

**FINAL**  
**NAVAL TRAINING CENTER (NTC) BOAT CHANNEL**  
**REGULATORY AGENCY MEETING**  
**FEBRUARY 3, 2016**

***Meeting Attendees:***

Name	Title and Address	Email	Phone
<b>Janet Lear</b> U.S. Department of the Navy (Navy)	Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) Program Management Office (PMO)-West, Environmental Coordinator (BEC)  33000 Nixie Way, Building 50, 2 <sup>nd</sup> Floor, San Diego, CA 92147	<a href="mailto:Janet.lear@navy.mil">Janet.lear@navy.mil</a>	619-524-1924
<b>Valerie Harris</b> Navy	BRAC PMO-West, Lead Remedial Project Manager (RPM)  33000 Nixie Way, Building 50, 2 <sup>nd</sup> Floor, San Diego, CA 92147	<a href="mailto:valerie.j.harris@navy.mil">valerie.j.harris@navy.mil</a>	619-524-5901
<b>Bryce Bartelma</b> Navy	BRAC PMO-West, RPM  33000 Nixie Way, Building 50, 2 <sup>nd</sup> Floor, San Diego, CA 92147	<a href="mailto:Bryce.bartelma@navy.mil">Bryce.bartelma@navy.mil</a>	619-524-5887
<b>Sherrie Komeylyan</b> California Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB)	Water Resource Control Engineer  2375 Northside Drive, Suite 100, San Diego, CA 92109	<a href="mailto:Chehreh.Komeylyan@waterboards.ca.gov">Chehreh.Komeylyan@waterboards.ca.gov</a>	619 -521-3366
<b>Kelly Dorsey*</b> RWQCB	Senior Engineering Geologist  2375 Northside Drive, Suite 100, San Diego, CA 92109	<a href="mailto:Kelly.Dorsey@waterboards.ca.gov">Kelly.Dorsey@waterboards.ca.gov</a>	619-521-3357
<b>Carolyn Rech</b> California Fish and Wildlife (CDFW)	1700 K Street, Suite 250, Sacramento, CA 95811	<a href="mailto:Carolyn.Rech@wildlife.ca.gov">Carolyn.Rech@wildlife.ca.gov</a>	
<b>Katie Zeeman</b> U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (US F&W)	2177 Salk Avenue, Suite 250, Carlsbad, CA 92008	<a href="mailto:katie_zeeman@fws.gov">katie_zeeman@fws.gov</a>	760-431-9440 ext. 291

Name	Title and Address	Email	Phone
<b>Allen Tsao*</b> California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW)	1700 K Street, Suite 250, Sacramento, CA, 95811;	<a href="mailto:Allen.Tsao@wildlife.ca.gov">Allen.Tsao@wildlife.ca.gov</a>	916-296-6489 916-296-6489
<b>Laurie Sullivan*</b> National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA)	1410 Neotomas Avenue, Suite 110, Santa Rosa, CA 95405	<a href="mailto:Laurie.Sullivan@NOAA.gov">Laurie.Sullivan@NOAA.gov</a>	
<b>Tom McDonnell</b> Brown and Caldwell	Navy Contractor 18200 Von Karman Ave # 400, Irvine, CA 92612	<a href="mailto:TMcDonnell@BrwnCald.com">TMcDonnell@BrwnCald.com</a>	714-689-4847
<b>Campbell Merrifield</b> Trevet Inc.	Navy Contractor 9888 Carroll Center Rd, Suite 228, San Diego, CA 92126	<a href="mailto:cmerrifield@trevetinc.com">cmerrifield@trevetinc.com</a>	415-450-1400

The meeting was held in the BRAC PMO West offices with additional attendees participating by telephone. An “\*” indicates attendee participated by telephone.

## **1. Introductions**

The attendees introduced themselves and a sign in sheet was completed. Ms. Lear (Navy) said the Navy together with the lead agency, RWQCB are pleased to report that the Draft Final Feasibility Study (FS) Report for IR Site 12, the boat channel sediments, will be available in February 2016, and a draft Record of Decision will be available later in 2016. The Remedial Investigation (RI) Work Plan was finalized in 1999, and the RI Report was finalized in 2003. She said supplemental data evaluations and risk assessments were performed following the Final RI Report. The last time the full team met was in 2007 and the group concluded that the boat channel sediment did not represent an ecological risk to bird and mammal wildlife and no further evaluation was required for these receptors.

Since that time, the Navy and the RWQCB have been working together to refine the benthic invertebrate community risk assessment and evaluation. Ms. Lear clarified that the focus of this meeting was to summarize the decisions made by all parties in 2007 regarding the wildlife risk for birds and mammals and to summarize the agreements and resolutions that the RWQCB and the Navy have made on the benthic invertebrate risk since the RI Report was finalized. The risk assessments are complete, and Chemicals of Ecological Concern (COECs), as well as the area of ecological concern (AOEC) have been selected. The Draft Final FS will document the previous agreements summarized during today’s meeting, as well as, present the path forward for the boat channel sediments.

## ***2. Installation Restoration (IR) Site 12 Boat Channel Sediments Project Update***

Mr. McDonnell reviewed the background and history of the Boat Channel and pointed out that the northeastern tip of the Boat Channel is actually within the Marine Corps Recruit Depot (MCRD) San Diego. He reviewed the sediment sampling station locations where sediment and water samples were collected during the RI. He said the Final RI Report was issued in October 2003, and since then supplemental evaluations have been conducted with regard to the human health risk assessment, the wildlife ecological risk assessment and the benthic invertebrate risk assessment.

Mr. McDonnell said the supplemental human health risk evaluation included an alternate exposure model, using the sediment to fish uptake bioaccumulation factors based on the Macoma clam as well as an evaluation of cobalt background concentrations. The Navy and RWQCB agreed that the risk identified to anglers is similar to background risk or is within the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) range and no further action was required based on human health risk.

Mr. Tsao (CDFW) asked if the ecological risk assessment included a similar exposure model, including the sediment uptake. Mr. McDonnell said a supplemental ecological risk assessment conducted in 2007 did include the sediment uptake as a factor in the ecological risk assessment, and that information was presented in the Draft Final FS. Mr. McDonnell reviewed the evaluations conducted for the supplemental wildlife ecological risk analysis with input from agencies. He said the final risk assessment did not identify unacceptable risk for wildlife (mammals and birds). Ms. Zeeman asked what lead toxicity reference value (TRV) was used for avian receptors. He said a conservative concentration was used based on recommendations from CDFW.

Mr. McDonnell reviewed the process the Navy and the RWQCB agreed upon to evaluate potential risk to benthic invertebrates. Each of the 26 sediment sampling stations was assessed in a manner similar to the sediment quality objective (SQO) methodology using multiple lines of evidence. As a result of this station assessment, two stations were identified as “Likely Impacted”; and six stations were identified as “Possibly Impacted”.

Mr. McDonnell said the COECs in the Boat Channel sediment are copper, lead, zinc, total DDT and total chlordane. He said two sets of risk-based cleanup goals were developed for the COECs; one set was based on Apparent Effect Thresholds (AETs) and one set was based on the 95% Upper Predictive Limits (95UPLs). The Navy and the RWQCB selected the 95UPLs as the sediment cleanup goals. The Navy and the RWQCB agreed that if the surface sediment concentration at the Possibly Impacted stations exceeded the sediment cleanup goals then the station was included in the Area of Ecological Concern (AOEC). Additionally, two stations (S2S9 and S2S10) were identified for action due to potential adverse effects from based on elevated concentrations of total dichlorodiphenyltrichloroethane (DDT) in subsurface sediment. Seven polygons were included in the AOEC (S1S1, S1S4, S1S5, S1S6, S2S4, S2S9, and S2S10).

Mr. McDonnell said the Remedial Action Objective (RAO) is to prevent the direct contact between the benthic invertebrates and the sediment COECs that may be harmful to them. The FS evaluated eight remedial action alternatives. He reviewed the comparative analysis of

alternatives, including: capping, removal of sediments for off-site disposal, removal of sediments for reuse as general fill or removal of sediments for use as daily cover at an off-site landfill. The highest rated alternative was dredging and removal of sediments to an offsite landfill.

The path forward is to finalize the FS Report, and then prepare a Proposed Plan that will identify Alternative 6 (dredging and removal of sediment to an off-site landfill) as the preferred alternative. He said the alternative will involve dredging at the seven polygons identified, limited laterally to 12 feet below mean lower low water (MLLW). He said at 12 feet below water, the slope becomes greater than 10% at which point the dredging equipment is less effective. He said 12 feet below the MLLW is generally the outer edge of the eel grass areas. Approximately 9.5 acres would be dredged.

Mr. McDonnell reviewed the calendar for upcoming documents. Ms. Lear said because there is no Site Remediation Agreement, it has been difficult to get funding for this project, however, the Navy has the funding allocated now and the Navy would like to remain on schedule so there is not a risk of losing the funding for this project.

Ms. Zeeman asked what the proposed removals will do to the contours of the bottom of the channel. She asked if it will lower the depth a couple of feet or if clean fill will be used. Mr. Bartelma (Navy) said that the depth of the dredging varies from one to three feet depending on the location and fill placement is not planned. Ms. Zeeman asked if the FS Report will show the depths of the dredging. Mr. McDonnell said cross-sections are included in the report and more detail will be provided in the upcoming remedial design/remedial action work plan. Ms. Zeeman asked if there will be dredging in eel grass areas. Mr. Bartelma said the proposed dredging area is outside of eel grass habitat.

Ms. Rech (CDFW) asked about dredging logistics. Mr. Bartelma indicated that barge mounted equipment will likely be used to dredge the area and the Navy will be working on the plans including the type of dredging equipment and locations for offloading sediments.

Mr. Bartelma said a meeting of the former NTC San Diego Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) will be scheduled for early March at a location nearby. All meeting attendees expressed interest to receive RAB Meeting notifications. Mr. Tsao asked if the NTC RAB would piggy-back on any other RABs in the area. Ms. Lear said the Navy looked into that but it was not feasible.

The meeting adjourned for a site tour.