



**DREDGED MATERIAL
MANAGEMENT OFFICE
(DMMO)**

**THIRD PILOT PHASE
REVIEW REPORT**

(October 1, 1997 through December 31, 1998)

June 11, 1999

Dredged Material Management Office Third Pilot Phase Review Report

The San Francisco Bay Area's pilot Dredged Material Management Office (DMMO) has completed its review of the DMMO's third pilot phase. The DMMO is a joint program of the San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission (BCDC); the San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB); the California State Lands Commission (SLC); the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, San Francisco District (USACE); and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region IX (EPA). In late 1995, a pilot DMMO program was initiated to determine whether and how a permanent program such as this should be established and operated. The attached report prepared by the staffs of the participating DMMO agencies evaluates the program's status. To date the DMMO has reviewed and made recommendations regarding 164 dredging and dredged material disposal projects in San Francisco Bay, with 69 projects reviewed during the third pilot phase.

The projects reviewed by the DMMO during the third phase have accounted for over 20 million cubic yards of material proposed for dredging and disposal from both maintenance dredging and new work projects. Of the new work projects reviewed during the third phase, approximately five percent of the proposed dredged material was not suitable for unconfined aquatic disposal (NUAD). Of the maintenance dredging projects reviewed during this phase, only one percent of material was NUAD. Prior to the initiation of the DMMO the participating agencies had estimated that up to ten percent of dredged material would be NUAD.

The staffs of the DMMO agencies have recommended to the Dredging Management Committee, which consists of each member agency's executive-level staff person or commander, and which oversees the DMMO, that the DMMO continue in a pilot phase until the DMMO is formalized as a permanent program. The transition to a permanent program will be dependent upon development of an automated permit tracking database, and on continued review of projects involving ocean disposal and upland/wetland/reuse.

Staff Contacts:

USACE	David Dwinell (Coordinator)	(415) 977-8471	[ddwinell@spd.usace.army.mil]
BCDC	John Weber	(415) 557-8765	[jweber@bcdc.ca.gov]
RWQCB	Glynnis Collins	(510) 622-2318	[gnc@rb2.swrcb.ca.gov]
SLC	Mary Howe	(916) 574-1839	[howem@slc.ca.gov]
EPA	Kathy Dadey	(415) 744-1995	[dadey.kathleen@epamail.epa.gov]

Non-member Resource Agency Contact:

CDFG	Becky Ota	(650) 688-6361	[bota@dfg2.ca.gov]
------	-----------	----------------	--------------------

(California Department of Fish and Game)

I. INTRODUCTION AND PURPOSE OF THE DMMO

The Pilot Program of the multi-agency Dredged Material Management Office (DMMO) was established to foster a comprehensive and consolidated approach to handling dredged material management issues in order to reduce redundancy and delays in the processing of dredging permit applications and Federal Navigation dredging, while ensuring environmental protection. The DMMO, in part, grew out of the Long Term Management Strategy (LTMS) for the disposal of dredged material in the San Francisco Bay area. The San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB); State Water Resources Control Board; San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission (BCDC); U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region IX (EPA); the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, South Pacific Division; and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, San Francisco District (USACE) are signatories to the LTMS program.

In 1995 the LTMS agencies formed a pilot DMMO, under existing authorities and budgets. The DMMO member agencies are the EPA, USACE, RWQCB, BCDC, and the California State Lands Commission (SLC). The USACE agreed to act as the “host” of the DMMO and take on responsibilities associated with this role. The California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) actively participates in the DMMO as a commenting resource agency. DMMO agencies have requested participation by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), and other interested agencies.

The DMMO facilitates the processing of dredging permit applications within existing law, regulation and policy. All applicable regulatory authority and processes of the member agencies remain in effect. The DMMO was specifically designed to provide a mechanism for consistent review of permit applications through coordinated efforts of DMMO member agencies. It also provides a mechanism to allow the involvement and participation of permit applicants and interested parties during the application process. The DMMO meetings are typically held twice monthly at the USACE offices in San Francisco.

The geographic area of the DMMO includes all of the San Francisco Bay Estuary up to Sherman Island, its major tributaries up to points where navigation is no longer feasible, upland areas surrounding the estuary, and the San Francisco Deep Ocean Disposal Site (SF-DODS) designated by the EPA. The member agencies have also agreed to coordinate with the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board regarding reuse of Bay dredged material in the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta region. Future coordination with the California Coastal Commission is envisioned as DMMO takes a more active role in reviewing applications for ocean disposal of dredged material.

II. HISTORY OF PREVIOUS REPORTS

The initial Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) for the Pilot DMMO was signed by all member agencies on July 9, 1996. In accordance with the terms of that MOU, at the end of each of two six-month pilot phases, the member agency staffs prepared a report for the Dredging Management Committee (DMC), consisting of management representatives of the DMMO member agencies, on the progress and success of the DMMO.

The first six-month pilot phase of the DMMO as well as the initial development period were described in the *Dredged Material Management Office (DMMO) Six-Month Pilot Phase Review Report* dated March 28, 1997. The initial pilot phase report was approved and accompanied by a

revised MOU also dated March 28, 1997 and signed by the DMC representatives. The report was presented and discussed, and public comments were addressed at a joint LTMS Policy Review Committee (PRC) and BCDC public meeting.

With approval of the revised MOU, the second six-month phase of the DMMO was initiated on April 1, 1997 and completed on September 30, 1997. The revised MOU retained the initial reporting requirements. Revised operational guidance for the second six-month phase of the DMMO was also provided in the revised MOU. The second six-month pilot phase of the DMMO was reported in the *Dredged Material Management Office (DMMO) Second Six-Month Pilot Phase Review Report* dated January 28, 1998, and was followed by a revised MOU dated March 6, 1998. The second six-month report was presented and discussed at a PRC meeting, at which public comments were addressed.

The revised MOU, in section 11(d)(3), requires:

At least once per year, the DMMO will prepare an annual report and conduct a public meeting on the report. The report will contain information regarding dredging projects, permit issues, disposal site monitoring and other matters considered during the year. Presentations will be made, as needed, on technical issues and any studies and research that may have a direct or significant bearing on management of Bay Area Dredging and disposal activities. The proceedings of the annual meeting will be compiled and made available to the public.

This report constitutes the third phase report to the DMC and covers the period from October 1, 1997 through December 31, 1998. The public meeting for the report will be held in conjunction with a BCDC public meeting in the summer of 1999.

III. DMMO ACCOMPLISHMENTS AND OUTSTANDING ISSUES

Of the five objectives established by the *General Operating Principles, Pilot Dredged Material Management Office (DMMO)* dated September 12, 1995, the DMMO has met and continues to meet the first four objectives for all in-Bay and most upland and ocean disposal projects:

- Combined application form for maintenance dredging applications
- Coordinated staff processing of all dredging permit applications
- Preparation of joint staff recommendations on:
 - sediment quality sampling and analysis plans (SAP);
 - suitability calls for disposal; and
 - approval or denial of permits (including disposal location, timing, and other permit conditions¹)

¹ The revised MOU describes the required agency actions with regards to recommendations on permits as follows:
Agency staffs will also recommend general permit conditions (i.e. length of permit, bathymetric surveys) and special permit conditions (i.e. timing of dredging operations, turbidity controls), as appropriate, to be included in permit approvals.

Agency staffs shall support the consensus recommendations made through this process subject to final approval by the respective agencies. Recommendations will be documented in the minutes of the meetings and through member agency correspondence.

The MOU language better reflects the process that is followed by the member agencies during DMMO review of projects.

- Increased beneficial reuse of dredged material (Port of Richmond Parking Lot, Galbraith Golf Course in Oakland, and Winter Island).

Work on the remaining objective,

- Creation of a shared database for dredging projects and disposal sites monitoring information

is still in progress. The agencies are working on two separate databases, both of which will eventually be accessible via the DMMO web site that is currently maintained by the host agency (www.spn.usace.army.mil/conops/dmmo). The first will track the permitting process for projects reviewed by the DMMO. The second will include data on disposal site monitoring, as well as all chemical and biological sediment data that have been submitted to the DMMO.

ISSUES AND ISSUE RESOLUTION

The MOU directs that each pilot phase report contain an analysis of issues that arose during that pilot phase and provide recommendations for further actions to be reviewed and approved by the DMC. DMMO agency members have worked collectively to identify issues, concerns and recommendations. The issues identified during each of the three pilot phases are listed and briefly described below, followed by a discussion of the results achieved and any further recommended actions.

A. Issues Arising During First Six-Month Pilot Phase, Results, and Recommended Actions

1. Issue: Internal DMMO communications, minutes and agendas.

Results: Issue resolved, see previous reports.

Recommended Action: No further action anticipated, remove item from future reports.

2. Issue: Applicant coordination.

Results: Issue resolved, see previous reports.

Recommended Action: No further action anticipated, remove item from future reports.

3. Issue: DMMO project tracking. In accordance with the MOU, the DMMO “host” agency (USACE) will develop and maintain an electronic tracking database of permit information for DMMO projects.

Results: While work has started, the USACE has been unable to complete the project tracking database during the third DMMO pilot period, due to staff shortages, workloads, previous commitments and changing priorities. As an interim measure, projects are tracked internally, in spreadsheet format, pending the establishment of a fully automated system. The DMMO agencies have worked jointly to maintain and periodically update the interim tracking system (see Table 1), and plan to post it on the DMMO web page (see Section IV of this report).

Recommended Action: The USACE plans to obtain assistance of technical experts from other USACE installations to complete the project tracking database and link it to the DMMO web page. The interim database is expected to be accessible at the DMMO web page by September 1, 1999.

4. Issue: Meeting MOU time objectives. The MOU establishes several goals for the DMMO's review of projects. Without an automated project tracking database (see item 3, above), quantitative evaluation of the DMMO's success at meeting the MOU time objectives is difficult.

Results: Based on existing operating procedures and the interim tracking system, the DMMO agencies believe that the time objectives are currently being met. Each objective is addressed below:

- a. "The member agencies will respond to inquires from applicants, the public or each other, within two days for telephone responses, and within one week for written response."

Most interagency, public, and applicant inquires are answered immediately. Any required written responses by the DMMO are usually issued within one week.

- b. "All applicant submittals will be placed on the next DMMO agenda providing that they are received at least one week prior to a scheduled meeting."

Currently applicant submittals are placed on the agenda if received one week or more before a scheduled DMMO meeting and are often placed on the agenda with significantly less lead time. In addition, the DMMO has held conference calls and special meetings to discuss particular projects needing rapid responses.

- c. "The DMMO will respond to an applicant's submittal of sampling plans, sampling results and/or other agendized items within two weeks of DMMO consideration of the item. However, any dredging project proposing a change in a previously permitted material disposal environment, must submit a complete DMMO application prior to DMMO consideration of the SAP or sampling results."

In most cases, the DMMO provides official written responses to such items within two weeks.

- d. "The Host agency will distribute to the member agencies any submittals by applicants within five days of receipt."

This is currently being accomplished, with most submittals distributed within two days.

- e. "The member agencies will respond to applicants regarding the completeness of a submitted application within thirty days after the application is submitted."

The staffs of the DMMO agencies believe this is currently being accomplished.

- f. "The Host agency will prepare and distribute draft meeting minutes to member agencies within five days of the meeting date."

The Host agency is accomplishing this objective the majority of the time.

- g. "The DMMO agencies will issue any necessary public notices, or other staff reports regarding pending applications within thirty days after the application is deemed complete."

This is being accomplished.

- h. “The DMMO agencies will process applications in an expeditious manner so that the member agencies can issue or deny permits for those applicants within ninety days after the application is deemed complete.”

The agencies believe that this objective is being met.

Recommended Action: Until the electronic database is established, the DMMO will continue to use existing semi-automated and manual methods to evaluate time objectives.

- 5. Issue: Duration and content of outside party comments at DMMO meetings.

Results: Issue resolved, see previous reports.

Recommended Action: No further action anticipated, remove item from future reports.

- 6. Issue: Host agency conflict of interest.

Results: Issue resolved, see previous reports.

Recommended Action: No further action anticipated, remove item from future reports.

- 7. Issue: The lack of an established process to deal with non-consensus DMMO decisions.

Results: Issue resolved, see previous reports.

Recommended Action: No further action anticipated, remove item from future reports.

- 8. Issue: The project information submittal time, contained in the MOU, allows for DMMO review of a sampling and analysis plan (SAP) submitted in advance of the complete project application. Where an applicant is proposing a change in a previously permitted disposal environment, it is critical to have a complete project description prior to reviewing a SAP or sampling results.

Results: Issue resolved, see previous reports.

Recommended Action: No further action anticipated, remove item from future reports.

- 9. Issue: Delays in DMMO processing due to agency absence at meetings.

Results: Issue resolved, see previous reports.

Recommended Action: No further action anticipated, remove item from future reports.

B. Issues Arising During Second Six-Month Pilot Phase, Results, and Recommended Actions

- 1. Issue: Upland disposal projects. The MOU directs that the DMMO make joint staff recommendations on the suitability of dredged material for disposal at in-Bay disposal sites, ocean disposal sites or upland/wetland/reuse (UWR) disposal sites. During the first year pilot project, the DMMO concentrated its efforts on in-Bay and ocean disposal and excluded reviewing data from projects that proposed UWR disposal. In some cases, the exclusion of UWR disposal projects from the DMMO review process created confusion and frustration for both agencies and applicants.

Results: During the third pilot phase, DMMO acted on dredging projects where UWR was among the range of disposal alternatives under consideration. For projects proposing use of an established UWR disposal site, the individual existing administrative agency processes,

such as USACE Nationwide Permit authorization, are the most efficient means of review and authorization and could be delayed by DMMO intervention. Applicants proposing UWR disposal were encouraged to use the DMMO as a single point of entry into the permit process. DMMO agency staffs then forwarded pertinent project information to appropriate personnel within their respective agencies.

With the issuance of the final *Comprehensive Management Plan* for implementation of the LTMS, it is likely that the DMMO will have more responsibility for the review of projects proposing UWR disposal.

Recommended Action: Consider holding separate staff education workshops on issues relating to UWR disposal of dredged material, such as testing requirements and sediment quality criteria for different disposal environments. Because UWR testing requirements and suitability determinations are generally within the State's purview, the DMMO agencies recommend that the RWQCB, with assistance from BCDC and SLC, convene these meetings.

2. Issue: In order to function better, the DMMO would benefit from greater interagency cooperation and improved personal communication between agency representatives.

Results: Since the last report, DMMO members held a meeting in Sacramento on July 9, 1998 with a facilitator provided by the California Department of Fish & Game. Each of the member agencies explained the background of their agency's interest in dredging and dredging disposal. Informal training regarding DMMO agency regulations and guidance has also been initiated. The DMMO will schedule such informal training whenever new members are assigned to the group. Coordination, cooperation, and communication have continued to improve. The issue is considered resolved.

Recommended Action: No further action anticipated, remove item from future reports.

3. Issue: During the second six-month pilot project, some communications with applicants occurred outside the MOU-established point of contact regarding project associated DMMO deliberations.

Results: DMMO members developed and agreed to follow a set of procedures once the group reaches consensus:

- (1) Communication with applicants on all decisions is made by the official DMMO point of contact staff person only;
- (2) All DMMO agency staff should honor the consensus determination;
- (3) In outside discussion with applicants, DMMO agency staff should not question or otherwise express doubts on the consensus decision; and
- (4) Disagreements are to be brought up within the DMMO. If consensus is not reached, the issues should be elevated as per Section 11(e) of the MOU.

The issue is considered resolved.

Recommended Action: No further action anticipated, remove item from future reports.

4. Issue: Lack of a database for tracking sediment testing results impairs the DMMO's ability to make recommendations on SAP adequacy and sediment suitability determinations. Project past history, especially results of physical, chemical and biological testing, are necessary for the

approval of a SAP or granting request for a Tier I exemption from sediment testing requirements. Currently, some SAP and Tier I requests either do not contain past data or present incomplete historical information. Thus, evaluation may rely on institutional memory or incomplete files, potentially resulting in inconsistent recommendations.

Results: The agencies agree on the need for such a database. Efforts by the USACE nationally with the Dredged Material Spatial Management, Analysis, and Resolution Tool (DMSMART) are being investigated.

Recommended Action: The Regional Board is working on a pilot database. For the next annual report, the process of developing this database will be reviewed to determine the resources and funding necessary to fully develop and implement the database to ensure its utility for all DMMO agencies.

5. Issue: Guidance regarding when DMMO detailed review of aquatic disposal projects is warranted. Non-navigational projects that do not require DMMO detailed review may include projects such as the side casting or replacement of excavated bottom material for pipeline or utility line installation.

Results: Individual agency policies and procedures must be considered during this process. The DMMO agencies have agreed to keep each other informed of these issues. This issue is considered resolved.

Recommended Action: No further action anticipated, remove item from future reports.

6. Issue: Need to encourage the other resource agencies to become more involved in the DMMO. With the exception of the CDFG, other resource agencies have not actively participated in the DMMO process. Resource agency participation can facilitate processing of dredging projects permit applications by bringing up and resolving issues early in the permitting process.

Results: Non-participating resource agencies have been included on distribution of all DMMO agendas and minutes. This has not resulted in increased participation. It is anticipated that the USFWS and NMFS's programmatic Biological Opinions for the LTMS, which include specific restrictions on dredging and disposal, may provide these agencies with a new impetus for participation.

Recommended Action: Continue to encourage resource agency participation; include resource agencies on DMMO distribution list and provide them with agendas and meeting minutes. Explore options such as conference calls for projects of potential interest to the USFWS and NMFS. The DMMO agencies will make an additional effort to directly contact USFWS and NMFS. If this effort is not successful, the DMMO may suggest that the Dredging Management Committee contact USFWS and NMFS directly to solicit their involvement.

7. Issue: More thorough review of applications at the DMMO level and consensus determination of the completeness of the project application.

Results: All applications received by the DMMO are now scheduled on the agenda and reviewed for completeness at DMMO meetings. This issue is considered resolved.

Recommended Action: No further action anticipated, remove item from future reports.

8. Issue: Need for Sampling and Analysis Plan (SAP)/Quality Assurance Project Plan (QAPP) guidance. Guidance on sampling, reporting, and data quality requirements is needed for project

proponents. Such guidance would help avoid unnecessary project delays, streamline the review of applications, and provide a consistent database for agency decisions regarding dredged material suitability.

Results: The DMMO agencies are currently finalizing a draft document entitled “Sampling and Analysis Plan (Quality Assurance Project Plan) Guidance for Dredging Projects within the San Francisco District.” This document provides guidance to project proponents on how to prepare and submit sampling plans and testing result reports, and uses EPA national guidance on the preparation of Quality Assurance Project Plans.

Recommended Action: Continue with preparation of the guidance. Distribute the guidance document for public comment via Public Notice by July 1, 1999.

C. Issues Arising During Third Pilot Phase, Results, and Recommended Actions

While no new issues arose during the third pilot phase, the unresolved issues from the first two pilot phases continued to be important, and the DMMO worked towards their resolution. Issues regarding internal DMMO communications and procedures for applicants or other interested parties attending DMMO meetings (Issues 1 and 5 from the first six-month pilot phase) were resolved during the third phase. Also resolved were issues relating to interagency cooperation, communication with applicants regarding DMMO deliberations, addressing non-navigational dredging projects, and ensuring thorough review of DMMO applications (Issues 2, 3, 5, and 7 from the second six-month pilot phase).

IV. THIRD PILOT PHASE ACTIVITIES

During the third pilot phase, the DMMO made progress on and resolved many of the outstanding issues from the first and second pilot phases (described in sections III.A and III.B, above). In addition, the DMMO continued to review dredging project proposals, began work on guidance for local implementation of *Evaluation of Dredged Material Proposed for Discharge in Waters of the U. S. – Testing Manual (Inland Testing Manual)* (EPA and USACE, February, 1998), created the DMMO web page, continued development of a project tracking database, and continued staff education activities. These efforts are described below.

PROJECT REVIEW

Since its inception, the DMMO has reviewed a total of 164 dredging projects, including both USACE and non-USACE projects. During the third pilot phase, a total of 69 dredging projects were reviewed. A listing and summary of action dates for these projects is presented in Table 1 attached to this report. DMMO activities have been completed for 61 of these projects and eight remain under review. Generally for those projects still pending, either the final design of the SAP is underway or the applicant is conducting the testing and analysis. Among the projects reviewed during the third phase were eight USACE civil works projects, which are included in Table 1. The DMMO has completed the review on all the USACE projects.

OTHER PROGRESS

Development of a Web Page for DMMO Related Information: In June, 1998, The DMMO “host” agency (USACE) developed a web site containing information on the DMMO and on dredging and dredged material disposal. This site provides links to DMMO meeting schedules and agendas; dredging- related Public Notices; testing manuals; LTMS Workshop schedules, meeting minutes, public comment letters; and other related publications.

The table below shows the number of hits and average viewing time by internet users other than USACE for the last three months of the third pilot phase.

Month	Number of Hits	Average Viewing time (minutes)
October 1998	73	3:55
November 1998	59	0:26
December 1998	56	5:00

Inland Testing Manual (ITM) Regional Guidance: During the third phase of the pilot DMMO program, the ITM was promulgated by USACE and EPA nationally. In the Implementation Memorandum for the ITM, USACE Districts and EPA Regions were charged with issuing regional guidance “to supplement the ITM to reflect regional circumstances as quickly as possible but no later than July 1, 1999.” The DMMO agencies have been working on local implementation guidance, and expect to distribute the draft guidance to the public via Public Notice, with a 60-day comment period, by July 1, 1999.

DMMO staff education: During the third pilot phase, the DMMO agencies have made efforts to include staff education in their activities. In addition to informal staff education on agency regulations and responsibilities, staff of the DMMO agencies have made joint field trips to:

- Observe sediment sampling
- Observe dredging and disposal techniques
- Observe beneficial reuse projects
- Participate in LTMS Workshops

V. ON-GOING AND FUTURE ACTIVITIES

Following the completion of the third pilot phase, the DMMO has continued to operate, reviewing dredging project proposals and making progress on the outstanding issues described in Section III of this report. On-going and proposed future activities of the DMMO are described below.

Future reports and annual meetings: The DMMO will continue to produce annual reports covering calendar years, and will arrange annual meetings at which the reports will be presented. The DMMO agencies anticipate that future annual meetings will be day-long and independent of other meetings, and will include presentations and discussions of matters considered by the DMMO during the year, and of other matters relevant to management of dredged material disposal in the Bay area.

Continue to coordinate review of project proposals: The DMMO will continue to coordinate review of dredging project permit applications. It is expected that the DMMO will be increasingly involved in review of projects proposing disposal of dredged material at the ocean disposal site and for beneficial reuse. Further guidance on the DMMO’s role in review of these projects is anticipated to be included in the LTMS *Comprehensive Management Plan*.

Sediment Quality Database: A RWQCB staff member has assembled sediment testing results from dredging projects into a database and is working on linking the database to a Geographical Information System. It is likely that the finished product could be linked to the DMMO web site

and serve as the DMMO's sediment quality database, including data on disposal site monitoring. This database would meet one of the objectives in the *General Operating Principles, Pilot Dredged Material Management Office (DMMO)* (see Section III of this report), and address the DMMO's need for a database tracking sediment testing results (see Section III, Issue B.4).

SAP template: In conjunction with the SAP/QAPP Guidelines discussed above, the DMMO plans to issue a document that can serve as a template for project proponents preparing SAPs.

Tier I guidance: The DMMO agencies are preparing a document to provide guidance, appropriate to all three disposal environments, to project proponents requesting a "Tier I" exemption from sediment testing.

Regional Implementation Manual: The DMMO agencies will prepare a Regional Implementation Manual which will compile testing requirements for UWR, in-Bay and ocean disposal of dredged sediments, based on Federal and State guidance.

Electronic version of DMMO application: The DMMO is currently finalizing an electronic version of the Consolidated DMMO Application form. When finalized, applicants will be able to receive copies on diskette, via electronic mail, or at the DMMO web site.

Increase public understanding of DMMO role in permitting process: Questions about the role of DMMO in the permitting process for dredging and disposal projects arose during some of the LTMS Management Plan public workshops that have occurred since the end of the third pilot phase of the DMMO. There are concerns on the part of some in the environmental and dredging communities about how the DMMO makes decisions and questions about how the public can access DMMO meetings and information about DMMO decisions. In response to these concerns, the DMMO agencies have distributed a "DMMO Fact Sheet," a one-page description of the role of the DMMO. The agencies have also increased efforts to make meeting agendas, minutes, and other relevant information available on the DMMO web site. Finally, the DMMO agencies are planning to initiate completely public DMMO meetings (currently, the portion of meetings when the agencies deliberate on projects is not open to the public, although complete meeting minutes are available after-the-fact). It is anticipated that completely public DMMO meetings will be initiated in 1999. The DMMO is currently determining the proper way to provide public notice of DMMO meetings, including use of the web site and perhaps mailing agendas.

CONCLUSION

The DMMO agencies and the applicants have found the DMMO to be very useful in coordinating review of dredging project proposals and in encouraging intra- and inter-agency consistency in the decision making process. The agencies recommend that the DMMO continue in a pilot phase, pending formalization of the program. The transition to a permanent program will be dependent upon development of an automated permit tracking database, and on continued review of projects involving ocean disposal and upland/wetland/reuse.

As the role of the DMMO becomes clarified through guidance in the LTMS *Comprehensive Management Plan*, it is expected that the agencies comprising the DMMO will act to formalize the arrangement through a new MOU, which will clearly describe the procedures under which the DMMO will operate.

Table 1. Projects reviewed by the DMMO during the third pilot phase.

Project	Application received	SAP/Tier I request rec'd	SAP or Tier I approval ¹	Sediment suitability determination			Disposal site ²	Corps PN issued	Approval/permit issued			
				Date ³	SUAD ⁴ (cy)	NUAD ⁵ (cy)			Corps	RWQCB	BCDC	SLC
Arques Marina	29-Jul-98	23-Jul-98	15-Sep-98	24-Mar-99	23,000	7,000	SF-11/UWR	pending	pending	pending	pending	NA
Ballena Isle Marina	31-Oct-95	Dec-95	09-Jun-98	18-Sep-98	40,000	0	SF-11			21-Oct-98	pending	NA
Benicia Port Terminal	16-Oct-97	19-Sep-97	06-Oct-97	NA	29,803	0	SF-9	15-Jun-92		16-Oct-96	26-Aug-98	07-Nov-97
Benicia Port Terminal	27-May-98	Oct-97	11-Mar-98		45,000	0	SF-9	16-Jan-98	27-Oct-98	17-Jun-98	26-Aug-98	NA
Brisbane Marina at Sierra Point	Sep-97	Dec-97	Dec-97	13-May-98	224,000	0	SF-11	11-Jun-98	29-Mar-99	17-Sep-98	16-Feb-99	15-Sep-97
Caltrans/ Benicia-Martinez Bridge	5-Apr-95	22-Oct-98	08-Dec-98	pending	NA	NA	SF-9	pending	pending	pending	14-Mar-97	NA
Caltrans/ San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge	13-Aug-97	pending	pending	pending	NA	NA	SF-11	pending	pending	pending	pending	NA
Caltrans/ Carquinez Bridge	5-Apr-95	22-Oct-98	08-Dec-98	pending	NA	NA	SF-9	pending	pending	pending	20-Nov-98	NA
Chevron Richmond Long Wharf B 2&3	29-Jul-93	19-Aug-98	26-Aug-98	NA	85,000	0	SF-11	27-Aug-93	14-Oct-93	30-Sep-98	08-Oct-98	NA
Chevron Richmond Long Wharf B1&4	29-Jul-93	02-Jun-98	09-Jun-98	26-Aug-98	112,000	0	SF-11	27-Aug-93	14-Oct-93	30-Sep-98	08-Oct-98	NA
City of Foster City	15-Sep-98	15-Sep-98	pending	pending	NA	NA	SF-11	pending	pending	pending	pending	NA
Clipper Yacht Harbor	17-Jul-92	20-Oct-97	06-Nov-97	NA	600	0	SF-11	30-Sep-92	31-May-94	02-Jan-98	21-Mar-94	NA
Clipper Yacht Harbor	17-Jul-92	25-Nov-98	08-Dec-98	NA	350	0	SF-11	30-Sep-92	31-May-94	02-Jan-98	21-Mar-94	NA
Exxon Benicia Refinery	22-May-92	05-Sep-97	01-Oct-97	04-Dec-97	30,000	0	SF-9	09-Sep-92	07-Dec-92	NA	01-Nov-99	NA
Exxon Benicia Refinery	16-Jun-97	03-Feb-98	17-Feb-98	NA	23,000	0	SF-9	07-Oct-97	13-Mar-98	19-Nov-97	13-Jan-98	07-Nov-97
Exxon Benicia Refinery	16-Jun-97	13-Jul-98	22-Jul-98	15-Sep-98	40,000	0	SF-9	07-Oct-97	13-Mar-98	19-Nov-97	13-Jan-98	07-Nov-97
Galilee Harbor	20-Feb-92	04-Jun-98	09-Jun-98	14-Oct-98	5,600	1,400	SF-11/UWR	10-Jun-92	28-Feb-96	06-Nov-98	NA	09-May-96

Table 1 (cont'd)

Project	Application received	SAP/Tier I request rec'd	SAP or Tier I approval ¹	Sediment suitability determination			Disposal site ²	Corps PN issued	Approval/permit issued			
				Date ³	SUAD ⁴ (cy)	NUAD ⁵ (cy)			Corps	RWQCB	BCDC	SLC
Jackson Property, Bellevue	05-Aug-98	28-Jul-98	15-Sep-98	NA	300	0	SF-11	09-Aug-93	12-Sep-94	12-Jan-99	04-Feb-99	NA
Kappas Marina	09-Apr-98	14-Mar-97	23-Jul-97	22-Apr-98	22,136	0	SF-11	10-Jul-98	12-Jan-99	19-Aug-98	24-Sep-98	NA
Larkspur Landing Ferry Terminal	26-Feb-99	25-Nov-98	08-Dec-98	16-Mar-99	730,000	0	SF-11	pending	pending	pending	pending	13-Apr-99
Marin Rowing Association	03-Jul-98	13-Jul-98	26-Aug-98	NA	1,000	0	SF-11	20-Jan-99	12-Apr-99	12-Jan-99	21-Jan-99	NA
Marin Yacht Club	09-Apr-98	09-Apr-98	<i>Tier I denied 08-May-98</i>	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Marin Yacht Club	06-Apr-98	13-Jul-98	15-Sep-98	08-Dec-98	17,000 ⁶	0	SF-11	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Marin Yacht Club	06-Apr-98	09-Feb-99	NA	06-Apr-99	17,000	0	SF-10	pending	pending	pending	pending	19-Jun-98
Marina Vista Homeowners Association	03-Jul-98	13-Jul-98	15-Sep-98	17-Feb-99	13,000 ⁶	0	SF-11	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Marina Vista Homeowners Association	03-Jul-98	09-Feb-99	NA	06-Apr-99	13,000	0	SF-10	pending	pending	pending	pending	NA
Oyster Point Marina	10-Jul-98	13-Jul-98	21-Jan-98	12-Aug-98	90,000	0	SF-11	02-Oct-98	20-Jan-99	16-Sep-98	20-Oct-98	NA
Paradise Cay (Marin Co. Service Area #29)	20-Mar-98	08-Jul-98	14-Oct-98	NA	27,000	0	SF-11	19-Jun-98		23-Feb-99	22-Apr-99	NA
Paradise Cay subdivision (Timmer's Landing)	13-Feb-98	Jan-98	08-Jan-98	NA	9,600	0	SF-11	02-Apr-98	28-Aug-98	19-Feb-98	15-Jun-98	12-Feb-97
Port of Oakland, 50 foot Project Harbor Deepening	16-Apr-97	Apr-97		9-Nov-98	11,443,000 ⁷	446,000 ⁷				pending	pending	NA
Port of Oakland, Berth 7	12-Nov-97	Mar-98	09-Apr-98	12-Aug-98	25,000		SF-11/UWR	20-Jan-98	06-May-98	18-Mar-98	24-Apr-98	NA
Port of Oakland, Berths 20/21 & 32/33	12-Nov-97	24-Apr-98	13-May-98	NA	25,000	0	SF-11	20-Jan-98	06-May-98	18-Mar-98	24-Apr-98	NA
Port of Oakland, Berth 22	12-Nov-97	25-Mar-98	25-Mar-98	NA	32,000	0	SF-11	20-Jan-98	06-May-98	18-Mar-98	24-Apr-98	NA

Table 1 (cont'd)

Project	Application received	SAP/Tier I request rec'd	SAP or Tier I approval ¹	Sediment suitability determination			Disposal site ²	Corps PN issued	Approval/permit issued			
				Date ³	SUAD ⁴ (cy)	NUAD ⁵ (cy)			Corps	RWQCB	BCDC	SLC
Port of Oakland, Berth 23	12-Nov-97	24-Apr-98	13-May-98	NA	28,000	0	SF-11	20-Jan-98	06-May-98	18-Mar-98	24-Apr-98	NA
Port of Oakland, Berth 24	12-Nov-97	24-Apr-98	13-May-98	12-Aug-98	7,400	0	SF-11	20-Jan-98	06-May-98	18-Mar-98	24-Apr-98	NA
Port of Oakland, Berths 25/26	12-Nov-97	24-Apr-98	13-May-98	12-Aug-98	20,000	0	SF-11	20-Jan-98	06-May-98	18-Mar-98	24-Apr-98	NA
Port of Oakland, Berth 30	12-Nov-97	24-Apr-98	13-May-98	12-Aug-98	30,000	0	SF-11	20-Jan-98	06-May-98	18-Mar-98	24-Apr-98	NA
Port of Oakland, Berth 35	12-Nov-97	24-Apr-98	13-May-98	12-Aug-98	7,000	0	SF-11	20-Jan-98	06-May-98	18-Mar-98	24-Apr-98	NA
Port of Oakland, Berth 37	12-Nov-97	24-Apr-98	13-May-98	12-Aug-98	5,000	0	SF-11	20-Jan-98	06-May-98	18-Mar-98	24-Apr-98	NA
Port of Oakland, Berths 55-58 Keyway Sediment	31-Oct-97	10-Dec-98	24-Mar-99	pending	NA	NA	SF-11			pending	pending	NA
Port of Oakland, Berths 55-58 Project	31-Oct-97	10-Nov-98	10-Nov-98	06-Jan-99	2,726,000 ⁷	358,000 ⁷	SF-11/UWR				pending	NA
Port of Oakland, Berths 60-63, 67/68	12-Nov-97	10-Dec-98	24-Mar-99	pending	NA	NA	SF-11	20-Jan-98	06-May-98	18-Mar-98	24-Apr-98	NA
Port of Oakland, Jack London Square Marina	12-Nov-97	Jul-97	NA	NA	0	33,500 ⁶	UWR	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Port of Oakland, Jack London Square Marina	12-Nov-97	Jul-98	22-Dec-98	3-Sep-98	8,420	24,980	SF-11/UWR	20-Jan-98	06-May-98	18-Mar-98	24-Apr-98	NA
Port of Richmond, Marina Entrance Channel	18-Dec-97	03-Apr-98	pending	pending	NA	NA	SF-11	13-Feb-98	pending	pending	pending	NA
Port of Richmond, Terminal 4	18-Dec-97	18-Mar-98	25-Mar-98	08-Jul-98	20,000	0	SF-11	13-Feb-98		16-Sep-98		NA
Port of Redwood City, Berth 1&2	05-Mar-96	Apr-97	Jun-97	06-Oct-97	0	22,630 ⁶	SF-11	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Port of Redwood City, Berth 1&2	05-Mar-96	Jan-98	21-Jan-98	04-Feb-98	16,800	5,200	SF-11/UWR	19-Nov-97	18-Feb-98	09-Apr-98	21-Jul-98	NA
Port of Redwood City, Berth 3	05-Mar-96	Jul-97	Aug-97	23-Oct-97	14,724	0	SF-11	19-Nov-97	18-Feb-98	02-Jan-98	21-Jul-98	NA

Table 1 (cont'd)

Project	Application received	SAP/Tier I request rec'd	SAP or Tier I approval ¹	Sediment suitability determination			Disposal site ²	Corps PN issued	Approval/permit issued			
				Date ³	SUAD ⁴ (cy)	NUAD ⁵ (cy)			Corps	RWQCB	BCDC	SLC
Port of San Francisco, Pier 27	04-Mar-97	04-Mar-98	11-Mar-98	13-May-98	26,000	0	SF-11	01-Aug-97	07-Nov-97	21-May-97	07-Jul-97	11-Jul-97
Port of San Francisco, Pier 35	04-Mar-97	04-Mar-98	NA	15-Sep-98	19,800	5,170	SF-11/UWR	01-Aug-97	07-Nov-97	21-May-97	07-Jul-97	11-Jul-97
Port of San Francisco, Pier 35	04-Mar-97	29-May-98	09-Jun-98	12-Aug-98	35,034	13,481	SF-11/UWR	01-Aug-97	07-Nov-97	21-May-97	07-Jul-97	11-Jul-97
Port of San Francisco, Pier 50D	04-Mar-97	04-Mar-98	11-Mar-98	13-May-98	23,000	0	SF-11	01-Aug-97	07-Nov-97	21-May-97	07-Jul-97	11-Jul-97
Port of San Francisco, Pier 50D & 80D	01-Dec-98	01-Dec-98	08-Dec-98	NA	4,000	0	SF-11	01-Aug-97	07-Nov-97	21-May-97	08-Feb-99	11-Jul-97
Port of San Francisco, Pier 70 Central Basin	04-Mar-97	Jan-98	Jan-98	pending	NA	NA	SF-11	01-Aug-97	07-Nov-97	pending	07-Jul-97	11-Jul-97
Port of San Francisco, Pier 80A & Inner Islais Creek	04-Mar-97	28-Jul-98	12-Aug-98	14-Oct-98	62,000	0	SF-11	01-Aug-97	07-Nov-97	21-May-97	03-Nov-98	11-Jul-97
Port of San Francisco, Pier 80B & Outer Islais Creek	04-Mar-97	29-May-98			25,150	0	SF-11	01-Aug-97	07-Nov-97	21-May-97	07-Jul-97	11-Jul-97
Port of San Francisco, Pier 80C & Approach Channel	04-Mar-97	29-May-98	09-Jun-98	12-Aug-98	38,000	0	SF-11	01-Aug-97	07-Nov-97	21-May-97	07-Jul-97	11-Jul-97
Port of San Francisco, Pier 80D & Approach Channel	04-Mar-97	04-Mar-98	11-Mar-98	13-May-98	33,000	0	SF-11	01-Aug-97	07-Nov-97	21-May-97	07-Jul-97	11-Jul-97
Port of San Francisco, Pier 94	04-Mar-97	May-97	Nov-97		26,450	0	SF-11	01-Aug-97	07-Nov-97	21-May-97	07-Jul-97	NA
Port of San Francisco, Berth 94	04-Mar-97	04-Mar-98	11-Mar-98	13-May-98	10,000	0	SF-11	01-Aug-97	07-Nov-97	21-May-97	07-Jul-97	NA
Port of San Francisco, Hyde Street Harbor Project	04-Nov-97	18-Jun-98	08-Jul-98		5,000	250	SF-11/UWR	02-Oct-98	31-Mar-99	04-Nov-98		NA
Port of San Francisco, Pier 39 Marina (East & West)	03-Jul-98	13-Jul-98	15-Sep-98	pending	NA	NA	SF-11	pending	pending	pending	pending	NA

Table 1 (cont'd)

Project	Application received	SAP/Tier I request rec'd	SAP or Tier I approval ¹	Sediment suitability determination			Disposal site ²	Corps PN issued	Approval/permit issued			
				Date ³	SUAD ⁴ (cy)	NUAD ⁵ (cy)			Corps	RWQCB	BCDC	SLC
Ryer Island Boat Harbor (Exxon)	16-Jun-97	27-May-98	Withdrawn	NA	2,250	0	SF-9	07-Oct-97	13-Mar-98	withdrawn		NA
San Francisco Drydock, DD 1&2	18-Mar-97	25-Feb-98			266,000	0	SF-11	10-Apr-97	14-Aug-98	18-Sep-96	16-Jul-98	19-Jun-98
San Francisco Marina at Gas House Cove (ADA Gangway)	11-May-94	11-May-98	13-May-98	NA	0	200	UWR	20-Jul-94	01-Sep-94	21-Apr-99	20-Aug-98	NA
San Francisco Marina, West Basin	11-May-94	06-Jul-98	08-Jul-98	12-Aug-98	98,000	0	SF-11	20-Jul-94	01-Sep-94		20-Aug-98	NA
San Francisco Yacht Club	10-Jul-95	May-98	May-98	NA	5,000	0	SF-11	18-Sep-95	26-Jan-96		25-Aug-98	NA
San Rafael Rock Quarry Wharf	27-May-94	26-Jul-09	15-Sep-98	06-Apr-99	46,265 ⁶	0	SF-11	02-Nov-94	12-Apr-95	16-Feb-95	pending	NA
San Rafael Rock Quarry Wharf	27-May-94	NA	NA	NA	28,000	0	SF-10	02-Nov-94	12-Apr-95	16-Feb-95	pending	NA
Schoonmaker Point Marina	25-Feb-99	13-Jul-98	30-Sep-98	24-Mar-99	40,000	0	SF-11	pending	pending	pending		NA
Tosco Refinery (Rodeo)	08-Apr-98	27-Apr-98	13-May-98	NA	60,000	0	SF-9	19-Jun-98	18-Mar-99	pending	pending	19-Jun-98
Valentine Property, Alameda	14-Oct-98	14-Oct-98	10-Nov-98	NA	125	0	SF-11			16-Apr-99		NA
USACE Oakland Inner Harbor	NA	10-Aug-98	24-Aug-98	23-Sep-98	205,000	0	SF-11	NA	NA	19-Mar-97	02-Apr-98	NA
USACE Oakland Outer Harbor	NA	23-Oct-97	23-Oct-97	22-Dec-97	18,000	0	SF-11	NA	NA	19-Mar-97	02-Apr-98	NA
USACE Oakland Outer Harbor	NA	13-May-98	13-May-98	26-Aug-98	16,000	0	SF-11	NA	NA	19-Mar-97	02-Apr-98	NA
USACE Oakland Outer Harbor	NA	04-Jun-98	25-Jun-98	12-Aug-98	352,704	0	SF-11	NA	NA	19-Mar-97	02-Apr-98	NA
USACE Petaluma Across the Flats	NA	06-Apr-98	22-Apr-98	23-Sep-98	211,768	0	SF-10	NA	NA	19-Mar-97	02-Apr-98	NA
USACE Pinole Shoal	NA	Dec-98	06-Jan-99	NA	620,000	0	SF-10	NA	NA	07-Apr-99	15-Apr-99	NA

Table 1 (cont'd)

Project	Application received	SAP/Tier I request rec'd	SAP or Tier I approval ¹	Sediment suitability determination			Disposal site ²	Corps PN issued	Approval/permit issued			
				Date ³	SUAD ⁴ (cy)	NUAD ⁵ (cy)			Corps	RWQCB	BCDC	SLC
USACE Redwood City Harbor	NA	22-Dec-97	22-Dec-97	11-Mar-98	392,000	0	SF-11	NA	NA	19-Mar-97		NA
USACE Redwood City Harbor	NA	03-Sep-98	15-Sep-98	25-Nov-98	390,000	0	SF-11	NA	NA	19-Mar-97		NA
USACE Richmond Outer Harbor	NA	25-Feb-98	<i>25-Feb-98</i>	NA	289,000	0	SF-11	NA	NA	19-Mar-97	02-Apr-98	NA
USACE Suisun Bay Channel (Emergency)	NA	08-Jan-98	<i>08-Jan-98</i>	NA	7,000	0	SF-16	NA	NA	19-Mar-97		NA
USACE Suisun Bay Channel	NA	17-Mar-98	22-Apr-98		80,365	0	WI	NA	NA	19-Mar-97	17-Aug-98	NA

¹ Date of DMMO meeting. Text in italics denotes Tier I approvals

² Key to disposal site indices: SF-9 – Carquinez Straits Disposal Site
 SF-10 – San Pablo Bay Disposal Site
 SF-11 – Alcatraz Disposal Site
 SF-16 – Suisun Bay Disposal Site
 UWR – Upland/wetland/reuse
 WI – Winter Island, levee repair

³ Date of DMMO meeting.

⁴ Volume of material determined to be Suitable for Unconfined Aquatic Disposal, in cubic yards.

⁵ Volume of material determined to be Not suitable for Unconfined Aquatic Disposal, in cubic yards.

⁶ Project reviewed by DMMO more than once, only final volume determinations are included in volume tallies.

⁷ New work project, volume not included in maintenance dredging tallies.