



**Naval Facilities Engineering Command Southwest
BRAC PMO West
San Diego, CA**

**FINAL
Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) Meeting
Minutes**

NAVAL TRAINING CENTER SAN DIEGO, SAN DIEGO,
CALIFORNIA

AUGUST 22, 2018

Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited

DCN: TRVT-4803-0005-0017

This page intentionally left blank.



**Naval Facilities Engineering Command Southwest
BRAC PMO West
San Diego, CA**

**FINAL
Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) Meeting
Minutes**

**NAVAL TRAINING CENTER SAN DIEGO, SAN DIEGO,
CALIFORNIA**

AUGUST 220, 2018

Prepared for:



**Department of the Navy
Naval Facilities Engineering Command Southwest
BRAC PMO West
33000 Nixie Way, Bldg 50
San Diego, CA 92147**

Prepared by:



**7220 Trade Street, Suite 300
San Diego, California 92121
(858) 275-6454**

Contract Number: N62473-13-D-4803
Task Order: 0005
DCN: TRVT-4803-0005-0017

This page intentionally left blank.

**FORMER NAVAL TRAINING CENTER SAN DIEGO
RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD (RAB)
INSTALLATION RESTORATION (IR) SITE 12 BOAT CHANNEL SEDIMENTS
Subject: Restoration Advisory Board Meeting Minutes of August 22, 2018**

The 60th Naval Training Center (NTC) Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) meeting was held on Wednesday, August 22, 2018, at the Liberty Station Conference Center, 2600 Laning Road, Room #201, San Diego. The meeting was attended by:

RAB Members: Steve Marsh, Jim Callian, Jan Thoresen

Navy/Regulators: Dave Clark, Navy Lead Remedial Project Manager (RPM); Louie Cardinale, Navy RPM; Reginald Paulding, Navy Interim BRAC Environmental Coordinator (BEC) (Navy BRAC Program Management Office [PMO] West [Navy]); C. Sherrie Komeylyan, California Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) Project Manager

Navy Contractors: Carrie Ross, Parsons; Campbell Merrifield, Trevet; Katy Kelsoe, Trevet; Pete Stang, Trevet

City of San Diego: Davin Widgerow, Deputy City Attorney

Welcome and Introductions:

Mr. Clark (Navy) called the meeting to order at 6:05 PM and welcomed attendees to NTC RAB meeting number 60. Mr. Clark said the last meeting in August 2017 was held after the completion of the final Record of Decision for the NTC Boat Channel, the last remaining Installation Restoration site at NTC. He said the August 2017 meeting was also the kickoff for NTC Boat Channel remedial action, and included an overview of the planned remedy. Introductions of regulators were made.

Review and Revisions/Approval of Meeting Minutes:

Mr. Clark said meeting minutes for meeting #59 on August 10th, 2017 were submitted for review, and asked for any comments. Jan Thoresen moved to approve the meeting minutes as submitted; Jim Callian seconded the motion. All were in favor and the minutes were approved.

RAB Updates:

Field work for the Boat Channel remedial action was conducted and completed earlier this year. Mr. Clark introduced presenters Carrie Ross (Parsons) and Louie Cardinale (Navy) to speak about the project.

Remedial Action Summary:

Mr. Cardinale presented a history of the investigations and studies conducted at IR Site 12, the Boat Channel sediments, including its current usage as a marina and kayak launch, and the contaminants of ecological concern (COEC) in the sediments including the metals copper, lead

and zinc; and pesticides, chlordane and DDT. He said the Record of Decision (ROD) presented the remedy selected by the Navy, the removal of contaminated sediments in seven areas of ecological concern (AOEC) to an off-site landfill.

Mr. Cardinale reviewed the planning activities for the remedial action, including pre-design investigations and surveys that were conducted. He said the Boat Channel floor was mapped, sensitive eel grass habitat was identified in two of the seven AOECs, and no invasive algae was identified in the Boat Channel. He said samples collected to confirm the vertical extent of dredging and characterize sediment for waste disposal. The reported concentrations of the COECs within the sediment samples collected in six of the AOECs were below cleanup goals and the sediment was classified as non-hazardous for disposal. However, reported concentrations from samples in one AOEC exceeded cleanup goals, and was classified as Non-Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) California Hazardous Waste. Mr. Callian (RAB member) asked what was the determining constituent. Mr. Cardinale answered it was lead.

Mr. Cardinale identified the staging areas and the route to the processing area for the dredged material. He discussed preparation activities such as permitting and relocation of infrastructure.

Ms. Ross (Parsons) reviewed the preparation activities including noise mitigation signage, usage of turbidity monitors to track exceedances in water turbidity, and installation of a double silt curtain to minimize dredge-related turbidity. Mr. Callian asked if any exceedances occurred. Ms. Ross answered that some did occur, typically due to “propeller wash” from the tug boat, and that the silt curtains were inspected after each event to ensure that they remained intact and that any exceedances were not a direct result of the dredging activities.

Ms. Ross listed the environmental protection and water quality and air monitoring measures taken, and discussed how sediment handling, dewatering, stabilization and transport occurred during the remedial action. She explained that following the completion of the dredging, confirmation sediment samples were collected and analyzed, and all COECs were reported below cleanup goals.

Ms. Ross stated that a post-dredge bathymetric survey indicated that dredged volume exceeded design volume by only one percent. Post-dredge eelgrass surveys showed that dredging impacted 407 square meters of eelgrass beds. Mr. Cardinale explained that that the Navy Region Southwest Eelgrass Mitigation Bank authorized up to 450 square meters of eelgrass mitigation credits, and that a final determination of the area of eelgrass impacted will be made after four years of future monitoring. Mr. Marsh (RAB member) clarified that if some eelgrass grows back, it will be subtracted from what must be mitigated. Mr. Cardinale confirmed that this is correct, and thanked the RWQCB for their assistance in obtaining the credits.

Mr. Cardinale said the Remedial Action Objective was achieved. He said a draft of the Remedial Action Completion Report (RACR) supporting no further action has been submitted. He said the review period was extended to October 1st, 2018, after which the Navy will respond to comments

and the report will be finalized. Mr. Callian asked who requested the review period extension. Mr. Paulding (Navy) explained that the Navy has decided it is not necessary to publicize who made the request in order to best work collaboratively with the public.

Mr. Clark thanked everyone involved in the project for working together and negotiating various challenges and obstacles. He restated that the Remedial Action Completion Report is out for review and that there are no further plans for additional work in the NTC Boat Channel. Mr. Clark opened the meeting to comments and questions.

Public Comment Period:

Mr. Callian commended the Navy and regulatory agencies for reaching the completion of the remedial action. Mr. Clark stated that sediment dredging was chosen as the most definitive solution for removal of contamination. Mr. Callian noted that all confirmation samples were below cleanup goals, and most were non-detect. Mr. Clark responded that the characterization of the boat channel was very complete, which allowed for a good understanding of the contamination and favorable timing of field work.

Ms. Thoresen commented that the collaborative effort of the community helped the success of the project. Mr. Clark responded that the Navy works with the other agencies to try to provide a net positive impact on the environment.

Mr. Marsh commended the whole NTC project, noting that all 15 Installation Restoration sites were completed, including this project with more difficult underwater work. Mr. Clark stated that the Navy follows the CERCLA process to give the public confidence that their decisions are carefully considered.

Mr. Marsh asked what the RAB needs to do to adjourn and what formal action is necessary, and if the RAB should wait until the RACR is finalized. Mr. Clark said adjournment can happen if certain criteria are satisfied and that the RAB does not need to take a vote. However, public input is taken into consideration, including first and foremost, that of the RAB. Mr. Clark notes that the Navy will wait on a final decision to adjourn the RAB until after the final report is published.

Mr. Callian asked about the difference between dissolution and adjournment; Mr. Clark responded that they are two different procedures. Adjournment typically takes place when all projects are complete and the RAB is no longer needed. Dissolution can occur if the RAB is not functioning properly or there is some conflict. Mr. Callian clarified that the purpose of the RAB is to obtain feedback from the public and asked if the RAB was still necessary because the public comment period is closed. Mr. Clark stated that a primary purpose of the RAB is to solicit input from the public to support remedy selection. Given that all remedy selections have been made, and fieldwork complete, consideration of adjournment is appropriate. Mr. Callian and Mr. Marsh agreed that adjournment is appropriate and another meeting is not necessary.

Mr. Callian moved to adjourn the RAB and Ms. Thoresen seconded the motion. Mr. Marsh moved to amend the motion to be effective upon approval of the final RACR; Mr. Callian seconded the amended motion. The motion passed unanimously.

The meeting adjourned at 7:00 p.m.