

From: Craig J. Wilson
To: Carmencita Sannebeck; Yates, Randal
Date: 1/26/2006 3:08:16 PM
Subject: Fwd: Delist Proposal: Monterey Harbor Lead

55

685

For the record and distribution to the Board. CJW

>>> Pete Osmolovsky Thursday, January 26, 2006 >>>
Craig,

On behalf of Lisa McCann and Region 3, I am submitting the Monterey Harbor Lead delist proposal for consideration in this round of list update.

In brief, we are proposing the delist based on:

- The primary source of lead loading to the harbor has been removed and remediated (i.e., onshore riprap slag removal and some harbor bottom sediment removal).
- Water quality objectives are currently being met in the water column;
- 4/30 (13%) sediment samples analyzed for total lead exceeded the (highside) NOAA-PEL numeric sediment quality guideline for lead, and a majority of sediment samples exceeded the (lowside) numeric guideline (NOAA-TEL); however, analytical evidence (SEM:AVS method) demonstrated that much of the total lead in sediment is sequestered in lead sulfide phases. When bioavailable lead is considered, it appears that virtually all of the sediment samples are below the NOAA-PEL (highside endpoint) and TEL (lowside endpoint) numeric sediment quality guidelines;
- 4/19 (21%) mussel tissue samples exceeded the median international standards (MIS) guideline of 2.0 mg/kg for lead in shellfish tissue. However, the MIS guideline appears to be overly conservative, and not appropriate as a mussel tissue lead criterion in Monterey Harbor. Ecological risk analysis, weight of evidence analysis, in conjunction with other evidence and literature review adequately demonstrated that avian and mammalian populations native to Monterey Harbor are not at risk from lead in the tissue of shellfish; and
- Analytical data indicate a decrease over time in the number and ratio of exceedences of sediment quality guidelines for lead, and for shellfish tissue lead guidelines.

In support of the delist proposal, please find attached::

- 1) Fact Sheet: "*FS-Delist Mont Harbor lead*";
- 2) Final Delist Project Report: "*Final Delist Project Report_Monterey Harbor Lead*";
- 3) Supporting Appendix 1: "*Appendix 1_MFG_Monterey_Harbor_Lead_Final_5-20-05*" (water quality, sediment quality, mussel tissue data); and
- 4) Supporting Appendix 2: "*Appendix 2_MHL_Risk_Literature*" (ecological risk assessment literature review)

Cheers,

Pete Osmolovsky
Central Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board

895 Aerovista Place, Suite 101
San Luis Obispo, CA 93401

Phone: (805) 549-3699

Fax: (805) 788-3587

email: paosmolovsky@waterboards.ca.gov

For the record and distribution to the Board. CJW

>>> Pete Osmolovsky Thursday, January 26, 2006 >>>
Craig,

On behalf of Lisa McCann and Region 3, I am submitting the Monterey Harbor Lead delist proposal for consideration in this round of list update.

In brief, we are proposing the delist based on:

- The primary source of lead loading to the harbor has been removed and remediated (i.e., onshore riprap slag removal and some harbor bottom sediment removal).
- Water quality objectives are currently being met in the water column;
- 4/30 (13%) sediment samples analyzed for total lead exceeded the (highside) NOAA-PEL numeric sediment quality guideline for lead, and a majority of sediment samples exceeded the (lowside) numeric guideline (NOAA-TEL); however, analytical evidence (SEM:AVS method) demonstrated that much of the total lead in sediment is sequestered in lead sulfide phases. When bioavailable lead is considered, it appears that virtually all of the sediment samples are below the NOAA-PEL (highside endpoint) and TEL (lowside endpoint) numeric sediment quality guidelines;
- 4/19 (21%) mussel tissue samples exceeded the median international standards (MIS) guideline of 2.0 mg/kg for lead in shellfish tissue. However, the MIS guideline appears to be overly conservative, and not appropriate as a mussel tissue lead criterion in Monterey Harbor. Ecological risk analysis, weight of evidence analysis, in conjunction with other evidence and literature review adequately demonstrated that avian and mammalian populations native to Monterey Harbor are not at risk from lead in the tissue of shellfish; and
- Analytical data indicate a decrease over time in the number and ratio of exceedences of sediment quality guidelines for lead, and for shellfish tissue lead guidelines.

In support of the delist proposal, please find attached::

- 1) Fact Sheet: "*FS-Delist Mont Harbor lead*";
- 2) Final Delist Project Report: "*Final Delist Project Report_Monterey Harbor Lead*";
- 3) Supporting Appendix 1: "*Appendix 1_MFG_Monterey_Harbor_Lead_Final_5-20-05*" (water quality, sediment quality, mussel tissue data); and
- 4) Supporting Appendix 2: "*Appendix 2_MHL_Risk_Literature*" (ecological risk assessment literature review)

Cheers,

Pete Osmolovsky
Central Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board
895 Aerovista Place, Suite 101
San Luis Obispo, CA 93401

Phone: (805) 549-3699

Fax: (805) 788-3587

email: paosmolovsky@waterboards.ca.gov

Region 3 – Regional Water Quality Control Board Data Submissions and Corrections for the 2006 303(d) list

1) Describe the reason(s) the listing is inappropriate.

Staff evaluated potential delisting for Monterey Harbor lead using two complimentary policy tools: the two-tiered approach used by USEPA for Newport Harbor TMDL (June, 2002), and *The Water Quality Control Policy for Developing California's Clean Water Act Section 303(d) List* (State Water Board 2004). Regional Board staff recommends delisting Monterey Harbor for lead based on the fact that:

- The primary source of lead loading to the harbor has been removed and remediated (i.e., onshore riprap slag removal and some harbor bottom sediment removal).
- Water quality objectives are currently being met in the water column;
- 4/30 (13%) sediment samples analyzed for total lead exceeded the (highside) NOAA-PEL numeric sediment quality guideline for lead, and a majority of sediment samples exceeded the (lowside) numeric guideline (NOAA-TEL); however, analytical evidence (SEM:AVS method) demonstrated that much of the total lead in sediment is sequestered in lead sulfide phases. When bioavailable lead is considered, it appears that virtually all of the sediment samples are below the NOAA-PEL (highside endpoint) and TEL (lowside endpoint) numeric sediment quality guidelines;
- 4/19 (21%) mussel tissue samples exceeded the median international standards (MIS) guideline of 2.0 mg/kg for lead in shellfish tissue. However, the MIS guideline appears to be overly conservative, and not appropriate as a mussel tissue lead criterion in Monterey Harbor. Ecological risk analysis, weight of evidence analysis, in conjunction with other evidence and literature review adequately demonstrated that avian and mammalian populations native to Monterey Harbor are not at risk from lead in the tissue of shellfish; and
- Analytical data indicate a decrease over time in the number and ratio of exceedences of sediment quality guidelines for lead, and for shellfish tissue lead guidelines.

2) Provide the data and information necessary to enable SWRCB to conduct a complete reassessment. Please see below and/or attached. Four PDF files are attached (report and four appendices of data).

- a. Name of the person or organization providing the information;
Regional Water Quality Control Board, Region 3

Data submissions and corrections for 2006 303(d) list

January 26, 2006

- b. Mailing address, phone number, and email address of a contact responsible for answering questions about the information submitted;
**895 Aerovista Place, Ste. 101
San Luis Obispo, CA 93401
(805) 549-3699
paosmolovsky@waterboards.ca.gov
Staff person: Pete Osmolovsky**
- c. Bibliographic citations for all published information provided;
See attached documentation.
- d. To the extent possible, all information should be submitted in electronic format (e.g., Microsoft [MS] Word, Access database, Excel spreadsheet, ASCII, or Adobe Acrobat files);
**File attached in: MS Word
Names are:**
- **Final Delist Project Report_Monterey Harbor Lead;**
 - **Appendix 1 – MFG_Monterey_Harbor_Lead_Final_5-20-05 (water quality, sediment quality, mussel tissue data); and**
 - **Appendix 2 – MHL_Risk_Literature (ecological risk assessment literature review)**
- e. Detailed quality assurance and quality control information about sampling and analysis of all numeric data;
All sampling, collection and analysis followed the Regional Board's Central Coast Ambient Monitoring Program's (CCAMP) Quality Assurance Plan. Please talk to staff, Pete Osmolovsky, for more details if necessary.
- f. Water body name and California water body identification number (available from local RWQCB). The preferred statewide Geographic Information System (GIS) projection is the California Teale Albers, NAD27. Please refer to the following web site for details on the Teale Albers projection for GIS information: <http://gis.ca.gov/albers.epl>;
**Monterey Harbor
Calwater watershed no. 30950042**
- g. Geographic extent of the potential water quality limited segment;
Monterey County
- h. Pollutant(s) of concern;
Lead
- i. Applicable water quality objective or criterion;
- **Basin Plan's water quality objectives for marine water**

Data submissions and corrections for 2006 303(d) list

January 26, 2006

- **Basin Plan's narrative objective for settleable and suspended material**
- **California Toxics Rule (Federal Register, Volume 65, No. 97, Part III, Environmental Protection Agency, 40 CFR Part 131. Water Quality Standards; Establishment of Numeric Criteria for Priority Toxic Pollutants for the State of California; Rule, Thursday, May 18, 2000.)**
- j. Comparison of results against applicable water quality objective or criterion;
See attached staff report "Final Delist Project Report_Monterey Harbor Lead" dated January 26, 2006.
- k. Designated beneficial use(s) that may be impacted by pollutant(s);
Determination is that beneficial uses are NOT being impacted.
- l. Complete background information (metadata) for field data (i.e., when and where measurements were taken, number of samples, detection limits, etc.); and
See attached.
- m. Full identification of any citizen volunteer water quality monitoring efforts including:
 - 1) The name of the group;
NA
 - 2) A description of any training in water quality assessment completed by members of the group.
NA
- 3. Make sure all numeric data submitted in support of new listings or changes to existing listings, can be evaluated to address the following:
 - a. data quality assurance assessment(s); *or if non-numeric, the types of observations;*
 - b. spatial representation;
 - c. temporal representation;
 - d. age(s) of the data;
 - e. effects of seasonality;
 - f. effects of any events that might influence data evaluation (e.g., storm events, flow conditions, laboratory data qualifiers, etc.);
 - g. the total number of samples;
 - h. the number of samples exceeding standards;
 - i. the source or reference for samples;
 - j. the potential sources of pollutants; and
 - k. any program that might address the water quality problem in lieu of a TMDL.

Attached information addresses the above criteria.