OF MEETING AGENDA

- Bill B. reviewed the agenda and directed Anchor QEA to include action items from the previous meeting on each meeting agenda by section as presented in the meeting notes.

BUDGET UPDATE

- Al P. reported that there has been no change in the budget status from last meeting (i.e. there is currently \$200,000 in the House report). Kate D. asked whether money would be reprogrammed from the Bay LTMS and Bill B. and Al P. responded that the budget had not reached a critical point where that would be pursued because sufficient funding was available for the next 6 months. Bill B. explained that the budget may prevent large tasks like the draft Programmatic Biological Assessment and sediment management plan from being initiated.

REMINDER OF FUTURE MEETING DATES

- The existing October 13 TWG meeting date was confirmed by the attendees.
- November 10 and December 8, 2009 were set as the next meeting dates from 9-12.
- Bill B. reminded the group that the Bay LTMS green sturgeon and longfin smelt symposia dates have been set for December 2-3, 2009, and announced that a methyl mercury symposium would be held at an unspecified future date. The mercury symposium would encompass dredging and habitat restoration and will most likely occur in February.

TECHNICAL WORK GROUP CHAIR ALTERNATES

- Bill B. explained that to accommodate everyone's busy schedules and last minute schedule demands, each TWG chair should arrange for an alternate to attend meetings in their absence. Brian R. suggested that the TWG chairs deliberate internally and then finalize the selection by the October TWG meeting.

DREDGING 201 WORKSHOP

- Bill B. announced that the potential Dredging 201 course has been cancelled for the time being.

BAY LTMS FACILITATION

- Bill announced that the Bay LTMS will now be facilitated by Anchor QEA in a role somewhat similar to their assistance on the Delta LTMS. Steve C. explained that he will continue in his role of project management while Katie Chamberlin will be the primary point of contact for the Bay LTMS as Jack Malone is for the Delta LTMS.

ACTION ITEMS

1. Anchor QEA will arrange meeting rooms for the November 10 and December 8 meetings.
2. Anchor QEA will send Outlook meeting requests and place phone calls to remind agency staff and key participants of the next TWG meeting dates.
3. Anchor QEA will remind TWG chairs to arrange for alternates and provide their names and contact information to Anchor QEA so that they can be added to the appropriate contact and distribution lists.
4. Anchor QEA will modify future meeting agendas to include past action items.
5. Bill B. will update the group on the status of the methyl mercury symposium as details are finalized.

PROTOCOLS WORK GROUP AGENDA

UPDATE ON SACRAMENTO DWSC PROJECT AND SEDIMENT TESTING RESULTS

- Brian R. asked for a brief summary of the status of the two DWSC projects and proposed that the Sacramento DWSC sediment results be discussed during the Permitting TWG section. He also asked for confirmation that Glen Mitchell is officially the USACE Project Manager for both DWSC projects and Glen affirmed this and replied that he is in the USACE San Francisco District.
- Bill B. stated that the DWSC salinity modeling results will be available next month and explained that Mike McWilliams from Hydroqual is performing the modeling. Bill stated that he will review and present a summary of the preliminary results of the modeling at the next TWG meeting. Brian R. asked for a brief summary of the technical questions being addressed by the modeling and Bill responded that the goal of the exercise is to evaluate salinity gradients within the Delta and how they would be affected by both DWSC projects, including no project and alternative project permutations.
- Brian R. asked for an update on the timeline for the Sacramento DWSC EIS. Bill replied that they are looking at an early 2010 date for the Draft EIS. Glen M. responded that he is currently working with internal USACE resources to determine what they can accomplish with the available funds and what that timeline would be.
- Brian R. stated that he is concerned after reviewing the Sacramento DWSC sediment data report because the discussion of project alternatives has not been developed sufficiently yet. Bill B. stated that the report should have focused on sediment results

and not addressed potential alternatives. Brian replied that Bill's response addressed his concern.

- Kate D. asked whether there have been red flags raised during the scoping process for the Sacramento DWSC EIS. Brian R. replied that issues like water quality changes had been there from the beginning. He stated that EPA had suggested in their comment letter that as much sediment as possible be made available for reuse and in such a way that it can be easily accessed by potential users. He also explained that for the Stockton DWSC, aquatic dissolved oxygen (DO) concentration is also a concern in addition to the salinity and reuse issues he just mentioned for the Sacramento DWSC project. For both projects, Brian R. stressed the need for documentation on potential water quality impacts. Bill B. explained that sensitive fish and wildlife issues are of concern for both DWSC projects. Bill stated that the USACE is performing modeling of potential impacts to DO for the Stockton DWSC. Brian added that cumulative impacts within the Delta are also of concern. Bill stated that they did not receive scoping comments from any of the resource agencies but have been working with them through the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act process. Tom S. stated that he is well aware of issues raised by the Bay Delta Conservation Plan (BDCP) as well as the other concerns about the projects and stated that their goal is to create as strong an environmental document as possible to ensure that all of the concerns are addressed. Mike H. explained that the establishment of a new USFWS office has caused internal confusion about roles and responsibilities and caused delays within the USFWS. Mike also pointed out that the salinity and hydrodynamic models being used for the DWSC projects should be coordinated with DWR to ensure that the correct ones are being used.

UPDATE ON STOCKTON DWSC PROJECT

- Brian R. asked for an update on the status of the Stockton DWSC project and Bonnie Hulkower replied that she has taken over as technical manager after Nancy Ferris. Bonnie said that the EIS for Stockton is scheduled for 2011 and she will provide an updated schedule at the next LTMS meeting. The technical issues for Stockton are similar to those for the Sacramento DWSC project, including the modeling exercises described above for the Sacramento project, and are moving their internal resources forward on the project.
- Bill B. added that the Stockton project is approximately 1 year behind the Sacramento one. Brian R. asked for the schedule for the sediment characterization effort (i.e. the draft SAP as a start) for Stockton and Bonnie and Bill replied that they plan to have the

draft SAP for the project progress through the LTMS or the DDRMT but that it will not be drafted in the immediate future. Bill explained that funding for the progress is nebulous, which necessarily affects the work schedule.

ACTION ITEMS

1. Bill, Susan, or Bonnie will provide brief (15 minute) summary of salinity and hydrodynamic modeling exercises and preliminary results. This report will include verification that the models being used are consistent with those used by DWR. An effort would be made to circulate an informational sheet before the next meeting to query for additional questions.
2. Anchor QEA will add this modeling update to the October TWG agenda

ALTERNATIVE DEVELOPMENT WORK GROUP AGENDA

CALFED LEVEE STABILITY PROGRAM AND BETHEL ISLAND PROJECT UPDATES

- Brooke S. stated that it is the end of the fiscal year so things have been busy and that they now have a programmatic management plan for the LSP (even though the program has been in existence for several years already). Kleinfelder-Geomatrix continues their field work evaluating proposed project sites as explained in previous meetings. Brooke expects that there will be 6 sites moving forward in the next FY with these sites potentially moving into construction in early 2011, which could line up with the DWSC projects. Al P. asked whether the projects would produce material or need to accept material and Brooke replied that most of them will need to accept material. Kleinfelder-Geomatrix is creating a matrix of the project sites within the LSP and identifying site constraints like transportation constraints and access points. Brooke explained that the new data being developed is more geographically explicit than the previous data. Steve C. asked how detailed the data would be and whether it would include information like projected sediment volume needed for each site. Brooke explained that such information is part of a separate information gathering process and could eventually be linked to the GIS data locations.
- Kate D. asked whether a SAP had been developed for Bethel Island and Brooke S. explained that Cory Koger had developed a draft SAP but that the local sponsor has not yet signed an agreement with the USACE so finalizing the plan and performing the sampling would occur next year at the earliest. Brian asked whether such an agreement had to be signed prior to moving forward with the SAP and sampling and Brooke

replied that it did and that the first \$100,000 outlay of each project is 100% federal funds but that the rest is cost-shared.

- Brian R. asked about the problem of delayed sampling that arose on the Bethel Island project as a result of sampling activity being prohibited because of environmental work windows. He suggested that this issue should be taken up at the Management Committee level because resolving this difficulty would potentially facilitate moving projects forward by an entire year in most cases. Brian stated that sediment coring is certainly an activity that would be expected to have minimal potential impacts on sensitive fish species.
- Kate D. asked whether there would be value in the LTMS group reviewing the SAP for Bethel Island and Brooke S. replied that this would be a good time to do so, before the project timeline becomes more pressing. Brian R. suggested that the DDRMT would be a good venue for reviewing the SAP instead of the LTMS TWG.
- Brooke S. stated that the DILFS project will have a USACE/DWR meeting on September 22 and 23 to discuss what they expect to accomplish with the project overall. She said that they will use the meeting to further refine their expectations for the study.

DUTCH SLOUGH PROJECT UPDATE

- John W. stated that last month he wanted to introduce the project and today he wants to keep the project on the LTMS radar and introduce the DWR project manager, Patty Quickert. She summarized the project briefly and stated that the three parcels involved could potentially accept a total of 3 million CY of material. The potential timeline for construction is probably 2013-2014 and is located within 3 miles of the Stockton DWSC.

DRAFT DELTA TABLE AND MAPS OF REGIONAL PLACEMENT SITES UPDATE

- Steve C. explained that Anchor QEA continues to work on the identification process for past, current, and future placement and reuse sites.
- Misty K. updated the group on the Decker Island project (in Solano County) in which D. I. Aggregate plans to extend their aggregate mining significantly deeper (to greater than 100 feet BGS) and said that they would potentially be able to accept dredged material. They anticipate annual aggregate production of up to 3 million CY, which they proposed to be used for levee repairs, among other uses. D. I. Aggregate also accepts sediment that they process and then resell. Tom S. stated that the Port of West Sacramento has an agreement with the mining company for them to accept dredged material from the Port. Brian R. asked whether they then resell the dredged material and Tom replied that they have in the past, but he is unsure to whom the material was

sold. Brian expressed concern that a private company might be profiting by reselling dredged material provided to them by federally-funded dredging.

- Brooke S. asked for confirmation that securing placement sites is the responsibility of the local sponsor, and the consensus is that placement sites are the local sponsor's responsibility. Brian R. reiterated his concern about overall project costs and private gain and stated that his concern is that no inappropriate arrangements are made with private companies. Steve M. pointed out that the potential concerns depend on the way that the "federal project" is defined and whether it includes dredging only or dredging, placement, and reuse. A general discussion followed in which various project permutations were discussed to illustrate potential conflicts that could arise through reuse of dredged material by private companies.
- Kate D. asked what the composition of the material is and Misty K. indicated that it is aggregate composed of sand and more coarse material. Tom S. said that he is not surprised because the site is a remnant of the Montezuma Hills. Christine B. pointed out that the proposed expansion would have to go through the environmental analysis and approval process. Misty replied that D. I. Aggregate is going through the process now and she confirmed that there is a wetland restoration site on the island adjacent to the site. Brian R. and Kate D. discussed whether or not the USACE would regulate the proposed expansion and whether the EPA would be involved. They agreed that further review of the project was necessary before making such a decision and Misty provided her contact information to Kate.
- Bill B. stated that as he mentioned at the August TWG meeting, one of the senior managers at the USACE was concerned with the schedule for developing the placement site information to meet the scheduling needs of the Sacramento DWSC project. He explained that the effort to let a contract for this work is still underway. Kate D. asked what the schedule is for completion of the task and Bill and Al replied that it is a very tight schedule. Brooke S. added that the DWSC projects will likely continue to have a more aggressive schedule than the LTMS because the LTMS lacks the funding of the DWSC projects.

DISCUSSION OF REVISED ALTERNATIVES TWG CHARTER

- Jack M. explained that the Alternatives TWG Charter was distributed to the group for review after the June 30 ATWG meeting and Phil Giovannini provided comments. The revised charter was distributed to the group, and a number of additional changes in language were discussed and recorded by Anchor QEA. Bill asked how the charters

were developed initially and Steve C. responded that they arose from the original LTMS and have been modified since.

- Al P. asked about resolution of the language regarding development of a centralized rehandling facility. A general discussion ensued about the practicability of a rehandling facility in the Delta. The general consensus was that dredged material is still widely perceived as being unsuitable for many uses. Brian R. said that EPA's interest is not in a rehandling facility per se, but rather that the USACE not restrict the alternative evaluation to existing placement sites to the detriment of other reuse options
- Steve C. stated that developing a rehandling site was evaluated in southern California but the same problem of perception that use of the material could result in potential future liability resulted in this alternative not being considered as practicable.

ACTION ITEMS

1. Brooke will provide LSP spatial data to Anchor QEA for inclusion on existing maps.
2. Mike Hoover will coordinate internally at USFWS to get more information on the application of environmental work windows for sediment sampling activities.
3. Brooke will provide a copy of the 2004 BO covering survey activities to Anchor QEA for posting on the Delta LTMS website.
4. Brooke will coordinate submittal of the Bethel Island SAP to the DDRMT for review once the DDRMT process is established and the group is active.
5. Brooke will report the results of the DILFS meeting with DWR at the October TWG meeting.
6. Anchor QEA will contact Patty Quickert to obtain Dutch Slough site information to add to the potential placement site maps and table.
7. Misty will coordinate with Kate regarding the Decker Island Mega Sand project.
8. Bill will update the group on the DWSC project sediment placement site task at the October meeting.
9. Anchor QEA will update the Alternatives TWG Charter and transmit it to Brooke for review. Once approved by Brooke, it will be marked as Draft and posted on the Delta LTMS website. It will be submitted to the Management Committee for review and approval once there are a few other items to transmit to them for review.

PERMITTING WORK GROUP AGENDA

MAINTENANCE DREDGING GENERAL ORDER AND NEXT STEPS

- Phil was not able to attend the meeting but conveyed brief updates to Jack who was unable to convey them to the group as a result of time constraints.

REVISIONS TO DDRMT MOU AND PATH FORWARD

- The group was unable to discuss this topic due to time constraints but Jack will follow up with the agency representatives prior to the October TWG meeting.

UPDATE ON REVISED DRAFT JPA

- Jack M. reported that the revisions suggested by the RWQCB and USACE OC have been made to the JPA and the draft final version has been posted on the Delta LTMS website. It was also provided to Steve M. for use in the Stockton Sailing Club (SSC) project.

STOCKTON SAILING CLUB PROJECT FOR DDRMT REVIEW

- The group agreed after general discussion about the status of the DDRMT to ask Steve M. to briefly present the SSC project and SAP to the group for general review and discussion. He explained the navigational constraints experienced by the SSC and that they want to dredge from -5 feet to -10 feet MLLW, generating 13,000 to 26,000 CY of material, including overdredge. He stated that the SAP was drafted in accordance with the draft maintenance dredging GO, which has since been finalized. Steve also explained that he is waiting for feedback from the RWQCB but that he doesn't expect difficulties because the SAP was drafted in accordance with the GO. The characterization depth extends down to -12 feet MLLW to include overdredge.
- There was a general discussion including comments from multiple participants suggesting additional analytes in addition to the ones proposed in the SAP, where were based on the minimum requirements in the GO and the client's concerns about cost. There was also a discussion of the technical aspects of the SAP, including the proposed analyses and information to be included in the SAP, such as bathymetric data.
- There was a general discussion about whether the minimum requirements set forth in the RWQCB's Maintenance Dredging GO are sufficient for SAPs and if not, why the LTMS participants didn't provide comments expressing their concerns to the RWQCB during the draft GO review process. Brian R. emphasized that the DDRMT member agencies have not set forth guidance on things like SAPs at this point and that each of the DDRMT member agencies must follow its own guidance and regulations. The consensus from the group was that the appropriate regulatory agencies will have to provide their formal comments and approvals, if required and appropriate, directly to Steve M.

- There was a general discussion that perhaps the DDRMT process is not yet established and that the SSC could act as a “good neighbor” to participate in the DDRMT process as long as the dredging can be completed next year. The suggestion was made that the end of the Permitting TWG section could be used as the DDRMT until it is formally kicked off. Kate expressed the opinion that the lead agency to coordinate the DDRMT process needs to be established first. Steve C. suggested that if necessary, Anchor QEA could facilitate coordination of the DDRMT until the lead agency is determined. Jack M. expressed concerns that the DDRMT would not be functional until the coordination process is worked out and formal meetings separate from the Delta LTMS are convened. Bill suggested that the agency staff convene via teleconference on September 28, 2009 to discuss the Sacramento DWSC sediment sampling results could also discuss the path forward for the DDRMT.

ACTION ITEMS

1. Anchor QEA will set up a teleconference and WebEx meeting for September 28 from 9 a.m.-11 a.m. and send the information to the appropriate meeting attendees.
2. Brooke will contact the USACE environmental contacts for Bethel Island and find out what restrictions NMFS imposed versus USFWS and then pass this information on to Steve M.