

SUMMARY: LTMS MANAGEMENT PLAN WORKSHOP (August 11, 1999)

Review of Action Items from LTMS Workshop of July 8, 1999

- (1) Meetings re: testing issues with environmental community possibly to occur in August, 1999: **planning in progress**
- (2) BCDC to organize availability of monitoring data re: Sonoma Baylands: **contact Jaime Michaels @ 415-557-8791 or jaimem@bcdc.ca.gov**; re: San Leandro ponds: **update to be given at September 17, 1999 workshop**
- (3) Forum to discuss conflict over Montezuma to be created: **in progress**
- (4) LTMS agencies create repository of LTMS studies and identify "key studies:" **in progress**
- (5) DMMO to identify informal "levels of concern": **in progress**
- (6) DMMO to clarify or eliminate "NUAD" term from next annual report: **in progress**

Long Term Monitoring & Management

A working group to be set up focused on monitoring and management plans for in-Bay and upland disposal and reuse sites. Initial focus on in-Bay sites, followed by upland sites. Issues to be considered: develop monitoring and management goals and priorities consistent with LTMS goals; identify types of monitoring; differentiate between management and monitoring; determine link to existing Regional Monitoring Program (RMP); determine whether near-field v. far-field monitoring appropriate for in-Bay sites; review existing management and monitoring plans for Alcatraz site (to avoid duplicative efforts, etc.); need baseline-habitat for upland monitoring; how to integrate existing data; how to make data available and use it. Work group participants: Jack Gregg (lead); Ellen Johnck; Richard Stradford; Audubon and/or Save the Bay representative; Jon Amdur; S.F. Estuary Institute representative; John Weber.

Baylands Habitat

Consensus reached on all "Possible Actions" identified in *Issue Paper on Baylands Habitat at Upland/Wetland/Reuse Sites* (for 8/11/99 workshop) with following changes: (1) BCDC definition for baylands to be used (i.e. not filled and developed) (note: definition not for regulatory purposes), and "UWR" term no longer used; (2) Implementation of beneficial use projects to be coordinated with Regional Habitat Goals Project keeping in mind Habitat Goals Project is dynamic and changing and that "adaptive management" strategy may be needed. Concern expressed about how Habitat Goals Project would affect small restoration projects; (3) To ensure compliance of projects with CEQA/NEPA, LTMS agencies will bring local government into process and develop template for comments (recognizing existing authorities and available resources). Development of means to deal with baylands issue should keep in mind: 40/40/20 LTMS goal; maintain habitat and habitat values; loss of habitat to development; consider "best mix" of seasonal & tidal habitat at each site; acknowledge limitations on dredged material use at sites.

Elimination of Unnecessary Dredging

Several mechanisms already in-place (identified in *Issue Paper on Reducing Dredging Needs or Elimination of Unnecessary Dredging* (for 8/11/99 workshop). As a part of Seaport Plan analysis could be broadened to consider minimizing dredging in addition to minimizing fill. Seaport Plan analysis could also include opportunities for consolidating different cargo types at regional ports.

Funding

Funding Work Group to be developed: Steve Goldbeck (Lead); Ellen Johnck, Coastal Conservancy; Audubon/Save the Bay; Port of Oakland; Corps (as a resource). Possible agenda: Determine "suite of mechanisms" consistent with LTMS goals to fund beneficial use of dredged material and LTMS. Funding needs should be coordinated with CAL FED. Also look at standard agreement with non-federal sponsors, and look at Ports costs.

Meeting Summary

- "+" Presentation re: baylands habitat by Steve Goldbeck (Barbara and Ellen agreed)
- "+" Presentation re: funding by Scott Nicholson

Action Items

- (1) BCDC to assess holding a workshop in San Rafael, as requested by local fishing community. Workshop might be held as regular Management Plan workshop or special workshop to discuss issues of particular concern to them.
- (2) Proposed Sampling and Analysis Plan Guidelines (COE PN 99-4), comments due 8/30/99.
- (3) Need discussion of fish windows in ROD at September 17, 1999 workshop
- (4) Develop monitoring and management work group: Jack Gregg
- (5) Develop funding work group: Steve Goldbeck.
- (6) Beginning with September 14, 1999, DMMO meeting, tentative agenda posted on website: <http://www.spn.usace.army.mil/conops/dmmo.htm>. BCDC to FAX copy of agenda to Barbara Salzman, Arthur Feinstein, and David Nesmith one week before DMMO meeting. For revised or final agenda, contact David Dwinell (Corps) @ 415-977-8471 one week prior to DMMO meeting.

SUMMARY: LTMS MANAGEMENT PLAN WORKSHOP (August 31, 1999)
Allocation Strategy for Dredged Material Disposal

Objectives of Allocation Strategy: Issues raised

Flexibility.

Reduce costs of upland disposal via increased cooperation between and participation of federal and State agencies (e.g., combined knowledge and experience with upland disposal more beneficial than one agency doing it alone).

Determine economic and environmental feasibility of upland disposal (i.e., assure upland disposal activities in compliance with Section 404(b)(1) guidelines and not be violated).

“Internalize” environmental costs (i.e., environmental impact costs) v. benefits of dredging and include in B/C analysis.

Reduce environmental impacts

Timing issues (i.e., phase management of process to determine feasibility/effectiveness of upland disposal as part of overall plan (e.g., address timing constraints associated with availability of upland sites and funding)).

Develop general set of feasibility criteria to be tailored and applied to each project (e.g., a checklist/roadmap for applicants).

Prior to applicant submitting permit application to DMMO, need to know what's expected of applicant in the permit process.

Develop tool/process to estimate predictability of plan success (e.g., what sites likely to be available, what types and quantities of dredged material allowed at each site). Conduct proper alternative analysis early to help determine sediment testing needs for appropriate disposal environment.

Applicant needs to know allocation up front.

Use DMMO as tool to manage uncertainty/predictability early in process for each project.

Allocation strategy must be “implementable.”

Expedite implementation of allocation ratios.

Implement enforcement strategies for disposal quantities (what happens if SFO wants to do disposal project?).

Define when sites are available.

Constraints of Allocation Strategy: Issues Raised

Lack of ability to pay.

Lack of consensus regarding “decision points” and lack of ability to agree on ground rules/solutions for disposal environments between dredgers and environmentalists.

Types of dredged material and suitability of placement in different disposal environments (e.g., don't put sand at Alcatraz).

Timing/costs issues associated with disposal environments.

Secondary constraints (e.g., impacts of dredging v. project delay due to lack of funds, subsequent decline in jobs, partially loaded ships if channel not dredged).

Cross-media impacts (i.e., SF Bay area presently in non-attainment of air quality standards).

Equipment availability (e.g., dredge equipment may need to be mobilized from East Coast, Northwest).

Segmented permitting process and lack of coordination among permitting. A project could pass LTMS process, but not pass individual permitting hurdles and long lead time associated with approvals (e.g., Section 7 of ESA).

Availability of sites needs to be projected into the future for budgeting reasons.

Contracting process is lengthy and needs to coincide with timing requirements/restraints associated with individual projects.

Project needs to be in compliance with Biological “windows” for both dredging and disposal and informal or formal Section 7 consultation may be required if dredging/disposal outside of windows.

Projects must be distributed within the windows of the Biological Opinion - what happens if projects coincide?

Variability in dredging/disposal volumes (“spikes”) from year to year. Initially disposal volumes may be over 2.8 mcy in-Bay and under the next year.

Lack of coordination among dredgers for total dredging program.

Higher disposal and/or reuse costs; need to figure out how to optimize costs.