Detailed Meeting Notes
Hamilton Army Airfield Restoration Advisory Board
Hamilton School, Multi-Purpose Room,
Novato, California
December 18, 2002

Attendance

RAB Members Present:

Ed Keller; Thomas Macchiarella; Naomi Feger; Ray Zimny; Jim McAlister; Jim Ponton; Preston Cook; Patricia Eklund; Marucia Britto; Joan Dekelboum.

RAB Members Absent:

Richard A. Draeger; Sabrina Molinari; Karol Raymer; Jack Walton; Lance McMahan; Thomas Hinman; Manuel Meir; Tunstall Lang; Matthew McCarron; Theresa McGarry.

Others Present:

Joy Lanzaro; Hugh Ashley; Samantha Calamari; Izzat Ahmadiyya; Peter Willmay; John Kaiser; Jim Davies; Pat Ryan, Travis Williamson.

Welcoming Remarks

Ed Keller welcomed the community to the December 18, 2002 meeting of the Hamilton Army Airfield Restoration Advisory Board (RAB). The meeting began at 7:20 p.m.

Navy BRAC Update — Thomas Macchiarella, DODHF Novato BEC

Mr. Macchiarella presented a new map and pointed out the three Navy parcels that remain to be transferred.

MTBE Plume
There are few changes in the features of the MTBE plume. The new data from August 2002 does not show much change from the August 2001 data. There has been some shrinking of the 10,000 ppb contour, some thinning of the 1,000 ppb contour, and some movement in the north eastern corner. Overall the plume looks fairly stable.

Pat Eklund: Why is the northern end of the plume moving towards the bunkers?
Mr. Macchiarella: The data are interpolated between different points up there. And so, if one of those points in August '02 compared to August '01 is significantly different than the last one it may have a different interpolation. In this case, what we believe is happening on the Northeast is a channel effect. We think that all the groundwater hits the base of Ammo Hill and veers to the right. As far as the flatter spot in front of Ammo Hill, the MTBE contour is probably starting to pile up as it approaches the rising bedrock in that area. It has a low concentration in this area.

Ms. Ryan: Please explain what the plume is for people have not been to previous meetings.

Mr. Macchiarella described the plume and reviewed the area where the plume is located by referring to the map.

Mr. Macchiarella gave a site status report. The results of the latest Quarterly Monitoring from August 2002 have been compiled. Benzene and MTBE are the two main constituents the Navy continues to track. For Benzene, the average concentration is 50% lower than it was a year ago, with the maximum concentration also about 50% lower than it was a year ago. For MTBE, the average concentration is 28% lower than it was a year ago with the maximum concentration 44% lower than it was a year ago. Generally, both Benzene and MTBE concentrations have continued to reduce over time.

Mr. Macchiarella then showed a graphical plot of the average and maximum concentration data for MTBE. The latest data are from August 2002. That data are plotted to show MTBE concentrations (average and max) over time. Over time, you can see that the concentrations are reducing – from the previoius remediation system, and by natural mechanisms. You can also see that the average and maximum concentration reductions are leveling out. That is, they arenot reducing as rapidly as they were when the concentrations were much higher.

The objectives of the biosparging system are to stabilize and contain the highest concentrations of MTBE to the current Navy property. The system will also reduce the time required to achieve maximum contaminant levels (MCL) for gasoline constituents in groundwater (even though that water is not used for drinking – Mr Macchiarella pointed out that it probably can never be used for drinking because the aquifer is much too shallow.) Nonetheless, the Water Board's objectives are to return contaminated groundwater to the MCLs, which are drinking water standards. The Navy's approach is biosparging (injecting air into the aquifer to increase the biodegradation of the constituents of concern) followed by monitored natural attenuation, which involves data collection over a period of time to demonstrate that naturally occurring remediation processes are underway.

The biosparing system operation started in September 2002. Monthly groundwater sampling was performed at eight monitoring wells to track the effectiveness of the system. The Navy has now sampled these locations three times. Regular soil-gas sampling was also performed to ensure safe and effective system operation. The recent reductions of MTBE concentrations near the Biosparging system is a good indication that the system is effective.

Future Activities

The Navy will continue the routine monitoring throughout the operation of the system, including regular soil gas monitoring in the probes around the system, and also the performance monitoring wells on a regular monthly basis. The Navy will also gather field data on a more frequent basis. The Operation and Maintenance Plan will be finalized and distributed after the Remedial Design Work Plan has been approved by the regulatory agencies. This year's Annual Site Status Report will be submitted to the regulators in January 2003. The next Quarterly Groundwater Monitoring event is scheduled for

February 2003. The Navy will also install additional bedrock wells beneath the gas station site in 2003 based on a request by the regulatory agencies.

Ms. Eklund: Why will the Navy install additional bedrock wells?
Mr. Macchiarella: There has been some question regarding whether the current wells are accurately defining the bedrock. There is a layer of fractured and weathered bedrock beneath the existing soil and sediment. Beneath this fractured bedrock is the more firm competent bedrock. The Navy believes that the groundwater has been mingling with this weathered bedrock, and does not believe that there is another aquifer in the bedrock. The new wells will verify this assumption.

Ms. Eklund: If there is some movement of the material in the lower aquifer, would that indicate that there is migration of the plume into the another aquifer that has not been identified to date?
Mr. Macchiarella: That could be the case, but it is highly unlikely based on the bedrock and groundwater information we have. Right now there is no evidence of that. The Navy intends to install the additional wells to verify that this is not occurring.

Ms. Eklund: What were the indications that led the regulatory agencies to require the additional studies?
Mr. Macchiarella: There was a lack of enough wells to prove that the wells are accurately portraying the bedrock.

The Navy will be releasing a Finding of Suitability to Transfer (FOST). There will be three separate FOSTs in the area near the gas station. These will be available for RAB members to review at the library. There will not be a public meeting.

Ms. Ryan: If there is a substantial amount of interest from the public, would a meeting be arranged?
Mr. Macchiarella: Sure.

Mr. Macchiarella discussed the estimated biosparging cost. The installation cost is $331,509 and the operation and maintenance cost is $325,051. The total cost through October 2003 is $656,560.

Ms. Eklund: An individual complained about noise during the biosparging. How is the Navy dealing with this, and were there any other complaints?
Mr. Macchiarella: There were no other complaints. The Navy took a few actions to reduce the noise. Since then a call has been made to confirm that a reduction in noise was apparent and the person who complained did affirm that the noise was reduced.

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

Landfill 26

Buffer Trench
The purpose of the buffer trench is to separate the landfill from Hamilton Meadows. The trench goes three feet into groundwater or to bedrock, which ever 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 entire length of trench and collection tube has been installed between landfill and Hamilton meadow subdivision. The impermeable barrier installation is underway, as required by Title 27 of the California Code of Regulations. Due to the rains the installation has been delayed. The construction crew has now moved to a drier section (Section 4) and this area is almost complete. The remaining area's completion will depend on the weather.

Risk assessment
The Corps completed a draft final Risk Assessment for review by the regulators, and is now making final minor corrections. A copy of the draft risk assessment is in the Novato public library and in the BRAC office.

Annual Monitoring Events
The Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) issued a permit to require annual monitoring of the landfill soil gas. The cost of the impermeable barrier in the buffer trench required that this annual monitoring be postponed. The Corps is now scheduled to perform this monitoring in January and should submit a report to the regulators within 90 days.

Timeframes

The impermeable barrier is being installed in the buffer trench in December 2002. (If weather interferes, the southern end of the barrier may not be installed until spring 2003. Monitoring will continue to assess suitability of soil for installation.)

Compliance with Board Order will be achieved in 2005-2008.

RWQCB permit compliance will begin in 2008.

monitoring of the landfill for methane will continue throughout this time period.

One area of the buffer trench has shown a substantial effect. In an area by GMP 9 and also in Lot 166 the Corps had detected levels of methane above 5%. At GMP 26 the reading had been about 13%. About two months after the trench was installed, the reading at GMP 26 and Lot 166 had been reduced to less than 0.1%. At GMP 9 the Corps has continued to have readings upwards of 5%. So the trench is having a positive effect on the migration of methane.

Mr. Ashley: What did you say the GMP 9 had gone down to?
Mr. McAlister: GMP 9 has fluctuated between 1% and 10%. Since about March or April, GMP 26 had been down to 0.1% - which shows the trench is working there.

The Corps does have a RWQCB Order to do sampling of the landfill and to devise a way to vent landfill gas right on the landfill as opposed to in the buffer trench. The buffer trench is an interim measure to separate the subdivision from the landfill. The implementation of this permanent mitigation will start in 2005 and implementation will run to 2008. Once compliance has occurred, a permit will be issued and the Corps will have on-going compliance with that permit.

Ms. Eklund: Did the Regional Board ask to investigate the entire landfill?
Mr. McAlister: This is required in the Board Order. There will be a complete investigation of the landfill in Spring 2003. Extensive sampling will occur around the whole perimeter looking for all kinds of contaminants – essentially creating a new baseline of the area. Quite extensive sampling had been done in the mid-90's and the Corps will do that again.

Mr. Davies: Were there enough funds for ITSI to continue work on the investigation?
Mr. McAlister: Yes, the investigation report is continuing. The Corps will complete the annual monitoring event. The Corps will also produce a completion report on the buffer trench. The Corps had extensive comments on the investigation report and will be meeting with ITSI to go over them so the report can be completed.

North Antenna Field
Ten different areas were identified as areas of concern: small arms ranges, pistol range, skeet range, three burn pits, an above ground storage pits, and septic systems. Many contaminants exist there. The primary contaminants of concern are lead (approximately 90% of the contamination in the area), PNAs associated with incomplete burnings at the burn pits as well as the clay pigeons at the skeet range, petroleum, dioxin/furans, PCBs, and low levels of VOCs in the septic systems.

Timeframes:
Remedial investigation- completed in October 2002.
Risk Assessment (to agencies)- completed in March 2002
Feasibility study (to agencies)- April 2003
OE clearance- October 2003
Decision document- November2003
Remedial action- October 2005

Lead appears to be the primary contaminant. The remediation will consist of treating it and hauling it off, which gets rather expensive so the Corps will spread that action over a couple years.

Mr. Ashley: Will the remediation effect the integrity of the levy? Will the Corps have to backfill to improve the integrity of the levy?

Mr. McAlister: If there is any removal of soil on the side of the levy, the levy would be repaired to hold until the wetlands installation in that area is complete.

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

Documentation and Field Work

Documentation

Main Airfield Parcel

- Record of Decisions/Remedial Action Plan (ROD/RAP) – DTSC/RWQCB are preparing the executive summary for the document. The Army will review the text and will revise the document to include the outboard parcels in the coastal salt marsh. The document will go back out for public comment in Spring 2003.
- Finding of Suitability for Early Transfer (FOSET) – FOSET will be revised based on the revisions to the ROD/RAP executive summary. The public comment period is also expected to occur during Spring 2003.
- Environmental Baseline Survey (EBS) – The EBS was completed and sent out for review a year ago. The EBS will need to be updated to include the additional actions the Army has taken since that time. The EBS will be out to support the public review of the ROD/RAP and the FOSET. There will not be an official public comment period for the EBS; it will be published to support the ROD/RAP and FOSET.

All documents will be available at the public library, at the Army BRAC office and on the Army website.

Hospital Hill

The Army now has a signed FOST document and has given direction to the Corps of Engineers Real Estate to transfer that parcel to the City of Novato. The Army is in final negotiations with the City of Novato. At the last RAB meeting Mr. Keller reported that there were some discussions regarding CERCLA language in the deed. These discussions continue but are now in a final stage and Mr. Keller hopes to report on a completion of that transfer at the next RAB meeting.

Building 82

Field work was completed in summer 2002. The data report is in final Army review and is due to the regulators by December 31, 2002. Mr. Keller gave a preview on the report: The Army punched eight holes around what was an excavation for a transformer site. The Army had previously cleaned up the site and no remaining PCB's were detected. However, there was some petroleum or oil still remaining down in a groundwater lens that was about 7 or 8 feet below ground surface.

Two of the eight holes came up dry, meaning the Army did not find the rock lens. Some of the other holes did come up with some detections in the groundwater so the Army took both groundwater and soil samples from those other six holes. The RWQCB will determine whether additional sampling should occur in those areas. Mr., Keller should have additional information on this issue at the next meeting.

Coastal Salt Marsh

- Feasibility Study – The study was forwarded for regulatory review on April 24, 2002. The Army continues to work with the regulators to resolve comments.
- Sampling Data Report – The report is due to go to regulatory review this week. (All data collected was already included in the Feasibility Study.)

Coastal Salt Marsh Sites - The sites will be combined with the Inboard Sites and addressed in the executive summary that is currently being worked on by the regulators.

POL Hill

The third round of groundwater monitoring was completed in August and the data report was submitted to the regulators in December 2002. The report documents the three rounds of monitoring, including August 2002, February 2002, and September 2001 (including two dry season and one wet season event). In the past, there were samples from the wet seasons in 1994, 1997-1999, which is why more dry season samples were taken. The findings were not too alarming. The site is above the residential clean-up goal for the GSA property, however this parcel's reuse is for open space not residential. All the soils that could be removed at the site have been removed, so now the remaining contamination is down in the fractures of the bedrock. There is a Corrective Action Plan (CAP) in final Army review and should be out soon recommending continued monitored natural attenuation of the site. The sampling over time has shown that the plume is not migrating, and encompasses an area about 200 feet in diameter.

The Closure Report for the tank farm on the site is in Army review. A FOST for the parcel is expected to go out for public comment in spring 2003. The city has recently expressed an interest in speeding up the transfer process to accommodate the proposed Bay Trail alignment. . The RWQCB has expressed that they do not have a problem moving forward with the transfer as long as the City is ready to go forward.

Main Airfield Inboard Sites Remediation

Efforts included the work identified in the Inboard Area ROD/RAP, including removal of Building 41, removal of Spoil Pile F and Revetments 6&7. All excavations were completed and confirmation samples were collected. Confirmation sampling data indicates that the actions were successful. The soils deposition is complete and the construction report was sent to the regulators this week for review.

Field Work

All of the plastic (HDPE) and debris has been removed from the site. This work was completed last week. This work was a cost share between the FUDS program and the BRAC program. All of the material went to Altamont landfill as Class II general debris. The soils did have some remnants of constituents of concern.

Next Steps

Main Airfield Parcel

- Complete the FOSET
- Update the Environmental Baseline Survey
- Complete Coastal Salt Marsh sampling data report

- Complete Coastal Salt Marsh Feasibility Study- Presents alternatives for remedation
- Determine investigation requirements for any new sties
- Complete the ROD/RAP- Presents the recommended remedial alternatives for the Inboard and Coastal Salt Marsh site
- Transfer the property
- Implement remedial actions

Mr. Davies: What is the status of the transfer of Parcel A4?
Mr. Keller: The FOST was sent back for signature. The Army legal department was still reviewing it. Hopefully, this will be signed in the near future.

Ms. Eklund: After the FOST is signed, how soon after will the property be transfer?
Mr. Keller: There could be an immediate turn around. As long as the deed language is acceptable it should be very quick.

Ms. Ryan: Requested to review the newsletter before it is released.

Regulatory agencies comments

There were no updates from regulatory agencies.

Administrative Issues - Ed Keller

Membership Subcommittee

Every two years, beginning in September 1996, a selection panel will review the RAB to ensure that it reflects the diverse interests of the community. A subcommittee consisting of Pat Eklund and Preston Cook was formed to do this.

Ms. Eklund and Mr. Cook gave an update on their recommendations. It was determined which RAB members have had consistent attendance at the RAB meetings.. There are four RAB members that have not been very good at attending meetings over the past two years. Mr. Cook has spoken to Jack Walton and Sabrina Molinari and they both indicated that they are no longer interested in serving on the board and gave verbal resignations. Mr. Cook has attempted to contact Karol Raymer and Richard Draeger to determine their involvement but has not been successful. Mr. Cook and Ms. Eklund have determined that according to the rules, these four members have not attended a sufficient number of meetings and could be expelled from the Board if the Board chose to do so.

Ms. Eklund and Mr. Cook suggest filling 2-4 seats by publicly announcing the openings and accepting applications during a specific period of time. Mr. Cook and Ms. Eklund and anyone else that is interested could review those applications and make recommendations to the full RAB Board on filing the seats that are vacant.

Ms. Eklund suggested that there should be a thank you letter written to those who verbally resigned thanking them for their service. For the other two RAB members, a

letter should be sent notifying them that the RAB is intending to remove them unless they indicate their willingness to continue their membership..

The other RAB members agreed that these actions should be taken. The subcommittee will work together to decide on how they would like to solicit applications.

Mr. Ashley: Are old applications considered for review?
Mr. Keller: There are old applications on file. These will be available to the subcommittee. The BRAC office will provide administrative support for the RAB member search.

Ms. Ryan: People on the past waiting list should be considered.

Mr. Keller clarified that the membership subcommittee will decide how to publicize the application process, and will also be responsible for compiling a list of existing RAB members and proposed new RAB members in whole. The RAB co-chairs will either accept the list in whole or will reject it in whole; the co-chairs do not have the right to pick and choose members.

Mr. Keller announced the election of the Community co-chair.

Ms. Eklund: I moved to re-elect Tunstall Lang.

Mr. Cook: I second the motion.

The RAB members present voted unanimously to re-elect Tunstall Lang. Tunstall Lang, although not present, had indicated that she would accept the nomination..

Mr. Ahmadizza: That site south of the gas station; is that a toxic waste site?

Mr. Macchiarella: That is the former Capehart housing area and that area has no contamination, nor is there any contamination encroaching on this area.

Mr. Ahmadizza: And on the other side of the highway is that a toxic waste site?

Mr. Macchiarella: That is the former Rafael Village and that area also does not have any contamination.

Although there was lead-based paint identified, it is something that is notified in the transfer document that there is a potential for lead-based paint, but it doesn't preclude property transfer, nor does it disallow people from using those houses under certain circumstances. Although that is not what happened here since the housing was demolished.

Ms. Britto: Will the RAB get to revisit the best time to hold RAB meetings?

Mr. Keller: When the new RAB is established the RAB will revisit when the best night to meet is, as well as the frequency of meetings The bylaws state that the RAB shall meet no less frequently than quarterly.

Mr. Ashley: Will the new RAB members be elected by the next meeting in February?

Mr. Keller: In the past, the call for application submissions have lasted about six weeks. Therefore, there will not be new members elected by the next meeting.

Next Meeting

Mr. Keller announced that the next meeting will be held on February 19, 2002. The meeting was adjourned at 9:05 PM.