

**Detailed Meeting Notes
Hamilton Army Airfield Restoration Advisory Board
Novato Police Station Meeting Room
Novato, California
April 14, 2004**

Attendance

RAB Members Present:

Ed Keller; Jennifer Valenzia; Naomi Feger; Jim Ponton; Matthew McCarron; Patricia Eklund; Richard A. Draeger; Sue Lattanzio; Lance McMahan; William McNicholas; Sabrina Molinari; Theresa McGarry; Eric Polson; Laurent Meillier

RAB Members Absent:

Jim McAlister; Tom Gandesbery; Ray Zimny; Manuel Mier; Preston Cook; Tunstall Lang; Ross Millerick; Jeff Johnston; Marucia Britto; Joan Dekelboum

Others Present:

Joy Lanzaro; Hugh Ashley; Samantha Calamari; Daniel LaForte; Travis Williamson; Jim Davies; Patty Wong-Yim; Liz Barr; Gina Lynch; Michael Wade; Wayne Newman; Jim Lukasko.

Welcoming Remarks

Ed Keller welcomed the community to the April 14, 2004 meeting of the Hamilton Army Airfield Restoration Advisory Board (RAB). The meeting began at 7:08 p.m.

Jim Ponton introduced a new member to the RWQCB. Laurent Meillier will be replacing Jim Ponton who will be working on the Hunters Point project.

Document Distribution and Public Access: Ed Keller, BRAC Environmental Coordinator (BEC)

Ed Keller commented on the procedure for document distribution and review. He clarified that a draft document is a document ready for regulatory review. Ed Keller announced that the regulatory documents and final documents are available at the Novato public library, on the internet or through the BRAC office. He encouraged reviewers to use electronic copies of the documentation since this is less costly. However, he did state that paper copies would be provided if specifically requested.

Mr. Davies: What about reproducing oversized documents?

Mr. Keller: Since oversized drawings are not as easily reviewed electronically those could be provided in hard copy. They may just take longer to reproduce.

Landfill 26, GSA, and North Antenna Field - Jim Lukasko, USACE

Methane Monitoring Update

Mr. Lukasko reported on the methane levels recorded since the buffer trench was installed. Mr. Lukasko presented a graphic that showed contour lines representing concentration levels of methane throughout the landfill area. Mr. Lukasko reviewed the methane levels in the soil

gas recorded since July 2001. As of March 23, 2004, the landfill gas mitigation control trench that has been used to measure methane through gas probes showed that the trench continues to be effective in decreasing the levels of methane in the soils. This data supports the viewpoint that there is naturally occurring methane in these areas.

The USACE continues to monitor methane levels on a monthly basis, on the south end of the landfill next to Hamilton Meadows. Based on the data collected, a buffer trench was installed. The purpose of the buffer trench is to separate the landfill from Hamilton Meadows. The trench goes three feet into groundwater or to bedrock, whichever was encountered first. The trench is filled with gravel and has vent pipes that are connected to a collection tube in the trench to vent methane to the ambient air.

The Army also installed an impermeable barrier to prevent the methane from traveling linearly down the length of the trench. The entire length of the trench and the collection tube has been installed between the landfill and the Hamilton Meadows subdivision. The first 1,000 linear feet was installed in January 2002, while the remaining 600 feet was installed in July/August 2002. The levels of methane have been reduced dramatically, although methane continues to be detected on the Shea property. Methane is also present at a monitoring point just south of the trench, GNP30, which has shown seasonal variation in methane levels.

Mr. McCarron: What is the highest level of methane? Do you remember how deep that was?

Mr. Davies: About 10-15 feet, plus another 6-8 feet. The depth outside of Lot 30 is about 5-6 feet down. The trenching that Shea Homes performed goes down about 12-15 feet. There is a difference in elevation.

Mr. Ponton: Only the probes circled have had data collected.

Mr. Davies: Not everyone agrees with the Army interpretation of the data. We've commented on the Army's 2001 investigation report. There are different interpretations of the data.

Ms. Eklund: What is the Army's interpretation of this data?

Mr. Lukasko: The Army's interpretation is that the methane underneath the landfill can be attributed to the marsh that was previously present in this area. Where there is organic material, methane can be produced above the water table. If there is suitable geology, methane can be generated and can accumulate. We are very familiar with the subsurface geology, which shows a correlation between areas of organic material and methane. This is site-specific based on the geology. We don't believe that methane can come out of the landfill. We believe that the cutoff trench has prevented any migration of methane. We expect this pattern to continue through the summer months. We will continue to monitor.

Ms. Eklund: What is the solution?

Mr. Lukasko: I am not sure there is a surface risk to people with the current depth and percentage of methane. People who live here should take extra safety measures to prevent exposure to methane, but methane under the subsurface is not a problem.

Ms. Eklund: What kind of mitigation measures are you proposing aside from not building?

Mr. Lukasko: That is not for the Army but for the developer to answer.

Ms. McGarry: We are concerned with this level on methane in the lot(s). We originally asked the local enforcement agency, the Department of Environmental Health Services, to work with Shea Homes to implement measures that came out of title 27. Title 27 details a list of impenetrable barriers and vents in the homes that can disperse methane. Shea Homes voluntary worked with the local enforcement agency to implement these Title 27 measures. Shea confirmed verbally that any time methane was detected they would put the protective measures in and around the area where methane was found. The Army is committed to monitoring both on and off of the property. There is a probe that will remain on Lot 30 that will be monitored. Beyond that we cannot stop them from construction.

Mr. McCarron: Since you are detecting high levels of methane, have you tested for anything else?

Mr. Lukasko: Yes, we have also tested for fixed gases, CO₂, nitrogen, carbon dioxide, hydrogen sulfide, and we look for TO14, TO15.

Mr. McCarron: Looking at the contours it seems as if there is a point source. Are you planning on getting rid of the point source?

Mr. Lukasko: We are monitoring and still reviewing the investigation report.

Ms. McGarry: We hope that when they complete the comprehensive investigation of the landfill which is required by the Water Board Order, it may shed some light what is happening in this area. At this point we don't think the Army will have to do anything further with the monitoring.

Future Activities

Mr. Lukasko addressed the upcoming activities for Landfill 26.

- Remedial Investigation Report –Responses to comments
- Landfill Comprehensive Monitoring Report – Regulatory Review
- Monitoring of Risk Assessment Probes – Quarterly
- Monitoring of Trench – Quarterly
- Board Order Compliance- 2005-8
- Field Measurements-Monthly

North Antenna Field

We have performed a Remedial Investigation (RI) on the North Antenna Field and the report went out to regulators in March 2003. The Risk Assessment Work Plan was processed as an addendum to the Risk Assessment that the BRAC had done on the adjacent parcel. However, the agencies pointed out that they never accepted the BRAC Risk Assessment, so we had to go back and create a stand-alone Risk Assessment.

Mr. Lukasko reviewed the schedule for the North Antenna Field clean-up.

- Risk Assessment Work plan to Agencies- May 2004
- Risk Assessment to Agencies- September 2004
- Final Risk Assessment- November 2004

- Ordinance Activities WP to Agencies- July 2004
- Feasibility Study to Agencies – December 2004
- Final Feasibility Study- April 2005
- Remedial Action- 2006-8

Mr. Meillier: Why was there a grenade found?

Mr. Lukasko: It was used in the context of the military base.

Mr. McNicholas: Why will it take so long to dispose of the grenade?

Mr. McMahan: There are budget considerations. This is the third practice grenade found, and was used for some sort of training on the base. We are talking about clearing the brush and getting an ordnance survey, as well as getting rid of the particular grenade. In the past, the Army has gone out and detonated on site, with some C4 attached to get rid of the previous finds. There is more to this than getting rid of the one grenade, which is why there is a Work Plan. There will be some changes to the RI and the community involvement plan.

Ms. Eklund: Did DTSC request a work plan? Why will it take so long to dispose of the grenade? I am concerned about public access.

Mr. McMahan: This is a responsibility of the Army Corps.

Mr. Lukasko: I will bring this concern to Mr. McAllister. The grenade is not accessible to the public. There would have to be heavy machinery taken to the site to access the grenade.

Mr. Polson: Will these two activities take care of all of the ordnance on the site?

Mr. Lukasko: I don't know.

Ms. Molinari: What is being done to underlying materials, close to the surface?

Mr. Lukasko: The brush will be cleared and geophysical methods will be used to determine that the grenade is not within the top 2-4 feet. It is part of the survey process and is quite involved, but this is not something that I work with. Jim McAllister will give you more information next month.

Mr. Polson: This will be part of the wetlands restoration project. Once we start constructing our project, there will be copious fill over the area making public access difficult. Once the tidal wetland is in place, there will be no public access as the site will be underwater.

Navy BRAC Update — Jennifer Valenzia, DODHF Novato BEC

Project Update

Ms. Valenzia presented an update on the quarterly groundwater monitoring results. We monitor six surface water samples quarterly, eight performance wells monthly, as well as certain soil gas probes that are located near sensitive receptors. There was a sample taken in February and there will be another event in May. The maximum MTBE that was recorded in the plume area in November 2003 was 23,000 ppb which is a decrease from the past measurement of 250,000 ppb. The maximum benzene concentration detected was 230 ppb, down from 12,000 ppb. The average concentration for MTBE is 1800 ppb and the Benzene concentration average is 7 ppb. There has been a decrease in the highest MTBE “hot spot” concentrations over the past 3 years.

Biosparging

The goal of the biosparging system is to stabilize and contain the MTBE plume, which is accomplished by injecting air into the subsurface to increase the biodegradation of organic compounds in the groundwater. The biosparging system has been operating successfully over the last 19 months. The biosparging treatment system includes 49 sparging wells, eight soil vapor extraction wells, five performance goal monitoring wells used three monitoring wells used to measure system performance and 13 soil-gas monitoring probes.

When the biosparging system was conceived, we anticipated a 95-99% estimated reduction in the dissolved MTBE concentrations in the performance wells. We have had varied results. The results in the eight wells that are monitored monthly have shown a 74% decrease of average MTBE concentration over the 19 months of biosparging operations. There was a 96% and 95% reduction in MTBE concentration at PG-MW2, PG-MW 3, respectively.

Mr. Draeger: Why have the performance results of PG-MW1 leveled out at high levels?

Ms. Valenzia: The reason is there are tighter subsurface soils and the air is not able to penetrate as effectively in that area. Our optimization plan will attempt to increase the degradation rates in the performance wells that are not as high as we would like them to be. Keep in mind that these are only eight out of about 75 wells.

Ms. Eklund: The concentrations in PG-MW4 seem to have been going back up. Why would it be going up that significantly?

Ms. Valenzia: It could be a seasonal variation.

Mr. Williamson: With the measurements being taken during the driest time of the year and then the rainy season, there is a big transition there and it is possible that those changes have resulted in the increase. Overall, we are pleased with the results from the system.

Ball field Parcel

There are a few areas of potential environmental concern that are going to be evaluated. The ballfield parcel is about three feet below mean sea level, and when it is developed as a wetland it will be six-to-eight feet above mean sea level. Even though there will be a large amount of fill material deposited in this area, we are still going to conduct an evaluation of ecological and human health risks using the existing conditions. We hope to start the field work on the ballfield parcel in early-to-mid summer. There is a preliminary draft work plan undergoing Navy review. If there are any RAB members that are interested in a copy of the document, they are available upon request.

The Navy met with regulatory agencies in February 2004 to discuss a Preliminary Assessment/Site Inspection (PA/SI) ecological evaluation and sampling strategy. The draft work plan is expected to be ready for regulatory agency and RAB review on April 26, 2004. Fieldwork is anticipated to begin in the early-to-mid summer.

Pacheco Creek

There was a question at the last RAB meeting that requested information regarding the risk to children playing in Pacheco Creek. There was an evaluation that was performed jointly with the DTSC. The informal evaluation was based on a child playing in the creek an estimated two hour per day, 52 days per year over six years. We evaluated dermal contact and the inhalation exposure pathways. We also used the highest concentration ever detected in the creek, 2400 micrograms/liter, which is not a likely exposure concentration. The

Regulatory Agency considers values of 1×10^{-6} for cancer and 1 for non-cancer hazards to be safe. The results for Pacheco Creek show safe conditions for children.

Upcoming Activities

- Routine biosparging operation and monitoring- Continuing
- Quarterly groundwater monitoring event- May 2004
- Draft work plans for PA/SI at Ballfields Parcel
- NEX Gas Station Site Update Fact Sheet
- DTSC Risk Memo concerning potential exposure at North Bay Children's Center, Novato Charter School and Pacheco Creek

Ms. Eklund: Who will the memo be issued to?

Ms. McGarry: The fact sheet will include a summary of this memo.

Ms. Wong-Yim: The memo I did was looking at the most current risk and the latest indoor model requirement. With this data, we concluded that it safe for the kids. Even if they are soaking in Pacheco Creek 24 hours a day for six years, they will still be safe.

Ms. McGarry: I wanted to thank Jim Ponton for being a great asset to the team.

Ms. Valenzia: The site status report is available in hardcopy.

Ms. Molinari: What is the plan for shutting the biosparging system down?

Ms. Valenzia: We plan to shut the system down once it seems that the biosparging is no longer effective. We expect this to be in the next six months. Once it is turned off, it will be left in place and the areas will be carefully monitored. The data will be evaluated and the Navy, in conjunction with the regulators, will determine if it should be turned back on.

California State Coastal Conservancy – Hamilton Wetlands Restoration Project Update- Eric Polson, CSCC Consultant

Eric Polson explained that a major project goal is to increase the size of the project by adding the adjacent 1,600 acre Bel Marin Keys V parcel to the existing 1,000 acre Hamilton Wetlands Restoration Project (HWRP). CSCC has owned the BMK-V property since 2000 and just received the Hamilton Airfield property in September 2003. Building demolition is almost done, and then there will not be any major construction activity on the site for the next two months. The next activity is the test fill on the new Hamilton Partner levee. That will occur next to parcel A4. We will be putting test fill against the levee to monitor how the fill affects the levee. This will help us design the exact detail of the wetland. The City of Novato is planning to raise the levee. There will be a public meeting put on by the city, and we will be there to talk about the raising of the levee and the test fill. There is no date for this meeting yet, but it should be later this month or early in May. The next significant activity that will occur onsite is the movement of soils containing low levels of DDT and PAH materials. Bioaccumulation of trace level contaminants through the food chain is the reason that these elements need to be removed from the site, even though the site is currently safe for humans. We have a soil management plan in development that will go to

Naomi Feger within the month. We will begin to move soil sometime in this fiscal year – before September 3, 2004.

The next aspect of the project is constructing some of the levee segments, in particular the bulge levee segment, which separates the Hamilton project from city property. We will build the levee from the New Hamilton Partners Levee north to the Pacheco Pond levee and will also improve the levee across the face of Pacheco Pond. This construction should occur this coming fall, which will facilitate the delivery of dredge material in the summer of 2005. The work depends on having the land ready and the funding available on a state and federal level.

Mr. McCarron: Is your project going to be in sync with the North Antenna Fields project?

Mr. Polson: We are hoping to have BMK-V as part of the property, but it is not a part of it yet. We have 1,000 acre authorized project and will have 10.6 million cubic yards of dredging materials utilized over about eight years to build the seasonal and tidal wetlands. The North Antenna Field is currently scheduled to be the last phase of this project. If BMK-V is added to the project the North Antennal Field will be incorporated into the last two tidal wetland cells that will be completed. For the existing HWRP, the tidal wetlands on the airfield are the first phase, and the seasonal wetlands on the airfield are the second phase. However, we might build the seasonal wetlands first given the timing of the Port of Oakland - 50 foot Project”, and when those sandy dredge materials arrives.

Mr. McCarron: Is the pipeline for Novato Sanitary District existing?

Mr. Polson: The pipeline for Novato Sanitary District comes along the edge of the property boundary between Pacheco Pond and BMK-V, and then along the property boundary of BMK-V and the HWRP and then goes out into the bay. There are two features involved in the Novato Sanitary District outfall, one is the dechlorination plant and its relocation and the second is the relocation of the outfall. It will likely be replaced in-kind along the same alignment. By Fall 2005 we should have the dechlorination plant relocated. We plan to do a survey of the outfall and a pressure test to ascertain its current condition.

Mr. McCarron: Where are the CEQA documents in delivery?

Mr. Polson: The NEPA and CEQA documents for the original Hamilton project are complete. Since the BMK-V was seen as a potential expansion of the original Hamilton project a Supplemental EIS/EIR was prepared. The Supplemental EIS/EIR for BMK-V is waiting to be signed.

Mr. Newman: Are there any plans for restoration of the area known as the bulge?

Mr. Polson: This area currently belongs to the City of Novato and is not included in the wetland project. Our sampling out on the airfield found that the area was safe to build a nursery school. The City has placed some soil materials in the Bulge area from Scottsdale Pond.

Ms. Eklund: The city is considering many options for that area, mostly recreational. There is no funding available for projects beyond what we have grants for. We have received a grant for the Bay Trail and for the interpretative center.

Mr. Newman: When would the current levee be breached?

Mr. Polson: No later than eight years from when the dredge materials begin to arrive, depending on funding.

Mr. Ashley: If the existing channels in the marsh are mature, what types of depths can we expect in a mature marsh 50 years from now?

Mr. Polson: We do have some existing channels in the outboard marsh, and the most notable is linear, which was the old rescue boat channel. There are other smaller channels that were probably put in by mosquito control people to keep the drainage going, and other natural channels are present as well. The HWRP is going to excavate that breach to 8 feet below Mean Lower Low Water (MLLW) which is about 11 feet below the existing tidalmarsh elevation. This is deeper than we think the channel will go, but there is an impacted levee there and we do not want that to be an impediment in the future. I believe the predominant depth will be about five feet below (MLLW).

Mr. Ashley: Will the bulge levee appear different than the new Hamilton Partners levee?

Mr. Polson: Yes, the surrounding environments are different. The Hamilton Partners levee is rock. When you enter into the site in the future and see the bulge levee you will see the land and not the water, which will include natural vegetation and not rock rip-rap.

Ms. Feger: What are the drainage plans?

Mr. Polson: There are a variety of drainages going on. We are not going to do anything to substantially change the drainage patterns. The BRAC has an agreement with the City to put in a pump. That is really more of a question of how the City wants to operate their stormwater system. One of the intents of the wetlands project is to take that water through the wetlands and use it as a feeder source for the seasonal wetlands.

Mr. Davies: You recognize that the new Hamilton Partnership is not involved in the levee anymore, and it is now a City levee and will be forever. Shouldn't it have a new name?

Ms. Lanzaro: Are there any steps being take to prevent the levee, where the pipes are going down, from being a predatory corridor?

Mr. Polson: Yes, whether it is a fence or other methods of keeping certain species out of the area.

Army BRAC Update: Ed Keller, BRAC Environmental Coordinator (BEC)

Documentation and Next Steps

Documentation

Main Airfield Parcel:

- Levee Parcel Finding of Suitability for Transfer (FOST) - This document included the 13.2 acre property beneath the existing levee, which is currently owned by the City. The public comment period was December 5, 2003 through January 9, 2004. Comments were received and responses were prepared and sent back east for Army signature. Army signature is expected soon. Copies will be made available at the Novato public library and on the internet at www.spk.usac.army.mil/cespk-pm/haaf/rab/docs.html.
- *POL Hill*-The Corrective Action Plan (CAP) was approved by RWQCB on February 4, 2004. The closure report for remaining features was approved by RWQCB on February

10, 2004. The FOST went out for public comment from June 30, 2003 through July 30, 2003. Comments were received and signature was obtained on January 15, 2004. The parcel will not transfer immediately to the City, it will be held for some time because we are also working on this levee parcel and would like to transfer them both at the same time. The Land Use Convent (LUC) is being prepared to restrict residential reuse and impose Title 27 requirements within 1000 feet of landfill. Between the new residential areas and the landfill, the Corps of Engineers have installed a mitigation trench which has an impermeable layer. So far all the agencies are in agreement.

Mr. McCarron: Shouldn't there be some type of restriction on the area and why is it not consistent?

Mr. Keller: For the 5.67 acres that are being transferred to the City of Novato, if the city is going to construct any buildings on the site within 1000 feet of the landfill they must abide by the Title 27 requirements.

Ms. Feger: It is just a precautionary measure. Currently there is no methane on this property. This is a voluntary action. Title 27 only applies to the property that the landfill is on. Technically, the local enforcement agencies would not have the right to impose these requirements, so this is a voluntary agreement to do this. The parties have agreed to this.

Mr. McCarron: Had we had a LUC for Landfill 26 would there be a different situation?

Ms. Feger: It has to do with the breaking up of the parcel.

Mr. Ponton: When is the LUC going to the City for review?

Mr. Keller: Right now it is going between the authors and the FUDS people for the language on Landfill 26. It should be imminent. The Army legal staff as well as the City Manager have already reviewed it and did not have a problem with the restrictions.

Field Work

Northwest Alleged Disposal Area (NWADA) – We had a community member come forward and allege that there was improper disposal of hazardous waste on the northwest end of the runway in the 1980s. We collected 23 samples for 12 locations on November 18 and 19, 2003. Final documents were distributed on February 26, 2004 and are available on the internet. The Army concluded that the alleged disposal activity did not occur and recommended that no further investigation or action is warranted. The RWQCB concurred with this conclusion.

Runway Soil Stockpiles- Sampling is complete and data was distributed on February 17, 2004. The report recommended unrestricted use for 44 piles, restricted on-site use for 45 piles and disposal of a portion of one pile off-site. Also recommended is additional sampling at four locations. Once we have received responses back from the agencies we will go out and do that sampling.

Mr. Polson: We plan to use the unrestricted piles in test fills for the wetlands.

Archive Search Report (ASR) Range Sites- Three range sites identified in the ASR were sampled. The final data report was distributed on April 5, 2004 and is in regulatory review. Further investigation is recommended at two of the three sites (Skeet Range Site and Testing Range). The Army recommended no further action at the Firing-In Butt, which was removed from the site in the 1940s. There were no significantly elevated metals in that location.

Miscellaneous Site Investigation- Sampling was completed as scheduled. The final data report will be out in June.

Coastal Salt March Investigation- Most of the sampling was completed in late January. A few additional samples were collected in February. *Final data report due out in July.*

South of Runway DDT Hotspot Investigation- Sampling was completed in February and the final data report is due out in May.

POL Hill- The Army conducted yearly monitoring of wells in February. When we went out to do our yearly monitoring, one of the wells had been paved over so the sampling date for that location is different from the others because we had to spend time to uncover the well. Final data report due out in May.

Unlined PDD DDT Hotspot- We also sampled for DDTs in the north corner in the unlined ditch. Sampling was completed in February. The final data report is due out in May.

Building demolition- Building demolition is currently underway. Asbestos containing material removed before any demolition is conducted. Additional asbestos containing material (ACM) was identified during the pre-demolition inspections. Removal of the additional ACM has been completed at all but one building which is expected to be completed this week. Building demolition is continuing after ACM removal.

Property Transfer Status

Main Airfield Parcel- Transfer of the 630 acres to the State Coastal Conservancy for the wetland restoration project is complete.

Hospital Hill- Transfer of 3.41 acres to the City of Novato for neighborhood commercial use is complete.

Outparcel A-4- Transfer of 3.96 acres to the developer for commercial use is complete.

POL Hill- Transfer of 5.67 acres to the City of Novato for open space is scheduled for spring of 2004.

Levee Parcel- Transfer of 13.21 acres to the City of Novato for levee footprint is scheduled for the spring of 2004.

Next Steps

Main Airfield Parcel

- Complete sampling required by ROD/RAP;
- Prepare remedial design documents;
- Implement remedial action
- Sign FOST and transfer Levee Parcel to the City of Novato

The construction schedule for the remedial action plan will be limited to September 1 through January 31 because of clapper rail nesting, which occurs from February through August.

POL Hill – Transfer the property. Long-term monitoring, required by the CAP, will continue until the Water Board is satisfied that the property is stable and we can obtain final closeout of the site.

Regulatory Agency Comments

Mr. McCarron: There is a big pile of dirt across from the Coast Guard Hanger, what is it?

Mr. Keller: That is a part of Shea Homes construction site and is fenced off. The dirt is from an off-site source and is there for preconsolidation. The fence is up because it is an active construction site. I will find out the source of the soils.

Ms. Valenzia: I want to acknowledge Jim Ponton and welcome Laurent Meillier. Liz Barr will also be supporting some of the Hamilton work.

Meeting wrap up and Adjournment- Mr. Keller

Mr. Keller announced that the next meeting will be held on July 14, 2004 at the Novato Police Station Meeting Room.