

**LONG-TERM MANAGEMENT STRATEGY FOR  
DREDGED MATERIAL IN THE DELTA (DELTA LTMS)  
MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE MEETING**

**Cal-EPA Building  
1001 I Street, Room 550  
Sacramento, CA**

Wednesday, July 29, 2009  
9:30 am – 12:00 p.m.

**MEETING NOTES**

Meeting Attendees

Bill Brostoff – USACE SPN  
Steve Cappellino – Anchor QEA, L.P.  
COL Thomas C. Chapman – USACE SPK  
(Management Committee member)  
Dennis Clark – USACE SPK  
Kate Dadey – USACE SPK  
LTC Laurence M. Farrell – USACE SPN  
(Management Committee member)  
Nancy Ferris – USACE SPN  
Linda Fiack – Delta Protection Commission  
(Management Committee member)  
Phil Giovannini – CVRWQCB  
Roberta Goulart – Contra Costa County  
Ellen Johnck – Bay Planning Coalition

Cory Koger – USACE SPK  
Jack Malone – Anchor QEA, L.P.  
Al Paniccia – USACE SPN  
Arijs Rakstins – USACE SPN  
Brian Ross – USEPA, Region 9  
Tom Scheeler – Port of West Sacramento  
Brooke Schlenker – USACE SPK  
Karen Schwinn – USEPA, Region 9  
(Management Committee member)  
Fari Tabatabai – USACE SPN  
Tanis Toland – USACE SPK  
Jeff Wingfield – Port of Stockton  
Garwin Yip – NOAA Fisheries

Steve Cappellino called the meeting to order and meeting participants introduced themselves. Steve explained that he and Al would be delivering the presentation in the interest of saving time and simplifying the process so that the meeting time could be more profitably used for discussion. He introduced the chairs of the Delta LTMS Technical Work Groups (TWG), Kate Dadey, Brooke Schlenker, and Brian Ross.. Steve explained that the Management Committee members and meeting participants should ask questions as they arise during the presentation and that he would defer to the TWG

chairs and LTMS project managers to answer them. Al and Steve then delivered the presentation, entertaining questions throughout and finishing with an opportunity for open discussion, general comments, and airing of stakeholder concerns. The notes below reflect the comments, concerns, and discussion that occurred throughout the entire meeting.

1. During presentation of the proposed DDRMT formation, LTC Laurence Farrell asked whether the resource agency members had seen how well the SF Bay DMMO meetings work.
  - Bill Brostoff replied that they were aware in concept of the SF Bay DMMO successes.
  - LTC Farrell said that in his view it is crucial that they actually be present at a DMMO meeting to see firsthand how well the process works so that they will become true believers in the potential value of the DDRMT and to learn what works and what doesn't work for the DMMO. Brian Ross concurred with LTC Farrell's suggestion.
  - Linda Fiack pointed out that the Bay Protection Commission might be an avenue for encouraging active participation by resource agencies in the Delta LTMS.
2. During presentation of sediment placement and reuse sites, Roberta Goulart pointed out that the Delta levees are fragile and that the islands throughout the Delta are subsiding so beneficial reuse of sediment within the Delta is critically important. In the overall scheme of sediment needs within the Delta, even the Sacramento and Stockton DWSC project volumes are not sufficient to provide all the material needed. As a result, it is even more crucial to encourage maximum beneficial reuse of dredged sediments.
3. During presentation of the CVRWQCB's draft maintenance dredging General Order (GO), Tom Scheeler reminded the group that the Delta LTMS provided the forum for all of the stakeholders and the agencies to work together to encourage development of the GO.
  - Jeff Wingfield concurred with Tom Scheeler's statement and Brian Ross added that in particular, Victor Izzo and Phil Giovannini were instrumental in developing a flexible solution to the longstanding problems preventing implementation of GOs.

- Arijs Rakstins asked whether it would be appropriate for the Delta LTMS Management Committee to draft a letter of commendation for Victor Izzo and Phil Giovannini. Al Paniccia and Bill Brostoff agreed that it would be.
4. During presentation of information about the DDRMT, Linda Fiack asked for a brief explanation of who would be on the DDRMT committee.
    - Kate Dadey replied that it would be USACE, EPA, CVRWQCB, NMFS, USFWS, CDFG, and SLC.
    - Linda Fiack pointed out that the Delta Protection Commission (DPC) has authority to review repeals of actions within the primary Delta zone and to comment on actions within the secondary zone that affect the primary zone. She suggested that those boundaries should be overlain on the Delta maps that have been prepared for the LTMS. She also suggested that the DPC probably need not be a member of the DDRMT but should be kept apprised of the DDRMT's communications and meetings.
  5. During the update of the Protocols TWG accomplishments, Brian Ross stated that Victor Izzo and Phil Giovaninni's efforts have been largely responsible for the TWG's current approach to developing a testing framework rather than spending time and effort deliberating about specific tests.
    - Fari Tabatabai stated that Brian has done a great job in keeping the Protocols TWG moving forward.
  6. During discussion of the Alternatives TWG, Al Paniccia stated that the background conditions characterization study funded by DWR will be very helpful in assisting the CVRWQCB in moving forward with additional GOs, especially for sediment beneficial reuse.
    - Roberta Goulart concurred that this background conditions study is crucial because once it is expanded past the initial phase focused on the western Delta islands it will serve a regional need and provide basic information that had previously not been available in the Delta.
  7. During discussion of the Delta LTMS Study Area map, Linda Fiack pointed out that the five Delta Counties are not all labeled on the map, and should be. Specifically she mentioned that San Joaquin County is not labeled.

- Fari Tabataba added that the both the Stockton and Sacramento DWSC projects are in intensive EIS development processes so there may be a need to develop more exhaustive lists of potential sediment placement sites. As a result, there is a need for the Ports to develop engineering and biological resource information for potential placement sites. These information development processes may need to proceed in advance of the LTMS placement site identification process to meet the USACE EIS schedule needs.
  - Karen Schwinn asked whether the red sediment placement sites denote permanent placement or temporary stockpile sites, for subsequent beneficial reuse. Steve Cappellino responded that the ongoing DWSC project processes will identify the reuse potentials and that the red sites indicate information collected from the Sacramento DWSC project documents.
  - Tanis Toland pointed out that Bay Delta Conservation Plan includes the Prospect tract.
  - Linda Fiack stated that the map would be good to distribute more widely to Delta stakeholders and increase the profile of the LTMS in the Delta.
  - Brian Ross added that the DWSC project EIS processes need to be structured so that analysis of potential beneficial reuse opportunities is an integral part of the discussion. Arijs Rakstins asked whether sediment beneficial reuse would be a state or federal initiative. Brian Ross replied that the idea is to place sediment so that it can be reused efficiently by non-USACE entities.
  - Phil Giovaninni concurred with Brian Ross's comment and pointed out that both Ports have sediment available for beneficial reuse, but the material is situated such that it is not economically feasible to reuse it. Tom Scheeler did not disagree with Phil's statement, but added that in addition to the economics; in general dredged material is viewed unfavorably by potential sediment users even though progress has been made to educate people about beneficial reuse. Tom Scheeler also suggested that the LTMS process can help to encourage efficient placement of sediment from dredging projects at locations that facilitate beneficial reuse.
8. Tom Scheeler stated that he appreciates the work that the LTMS group has done and the commitment of the agency representatives. He explained that the current schedule calls for Sacramento DWSC dredging to resume in fall of 2010 and that a lot of work remains to accomplish that goal. As one example, he stated that there are PG&E pipelines that need to be relocated. He stated that the DWSC project would provide economic benefits to the region as well as environmental benefits by facilitating maritime transportation.

He also explained that the Port of West Sacramento and the Port of Stockton have been working with the Port of Oakland to discuss barge container service.

9. Linda Fiack reminded the group that the DPC is able to promote and encourage resource agency participation in the LTMS process so the DPC should be kept involved and the LTMS group should think about ways that the DPC can be helpful to the LTMS process. She explained that on August 19, 2009 the DPC is having an all day workshop to discuss their new policies with eventual adoption of the regulations to implement the policies by November 2009. She stated that this process entails major revision of their policies and that levees and water resources are major portions of the policies. The draft version of the documents is on the DPC website (<http://www.delta.ca.gov/>).
  - Brian Ross asked whether the DPC wants agency or public input on the documents and Linda Fiack replied that they have been going through the public comment and review process and have been engaged with the appropriate agencies. She said that there is still time to be part of the process, though time is growing short for review and comment now.
10. Roberta Goulart stated that funding seems to be the limiting factor in the LTMS development process and as well as for USACE navigation projects and therefore it would be a good idea to proactively engage Delta stakeholders and agency representatives. Leveraging support for funding making use of a large advocacy group, both at the state and federal level, would be more productive than pursuing more individual efforts. Roberta said that she feels that the LTMS group has been very productive despite the funding constraints it has experienced.
11. Brian Ross observed that the projected funding for the coming year is very meager and expects that as a result LTMS progress is going to fall behind the DWSC project schedules. Arijs Rakstins agreed with Brian and explained that that the Sacramento DWSC project schedule is very tight and identification of sediment placement sites must move ahead quickly. Arijs stated that the USACE might be able to identify sources of funding to be reprogrammed, though the process requires a lot of work politically. He said that in that regard, everyone in the room could help to make the reprogramming process successful by lending their support.
12. Ellen Johnck said that she has considered potential funding sources for the LTMS, potentially including Hamilton Airfield Wetland Restoration site and Central Bay LTMS. Ellen also thanked Linda Fiack for reminding the group about the DPC and that we all

need to rebuild a constituency for the Delta LTMS to encourage political support, agency participation, and funding support. Ellen explained that the permitting and technical accomplishments are useful but the Delta LTMS needs a step up in funding. Ellen also stated that resource agency participation is crucial and perhaps if funding is made available some of it could be used to reimburse resource agency staff involvement in the LTMS. She said that DWSC project involvement with the Delta LTMS is crucial and that getting more closely involved in the larger Delta Vision process is important.

13. Linda Fiack said that the DPC has a very large list of interested parties who should be kept updated on Delta LTMS work and could potentially be useful in providing support and securing funding. Linda agreed with Ellen Johnck and Roberta Goulart that getting together to strategize in this regard is a very good idea.
14. After the general discussion detailed above, Al Paniccia asked whether we should think about establishing a potential timeframe for another MC meeting. Karen Schwinn stated that she would prefer to wait until there is a definitive need for another meeting so that the LTMS resources can be used to get work done rather than prepare for a meeting. Brian Ross suggested that as a default, one year from now would be a good time period to consider for the next Management Committee meeting.
15. Linda Fiack asked when the Delta LTMS Executive Committee (EC) might meet next and there was general agreement that an EC meeting would be called only when a major action is to be taken or a significant need identified.
16. Ellen Johnck asked whether the DDRMT MOU needs to be finalized before the DDRMT begins to meet and Al Paniccia replied that it need not be finalized before the DDRMT meets. Ellen asked whether the host agency is still in question, and Brian Ross and Kate Dadey replied that it is. Ellen replied that the USACE is the host in the SF Bay DMMO for a number of reasons and that perhaps the USACE is the logical host for the DDRMT.
  - LTC Farrell pointed out that it is important to consider who the major dredging project proponents are when considering this issue. Ellen Johnck asked the USACE for their thoughts on the DDRMT host agency question and Kate Dadey replied that the USACE Civil Works project proponents are not involved in the SF DMMO, because the USACE Regulatory staff is responsible for the permitting. Kate explained that the USACE doesn't make sense as the DDRMT host agency because the CVRWQCB is more involved in permitting of dredging

projects in the Delta than the USACE Sacramento Regulatory Branch is. LTC Farrell said that COL Thomas Chapman would have to make that decision.

- Brian Ross stated that with limited funding, proceeding informally without a host agency would be a potential way to move forward and LTC Farrell concurred.

With no further formal discussion, the meeting was adjourned.