

STATE WATER RESOURCES CONTROL BOARD

DRAFT AMENDED FUNCTIONAL EQUIVALENT DOCUMENT |

CONSOLIDATED TOXIC HOT SPOTS CLEANUP PLAN

August 29, 2003~~June 1999~~ |

## PREFACE

California Water Code Section 13394 required the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) and coastal Regional Water Quality Control Boards (RWQCBs). The State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) is required by the California Water Code to develop a Statewide Consolidated Toxic Hot Spots Cleanup Plan by June 30, 1999. On April 29, 1999 the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board (CVRWQCB) approved a Regional Toxic Hot Spots Cleanup Plan that identified three hot spots related to pesticides. The plan identified the total maximum daily loads process under Section 303 (d) of the Clean Water Act as the appropriate mechanism to reduce pesticide loading and for restoring beneficial uses instead of utilizing the bay protection program. This action required that a variance from the requirements of the Bay Protection Program be approved for the three sites by both the CVentral Valley RWQCB and the SWRCB.

In 1999, a lawsuit was filed by San Francisco Baykeeper and Bill Jennings (petitioners) challenging among other things the site specific variances for the three hot spots. On October 11, 2001, Sacramento County Superior Court entered a judgment in favor of the petitioners and issued a writ of mandate directing the SWRCB to vacate and set aside the variances and directing the RWQCB to amend the cleanup plan for those sites. The SWRCB vacated the site specific variances on November 15, 2001. Under a court approved compliance schedule the SWRCB has until September 1, 2003 to amend the Consolidated Hot Spots Cleanup Plan and submit the amended Plan to the Office Administrative Law.

This ~~document report~~ is the amended environmental document supporting the prepaeration of the amended development of the Consolidated Toxic Hot Spots Cleanup Plan (Consolidated Cleanup Plan). This draft Functional Equivalent Document (FED) explores various alternatives, provides options and recommendations, and evaluates the environmental impacts of the Plan.

The Consolidated Cleanup Plan provides a listing of known toxic hot spots in California enclosed bays, estuaries and coastal waters. The Plan also lists actions to address these toxic hot spots, costs of remediation, benefits of

remediation and provides findings on funding to implement the Plan. The SWRCB held a public hearing on [June 3, 1999](#) ~~June 3, 1999~~ on the [original](#) draft FED [and on May 4, 2003- on the amended draft FED](#).

This document has three parts: (1) the ~~draft final~~ FED, (2) [a draft](#) Volume I of the proposed Consolidated Cleanup Plan (which contains the consolidated list of toxic hot spots, policy statements and findings), and (3) and a draft Volume II of the proposed Consolidated Cleanup Plan (which contains each of the Regional Toxic Hot Spots Cleanup Plans). [The draft](#) Volumes I and II ~~of the final Consolidated Cleanup Plan~~ are [presented](#) in Appendices A and B, respectively.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>PREFACE</b> .....	<b>IV</b>
<b>TABLE OF CONTENTS</b> .....	<b>IV</b>
<b>LIST OF TABLES</b> .....	<b>XI</b>
<b>LIST OF FIGURES</b> .....	<b>XII</b>
<b>LIST OF APPENDICES</b> .....	<b>XII</b>
<b>LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS</b> .....	<b>XII</b>
<b>INTRODUCTION</b> .....	<b>1</b>
PURPOSE.....	3
NECESSITY FOR THE REGULATORY PROVISIONS OF THE CONSOLIDATED TOXIC HOT SPOTS CLEANUP PLAN .....	3
CEQA COMPLIANCE .....	4
BACKGROUND .....	5
<i>Program Activities</i> .....	6
<i>Toxic Hot Spot Identification</i> .....	6
<i>Ranking Criteria</i> .....	7
<i>Sediment Quality Objectives</i> .....	7
<i>Toxic Hot Spot Cleanup Plans</i> .....	8
<i>Program Organization</i> .....	9
<i>Legislative Deadlines</i> .....	9
SCOPE OF FED .....	10
<b>PROJECT DESCRIPTION</b> .....	<b>12</b>
PROJECT DEFINITION .....	12
STATEMENT OF GOALS .....	13
PROPOSED ACTION .....	15
<b>POLICY ISSUE ANALYSIS</b> .....	<b>16</b>
ISSUE 1:    AUTHORITY AND REFERENCE FOR THE CONSOLIDATED TOXIC HOT SPOTS CLEANUP PLAN .....	17
ISSUE 2:    ORGANIZATION OF THE CONSOLIDATED TOXIC HOT SPOTS CLEANUP PLAN .....	20
ISSUE 3:    APPROACHES FOR CONSOLIDATING AND COMPILING REGIONAL TOXIC HOT SPOTS CLEANUP PLANS ..	22
ISSUE 4:    RWQCB LISTING AND RANKING OF CANDIDATE TOXIC HOT SPOTS .....	26
ISSUE 5:    REMOVING LOCATIONS FROM AND REEVALUATING THE LIST OF KNOWN TOXIC HOT SPOTS .....	38
ISSUE 6:    GUIDANCE ON REEVALUATING WASTE DISCHARGE REQUIREMENTS IN COMPLIANCE WITH WATER CODE SECTION 13395.....	41
ISSUE 7:    IMPLEMENTATION OF REMEDIATION AT IDENTIFIED TOXIC HOT SPOTS .....	45
ISSUE 8:    SOURCES OF FUNDS TO ADDRESS TOXIC HOT SPOT REMEDIATION .....	48
ISSUE 9:    FINDINGS IN THE CONSOLIDATED TOXIC HOT SPOTS CLEANUP PLAN .....	51

<b>ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING AT TOXIC HOT SPOTS.....</b>	<b>54</b>
NORTH COAST REGION (REGION 1).....	54
<i>G&amp;R Metals at the Foot of H Street Between First Street and Humboldt Bay Eureka, California (scrap yard)...</i>	54
Site Description.....	54
Pollutants of Concern.....	54
Background.....	57
Areal Extent.....	57
Sources.....	57
SAN FRANCISCO REGION (REGION 2).....	58
<i>San Francisco Bay.....</i>	58
Site Description/ Background.....	58
Reason for listing.....	60
Areal extent.....	60
Sources.....	60
Mercury.....	60
PCBs.....	62
Chlorinated Pesticides.....	63
Dioxins.....	63
<i>Castro Cove.....</i>	64
Description of site.....	64
Historical Background.....	64
Areal Extent.....	66
Sources.....	67
<i>Peyton Slough.....</i>	67
Description of Site.....	67
Reason for Listing.....	69
Areal extent.....	69
Sources.....	70
<i>Stege Marsh.....</i>	70
Site Description.....	70
Historical Background.....	71
ICI Americas Investigations (1987).....	72
The Mark Group Investigations (1990, 1991).....	72
URS Corporation Investigation (1991).....	73
Woodward-Clyde Consultants Investigation (1993).....	73
ICF Kaiser Investigation (1997).....	73
Zeneca and RWQCB sediment sample (1997).....	74
Bay Protection and Toxic Cleanup Program (1998).....	74
Pacific Eco-Risk Laboratories.....	75
Areal extent.....	75
Sources.....	76
<i>Point Potrero/Richmond Harbor.....</i>	76
Site Description.....	76
Historical Background.....	77
Areal Extent.....	77
Sources.....	77
<i>Mission Creek.....</i>	78
Site Description.....	78
Reason for listing.....	79
Areal extent.....	80
Sources.....	81
<i>Islais Creek.....</i>	82
Site Description.....	82
Reason for listing.....	82
Recurrent Toxicity.....	83
Elevated Chemicals.....	84
Impacted Benthic Community.....	84
Areal extent.....	85
Sources.....	86

CSOs.....	86
Quint Street Outfall.....	87
Other Potential Sources.....	88
CENTRAL COAST REGION (REGION 3).....	88
<i>Moss Landing and Tributaries</i> .....	88
Site Description.....	88
Background and most likely sources of pollutants.....	90
Agricultural Activities.....	90
River and Stream Maintenance Activities.....	91
Urban Activities.....	91
Harbor Activities.....	92
<i>Cañada de la Huerta – Shell/Hercules Site</i> .....	92
Site Description.....	92
Background and most likely sources of pollutants.....	94
LOS ANGELES REGION (REGION 4).....	95
<i>Region Description</i> .....	95
<i>Santa Monica Bay/Palos Verdes Shelf</i> .....	96
Areal Extent of the Toxic Hot Spot.....	96
Sources of Pollutants.....	97
<i>Mugu Lagoon/Calleguas Creek Tidal Prism</i> .....	98
Areal Extent of the Toxic Hot Spot.....	99
Sources of Pollutants.....	100
<i>Los Angeles/Long Beach Harbors</i> .....	101
Los Angeles Outer Harbor/Cabrillo Pier.....	102
Areal Extent of the Toxic Hot Spot.....	102
Sources of Pollutants.....	103
Los Angeles Inner Harbor/Dominguez Channel, Consolidated Slip.....	103
Areal Extent of the Toxic Hot Spot.....	103
Sources of Pollutants.....	105
<i>McGrath Lake</i> .....	105
Site Description and Background.....	105
Areal Extent and Pollutants of Concern.....	106
Sources of Pollutants.....	107
CENTRAL VALLEY REGION (REGION 5).....	107
<i>Mercury</i> .....	107
Site Description.....	107
Background.....	108
Areal Extent.....	110
Sources.....	111
<i>San Joaquin River Dissolved Oxygen</i> .....	112
Background.....	112
Areal Extent.....	115
Sources.....	115
<i>Pesticides</i> .....	115
Background.....	115
Areal Extent.....	118
Sources.....	118
<i>Urban Stormwater Pesticide Cleanup Plan for the Delta</i> .....	125
Background.....	125
Areal Extent.....	128
Sources.....	128
<i>Irrigation Return Flow Pesticide Cleanup Plan For the Delta</i> .....	132
Background.....	132
Areal Extent.....	135
Sources.....	135
SANTA ANA REGION (REGION 8).....	140
<i>Lower Newport Bay Rhine Channel</i> .....	140
Site Description.....	140
Background.....	140

Areal Extent .....	141
Source .....	141
SAN DIEGO REGION (REGION 9) .....	142
<i>Seventh Street Channel, National City</i> .....	142
Site Description.....	142
Areal Extent of the Toxic Hot Spot.....	142
Most Likely Sources of Pollutants (Potential Discharger) .....	142
<b>PROPOSED REMEDIATION APPROACH AND ALTERNATIVES AT TOXIC HOT SPOTS .....</b>	<b>143</b>
<i>Site 1.1: North Coast region, G&amp;R Metals at the foot of “H” Street     between First street and the Humboldt Bay shore</i> .....	144
Description of the Site.....	144
Summary of actions initiated by the RWQCB .....	144
Estimate of the total cost to implement the Cleanup Plan .....	144
Estimate of recoverable costs from potential Dischargers.....	145
<i>Site 2.1: San Francisco Bay Region, San Francisco Bay</i> .....	146
Description of the Site.....	146
Actions Initiated at the Site .....	147
Mercury .....	147
PCBs .....	150
Chlorinated Pesticides.....	151
Dioxins.....	151
Summary of actions by government agencies in response to health advisory .....	152
Estimate of the total cost to implement the cleanup plan .....	154
Estimate of recoverable costs from potential dischargers .....	155
Two-year expenditure schedule identifying funds to implement the plans that are not recoverable from potential dischargers .....	155
<i>Site 2.2: San Francisco Bay Region, Peyton Slough</i> .....	156
Description of site .....	156
Summary of actions initiated at the site .....	158
Estimate of the total cost to implement the cleanup plan .....	159
Estimate of recoverable costs from potential dischargers .....	160
Two-year expenditure schedule identifying funds to implement the plans that are not recoverable from potential dischargers .....	160
<i>Site 2.3: San Francisco Bay Region, Castro Cove</i> .....	161
Description of site .....	161
Summary of actions initiated at the site .....	161
Estimate of the total cost to implement the cleanup plan .....	163
Estimate of recoverable costs from potential dischargers .....	163
Two-year expenditure schedule identifying funds to implement the plans that are nor recoverable from potential dischargers .....	164
<i>Site 2.4: San Francisco Bay Region, Stege Marsh</i> .....	165
Description of site .....	165
Summary of actions initiated at the site .....	166
Estimate of the total cost to implement the cleanup plan .....	167
Estimate of recoverable costs from potential dischargers .....	168
Two-year expenditure schedule identifying funds to implement the plans that are not recoverable from potential dischargers .....	168

<i>Site 2.5: San Francisco Bay Region, Point Potrero/Richmond Harbor</i> .....	169
Description of site .....	169
Summary of actions initiated at the site .....	169
Estimate of the total cost to implement the cleanup plan .....	171
Estimate of recoverable costs from potential dischargers .....	171
Two-year expenditure schedule identifying funds to implement the plans that are not recoverable from potential dischargers .....	172
<i>Site 2.6: San Francisco Bay Region, Mission Creek</i> .....	173
Description of site .....	173
Summary of actions initiated at the site .....	173
Estimate of the total cost to implement the cleanup plan .....	175
Estimate of recoverable costs from potential dischargers .....	175
Two-year expenditure schedule identifying funds to implement the plans that are not recoverable from potential dischargers .....	176
<i>Site 2.7: San Francisco Bay Region, Islais Creek</i> .....	177
Description of site .....	177
Summary of actions initiated at the site .....	177
Estimate of the total cost to implement the cleanup plan .....	179
Estimate of recoverable costs from potential dischargers .....	180
Two-year expenditure schedule identifying funds to implement the plans that are not recoverable from potential dischargers .....	180
<i>Site 3.1: Central Coast Region, Moss Landing Harbor and Tributaries</i> .....	181
Description of the site .....	181
Summary of actions initiated at the site .....	181
Issuance of Discharge Permits and CWA 401 Certifications .....	181
Harbor Dredging Activities .....	182
303(d) Listings of Water Quality Limited Water Bodies .....	183
Watershed Management Initiative .....	183
Salinas River Watershed Strategy .....	184
Nonpoint Source Program .....	184
Urban Runoff Management .....	185
Clean Water Act Section 319(h) and 205(j) Grants .....	186
Coordination with Existing Resource Protection Efforts .....	187
Control of Harbor Pollutants .....	191
An estimate of the total costs to implement the cleanup plan .....	197
An estimate of recoverable costs from potential dischargers .....	201
Harbor .....	201
Urban .....	201
Agricultural .....	201
Five-year expenditure schedule identifying funds to implement the plans that are not recoverable from potential dischargers .....	202
<i>Site 3.2: Central Coast Region, Canada de la Huerta</i> .....	204
Description of the site .....	204
Summary of Actions Initiated at the Site .....	205
Environmental Benefits .....	206
Commercial and Sport Fishing .....	206
Aquaculture .....	206
Wildlife Habitat .....	206
Cold/Warm Freshwater Habitat .....	207
Rare, Threatened, and Endangered Species .....	207
Estimate of the total costs to implement the cleanup plan .....	207
Estimate of recoverable costs from potential dischargers .....	207
Two-year expenditure schedule identifying funds to implement the plans that are not recoverable from potential dischargers .....	208



<i>Site 4.1: Los Angeles Region, Santa Monica Bay/Palos Verdes Shelf</i> .....	209
Description of the site .....	209
Summary of actions initiated at the site .....	209
Cost Estimate to Implement Cleanup Plan .....	213
Estimate of Recoverable Costs from Dischargers .....	213
Two-year Expenditure Schedule .....	214
Benefits of Remediation.....	214
<i>Site 4.2: Los Angeles Region, Mugu Lagoon/Calleguas Creek Tidal Prism</i> .....	215
Description of site .....	215
Summary of actions initiated at the site .....	217
Cost Estimate to Implement Cleanup Plan .....	219
Estimate of Recoverable Costs From Dischargers .....	219
Two-Year Expenditure Schedule .....	220
Benefits of Remediation.....	220
<i>Site 4.3: Los Angeles Region, Los Angeles/Long Beach Harbors, Los Angeles Outer Harbor, Cabrillo Pier</i> ...	221
Description of the Site.....	221
Summary of Actions Initiated at the Site .....	222
Cost Estimate to Implement the Cleanup Plan .....	223
Estimate of Recoverable Costs from Dischargers .....	223
Two-year Expenditure Schedule .....	224
Benefits of Remediation.....	224
<i>Site 4.4: Los Angeles Region, Los Angeles Inner Harbor/Dominguez Channel, Consolidated Slip</i> .....	225
Summary of Actions Initiated at the Site .....	225
Cost Estimate to Implement Cleanup Plan .....	226
Estimate of Recoverable Costs from Dischargers .....	226
Two-year Expenditure Schedule .....	226
Benefits of Remediation.....	227
<i>Site 4.5: McGrath Lake</i> .....	228
Description of the Site.....	228
Summary of actions initiated at the site .....	229
Preliminary Assessment of Remediation Actions .....	229
Cost Estimate to Implement Cleanup Plan .....	229
Estimate of Recoverable Costs from Dischargers .....	230
Two-year Expenditure Schedule .....	230
Benefits of Remediation.....	231
<i>Site 5.1: Central Valley Region, Mercury Cleanup Plan</i> .....	232
Description of the Site.....	232
Summary of Actions Initiated at the Site .....	232
Loading studies .....	233
Bioavailability.....	233
CALFED .....	233
Estimate of Costs.....	243
Estimate of recoverable costs from potential dischargers .....	244
Two-year expenditure schedule .....	244
<i>Site 5.2: San Joaquin River Dissolved Oxygen Cleanup Plan</i> .....	245
Description of the Site.....	245
Summary of Actions Initiated at the Site .....	245
Estimate of Costs.....	251
An Estimate of Recoverable Costs from Potential Dischargers .....	251
Two Year Expenditure Schedule.....	251
<i>Site 5.3: Diazinon Orchard Dormant Spray Cleanup Plan</i> .....	253
Summary of Actions Initiated at the Site .....	253
An estimate of the total costs to develop the plan .....	267
An estimate of recoverable costs from potential discharges.....	272
Two-year expenditure schedule identifying funds to implement the plan that are not recoverable from potential dischargers.....	273

<i>Site 5.4: Urban Stormwater Pesticide Cleanup Plan</i> .....	275
Summary of Actions Initiated at the Site .....	275
An estimate of the total costs to develop the plan .....	279
An estimate of recoverable costs from potential dischargers .....	282
Two-year expenditure schedule identifying funds to implement the plan that are not recoverable from potential dischargers.....	283
<i>Site 5.5: Irrigation Return Flow Pesticide Cleanup Plan</i> .....	284
Summary of Actions Initiated at the Site .....	284
An estimate of the total costs to develop the plan .....	292
An estimate of recoverable costs from potential dischargers .....	297
Two year expenditure schedule identifying funds to implement the plan that are not recoverable from potential dischargers.....	297
<i>Site 8.1: Santa Ana Region, Lower Newport Bay, Rhine Channel</i> .....	299
Description of the Site.....	299
Summary of Actions Initiated at the Site .....	299
An estimate of the total cost and benefits of implementing the cleanup plan .....	301
Estimate of recoverable costs from potential dischargers .....	301
Two-year expenditure schedule identifying funds to implement the plans that are not recoverable from potential dischargers .....	302
Year 1 .....	302
Year 2 .....	302
<i>Site 9.1: San Diego Region, Seventh Street Channel, National City</i> .....	303
Description of the Site.....	303
Summary of Actions Initiated at the Site .....	303
NPDES Permits for the Naval Station.....	303
NPDES Municipal Storm Water Permit.....	303
Pacific Steel site.....	304
Military cleanups .....	304
Estimate of the Total Cost to Implement the Cleanup Plan.....	306
Costs for dredging and upland disposal .....	306
Costs for dredging and contained aquatic disposal .....	307
Estimate of Recoverable Costs From Potential Dischargers .....	308
Two-Year Expenditure Schedule Identifying Funds to Implement the Plans That Are Not Recoverable From Potential Dischargers.....	308

**ENVIRONMENTAL BENEFITS OF THE PROPOSED CONSOLIDATED TOXIC HOT SPOTS CLEANUP PLAN .....310**

ECOLOGICAL BENEFITS .....	310
HUMAN HEALTH BENEFITS .....	312

**POTENTIAL ADVERSE ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS OF THE PROPOSED CONSOLIDATED TOXIC HOT SPOTS CLEANUP PLAN .....314**

POTENTIALLY ADVERSE SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS .....	314
<i>Dredging, Disposal, and Capping</i> .....	322
Potential Impacts to Air Quality.....	322
Water Resources and Wetlands.....	324
California Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act .....	325
CWA Section 404/401 .....	325
Stream Bed Alteration Agreement Program .....	327
Landfill Disposal.....	328
Rehandling Facilities and Confined Disposal Facilities.....	328
Capping or Confined Aquatic Disposal .....	331
Other water resources issues .....	334
Biological resources .....	335
Hazards and Polluted Sediments .....	341
<i>Source Control</i> .....	341
Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDLs).....	345
Nonpoint Sources .....	346
Storm Water/Urban Runoff.....	351

MS4 Permitting .....	352
Industrial/construction permitting .....	352
Public Education .....	354
Point Source Discharges.....	355
<i>Implementation of Existing Plan and Policies.....</i>	<i>356</i>
CUMULATIVE IMPACTS.....	357
GROWTH-INDUCING IMPACTS .....	357
MITIGATION FOR POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT ADVERSE EFFECTS OF CLEANUP .....	358
UNAVOIDABLE ADVERSE IMPACTS.....	363
<b>ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST .....</b>	<b>364</b>
<b>COMMENTS AND RESPONSES .....</b>	<b>373</b>
LIST OF COMMENTERS.....	373
SUMMARY OF COMMENTS AND RESPONSES.....	377
<i>Key for Reading the Comments and Responses Table.....</i>	<i>377</i>
<i>Summary of Comments and Responses.....</i>	<i>378</i>
<b>REFERENCES .....</b>	<b>408</b>

## LIST OF TABLES

TABLE 1: WATER CODE-MANDATED DEADLINES FOR THE BPTCP.....	9
TABLE 2: TOXIC HOT SPOTS ARRANGED BY RANK AND IN ALPHABETICAL ORDER WITHIN EACH RANK.....	24
TABLE 3: TOXIC HOT SPOTS ARRANGED BY REGION (FROM NORTH TO SOUTH) AND IN THE ORDER PROVIDED BY THE RWQCBs.....	25
TABLE 4: CANDIDATE TOXIC HOT SPOTS IDENTIFIED IN THE REGIONAL TOXIC HOT SPOTS CLEANUP PLANS.....	27
TABLE 5: SITE IDENTIFIED BY RWQCBs THAT DOES NOT QUALIFY AS A TOXIC HOT SPOT.....	34
TABLE 6: RANGE OF COSTS TO REMEDIATE TOXIC HOT SPOTS, FUNDING POTENTIALLY RECOVERABLE FROM DISCHARGERS AND UNFUNDED AMOUNT.....	47
TABLE 7: HARBOR IMPLEMENTATION COSTS .....	198
TABLE 8: URBAN IMPLEMENTATION COSTS .....	198
TABLE 9: OVERALL AGRICULTURAL IMPLEMENTATION COST ESTIMATE .....	200
TABLE 10: FIVE-YEAR EXPENDITURE SCHEDULE .....	202
TABLE 11: ESTIMATE OF COST TO COLLECT INFORMATION TO DEVELOP A MERCURY CONTROL STRATEGY.....	244
TABLE 12: COST ESTIMATES FOR DEVELOPING A DISSOLVED OXYGEN TMDL IN THE LOWER SAN JOAQUIN RIVER.....	251
TABLE 13: COST ESTIMATE TO DREDGE RHINE CHANNEL .....	301
TABLE 14: COMPARISON OF HIGH AND LOW COSTS FOR DREDGING AND UPLAND DISPOSAL .....	307
TABLE 15: COMPARISON OF HIGH AND LOW COSTS FOR DREDGING AND CONTAINED AQUATIC DISPOSAL .....	308
TABLE 16. BENEFICIAL EFFECTS OF REMEDIATION.....	311
TABLE 17. IDENTIFIED REMEDIATION ALTERNATIVES .....	317
TABLE 18: AREAL EXTENT AND HABITAT AT TOXIC HOT SPOTS.....	320
TABLE 19: DREDGE MATERIAL DISPOSAL ISSUES RELATED TO REHANDLING FACILITIES AND CONFINED DISPOSAL FACILITIES TO BE ADDRESSED DURING PROJECT-SPECIFIC REVIEW.....	330
TABLE 20: ISSUES RELATED TO CONFINED AQUATIC DISPOSAL AND CAPPING SITES TO BE ADDRESSED DURING PROJECT-SPECIFIC REVIEW .....	332
TABLE 21: ENDANGERED AND THREATENED ANIMALS THAT MAY BE PRESENT AT IDENTIFIED TOXIC HOT SPOTS.....	337
TABLE 22. SUMMARY OF POTENTIAL SOURCE CONTROL MEASURES IDENTIFIED IN CONSOLIDATED TOXIC HOT SPOTS CLEANUP PLAN.....	341
TABLE 23: POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT ADVERSE IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES.....	359

## LIST OF FIGURES

FIGURE 1: AREA THAT THE CONSOLIDATED CLEANUP PLAN IS APPLICABLE .....	14
FIGURE 2: HIGH, MODERATE, AND LOW PRIORITY KNOWN TOXIC HOT SPOTS .....	35
FIGURE 3: HIGH PRIORITY TOXIC HOT SPOTS .....	55

## LIST OF APPENDICES

APPENDIX A: FINAL CONSOLIDATED TOXIC HOT SPOTS CLEANUP PLAN, VOLUME I: POLICY, TOXIC HOT SPOT LISTS AND FINDINGS

APPENDIX B: FINAL CONSOLIDATED TOXIC HOT SPOTS CLEANUP PLAN, VOLUME II: REGIONAL CLEANUP PLANS

## LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

ACL	Administrative Civil Liability
AMBAG	Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments
APA	Administrative Procedure Act
BAT	Best available technology economically achievable
BCT	Best conventional pollutant control technology
BIOS	Biologically Integrated Orchard System
BIPS	Biologically Integrated Prune System
BMP	Best management practice
BOD	Biochemical oxygen demand
BPTCP	Bay Protection and Toxic Cleanup Program
CAD	Confined aquatic disposal
CalEPA	California Environmental Protection Agency
CBOD	Carbonaceous biochemical oxygen demand
CCMVCD	Contra Costa Mosquito Vector Control District
CCR	California Code of Regulations
CCSF	City and County of San Francisco
CDF	Confined disposal facility
CEQA	California Environmental Quality Act
CERCLA	Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act
CFR	Code of Federal Regulations
CSO	Combined sewer overflow
CWA	Clean Water Act (federal)
cy	cubic yard
CZARA	Coastal Zone Act Reauthorization Amendments
DDT	dichlorodiphenyltrichloroethane
DDE	dichlorodiphenyldichloroethylene
DERP	Defense Environmental Response Program
DFG	Department of Fish and Game
DHS	Department of Health Services

DPR	Department of Pesticide Regulation
DTSC	Department of Toxic Substance Control
EE/CA	Engineering evaluation/cost analysis
EIR	Environmental Impact Report
EPA	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
EQIP	Environmental Quality Incentives Program
ERL	Effects Range Low
ERM	Effects Range Median
EROD	Ethoxyresorufin O-deethylase
FDA	U.S. Food and Drug Administration
FED	Functional Equivalent Document
FEMA	Federal Emergency Management Agency
FS	Feasibility study
gpd	gallons per day
IR	Installation restoration
kg	kilogram(s)
LACSD	Los Angeles County Sanitation District
LRCS	Leachate removal and containment system
LTMS	Long-Term Management Strategy
MAA	Management Agency Agreement
MEP	Maximum extent practicable
MGD	million gallons per day
mg/kg	milligrams per kilogram (parts per million)
mg/l	milligrams per liter (parts per million)
MOCOCO	Mountain Copper Company
MOU	Memorandum of Understanding
MSD	Minimum significant difference
MS4	Municipal separate storm sewer system
NAS	National Academy of Sciences
NEPA	National Environmental Policy Act
ng/l	nanograms per liter (parts per trillion)
NMFS	National Marine Fisheries Service
NOAA	National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
NPDES	National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System
NPS	Nonpoint Source
NRCS	Natural Resources Conservation Service
OAL	Office of Administrative Law
OEHHA	Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment
PAH	Polynuclear Aromatic Hydrocarbon
PCA	Pest control advisor
PCB	Polychlorinated biphenyl
PEP	Process effluent purification
PMP	Pesticide Management Plan
POTW	Publically owned treatment works
PRMP	Pilot Regional monitoring program
PY	Personnel year

RAP	Remedial action workplan
RBI	Relative benthic index
RCD	Resource Conservation District
RMP	Regional monitoring program
RWCF	Regional Wastewater Control Facility
RWQCB	Regional Water Quality Control Board
SAP	Sampling and Analysis Plan
SFEI	San Francisco Estuary Institute
SMBRP	Santa Monica Bay Restoration Project
SMW	State Mussel Watch
SOD	Sediment oxygen demand
SRF	State Revolving Fund
SWPPP	Storm water pollution prevention plan
SWRCB	State Water Resources Control Board
TBD	to be determined
THS	Toxic Hot Spot
TIE	Toxicity identification evaluation
TMDL	Total Maximum Daily Load
TSS	Total suspended solids
UPC	Urban Pesticide Committee
USFWS	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
USGS	U.S. Geological Survey
WDR	Waste Discharge Requirement
WMI	Watershed Management Initiative