

Minutes
Hamilton Army Airfield Restoration Advisory Board
500 Palm Drive War Room
Novato, California
October 4, 2007

Attendance

RAB Members Present:

Karole Ward, USACE Co-Chair, Matthew J. McCarron, Co-Chair, Richard Draeger, Patricia Eklund, James Sullivan, Navy, Ray Zimny, USACE, Marucia Britto, Sue Lattanzio, Theresa McGarry, DTSC, Lance McMahan, DTSC Linda Rao, RWQCB, Brian Thompson, RWQCB

RAB Members Not Present:

Jeff Johnston, Bill McNicholas, Ross Millerick, Manual Mier,

Others Present:

B.J. Baily, USACE, Travis Williams, Battelle Consultant, John Kaiser, RWQCB, Ed Keller, USACE, Dave Clark, Navy, Jim Davies, Davies Associates, Peter Theran, Mary Ann Parker, Parker Design, Stephanie Pinkham Parker Design

Welcoming Remarks

1. **Introductions: Mr. Matt McCarron** - Called the Hamilton Army Airfield Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) meeting to order at 7:10 P.M.
2. **Old Business:** The minutes of the May and August meetings were approved.
3. **New Business:** Ms. Parker provided specifics of time, location, and format of the Hamilton public meeting scheduled for October 24. An open house format was planned with separate information stations on different aspects of work being done at the NAF and LF 26. Other related agencies and community groups were invited to participate. They included the Todd's Road Working Group, Coastal Conservancy, DTSC and the RWQCB.

Karole Ward, explained the Corps felt that there were so many different activities going on at both the North Antenna Field and Landfill 26 it was a good idea to provide an overview so the public could better understand the process and what was planned.

Several RAB members didn't like the location of the Margaret Todd Center for the meeting. It was suggested and agreed the school on Hamilton would be used in the future for this type of event.

Presentations

4. **Alternatives for the North Antenna Field:**
Karole Ward, USACE, Program Manager

Ms. Ward, gave a PowerPoint presentation, in response to a request from the previous RAB, to provide an overview of the remedial action objectives and the alternatives under consideration from the North Antenna Field Feasibility Study.

Ms. Ward, explained because of project costs, the Corps had submitted the North Antenna Field Feasibility Study to the Army Environmental Center of Expertise, and the U.S. Center of Health Promotion Prevention Medicine for review. After the Sacramento Corps receives and reviews the comments they will be able to discuss the alternatives in more detail.

Each Alternative was broken down into the following categories: pros & cons; number of truck passes; and cost.

It was anticipated, the final alternative would be a combination of the proposed alternatives bellow:

1.) No Action

2.) Excavation & Offsite Disposal: clean closure; disruptive; long-term liability; most expensive; significant truck traffic

3.) Excavation & Onsite Disposal: reduce footprint of contaminated materials; soil stays on the NAF; reduced truck traffic; some environmental liability; some site disruption; uncertain administrative liability (flexibility to negotiate with the regulators could be limited)

4.) Excavation & Off North Antenna Field Consolidation: would depend on the Coastal Conservancy allowing an upland location.

5.) Capping: low cost; minimal exposure; contamination is kept in place; residual liability

Cost spread: \$23,000,000 to \$2,000,00

Open Discussion: Pat Eklund, thought the disruption to the neighborhoods in alternatives 2 and 3 needed more clarification. Rick Sturm, explained that with both alternatives there was exposure to contaminated materials. The big difference was the number of truck passes. Ms. Eklund, emphasized the thousands of truck passes required in an off site disposal was a hardship to the residents on Todd Road and needed to be factored in, because the alternative road may not be built in time.

Pat Eklund, wanted to know if the contaminated soil from the NAF could be encapsulated and used for the interiors of new levees. This would be dependent on the Coastal Conservancy allowing an upland location. On November 15, the Sacramento and San Francisco Districts, the Coastal Conservancy were having an internal meeting to coordinate between the different Hamilton projects. At the meeting the suitability of encapsulation would be discussed.

Matt McCarron, commented he had experience working on a project that considered encapsulation, but ultimately rejected. The suitability of encapsulation depended on variables of properties and levels of the contamination.

Linda Rao, requested a meeting between the Corps and the regulators before the Feasibility Study went to draft final. Ms. Rao, wanted better access to more detailed information before the Draft Final.

Ms. Ward, understood the frustration indicated by the regulators. She explained the NAF FS had a high level of difficulty because there are so many approaches. They also needed to process the comments from headquarters on the alternatives first. She explained the Corps wasn't far enough along to engage in the type of detailed discussion.

Risk Assessment

The assessment of risk takes into consideration many factors and how they interact. At the North Antenna Field ecological receptors drive the cleanup goals since the terrestrial and wetland biological resources are more sensitive to lead than humans.

Mr. Sturm, explained for soil contaminates there are no cleanup laws like there are with ground and drinking water. Most cleanup levels for soil are derived through negotiation with regulatory agencies, are based on risk and usage. Ms. Eklund said EPA has cleanup guidance goals based on human health or ecological risk. Mr. Sturm clarified that there was guidance, but no actual laws.

Mr. McMahan: It's a combination of human health risk and ecological risk. Ms. Ward, yes, because of future use.

Matthew McCarran, wanted to know if the study done for the entire field under BRAC could be used? Karole Ward stated the Corps technical team had reviewed the BRAC study and determined there were major technical flaws. Assumptions like organisms locating only the most contaminated areas for their entire life wasn't considered realist. The BRAC study established a lower PRG than the Corps risk assessor thinks is credible. One of the reasons CH2 was hired; they have a national recognized risk assessor.

B.J. Baily, stated the contaminate at the NAF are different than other locations at Hamilton.

Ecological receptors drive the cleanup goals. Lead is the contaminant. Since human levels are much higher than creature like birds the driver is the ecological receptors. The assumption the little organism would exist in the worst hot spot. Their risk assessor believed

5. Landfill 26, Groundwater Monitoring Report & Soil Gas Update

B.J. Baily, USACE

Gas sampling and water sampling were completed but the results, haven't been completed.

Integrity sampling: Because of fluctuation in temperature the well caps become loose over time. Integrity testing, on the sampling train was conducted on two gas probes at Hamilton Meadows. It was determined the sampling train needed to be modified to stop leaking the atmosphere into the methane probes. The caps have been modified so they don't have to be removed during testing.

Field test on location: All the wells have been tested for the report. The new data will identify if the concentrations vary. Mr. McMahan wanted to know if there had been any false positives? Ms. Baily couldn't comment until after the data had been analyzed. She anticipated if there were any variances, they would be low, because the purge rate is low. Data was expected in two weeks.

Break

6. UST Site 957/970 Navy Update DoD Housing Facility Novato James Sullivan, P.E. – Navy BRAC PMO and Travis Williams - Battelle

Mr. Sullivan began the presentation for the Department of Defense Housing Facility by providing a brief introduction and an overview of the contents of the presentation: remediation site at the former NEX gas station at buildings 957/970; quarterly groundwater monitoring; disparaging systems operation; parcel 1A wash pad VOC investigation; Documentation; Upcoming activities.

Mr. Sullivan announced the ball field parcel had been transferred to the Coastal Conservancy on September 20, 2007.

Upon completing his introduction, Mr. Sullivan gave the presentation over to Mr. Williams. He identified sites on the map to be discussed.

Quarterly GW Monitoring

Mr. Williams began by showing a map detailing the locations of the sites being discussed. **Mr. Williams** indicated that groundwater and surface water sampling was recently conducted in the third week of August 2007, the Navy planed to continue sampling quarterly, with the full annual event in November consisting of 95 wells. During the other three quarters the Navy samples 50/51 wells. The preliminary objective of these small sampling event is to continue collect data inside the disparaging area and down gradient to monitor performance, and monitor the extent and status of the leading edge of the plume.

Validation contractor has been provided data. Preliminary results indicate no MTBE at down gradient wells. In the leading edge area the data from the 22 wells saw a small increase in concentrations. When the data from August 2006 was compared to August 2007 the indications are except for three wells concentrations are stable or less than they were last year.

Disparaging System Operation

No change in data gathered in February, May and August.

June 13 the Navy met with the regulatory agencies to discuss remedial activities at the site.

July 27 Navy requested to shut down the biospaging system and transition to a one-year rebound-monitoring program. Currently the Navy is developing a more detailed description of the monitoring program for the Water Board, to support justification for shutdown. If concentrations rebound there is a plan in place to restart the system.

The system was installed to stabilize and contain the plum on Navy property and cutoff the source of contamination.

The indications are the plum isn't migrating and the concentrations have been greatly reduced.

Objectives for Parcel 1A VOC Investigation

As part of the school sites program USD conducted additional tests and got an unexpected VOC detection at one of their soil gas sampling locations. The suspected source is a concrete truck wash pad located at Building 965 in the Parcel 1A area. The Navy worked with DTSC and the Water Board in developing a Work Plan. The goal of the plan was to confirm the results, identify the source of contamination, soil or groundwater and determine if there is unacceptable risk.

Fieldwork: During three days 20 soil-gas samples, 2 groundwater samples and 2 soil samples were taken and processed at the site. Stepped off to determine if there were other locations with higher concentrations. At the point that had the highest soil gas concentration they weren't able to get a groundwater sample. They went to 23 feet and didn't find any permeable zone because the clay so tight.

Conceptual Site Model: The findings show the source of contamination isn't from ground water. General observation is the source of the VOC is the soil beneath truck wash pad. During that process some solvents were diluted with water and seeped through crack in the pad. The concrete wash pad acted like a cap, and stopped most infiltration not enough to transport to ground water.

Mr. McMahan, what screen level was used? The level was 13.3.

Documentation & Upcoming Activities

Mr. Williams provided an overview of documentation and upcoming activities.

August 16, issued Final Groundwater Monitoring Plan Update

Sampling Analysis

Final Abbreviated Work Plan for VOC Investigation

September 17, issued semiannual Site Status Report

Until last month the Navy had 4 parcels. With the transfer of the ballpark, and Parcel CT3 has been auctioned. The Navy is moving into the real estate closing phase. Parcels 1A and 1B are the only remaining parcels. Hope to transfer in 2008.

6. Agency Status Reports

Lance McMahan, DTSC – Reported DTSC is currently reviewing the MEC site geophysical prove out work plan. Provide compliance comments by October 19-22. Looking forward to reviewing the NAF Feasibility Study

7. Suggestions for Next Meeting

Mr. McCarron – Finalize the RAB bylaws

Mr. McCarron – Community Co Chair election

Ms. Parker – Develop and send termination letter to members that haven't been participating.

Ms. Eklund - Invite the Coastal Conservancy to participate in the meeting

Ms. Rao – Status about conveyance of dirt

8. Date of Next Meeting

Ms. Parker suggested January 10, 2008; 7:00 P.M. would put the RAB back on schedule.

The meeting was adjourned about 9:10 P.M.007.

I changed my service to AT7T in May. I continued to get statements from XO. On July 19, 2007, check number 2077 I payed \$207.43. ON THE CHECK I WROTE “CLOSE ACCOUNT”