

**Detailed Meeting Notes
Hamilton Army Airfield Restoration Advisory Board
Novato Police Station Meeting Room
Novato, California
July 30, 2003**

Attendance

RAB Members Present:

Ed Keller; Thomas Macchiarella; Naomi Feger; Jim Ponton; Preston Cook; Tunstall Lang; Matthew McCarron; Patricia Eklund; Richard A. Draeger; Sabrina Molinari; Ross Millerick, Jeff Johnston, Sue Lattanzio; Lance McMahan; William McNicholas; Marucia Britto.

RAB Members Absent:

Joan Dekelboun; Theresa McGarry; Ray Zimny; Jim McAlister; Rich Seraydarian.

Others Present:

Joy Lanzaro; Hugh Ashley; Samantha Calamari; Travis Williamson; Jim Davies; Carole Dillon-Knutson; Joe Quigley; Frank Ross, Jim Gibbs.

Welcoming Remarks

Ms. Lang welcomed the community to the July 30, 2003 meeting of the Hamilton Army Airfield Restoration Advisory Board (RAB). The meeting began at 7:14 p.m. She welcomes the new RAB members: Ross Millerick, Jeff Johnston, Sue Lattanzio and William McNicholas. Members then went around the room and introduced themselves.

Navy BRAC Update — Thomas Macchiarella, DODHF Novato BEC

Project Update:

Mr. Macchiarella reported that the Hydraulic Lift Removal Report was finalized on May 21, 2003. Responses to Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC's) comments on the Draft Bedrock Well Installation Work Plan were issued on May 20, 2003. Mr. Macchiarella received a letter today (July 30, 2003) from DTSC saying that the Navy's responses were accepted and the Navy can now finalize the work plan and move forward with the field work.

The bio-sparging system is still operating in accordance with the final work plan, and Mr. Macchiarella will elaborate on that subject later in the presentation. The quarterly groundwater monitoring is also ongoing: the last monitoring event was conducted in May 2003, and the next monitoring event will be held in August 2003.

Water Board Order No. 00-064

The Navy has completed all of the work associated with the original Board Order. Of the nine tasks in the Board Order, five have been completed to the satisfaction of the Water

Board. The fieldwork for Tasks 3 and 4 has also been completed. Tasks 8 and 9 require continued monitoring and reporting from the systems that are already in place.

The Water Board approved the Annual Site Status Report recommendations, which included adjusting the sampling frequency of 12 wells, removing some analytes from the monthly bio-sparging monitoring program, combining monthly reports into the site status report and adjusting the site status reporting frequency to semi-annually. The semi-annual) site status report from the latest quarterly monitoring from May 2003 indicates that benzene concentration has continued to decrease. The average concentration is 60% lower than two years ago. MTBE concentration has also continued to decrease with the average concentration 51% lower than two years ago.

Mr. Cook: Are you going after specific “hot spots” within the higher concentration area?

Mr. Macchiarella: I will show you a slide that zooms in on that area so you can see the location of the sparging wells more clearly. All of the points are within the 10,000 µg/L contour.

Remediation System:

The Navy officially started running the system on September 6, 2002. The Navy monitors in that treatment zone on a monthly basis, compared to the quarterly monitoring that occurs for the entire plume. The Navy tracks a range of information, some gathered from field meters, others from laboratory data. The data allows the Navy to track the effectiveness and the safety of the system.

The performance goals of the bio-sparging system are to reduce dissolved MTBE concentrations in the eight performance well locations by 95-99% and to establish a stable or shrinking MTBE plume at the property boundary. At some point the system will achieve an asymptotic curve, meaning that the reductions in concentration will decrease to a point where it will not be effective to spend more money on the system.

Mr. Macchiarella presented the performance well data, which shows that there has been a 72% decrease of average MTBE over ten months of system operation.

Questions

Mr. Cook: What is the process to implement the data?

Mr. Macchiarella: There are more than 40 sparging wells that are operating for the entire zone. If there was a quadrant that was clean and meets the remediation goals, consideration could be made to shut down that quadrant. This would not be done without approval from the regularly agencies.

Ms. Britto: My understanding that you have to shut down some of the sparging wells and then observe what the results were before you would stop monitoring.

Mr. Macchiarella: That is correct. The system will be shut down but remain in place. We expect some concentrations of MTBE to rise once the system is off, but we will monitor the rebound and turn the system back on if necessary.

Mr. Cook: Is this the final process in the proposed clean up for the Navy at this site?

Mr. Macchiarella: No, after the bio-sparging system is finished, the monitoring natural attenuation phase will begin which involves structured data gathering over time, which will demonstrate that the contaminants continue to naturally decrease.

Mr. Cook: Is there an estimated time in which this process will be done?

Mr. Macchiarella: I will talk more about that shortly.

Question: How deep is the groundwater table?

Mr. Macchiarella: Generally, the groundwater table is 10-feet below ground surface.

Mr. Draeger: I notice that the results from PG-MW1, which is near PG-MW2, are not nearly as good, yet the concentrations are the same as PGMW2. Why is this?

Mr. Macchiarella: I have looked at the differences between some of the wells. Some of these performance wells are located outside of the preferential pathway zone, where most of the MTBE is flowing. That is why some of the wells perform so much better than others. Remember that even before the system was put in place, the plume did not provide any risk to humans or to biological receptors. This clean-up isn't necessary in that sense; this cleanup is necessary to achieve Water Board guidelines and policies to clean up the aquifer to its original state, which means getting it back to drinking water levels. The goal for MTBE would be 13 ppb which is the Water Board's drinking water standards for the overall site.

Ms. Molinari: Why is 13 ppb acceptable here instead of 5 ppb?

Mr. Macchiarella: The standard is based on a two-tier system; there is a primary MCL and a secondary MCL. The primary MCL is based on health and is normally a lower number. The secondary MCL is based on odor and taste, which is typically a higher number. With MTBE however, the odor is more noticeable, so the secondary number is actually the smaller number (5 ppb), while the primary MCL is 13 ppb.

There are reasons other than MTBE that would prevent people from using this aquifer for drinking water. First, people get their water from the tap, from the City's municipal supply, which does not draw from this aquifer. Second, this aquifer is too shallow; it's only 10 feet deep. And finally, this aquifer is too small and could not support people in any great number.

Ms. Eklund: The Regional Board has designated this body of water as beneficial use, so that is why the Navy is required to bring it down to these levels.

Mr. McCarron: Has there been research on natural attenuation?

Mr. Macchiarella: We are anticipating that it will take many years before the concentrations are reduced to drinking water standards. At some point between shutting down the bio-sparging system and achieving the drinking water standards the Navy will stop monitoring. I can't say with any certainty whether that point will be five years or tens years and whether we will continue monitoring until the last well has achieved the drinking water standards.

Mr. Ponton: There are several criteria including removing gasoline tanks and excavating contaminated soil. The Navy used a process of soil vapor extraction (SVE) during the period of 1998-1999 to remove about 2,000 lbs of gasoline constituents, including benzene and MTBE. So potential sources have been removed, and the Navy has also removed much of the load in the soil and groundwater. This next phase is aspiring to address the hot spots. At some point only a set of wells will be monitored and eventually wells will be removed as they are no longer needed.

Ms. Eklund: What is your estimate for how long the entire process will take?

Mr. Ponton: We are hopeful that it will be ten to fifteen years, it might be longer but we can't venture to guess. There are many criteria. I've noticed that around Hamilton Meadows there have been trees planted and the trees will help when they reach the groundwater and draw water upwards and remediate contaminants as they transpire. All of these actions combined with the natural processes should accomplish our goal.

Mr. Macchiarella: The goal here is getting the aquifer to achieve the Water Board's six low risk criteria. Among the low risk criteria are: demonstrating that there isn't a risk, demonstrating that the plume is stable, removal of all USTs and dirty source soil at the USTs, etc.

After that the Navy will work towards meeting the drinking water standards. The process is as follows:

- Remove source;
- Remove load from soil;
- Sparge;
- Address hot spots;
- Monitor;
- Identify wells that are not crucial;
- Maintain a select set of wells; and
- Reach ultimate goal of achieving feasibility.

Mr. Millerick: The plan for the site is public benefit transfer for educational use. I believe that since that is a state agency, that DTSC would govern the transfer process. How does this remediation process relate to the transfer process?

Mr. Macchiarella: We work with DTSC and the Water Board regularly, even daily. The recipient does not determine when DTSC gets involved. However, by virtue of becoming a school at some point, the school district may need to go through DTSC's certification process. DTSC is working with the Novato Unified School District on this parcel.

Mr. Ponton: Both DTSC and the Water Board have their own processes, and they work side by side. We did a risk assessment for Water Board standards, but we also did a risk assessment that meets the DTSC school program standards. DTSC is the lead agency for entire site, so they will certify that all the remedial actions have been taken, but the clean-up has been done via our Water Board Order and the standards that we promulgated.

Mr. Davies: DTSC has two entities that school district would have to deal with: DTSC and DTSC's Schools Program, which is a separate entity with its own staff. The school property would have to comply with the Schools Program standards in order for the property transfer to take place. The school district is working with the Schools Program to satisfy all the necessary requirements.

Future Activities

The Navy will continue to run the bio-sparging system. The Navy will also continue monthly groundwater sampling of performance goal monitoring wells to track treatment effectiveness. Finally, the Navy will continue monthly soil-gas sampling to ensure safe and effective system operations. The quarterly groundwater monitoring event will be conducted in August 2003. The bedrock well installation work plans, hydraulic lift removal report and the sale are FOST will all be finalized

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

Ms. Lang announced that Mr. McAlister was not present but handouts of his presentation were made available.

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

Documentation and Next Steps

Documentation

Main Airfield Parcel:

- Record of Decision/Remedial Action Plan (ROD/RAP) – This document covers all Inboard Area and Coastal Salt Marsh sites. Public comment period was held from June 5 through July 21, 2003. A well-attended public comment meeting was held on July 9, 2003 and written comments have been received. An Army contractor is working closely with DTSC/RWQCB/Army to prepare the response to comments.
- Finding of Suitability for Early Transfer (FOSET) – The public comment period was held from June 5 through July 7, 2003. A public comment meeting was held on June 16, 2003 and no written comments were received. Some questions were discussed at the public comment meeting. An Army signature is expected on this document any day.
- Environmental Baseline Survey (EBS) – This document was updated to support the public comment period of the FOSET. It provides a snapshot of what the property looks like environmentally at this point in time.

Mr. Ross: Are you aware of any archeological sites in the area?

Mr. Keller: We have done extensive research into archeological findings. There doesn't seem to be anything on the airfield parcel itself. We have indications that archeological findings were made in the Coast Guard housing area and adjacent playing field areas.

Another area includes the swimming pool and the VIP quarters. All of these areas have been transferred to the City of Novato.

There is some documentation from the early 1940s that does describe some archeological sites but they seem to refer to the circle areas, which are the roadways.

Mr. Ross: There are federal funds involved with this project. There are tribal lands in the area and there is supposed to be consultation with the tribe.

Mr. Keller: We have no information regarding tribal land where the runway is. I'd be interested in seeing what information you do have.

Mr. Ross: Has the area been surveyed by an archeologist?

Mr. Keller: There is a description in the environmental impact statement that looked at the transfer actions of that parcel. There is an archeological description and findings included in that document.

Mr. Ross: Does the City of Novato plan to do any studies on the area?

Ms. Eklund: The coast guard would be the agency to request this study. The City has no plans to do a survey at this time.

Hospital Hill:

The deed has been recorded and the property has been officially transferred to the City of Novato.

POL Hill:

The Corrective Action Plan (CAP) was forwarded to the Water Board and DTSC for regulatory review. The closure report for remaining features was forwarded for regulatory review. The FOST went out for public comment from June 30, 2003 through July 30, 2003. No comments have been received.

There was a leak from a petroleum tank located in the fractured bedrock in the area of POL Hill. The area has been monitored since 1994 and the CAP recommends monitored natural attenuation as the solution. All of the contaminated soils were removed down to the bedrock itself, thus making any more removal infeasible. Petroleum concentrations have fluctuated over time; they are higher in the winter when groundwater elevations rise due to rainwater, and lower in the summer (August through September) before it starts to rain again. Recent data shows that the plume is not migrating. Groundwater was sampled in the area of the tanks and was determined not to be impacted.

The Army has prepared a closure report for all the remaining features on the parcel. That report has been submitted for regulatory review. The Army has talked to the Water Board and they have completed their preliminary review of the documents and they seem to support moving forward with transfer of the property as it does not seem to pose any risk to human health or the environment. The Finding of Suitability for Transfer was released for public comment on June 30, 2003. The comment period ends today, July 30, 2003. A public comment meeting was held on July 23, 2003 and no comments have been

received at this time, although some are expected from the Water Board. Once the comment letters have been received, a response to comments document will be prepared.

Next Steps

Main Airfield Parcel:

- Finalize the ROD/RAP;
 - Responding to comments
 - Finalizing document with DTSC and the Water Board.
- Forward Finding of Suitability for Early Transfer to the Governor.
 - Signature required
- Transfer the property
 - Main airfield parcel will be transferred to the State of California for development as open space/wetland habitat.
- Accomplish sampling required by the ROD/RAP.
- Prepared remedial design documents.
- Implement remedial investigations of a few sites:
 - Skeet range on the south end
 - Firing range in the levee area
 - Firing in-but
 - Alleged disposal area in the north end of the airfield
 - Sampling will be done at all of these sites outlined by the ROD/RAP and remedies will be implemented after the point of transfer.

POL Hill:

The whole parcel is approximately eight acres and we are proposing to transfer approximately six acres to the city. Landfill 26 shares a property boundary with the parcel although it is buffered by a 200-ft buffer zone. According to the Congressional Act Defense Authorization Bill, the Army will retain property title to the Landfill and the buffer zone. We need to determine which entity within the Army holds the title for Landfill 26 so we can transfer the buffer zone property to them. The rest of the parcel will be transferred to the City of Novato while the Army will retain title to the buffer zone property.

- Finalize FOST and transfer the property. Long-term monitoring will continue until the Water Board is satisfied that the property is stable and we can obtain final closeout of the site.

Ms. Eklund: When will transfer occur?

Mr. Keller: It is estimated that this will happen by September 2003.

Mr. Millerick: After the transfer, will the restoration process begin?

Mr. Keller: The transfer of the property has to take place before the restoration project can begin. The construction of the levee is planned to take eight years from start of

construction. The construction should begin in October 2003, demolishing buildings and preparing the property.

Ms. Britto: The outer levee would be breached by 2013.

Mr. Ross: Was soil contamination from the gas station parcel taken off site? And where were they taken?

Mr. Macchiarella: Yes, they were removed from the site. The soil was removed in the mid-1990's but I can't say which landfill they were sent to. I can look it up though and get back to you.

Mr. Ross: I request that my former comments regarding archeological sites be documented.

Mr. Keller: This is not a formal public comment meeting, but we do take minutes and I would be happy to sit down with you and talk about this further.

Mr. Ross: Are your archeological sites in the Sonoma State database?

Mr. Keller: I don't know, I can check on that.

Mr. Davies: When is the transfer set for the governor signage?

Ms. Feger: The briefing package is being prepared for September 30, 2003.

Ms. Britto: Is anything happening to the soil berms on the airfield?

Mr. Keller: This has not been fully decided. The Water Board will request that we take some additional samples of the soil stock piles before the determination can be made whether the soils can stay on site or not. The soil berms are from excavations in an area that is now a housing area; it was placed on the runway as temporary storage. About 80 percent of the soil is from FUDS and 20 percent is from the BRAC program..

Mr. Draeger: Is there a timeline for excavations required under the FOSET?

Mr. Keller: There are Fish and Wildlife Service restrictions for the time of the year when the excavations can take place. The majority of the excavations will take place on the other side of the levee, calling into concern Section 7 concerns from the Fish and Wildlife Service. There will most likely be restrictions on doing excavations during bird nesting season, which restricts us to September to January. The excavation will probably take place September 2004 to January 2005.

Ms. Lang: Is funding available to complete this project?

Mr. Keller. The majority of the funds necessary are already in hand. Other funds will be identified for Hamilton in the next few fiscal years.

Ms. Feger: What is the status of the BRAC program and the funding over the next few years?

Mr. Keller: The BRAC program funding is declining. Funding availability is uncertain and we will have a better idea after design.

Ms. Feger: Does the program have to go through any re-authorizations, or is there a sunset?

Mr. Keller: The BRAC program is looking at when the next round of closures would take place. I don't believe the BRAC program itself would sunset any time in the near future. Funding is declining, but I don't know if it's declining because remediation is being completed and so less funding is needed, or whether Congress is reducing the amount of funding for the program.

Regulatory agencies comments

Ms. Feger reported that copies of the ROD/RAP were distributed. There were no comments received on the ROD/RAP and the public comment period ended on July 21, 2003.

There is a Board Meeting on August 20, 2003 to approve the Order. The Order and a number of other agreements have been worked on various agencies including DTSC and the Coastal Conservancy. These documents will be part of a briefing package which includes MOA between the State Coastal Conservancy Army Corps and the Army, the property deed, site clean-up requirements and the Supplemental Environmental Impact Report (SEIR) will be delivered to the Governor's offices for signature.

There were no formal comments received on the SEIR. The public comment period for the SEIR and the ROD/RAP ran parallel and both were closed on July 21, 2003. The site clean-up requirements parallel what is in the ROD/RAP and insure that the remedial actions are implemented.

Mr. Ponton reported that Mr. Macchiarella led a brown bag meeting on soil contamination at the gas station site. The gas station parcel is going to be transferred by the end of September 2003 from the Navy to the City of Novato. Over the next month, there will be a public comment period sponsored by DTSC on the Land Use Covenant (LUC) which specifies restrictions that run with the land and deal with residual soil and groundwater contamination associated with the operation of that property. Not everything was able to be captured and removed or remediated so there will be some residual groundwater contamination research and some management of residual soils at the site.

Ms. Eklund: As for Building 870, was the decision to require the Navy to remove the entire building and test the soil underneath?

Mr. Ponton: The decision is that the Navy is not required to remove the building. When the property is transferred, the soils will be required to be removed responsibly. The remaining contamination is well constrained by the sampling that has taken place. When the property is transferred, if the building comes down the footprint will have a restriction for digging and will call for a management plan for the soils so proper disposal will occur if they are removed.

Ms. Eklund: Does the Novato Community Partners find this acceptable?

Mr. Davies: The Novato Community Partner's agreement to purchase the property was based upon the fact that there would be no additional remediation cost involved. The additional remediation action is estimated to cost \$300,000. The developer is not

interested in remediating this property. I don't believe the City of Novato is going to accept the land under those conditions.

Mr. Macchiarella: The Navy has a Contract Sale Agreement with the City which expires on September 30, 2003. If the City of Novato does not accept the property as the Navy presents it by September 30, 2003, The City can withdraw from the agreements. The Navy will then locate another recipient by whatever means necessary.

Ms. Eklund: Would it go to GSA?

Mr. Macchiarella: That is certainly one option.

Mr. McMahan: I am working on the early transfer document for the Governor's signature. Once the FOSET comes in from the Army, we will put it in our package and forward it on the Governor's staff so they can review it and make a recommendation to the Governor. The early transfer is a joint effort between DTSC, the Water Board and the Coastal Conservancy in terms of presenting the case for the transfer to the Governor's office. We are all working closely to make sure the briefing package and action requested meets everyone's needs. We have received comments on the ROD/RAP and are waiting for the Army to respond to them. I do have copies of ROD/RAP comments from Department of Fish & Game as well as Friends of Novato Creek. We are aiming for a September 30, 2003 transfer.

Mr. McCarron: How long will remediation activities required in the FOSET take to complete. There are approximately 60 sites where further actions are needed.

Mr. McMahan: About the time they open the levee is when they will be done because the remediation is tied in with the wetland restoration project. One of the larger elements of the remedy out there is the placement of cover and that coverage is being provided by the dredged soils.

Ms. Lang: Does the \$15 million of funding include all of the ROD/RAP responsibilities?

Mr. Keller: All the different actions that the ROD/RAP proposes are not all BRAC responsibilities. So we need to look at what will require BRAC funding versus what will be paid for be the Hamilton Wetland Restoration Project itself.

Mr. McCarron: Since not all the soil piles are BRAC piles, we still need to get them off before we can fully remediate the site. How does that tie into the clean-up actions?

Ms. Feger: There is a task in the Board's Order for the Army to present a technical report evaluating the potential reuse of the soils, whether they can be reused on site. We will move forward with whatever sampling will be needed for the piles and then the determination of whether they can be reused on site will be made. Until this determination is made, we do not know if there is enough money to deal with the piles.

Mr. Keller: There should be enough money for the soils sampling. We cannot determine the cost of removing the soil and if there is sufficient funding until it is determined what is in the soil.

Mr. Millerick: The runway is a concrete slab that is impervious. Will it be broken up to make it pervious, will it just be covered?

Mr. Keller: The wetland project does call for some removal of pavement (taxiways) where it would impact the natural development of channels. The runway itself may be removed, but the majority of the runway is planned to be left in place. There is no plan to break it up to make it pervious.

RAB TRC discussion on the recent public comment documents-

No comments were made.

Schedule the new member RAB orientation meeting- All RAB members

Mr. Keller asked what availability people have for holding a new member RAB orientation meeting.

A meeting was scheduled for Monday, August 25, 2003 at 6 p.m. The meeting will be held at the BRAC office. Then there will be a tour of the Hamilton sites.

Meeting wrap up and Adjournment- Tunstall Lang

Ms. Lang announced that the next meeting will be held on October 8, 2003. The meeting will be held at the Hamilton School.