

**Detailed Meeting Notes
Hamilton Army Airfield Restoration Advisory Board
Novato Police Station Meeting Room
Novato, California
October 8, 2003**

Attendance

RAB Members Present:

Ed Keller; Thomas Macchiarella; Naomi Feger; Jim Ponton; Matthew McCarron; Patricia Eklund; Richard A. Draeger; Sue Lattanzio; Lance McMahan; William McNicholas; Marucia Britto; Theresa McGarry; Jim McAlister; Joan Dekelboum, Tom Gandesbery, Eric Polson

RAB Members Absent:

Ray Zimny; Rich Seraydarian, Manuel Meir; Preston Cook; Tunstall Lang; Ross Millerick; Jeff Johnston.

Others Present:

Joy Lanzaro; Hugh Ashley; Samantha Calamari; Travis Williamson; Jim Davies; Sandrine Sovlet; Laurette Rogers; Jennifer Valenzia; Tom Gandesbery.

Welcoming Remarks

Ed Keller welcomed the community to the October 8, 2003 meeting of the Hamilton Army Airfield Restoration Advisory Board (RAB). The meeting began at 7:10 p.m.

Navy BRAC Update — Thomas Macchiarella, DODHF Novato BEC

Project Update

Mr. Macchiarella announced that he is moving to another project (Alameda Naval Air Station) and Jennifer Valenzia will be his replacement for Hamilton Army Airfield.

Mr. Macchiarella gave an update of the “Sale Area” transfer. The Sale Area is where the gas station proper is located, which is intended for sale by the Navy to the City of Novato for commercial and industrial use. The PBC area is intended for transfer to the Novato Unified School district. The FOST was finalized and amended on September 15, 2003. The FOST documents the environmental work that was done on the property and determines that the property is suitable for transfer for its intended re-use. The Final Land Use Covenant which gives the state regulatory agencies the power to enforce the institutional controls was finalized in September 2003. The Navy will include them with the deed transferring the property. The Navy will retain the right to enforce the restrictions that will be placed in the deed so that the restrictions will run with the land. The escrow for the Sale Parcel has been extended until October 31st, 2003.

The Navy bedrock work plan was approved by the Water Board and DTSC, and they plan to begin installing bedrock walls in the area of the gas station. The regulatory agency

participants wanted to see more groundwater wells installed in the bedrock, so the Navy will do that in November. Quarterly groundwater monitoring continues: the last event was conducted in August and next monitoring event will be conducted in November. The bio-sparging system is being operated in accordance with plan.

Remediation System

The remedial action objectives of the Navy bio-sparging system are to stabilize and contain the MTBE plume on Navy property and to reduce the time to reach the MCL of drinking water. The Navy officially started running the system on September 6, 2002. The bio-sparging system focuses on the highest concentration area of the plume and 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, and others from laboratory data. The data allow 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. Reaching a 95-99% reduction in concentration does not mean that the sparge wells will be eliminated. The wells will continue to operate as long as it is cost-effective and as long as the biosparging system is effective. 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.

The biosparging system is now off and the wells have been sampled again. The performance wells are a set of nine wells that are in the area that the Navy is actively treating, which is a subset of the entire plume. Mr. Macchiarella presented the performance well data, which shows that there has been a 64% decrease in the average concentration of MTBE over the twelve month operation period of the system – from 14,000 ppb average to 5,000 ppb. The percent reduction in the wells is not consistent because there were various concentrations in the wells to begin with as well as varied geologic conditions among the different wells. Not all wells will clean up as well as the others. Seasonal changes in the groundwater elevation and seasonal heterogeneities in the subsurface can cause the values of MTBE to increase in the wells even after there has been a reduction in concentration. There is now a leveling out of the readings because there have modifications to the system, such as cycling of injection of air through the various bio-sparging points as well as increasing the flow rates. Compared to data gathered in May 2002, there has been a great reduction in MTBE mass in the ground water.

Mr. McCarron: For wells PG-MW5 and PG-MW1, what are the geologic conditions? More clay or sand?

Mr. Macchiarella: PG-MW5 is on the edge of the area in the tighter part of the foundation. The clay tightens between these two wells.

None of the concentrations is firm, and we expect the values to fluctuate. However, there is good improvement in the sense that there is no longer a large MTBE mass in the 10,000 contour. The average reduction is about 70%, ranging from 39%-98% in the various wells, which is indicative that the system is working. The system has been running for about 12 months, and was initially believed to be needed to run for 18 months. The Navy will continue to make system adjustments. The biosparging system is still operating in accordance with the final work plan. The quarterly groundwater monitoring is also ongoing: the last monitoring event was conducted in August 2003, and the next monitoring event will be held in November 2003. We will implement our better-off wells as well as continuing with the property transfer of the Sale Area. Then will put FOSTs out for agency review on other parcels.

Ballfield

The Navy will work with the regulatory agencies to determine what areas need further mitigation on the Ballfield parcel. There was previously a FOST for the parcel but the FOST was removed when new information was discovered. The Navy will be taking a closer look to ensure that the property is suitable for the original use, which is wetland. There were some revetments and spoils piles found and the Navy will be working in the area make sure it is suitable for transfer. The goal is that the land will be transferred for wetlands restoration. There will be information at that next RAB meeting that addresses the study design.

Ms. Eklund: What new information was received that made the Navy retract the FOST?

Mr. Macchiarella: The aerial photos showing revetments in use on the parcel. It was also recognized that the spoils pile was on the Navy property, which was not accounted for in the previous FOST. The revetments and spoils pile and some other environmental issues also apply to the adjacent Army BRAC parcel, which has its own environmental conditions. Due to the proximity of the Navy parcel, the Navy will be taking a closer look at the ballfield parcel. There will need to be a FOST to transfer the parcel, and it will not be transferred until this issue is examined.

Ms. Britto: Who will the land be transferred to?

Mr. Macchiarella: The land will be transferred to the California Coastal Conservancy.

Ms. Britto: What is the Army's area of concern?

Mr. Macchiarella: That still needs to be determined. The revetment use will be studied for more information. We will examine the way in which the Army studied their revetments.

Ms. Lattanzio: What will be done with the area once it is transferred?

Mr. Polson: The general elevation varies between 3-5 feet below mean sea level. We will build it up to about +8, +6 feet. There will be a drainage ditch, and the drainage will go through the seasonal wetland as a channel feature and will be discharged. The area would be leveled out. Most of the area is surface concrete.

Future Activities

The Navy will continue to run and monitor 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 November 2003. The bedrock well installation work plans will be implemented. The sale area property transfer will be complete. The Navy will proceed with the FOST for the College of Marin and PBC Parcel.

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

Methane Monitoring Update

Mr. McAlister reported on the methane levels recorded since the buffer trench was installed. Mr. McAlister presented a graphic that showed contour lines representing concentration levels of methane throughout the landfill area. Mr. McAlister reviewed the methane levels in the soil gas since July 2001. As of September 26, 2003, the landfill gas mitigation control trench that has been measuring methane through gas probes showed that the trench continues to be effective and decrease the levels of methane in the soils. In some parts of the trench, the methane levels are close to zero.

The USACE continues to monitor the methane 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. However, there is still persistent methane. 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 trench and collection tube has been installed between landfill and Hamilton meadow subdivision. The first 1,000 linear feet was installed in January 2002, while the remaining 600 feet was installed in July/August 2002. The contours have changed dramatically, with persistent methane present 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.

We have our report coming out, and should be in the agency's hands in November. We are currently working on it in-house. We believe that all of the methane south of the landfill originates from natural organic materials down in the soils. We have H-dated the methane in the soils and groundwater, and they have consistently shown up as between 300 and 800 years old, which is consistent with natural degradation of natural organics. Generally landfill gas from refuse is closer to 60 or 100 years old.

The ventilation trench would not have an effect on the naturally occurring methane because there is an impermeable layer on the outer edge of the landfill and the methane finds the path of least resistance, which is the ground fill of the trench. We feel the trench is effective around GNP 9, which is an area where there was elevated methane as you can

see on the 2001 plot. Once the trench went in, two months later there was an almost complete decrease of methane. Methane which may travel from the landfill is being intercepted by the trench, but naturally occurring methane is not affected by the trench.

Ms. Eklund: Obviously, there is some methane being generated by the landfill – I thought the Corps was looking into how to mitigate any methane being generated by landfill.

Mr. McAlister: This will be addressed further along in the presentation.

Mr. McCarron: What is the cause of the methane that is older than the landfill?

Mr. McAlister: The bedrock in Pacheco Creek has a canyon effect where the Creek bed had previously been. Also, the Bay front was much closer in the past. The vegetation associated with the natural area and the natural organics that have been laid down over time relates to the detected methane. It is unknown why it is concentrated in that specific spot. The report coming out will discuss the naturally occurring methane.

Mr. Davies: Is there no methane detected in GMP-9?

Mr. McAlister: There was a 1% concentration found in the last month in GNP-9. Part of the comprehensive monitoring plan is to install a second set of 3-foot-deep soil gas probes that will be above groundwater level, and therefore not be affected by groundwater, so we can compare the readings. The probes that are currently in place are affected by groundwater.

Mr. Davies: When is the methane investigation report due for public release?

Mr. McAlister: We have just finished our internal review, and have sent it out to the Corps Center of Expertise, and they will be done October 29th. We will incorporate any comments received and then send it out for regulatory review. It will then be circulated to the regulatory agencies. A release date will depend on the length of the review period. We have also just approved the final revision of the Construction report and will start printing at the end of this week. This report covers the installation of the trench.

Mr. McNicholas: What will be done with the 300 year-old hot spot? Will that be cleaned-up? Is DOD responsible?

Mr. McAlister: If it was caused by Department of Defense than it would be the DOD's responsibility to clean it up. But since it is a natural occurrence, it will not be a responsibility of the DOD.

Mr. McNicholas: What are the potential dangers to the surrounding neighborhoods?

Mr. McAlister: Methane will burn in air when it is in the 5-15% percent range. However, once the methane reaches the air, it disperses quickly.

Ms. Eklund: The Environmental Impact Report (EIR) conducted for this area did not disclose naturally-occurring methane. If the methane is naturally-occurring, is it the responsibility of the regulatory agencies to clean-up the area?

Mr. Pulon: First, I would like to review the report before it is determined if this is a natural occurrence. The developers stopped work when this situation came up. They have

presented work plans to the Waste Board and the local agencies for mitigation measures for 2004 to continue building. The homes are now being constructed with mitigation measures built into the homes. They are on gravel pads with vent pipes that go to the roof. These mitigation measures have been voluntarily accepted into the construction process. We issued method and abatement orders on the Army Corps, which will require them to come up with a plan to fully characterize the extent of the landfill and to come up with a way to ventilate the fill so it can breathe beginning in 2004 through 2008. The trench is being used as an interim measure to control gas for the construction to proceed.. The trench is only a temporary solution.

Jim Davies: Developer has voluntarily adopted mitigation measures but it is not yet clear what additional mitigation measures the regulatory agencies might require.

Mr. Davies: When are the September 2003 monitoring results going to be released?

Mr. McAlister: The results will be released next week.

Mr. Davies: I do not agree that it is not the responsibility of the DOD. The developers definitely do not agree. The developers are doing their own investigation in Lot 30.

Ms. Britto: What is the concentration in the hotspot and has the concentration varied?

Mr. McAlister: It is generally around 50 percent. The range has been high 40s to 63 percent. The percentage of what is released from the vent pipe is not at dangerous levels as it immediately dissipates.

Mr. McCarron: Should the old creek bed be set aside for park or similar use? If it is going to cost a lot of money to study, it is worth developing on it? What is the risk to the public?

Mr. Davies: The developer will not build on this area without knowing that this area is clean. The information was not disclosed during the date of transfer. What the state of the land was at the point of sale is now being debated. The hotspot in Lot 30 was not known about but methane generated at the landfill was. The Army contested that the methane was contained in the bounds of the landfill even though in 1998 it was know that it had migrated offsite.

Mr. McCarron: Were there any aerial photos taken for the section of land during the 1930's?

Mr. McAlister: We can bring in some historical photos.

Future Activities

Mr. McAlister addressed the upcoming activities for Landfill 26.

- Investigation Report – November 2003
- Trench Completion Report – October 2003
- Comp. Monitoring Workplan - September 2003
- Landfill Comp. Monitoring - October 2003
- Monitoring of PA Probes – Quarterly
- Monitoring of Trench – Quarterly

As you can see, we have a much more extensive monitoring program here. We have contractors scheduled to start on the week of the 22nd, to install 20 additional soil gas probes. All we will be measuring is soil gas and not groundwater.

Ms. Eklund: Will the probes all be placed on the northern part of the trench?

Mr. McAlister: No, they will be spread throughout the trench. They will be on both the inside and the outside of the trench. The probes on the western and northern sites of the landfill to monitor groundwater are almost at the surface. Therefore there is not much use to monitor the soil gas; because the soil is saturated and there is no pore space for the gas to accumulate. There will be one or two probes placed in this area in case of a drought so there is access to the soil gas. There is no surface water coming through that area.

Mr. Davies: There are probes in the area to monitor the groundwater during the fall.

Mr. Ponton: There was a meeting held with the regulatory agencies and everyone was satisfied with the work plan and the scope of work being proposed.

Mr. Davies: The stakeholders should have been invited to this meeting.

Mr. McAlister: This was an inter-agency meeting and a copy of the work plan was sent to Ken Bell at the City

Ms. Lattanzio: When will the work plan be released to the public?

Mr. McAlister: Depending on the extent of the comments, it will be finalized November 2003 and the data report would be released in January 2004.

North Antenna Field

We have performed a remedial investigation 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. The wetlands people don't anticipate being ready for the North Antenna Field until the 2009 timeframe.

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

- Remedial Investigation – March 2003
- Risk Assessment Workplan to Agencies- December 2003
- Risk Assessment to Agencies- March 2004
- Feasibility Study to Agencies – June 2004
- Decision Document to Agencies – To follow Feasibility study
- Remedial Action- October 2009

Mr. McCarron: What type of risk assessment will be conducted? Human Health?

Mr. McAlister: An ecology and human health risk assessment for the area will be done. The human health will be for recreational uses.

Mr. McMahan: Are you thinking about some of the potential off-site remediation disposal work before 2009?

Mr. McAlister: 2009 is the completion date for the project. The remediation depends on the feasibility study and what is found. Because of the type of contamination (lead) that may be there, it will have to be hauled off site, which will be very costly and thus spread out over time.

Mr. McCarron: Out of the 10- 15 sites on the parcel, is there a piece of land that is priority for remediation?

Mr. McAlister: Lead is the main contaminant in the area but there are other contaminants as well – VOCs and petroleum. The areas with the most contaminant will be priority.

Mr. McMahan: There are two good prospects for excavation and off-site disposal. One is the lead issue and the other is the firing range, as well as a skeet range. We have found hot spots of lead in these locations. The other area that caught our attention was the fire practice burn area (also referred to as the landfill area). When the landfill was removed from the North Antenna field, the area was built up about 4 feet, because this area is about 7 feet below sea level. Clean-up will also depend on funding.

Mr. Gandesbery: The California Coastal Conservancy is not going to do remediation action in this area so we are planning to have this done before 2009. 2005 is a target date.

Mr. McCarron: The decision document should include some of the remedial action design that may help mitigate the containments for the wetlands development.

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

Mr. Keller announced that the 630 acres of the BRAC was transferred to the California Coastal Conservancy. Tom Gandesbery is the project manager for the wetlands restoration with the Coastal Conservancy and Eric Polson is working as a contractor to the Coastal Conservancy.

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 were been received. Joint responses were prepared by DTSC/RWQCB/Army. The Document was finalized and signed by all agencies on September 12, 2003.
- 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. The levee parcel was removed from the package. The document was finalized and signed by the Army on August 15, 2003. Originally, the FOSET covered 644 acres there was some discussion with the City about the levee parcel. The City owns the levee itself and the Army owns the property under the levee. This portion of the property was removed from the early

transfer package at the request of the City because the City did not want to have a Land Use Covenant on their property, and so the 14 acres was removed from the Early Transfer, and therefore only 630 acres went forward. The agencies and City agreed that the rest can move forward on a regular FOST.

- Land Use Covenant (LUC) – The LUC was completed September 29, 2003 in support of the transfer.
- Main Airfield Parcel Early Transfer Package- Approved by the Governor on September 29, 2003. Deed processed/transferred to the State of California Coastal Conservancy.
- Outparcel A-4- Deed processed/transfer to the developer.

Ms. Britto: What is a LUC?

Mr. Keller: It is a document that has three restrictions. It restricts this property from being used for residential purposes. It also gives the State and Federal agencies access rights. The third item is that there is a requirement to have a soil management plan before any excavation or subsurface intrusion takes place.

Ms. Eklund: What about adding to the levee?

Mr. Keller: That is different issue. The LUC is for intrusive activities. The dredge material requirements are through the Water Board's Site cleanup requirements, which require a Soil Management Plan be in place prior to placing dredge material onsite.

Mr. McCarron: When the FOST is complete, are all the land covenants taken off?

Mr. Keller: When all the sites have been remediated, the Army will issue the covenant warranty under CERCLA that all actions have been taken. The Land Use Covenants are on the land for perpetuity.

Ms. Dekelbom: Who is responsible for the covenant?

Mr. Keller: The State and/or the Army both sign the document, which is binding on the State, which is the property owner.

Parcel A-4: Small parcel just less than 4 acres south of the coast guard hangers. This property has most probably been recorded, and we have received a letter from DTSC granting conditional acceptance. The condition is that the future property owners remove a segment of fuel line that was left in place there. That work is happening right now and the property should be transferred by now.

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. Comments were received and the final document is almost ready to send to the Army for their legal review and signature. 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. Everything that did not make it by September 30th, the Army thinks that is ready to go early in fiscal year 2004, so the Corps is pushing to get it through.

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 ended 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. The final document is ready for Army signature. The area will be monitored by natural attenuation process until the land is transferred.

Ms. Eklund: What types of comments were received on the document?

Mr. Keller: On the POL FOST the comments pertained to the proximity to the landfill itself. There is also a strip of the parcel that is within the landfill buffer that is going to be retained by the Army, which amounts to about 2 acres. There was a Defense Authorization Act that states that the Army shall retain title to the landfill and its buffer zone. There were questions regarding the buffer zone area. From the BRAC perspective, we are done with documentation for that parcel. We are working with the Army to determine who is holding title to the 2 acres.

Property Transfer Status

Main Airfield Parcel- Transfer of the 630- acres to the State Coastal Conservancy for 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 of 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 scheduled for the spring of 2004.

Next Steps

Main Airfield Parcel

- Accomplish sampling required by ROD/RAP;
- Prepare 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;
 - Disposal area in the north end of the airfield; and

Sampling will be done at all of these sites outlined by the ROD/RAP and remedies will be implemented after the point of transfer. We would like to get started on the outboard sites September of next year, while there is still good weather, but after the nesting season of the clapper rail. Our excavation window is September 1st-January 31st.

Prepare FOST for Levee Parcel- Working on a draft and ready for Public Comment late this year, hopefully before the holidays.

Transfer levee parcel to the City of Novato, along with the POL Hill Parcel.

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 separated 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.

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

McCarron: For POL Hill what type of materials are out there?

Mr. Keller: There are mixed materials, mostly weathered diesel, jet fuel and kerosene.

Ms. Lattanzio: With site clean up requirements, where do you stand on the time frame?

Mr. Keller: We have submitted a sampling plan for one of the sites. We are currently working on the sampling plan for the coastal salt marsh with the Corps. We would like to collect some additional samples in some of the excavations that we did 2 years ago. The skeet range area, and some of the other target firing areas, will be sampled. The Corps was here last week, looking at these sites. We are still working on gathering the samples. The first samplings should be done within the next couple of weeks and we are actively working towards being ready for all sites.

Ms. Feger: From the Army's perspective, where do you stand on the North West area? Where the samples would be taken? We would like to see some resolution between Friends of Novato Creek and the Army, as it has been three quarters of a year since our last meeting.

Ms. Lattanzio: We have been in communication about what would be sampled.

Mr. Keller: The total number of samples to be taken and the trenching are the outstanding issues. We would like to take core samples in creek bed. We have spoken with Jim Hardwick at Fish and Game.

Ms. Lattanzio: The only other outstanding issue was an expedited time frame for the samples.

Ms. Feger: The fact that samples are proposed in a jurisdictional wetland also needs to be addressed somehow

Mr. Keller: We proposed that the Army would collect 12 samples and there would be no expedited time frame. There were disparities between the amount of samples that would be collected and which would be split. Eventually we will be collecting 24 primary samples, plus 24 total splits, with 48 total samples. No expedited turnaround.

Ms. Sovlet: Could the soil contaminated with petroleum shift and move in the event of an earthquake or other natural occurrence?

Mr. Keller: POL Hill is a bedrock outcropping. The cleanup involved excavating all soil down to the rock itself. The only thing left is residual petroleum in the cracks of the bedrock. Bedrock does not move much in earthquakes. There is minimal residual petroleum in the bedrock. In the winter when groundwater levels increase, the concentration of petroleum in the groundwater increases. Summer samples are one third to one half the winter concentrations. This is hard to treat so it will be monitored over time to ensure that it is not migrating to receptors.

Ms. Britto: When will the new owners of the land start to see things happening to the airfield? When there is more evisceration of the habitat, is it possible to have the wall removed?

Mr. Gandesbery: The wall will not be removed; the plan is to add rock and soil to the outside of the wall. There will be another brick wall that will be built. That may not be necessary anymore now that the levee is in place. There will be building demolition that will happen this fall.

Ms. Britto: The two parties should work together decide on a feasible design.

Mr. Polson: The city and the engineers are working together on this. The Corps is performing an evaluation. However, the Corps is having some contracting issues due to lack of a budget.

Ms. Britto: When is the earliest date that dredge materials are going to be brought up?

Mr. Polson: The earliest is sometime in the summer of 2004, more likely 2005.

Ms. Eklund: Is your intent to do outreach to the neighbors?

Mr. Polson: There has been one public meeting. We do plan on doing public outreach for the rest of the project. We have not planned for the drilling.

Ms. Eklund: I request that the City Council also receive any materials distributed to community.

Ms. Britto: I suggest you do representations to the Hamilton Forum that are held monthly.

Mr. Gandesbery: Right now we are considering different options for outreach; there is an idea of creating a new mailing list. We might start by creating an insert. We do not want to overwhelm the public with too much information.

Mr. McNicholas: What programs are available to let residents know about current BRAC activities?

Mr. Keller: The Environmental Newsletter gets distributed to about 1,500 people and we advertise the RAB meetings and public meetings in local newspapers.

Ms. Lattanzio: Has there been outreach to Bel Marin Keys?

Mr. Keller: There are Bel Marin Keys residents on the mailing list.

Ms. Britto: I suggest that agenda item for project updates be added to the RAB meeting agenda.

Ms. Dekelbom: How are they going to get dredge material on site?

Mr. Keller: There is a 30-inch diameter pipeline offshore.

Ms. Eklund: I suggest there is a presentation on how this is happening.

Regulatory Agencies comments

Ms. Feger reported the dates for the work plan. There was a Board Meeting on August 20, 2003 that approved 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.

Lance McMahan reported that POL Hill has a file data and DTSC is reviewing this information. There probably will be a Land Use Convent (LUC). The runway piles are being reviewed. If there are copies of the "Erler Kalinowski" report, Mr. McMahan would like a copy.

Theresa McGarry thanked Thomas Macchiarella for his service at Hamilton and clarified that the meeting referred to by Mr. Davies, was an inter-agency meeting. Inter-agency meetings commonly do not include stakeholders.

Meeting wrap up and Adjournment- Ed Keller

Mr. Keller announced that the next meeting will be held on January 14, 2004