

Minutes
Hamilton Army Airfield Restoration Advisory Board
Novato Police Station Meeting Room
Novato, California
October 11, 2006

Attendance**RAB Members Present:**

Karole Ward, Marucia Britto, Joan Dekelboun, Richard A. Draeger, Lance McMahan, Theresa McGarry, James Sullivan

RAB Members Absent:

Matthew McCarron, Preston Cook, Patricia D. Eklund, Jeff Johnston, Sue Lattanzio, Bill McNicholas, Ross Millerick, Manuel Mier, Tom Gandesbery, Brian Thompson, Linda Rao

Others Present:

John Kaiser (representing RAB members Brian Thompson and Linda Rao), Barry Buckley, Jim Davies, Ann Morrissey, Caroline Mulder, Christine Theran, Dr. Peter Theran, John Kowalczyk, Brad Call, Donn Diebert, Rick Sturm, Travis Williamson, Mary Ann Parker, Maureen Williams

1. Welcoming Remarks- Karole Ward, USACE

Karole Ward, RAB Co-chair, welcomed the community to the October 11, 2006 meeting of the Hamilton Army Airfield Restoration Advisory Board (RAB). Attendees introduced themselves.

2. Old Business

The minutes from the July 12, 2006 meeting were approved.

3. New Business – Discussion of By-Laws

Karole Ward asked for suggestions for topics for the next RAB meeting. A possible RAB bylaw update was discussed.

Members had been asked to come an hour early to this meeting to discuss a possible bylaw update. Only two members had arrived early so the discussion did not take place. Mary Ann Parker gave the two members copies of the existing by-laws and samples of current bylaws for another project to compare and discuss at a later date.

It was decided that the members would meet from 6:00 – 7:00 before the next RAB meeting and discuss the bylaws.

4. Formerly Used Defense Sites (FUDS) Update Presentation – Karole Ward, USACE

Karole Ward gave a presentation on the FUDS program. Highlights of the presentation are included here. A hard copy of the full presentation will be made available with these minutes. Ms. Ward's presentation included a discussion of:

- FUDS categories: Installation Restoration, Military Munitions Response Program, and Building Demolition / Debris Removal

- The FUDS program process
- Related laws and authorities
- Program limitations
- The CERCLA Process
- Updates on:
 - The North Antenna Field
 - Landfill 26 project

The FUDS program process involves three steps: Inventory, Study, and Restoration. The inventory phase was completed to determine all FUDS-eligible properties, i.e., all properties that had been used by the Department of Defense and where ownership had been transferred prior to October 17, 1986. The FUDS inventory identified 1294 sites in California, including parts of the Hamilton Army Airfield (not including Landfill 26). While Landfill 26 is not a FUDS property, it is being funded under the FUDS program by exception from congress.

After the inventory was completed, the next step in the FUDS process was a study involving field investigations and decision-making. The final step in the FUDS process is restoration, project clean up, removal and remediation.

FUDS program funds are used only for cleanup of waste caused by Department of Defense (DoD) installations, and Comprehensive Environmental Response Compensation and Liability Act (CERCLA)-defined wastes.

The CERCLA process is completed in four stages:

1. Preliminary assessment / site investigation (PA / SI)
2. Remedial investigation / feasibility study (RI / FS)
3. Remedial design / remedial action (RD / RA)
4. Operations and / or long term monitoring (RA-O / LTM)

Current status on the North Antenna Field is that the final remedial investigation was completed in January 2006, risk assessment study is being finalized and expected to be complete in November, 2006. A feasibility study began in October, 2006, and project planning for the military munitions response program was begun in October, 2006.

When methane was found at Landfill 26, a presumptive remedy (a cut-off trench) was put in place to provide community protection. Now the Corps is going back and finalizing the CERCLA Process, starting with a Feasibility Study. This will be followed by an amendment to the Record of Decision.

Discussion:

Theresa McGarry added that a correction plan was expected for completion for Landfill 26. (The plan would document interim remedies and determine whether any further actions are necessary. This is a task item in the newly adopted WB order.) The situation is currently being monitored.

Christine Theran asked where the area was that may need another well. Karole Ward showed the area on the map. It is to the north / northeast of the landfill.

Jim Davies asked whether there was a requirement to do more information gathering. A discussion took place wherein John Kaiser (representative from the Regional Water Quality Control Board) advised that with regard to the waste discharge requirement, many requirements were discussed in joint meetings with other agencies. They came to an agreement that additional investigation was not required. Reports show that the methane problem is capped in the Landfill area. A Five (5) year circle of review is being written. Brad Call indicated there is a need for additional monitoring.

A large map showing where the methane probes are located was available. The probe results were color-coded on the map and only two of the several existing probes show relatively high levels of methane. Christine Theran noted that one of the areas where monitoring shows a higher level of methane is a lot near where a home is located. She asked if the owners of that home are aware of the situation. Theresa McGarry noted that she had advised the Marin County Health Department of the situation.

It was noted by a community member that even though the county health department was notified, they have a lot of issues to deal with and may not have notified the homeowner. Theresa McGarry explained that the home in question was built by Shea with a ventilation system because of the location; and there have been no complaints. Methane has not been found in the homes, but outside in probes. (To clarify: The county health department has been involved with Shea homes in the construction of protective measures in specific homes to prevent methane buildup. Both the State California Waste Management Board and the Marin County Environmental Health Services Department have participated in all the investigations and monitoring of the landfill.)

Jim Davies added that Shea had a comprehensive disclosure statement regarding the property and that and all technical reports were disclosed to buyers. Christine Theran said that everyone got that disclosure.

Brad Call noted that sampling is done on a regular basis and that it has been observed that the mass of methane dissipated quickly. The interpretation is that the probe in question is close to the point of methane generation but the mass is not great. John Kaiser explained how methane is generated. Methane is common near water. To understand where the methane was coming from, many probes were put in and are monitored. A monitoring report is being generated.

Action Item: Jim Davies requested to receive an email with the monitoring measurements. Karole Ward agreed this would be done.

The discussion continued with Theresa McGarry adding that all agencies have been working on decision-making regarding the probes, their placement and monitoring. Marin County Health Department is aware of the situation. The methane problem is not an imminent threat and not considered a risk. The trench has effectively reduced the methane from the landfill and the situation is constantly monitored.

Richard Draeger asked if Marin County was taking an interest. Theresa McGarry responded that they are out there when the probes are done and that they had sent a letter to Shea, (the builder).

5. North Antenna Field Remedial Investigation Findings Presentation – Brad Call

Brad Call presented the findings of the North Antenna Field remedial investigations. Highlights of the presentation are included here. A hard copy of the full presentation will be made available with these minutes. Mr. Call's presentation included site location maps, a brief history of land use, previous work that has been done in the area, the areas investigated, and findings. Areas investigated were areas used as:

- Firing Ranges
- Ammunition Burn Pit
- Fire Practice Area
- Rifle Range Road
- Support Facilities Area
- Western Property Boundary Area
- Coastal Salt Marsh

In summary, Mr. Call noted that there were multiple rounds of investigation, and over 500 areas were sampled. The areas of most concern were the firing ranges. They comprise about one quarter of the parcel and are the most contaminated. A final risk assessment will be completed by the end of the year and a feasibility study is to begin soon.

Discussion:

There was a discussion about remediation. Christine Theran asked how many acres were involved and how much needs remediation. Brad Call answered that there are 267 acres. Mr. Call indicated the best answers to how the area would be remediated will be in the planned feasibility study. Ms. Theran asked about monitoring. Mr. Call said that there are a variety of things that could be done from physically removing every bit of contamination and taking it somewhere else, to doing something on site, to various other alternatives. He suggested at a future meeting presentation of the feasibility study and remediation alternatives will be made. Mr. Call mentioned that the California State Coastal Conservancy agency is expected to be part of the Wetlands reclamation project.

It was asked why is the wetlands project considered so important? Why are they doing it? John Kaiser answered from the water board's perspective, it has value. Wetlands provide a filter to clean run off as well as serving as a habitat for wildlife. The bay area has lost 80% of its original wetlands.

A community member asked if there were federal minimum or state standards for this type of clean up. John Kaiser said yes, there are a number of agencies and regulatory methods involved. Clean up levels depend on a number of factors including the type of wildlife present and human health.

Lance McMahan, DTSC Project Manager for the Hamilton NAF and the Army BRAC Airfield Parcel, distributed the attached map and spoke about debris remaining and levels of contamination in the fire practice area. The map shows a number of problem areas that have been identified, including an area where an ammonia drum was removed and ammonia was spilled on the ground, areas with metal debris, a blue stain caused by an unknown material, and a lens of burned soil. There is an elevated mercury level (30 ppm) and an elevated total DDTs level (2

parts per million). For comparison, on the BRAC side of the property, any soil containing over 1 part per million total DDTs was required to be hauled off site. At this point, it is unknown how much might be hauled off or what remedial action will be required here. That will be addressed in the feasibility study.

Barry Buckley asked if they hauled off 2 feet of dirt, how many 18-wheelers would it take? Brad Call responded that there was some initial work done in this regard in the Remedial Options Study. The draft feasibility report will be released to the public in June and the findings will be reported to the Restoration Advisory Board.

Dr. Peter Theran noted that the neighbors have some concern that the alternative road be build before all the hauling begins so as not to tie up Todd Road. A strong cooperative effort has been working well. The main effort is to keep the city moving on this.

6. DoD Housing Facility Novato Restoration Advisory Board Navy Update – Travis Williamson, P.E. Battelle Consultant

Travis Williamson gave a presentation on the sites that the Navy Base Realignment and Closure project (BRAC) is monitoring and remediating. Highlights of the presentation are included here. A hard copy of the full presentation will be made available with these minutes.

Navy projects include the Former NEX gas station site where MTBE concentration is being monitored and remediated, the Ballfields Parcels.

Former NEX gas station site:

Mr. Williamson presented maps showing the area with MTBE concentration depicted. A biosparging system to remediate the MTBE concentration was originally started and run from 2002 – 2005. It was restarted in 2006. Groundwater and surface water quarterly monitoring was performed in August, 2006. 51 wells were sampled for groundwater and 5 locations were sampled for surface water.

In 2002 – 2005, biosparging consisted of a continuous injection of air. Since it was restarted in 2006, the air is introduced sporadically and better results are being achieved. In 2005, MTBE concentration in the performance goal monitoring wells had been reduced by approximately 82% from 2002 levels. Following only 2 months of renewed operation in 2006, concentration levels were reduced approximately 94% from 2002 levels.

The following documentation is completed and available to the public:

- Semiannual Site Status Report – issued July 31, 2006. Summarizes data and activities from December, 2005 – May, 2006.
- Final Human Health Risk Assessment Update for NUSD (Public Benefit Conveyance) Parcels 1A and 1B – issued August 31, 2006.

The following documentation is being prepared:

- Updated Health and Safety Plan and Monitoring Plan
- Real estate documentation

Upcoming activities for the Former NEX gas station site include:

- Performing a quarterly groundwater / surface water monitoring event in November, 2006
- Continuing to evaluate the biosparging operations and coordinating with regulatory agencies regarding potential shutdown in 2007 after two additional quarterly monitoring events in November, 2006 and February, 2007
- Identifying additional data needs and addressing those needs with regard to the MTBE plume leading edge
- Preparing an updated Health and Safety Plan and Monitoring Plan.

Navy Ballfields Parcels Update:

- Final Preliminary Assessment / Site Inspection Report was issued April 14, 2006.
- Draft Finding of Suitability for Transfer (FOST) report was made available to regulatory agencies and to the public for 30-day review at the South Novato Public Library.
- Final FOST report scheduled to be issued December 4, 2006.

Discussion

A discussion regarding the plume occurred. Peter Theran mentioned that an alternative route for trucks is out of the old rock crushing site to Ammo hill and asked if there was any issue regarding driving trucks over the plume? Mr. Williamson said there was not.

In a discussion of the plume, Mr. Williamson said that the depth of the ground water is 8 – 10 feet; thickness of waste is 8-10 feet. Bottom of landfill may be at mean sea level. How long would it take for the plume to naturally disperse? (Unknown)

Joan Dekelboun asked if the plume was headed to Pacheco Creek or pond and whether they were in danger. Mr. Williamson said it was probably going toward the pond and additional data was needed. It could be a significant amount of time for the plume to move there. John Kaiser noted that MTBE is a resistant pollutant. It may reach Pacheco pond or bay. The concern is that it not be in a concentration that will affect marine or human life. It also can represent an odor problem. It is thought that if it does reach the pond or bay it will be degraded significantly. Ms. Dekelboun asked if they could biosparge or build a barrier like a slurry wall. Mr. Williamson said that doesn't always work. Donn Diebert asked if there was anything helpful in the landfill to remediate. Mr. Williamson indicated a prescriptive remedy was a cap but that solution has problems too as it lowers the oxygen level. It was mentioned that the POL hill petroleum storage site was monitored for 4 – 5 years and numbers were in line with goals.

7. Agency Updates

Theresa McGarry – California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC)

- The Human Health Risk Assessment is focused on the area that is being transferred to the school district. The site determination will be made by the school district.
- The DTSC is working with the Navy regarding use restrictions on C Street.

Lance McMahan - DTSC

Contact Lance McMahan with any questions regarding North Antenna Field: 916-255-3674.

Christine Theran asked about Hamilton Square – would it be zoned for commercial or residential

use? Ms. McGarry explained that if it were to go residential, they would have to do more work on a human health assessment.

John Kaiser – Regional Water Quality Control Board

Waste discharge requirements for Landfill 26 have been passed by unanimous vote of the Water Board:

- The discharger is to continue monitoring and investigation of water quality and soil in Landfill 26 and report findings to regulatory agencies.
- The discharger will conduct investigation activities that were identified in the final report in December 16, 2005. This involves additional monitoring, a five-year review report, a feasibility study and an action plan for any needed remedial action, a corrective action report, and a landfill closure / post-closure plan.

At the request of the City of Novato, the Water Board approved environmental testing for Pacheco Creek.

8. Date of Next Meeting

It was agreed that the next meeting will be on Thursday, January 11. Board members will arrive an hour early (at 6:00 PM) to discuss bylaws.