

**Detailed Meeting Notes  
Hamilton Army Airfield Restoration Advisory Board  
Novato Police Station Meeting Room  
Novato, California  
July 13<sup>th</sup>, 2005**

**Attendance**

**RAB Members Present:**

Ed Keller; Jennifer Valenzia; Patricia Eklund; Richard A. Draeger; Lance McMahan; Jim McAlister; Laurent Meillier; Jeff Johnston; Matthew McCarron

**RAB Members Absent:**

Sue Lattanzio; Manuel Mier; Preston Cook;; Ross Millerick;; William McNicholas; Naomi Feger; Marucia Britto

**Others Present:**

Joy Lanzaro; Hugh Ashley; Cara Naiditch; Travis Williamson; Jim Davies; Tom Davy, Liz Barr, Eric Polson

**Welcoming Remarks**

Matthew McCarron welcomed the community to the July 13, 2005 meeting of the Hamilton Army Airfield Restoration Advisory Board (RAB). The meeting began at 7:10 p.m.

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

**FUDS Update**

All of the methane monitoring probes except for two had readings of less than 0.1 percent methane. The two probes with higher concentrations were determined to be naturally occurring methane. The USACE is confident that the buffer trench is working as designed. The vent trenches were below 0.1 percent except for one trench which was 0.25 percent.

Hugh Ashley: Are these values taken from the vents?

Jim McAlister: The vents are connected to the pipe and the detection for the sampling port is at the base. You remove a small plug and then take the measurement and then replace the plug. This is the gas that is actually in the structure as opposed to what is in the atmosphere.

Tom Davy: I see that a number of the gas wells were not sampled. Why was that?

Jim: There are times that they are flooded and a reading cannot be taken. The USACE representative that was in the field made a mistake and did not sample some of the wells. The California Code of Regulations dictates that we monitor at least every 1,000 feet around the perimeter, the sampling that was completed was within regulation, but all of the wells are usually sampled.

Matthew McCarron: Have you seen changes over time in the readings?

Jim McAlister: GMP 9 had a reading above 5 percent. This is the geologic high point for the landfill. When groundwater lowers in the springtime, there will be an expression of gas trapped underneath the landfill cap. The concentrations can vary with the seasons, although the trench has been shown to be effective in interrupting the concentrations. When the groundwater goes down and the screen of the probe is exposed, we will start to get higher readings. We attribute that to the natural organic elements in the area.

Matthew McCarron: Did you do any sampling in the lots 29 or 30?

Jim McAlister: In the investigation report, we determined that the methane in the south of the landfill is naturally occurring, and therefore there is no requirement to monitor. Thus, we have removed Hamilton Meadows from our monitoring program.

Tom Davy: Who made the determination that the methane is naturally occurring?

Jim McAlister: The Corps of Engineers researched the data, as well as many consultants. Carbon age dating found the methane to be 300 to 800 years old, which aligns with the degradation of naturally occurring materials. This indicates that the higher readings are due to naturally occurring methane. We also installed a buffer trench which completely separates the landfill from the housing developments. The trench is shown to be effective, which points to a naturally occurring condition.

Richard Draeger: Did you employ an independent consultant to peer review the data?

Jim McAlister: We wrote the report in house and we had it reviewed by CH2MHill and our Center of Expertise in Omaha which oversees all of the landfills that we work on. CH2MHill agreed with the report, but it was not a specifically independent peer review.

There is a couple of Board Orders, one is a cleanup and abatement order and the other is a time schedule order for addressing landfill gas and some groundwater issues. We have submitted a Corrective Action Work Plan and TSO 140 to the Board for Regulatory Review. The RWQCB review is complete and we are waiting for a comment letter. There was a perceived data gap on the north end of the landfill. There is still a detection of diesel fuel out on the edge of the landfill. It is 900 parts per billion, which is very low for diesel. There is a perception that it comes from the landfill, although there were some ready hangers in this area where fuel tanks were located. Our recommendation was that a new monitoring well be placed near this concentration.

Travis Williamson: Is that soil gas or groundwater?

Jim McAlister: Groundwater. From GMP 18 to around the north side, the groundwater is very close to the surface so there would be no opportunity for the soil gas to come through.

#### Upcoming Events

- Various Monitoring Reports under review by agencies.
- Annual Monitoring Event in September. This is by previous Board order and the USACE will be doing that with in house staff.

- Submit RWQCB Task 2 Document December 30<sup>th</sup>, 2005.

#### *North Antenna field*

The Risk Assessment comments were completed May 2005. The comments were very extensive, and we are in the process of writing a new contract to address the comments. The Final Risk Assessment is scheduled for completion November 2005. The Archives Search Report is scheduled to go to the agencies September 2005, and the Feasibility Study is scheduled to go to the agencies April 2006. The Decision document and Remedial Design document are due to be completed in 2006; the Remedial Action is due for completion 2007-2008.

Lance McMahon: Did your notes say anything about response to comments on the risk assessment?

Jim McAlister: The new contract is not awarded so I can't be specific on the date. It looks like mid-August to get the green light to send out the contract for the Final Risk Assessment. The Remedial Investigation Report deadline has been pushed to August.

Matthew McCarron: Since the timeline is getting pushed out, what does the funding look like?

Jim: We have submitted our 2006 budget, and we have money in place to compete our actions. The FUDS program is a single year budget. For FY06, the budget won't be approved until mid September.

#### **Navy Update - Jennifer Valenzia, Navy BRAC Environmental Coordinator**

The Navy had an active biosparging treatment system at the NEX Gas Station Site, which was turned off in March in consultation with the regulatory agencies. The Navy continues to monitor the performance wells on a monthly basis. The Navy has collected about three months of data since the biosparging system was turned off, and a summary report of that data is due out in July. The Water Board has requested that the Navy extend the monitoring effort at the northeast leading edge of the plume. The Navy agreed to sample 3 additional locations. At the last quarterly groundwater monitoring event, the Navy sampled the additional wells and the concentrations were non-detect in all three wells. The Navy is also planning on installing an additional well in the north part of Ammo Hill. The average concentration trend is decreasing, and the Navy has achieved an average reduction of 82 percent.

Pat Elkund: Why is the Water Board asking for new wells? Why wouldn't you go to the base of Ammo Hill?

Jennifer Valenzia: We are noticing an upward trend in concentrations in that area. The Water Board felt that we had not adequately characterized the toe of the plume. This is the only area that we are noticing increased concentrations.

Matthew McCarron: How close are these wells going to be to the Corps wells?

Jim McAlister: They are using some of our monitoring systems.

Travis Williamson: The wells in blue belong to the Corps; we are taking samples from their wells and are only building one new well.

Matthew McCarron: What is the depth of those wells?

Travis Williamson: 20-22 feet.

Matthew McCarron: What is the flow of the groundwater?

Jim McAlister: The flow pattern underneath the landfill goes to the northeast. In the Summary Technical Report prepared in 1997, we looked at the groundwater flow. The determination in the report was that evapotranspiration on the northeast part of the landfill was the main mechanism for groundwater flow. There is not much movement because it is all bay muds and very tight soils in that area. Towards the southern end of the landfill there are much more permeable soils, and the old bay fringe used to be in between POL Hill and Ammo Hill before the dikes were established in the turn of the century.

Jeff Johnson: What is the proximity of the residences to these three new wells?

Jennifer Valenzia: There are no houses located near the new testing sites.

Jeff Johnson: Is there any concern that the Navy has related to the plume in Hamilton Meadows?

Jennifer Valenzia: We do monitor wells that are in the subdivision.

Travis Williamson: We have about five wells in the streets of Newport. There are three wells at the edge of the plume which are not detecting any concentrations. There has not been an issue of groundwater moving to the east.

Jeff Johnson: Can you tell me what the last concentrations at these wells were?

Travis Williamson: They have always been non-detect, below 0.05 ppb. We are seeing decreasing trends in the housing development areas.

The Navy turned off the biosparging system in March, and data from the first month of non-operations was collected in April and the average concentrations have remained consistent in the last three months. There is a certain amount of seasonal fluctuation, and the Navy uses a calculation comparing the original concentration and the concentration when the system is turned off to determine if there has been a significant change resulting from the shutdown of the biosparging system.

Jeff Johnson: I remember that it was quoted that the Navy's goal was to reduce concentrations to 95%. Has the Navy changed the criteria?

Jennifer Valenzia: There were many circumstances that were part of the decision criteria when we elected to turn off the biosparging system. It was and is our goal to achieve a 95% removal. We thought that we could achieve a 95% reduction with the biosparging system. We intended to operate the system for 18 months and we ended up operating the biosparging system for 30 months. One of the conditions of the operation of the system was to operate it only if it was cost effective. When we designed the system, we thought there were much higher concentrations in the area. We had estimated that the average concentration in the source area would be about 30,000 ppb, which was based on

previous quarterly results. When we actually installed the system, the average concentration was about 13,000 ppb, or 57% lower than we had initially thought. If we compare our concentrations now to the concentrations that we thought we had then we have achieved a 92 percent decrease. We had observed flat conditions over about a year, and we agreed with the Water Board to be in a non-operational test period. We are in the process now of evaluating the conditions of the plume to see if the constituents will degrade naturally within a reasonable time period. We have seen that degradation in all locations with the exception of the northeast leading edge of the plume. We are currently in an evaluation period at this time, and there are a variety of options as how to continue.

Richard Draeger: I read that the federal government is going to provide money to ensure that money is provided for MTBE cleanup. What is the Navy's position with respect to mitigation to this site?

Jennifer Valenzia: I don't have an official opinion to share with you on that subject. With this technology there is going to be a certain amount of technical feasibility. MTBE is a very tricky constituent because it travels very quickly in water and does not stick to soils. The goal is to have concentrations of MTBE below safe drinking water standards.

Pat Elkund: It appears as though some of the numbers on the chart have started to increase since the biosparging system has been shut off.

Jennifer Valenzia: You have to consider the scale. These are parts per billion. We have not found these changes to be significant. When we see a rebound value of 0.5 we are considering that to be a sign of increasing concentrations. Right now, everything is below a 0.2 level.

Jim McAlister: Is the rebound value a percent?

Jennifer Valenzia: No, it is a log calculation.

Matthew McCarron: 13 parts per billion is the calculation for drinking water?

Jennifer Valenzia: We are at about 2300 parts per billion in the higher concentration areas.

Matthew McCarron: Have there been any studies for the rate of degradation of MTBE?

Jennifer Valenzia: Yes, we will be presenting some of those results in the site status reports.

Travis Williamson: We are using the same tools and evaluation techniques in an EPA guidance manual

Matthew McCarron: Is that manual acceptable from the perspective of the Water Board and the State?

Laurent Meillier: I don't have any experience using the guidance manual. I will wait for the report. I believe there is a training on MTBE in San Francisco in the near future.

### **Ballfields Parcel**

The Navy is conducting a preliminary assessment and site inspection on the ball fields parcel, which will ultimately be a part of the Hamilton Wetland Restoration project. The Navy completed field work in March and collected samples at a number of areas. The

draft report is currently underway and the Navy should have some results at the next meeting.

Pat Elkund: Is the Navy schedule for the ball fields analysis okay with the Coastal Conservancy?

Eric Polson: Right now we are permitting, and are not including that property in our design.

Jennifer Valenzia: Our schedule anticipates that the property will be available for transfer next year. It is important to note that this property will be a part of the seasonal wetland and thus will have 6-9 feet of soil on its surface.

Lance McMahon: Was there anything noteworthy in the data you received?

Jennifer Valenzia: I have not seen the data. We had a decision tree about PCBs.

Travis Williamson: The sampling was done the second week of April, and is going through the data evaluation process.

The Navy is going to continue to sample the wells at the NEX gas station. The next sampling event is the six month sampling and then the Navy will continue quarterly monitoring in August. The new well will not be in place by August. The Navy will proceed with all property transfers and will issue the semi-annual site specification report at the end of July. The NEX gas station is slated for transfer to the Novato School District. This property should be transferred to the school district by February 2006.

There will be a new Navy BRAC Environmental Coordinator (Michael Bloom) and Remedial Project Manager (John Kowalczyk) that will be taking over the NEX Gas Station Site and Ballfields Parcels this summer and will be introduced at the October RAB meeting.

Matthew McCarron: There is a technical advisory committee in this group, so you can send them updates.

Ed Keller: There are about eight people on the technical advisory group and we usually send them CDs with new information.

### **Hamilton Wetlands Restoration Project Update- Eric Polson, CSCC**

The Project has all applications in to the regulatory agencies and is working on permitting. The first hearing with the RWQCB is on July 20<sup>th</sup> and the first hearing with BCDC is on July 21<sup>st</sup>. Both meetings are in Oakland. We received the draft project description on the Biological Opinion and are working on responding.

The Project is just finishing up the Bulge and Pacheco levees. The levees are essentially done now. The New Hamilton Partner Levee test fill is complete and data collection will continue through August. The preliminary information is that everything looks good. This year construction will include the N-1 levee. The N-1 levee is fully designed and

permitted. The contractor should be out in the field by late August/early September. The borrow source will be out of some of the panhandle areas.

The next contract is the design/build contract. The contractor has been given a 50% design so they will just be working on the final design and drawings. This contract will include construction of the wildlife corridor berm, which will be located 300 feet from the City levee, as well as some other intertidal berms in the tidal wetlands area and removing some of the pavement in the tidal wetlands area. Construction will start in September/October. Dredge material should arrive from the Port of Oakland late next winter or next spring. The contract planning process currently indicates an award of a contract in December.

Pat Elkund: What kind of outreach has the Coastal conservancy been doing in relation to the homeowners?

Eric Polson: The Corps has hired a new public outreach officer and has been working on hiring a public involvement firm. I might end up putting together a public meeting myself. I have put some more signs up near the project area about the construction. I was also planning on attending the Hamilton neighborhood block party, and I will try to have some presence there.

Lance McMahon: Did you provide an update for the transfer facility?

Eric Polson: On the aquatic transfer facility, we are awarding a contract for the supplemental EIR/EIS. We are doing some work with the USGS about some of the research work that is a part of the project.

Lance McMahon: Is there a date for the next document?

Eric Polson: I am hoping less than a year, maybe 6 months, but there is currently no firm schedule.

#### **Outparcel A-4 – Additional Excavations/Deed Amendments: Jim Davies, Davies Associates**

Outparcel A-4 is about four acres in size and is next to the Coast Guard hangers near Southgate. Originally the plan was to do a commercial development on the site, and then residential development was considered. When the Army was working on the GSA, there were both commercial and residential goals for soil cleanup. The criteria for soils are the same for residential and commercial development for several chemicals. The site was cleaned up almost to residential standards by the Army.

During the Army investigations, a pipeline was found to be running underneath the site and Building 138, as well as a 110-gallon underground storage tank. There was a Phase II investigation in 1997-1998 which led to the removal of the building that was present on the pipeline. After the building was removed, the Army performed Excavation 5 to remove the pipeline and contaminated soil. They tested the soil and the results came up to be slightly above residential clean-up goals at four small locations. The Army also installed three groundwater monitoring wells and sampled them four times over two

years. There were no chemicals detections which were above the groundwater cleanup goals, so the groundwater was determined to not be a problem.

Excavation 5 covered most of the footprint of building 138. Nine out of 47 confirmation samples taken there tested higher than residential and commercial cleanup goals. All of the other excavation soils were below cleanup goals. The Army followed up by doing a Tier II Risk Assessment that showed that the area was okay for commercial development.

When Barker Pacific Group (BPG) took over the property, it was suitable for commercial development, but not residential due to a few spots in Excavation 5 that had some hydrocarbons that were greater than residential cleanup goals. BPG changed their plans to residential which required removal of the contaminated soil above the cleanup goals for this use. Approximately 250 cubic yards of clean soil was removed to access the 80 cubic yards of contaminated soil at Excavation 5. Confirmation sampling showed that all of the contaminated soil was removed and the remaining soil was below the residential cleanup goals. The clean soils were replaced and the contaminated soils were disposed offsite at a state permitted landfill.

Assuming that the Water Board is satisfied with the soil remediation, we will then remove the restriction that was recorded with the deed and the property will be suitable for residential development.

Pat Eklund: What is the restriction on the deed?

Jim Davies: That the site cannot be used for residential development unless it is cleaned up and approved by the Board.

Pat Eklund: How many units are proposed for the site?

Jim Davies: I don't know. The tentative map has not been filed yet.

Matthew McCarron: Where did you take out the pipeline?

Jim Davies: It was taken out on the eastern side.

Pat Eklund: So there is no pipeline left on the property?

Jim Davies: Correct. There are other pipelines, such as utilities, but not from the onshore field line.

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

### **Documentation**

The Army distributed the Remedial Design Investigation report for Revetments 14, 19, 21, 22, 25, and 26 in May 2005. The wetland project removed some of the concrete pavement off of some revetments because they were in an area for potential scour from the wetland design. The Army agreed to sample the soils underneath to see if any actions were necessary. The report documents the extent of contamination on Revetment 19, 21, 22, and 26. There was no contamination found above the ROD/RAP action goals at Revetment 14 and 25. The Army recommended no further action on these revetments,

and will be going ahead with actions at the other four revetments. We went out as the concrete was being removed and looked for staining under the concrete, but there were only two revetments (21 and 22) with any staining or odor.

The Remedial Action Workplan for Revetments 19, 21, 22 and 26 was distributed in May and identifies the excavation boundaries at these revetments.

The Final Remedial Design Investigation Workplan for the Skeet Range and Testing Range was distributed in June 2005 and documents the process to be followed for defining the extent of contamination on those sites. The Skeet range was identified in the southern corner of the property and the testing range was identified along the levee itself. The Workplan documented how the Army is going to go about finding the extent of contamination on-site. Lead and cadmium were found at the testing range, and elevated levels of copper and lead were found at the skeet range. The Army also sampled for PAHs at the skeet range. At the testing range, the Army also found some fragments of skeet, and thus added PAHs to our sampling protocols. Everything at the testing range came up non-detect for PAHs.

### **Field Work**

The Range Sites Remedial Action Investigation determined the extent of contamination using on-site techniques and off-site laboratories. The revetment remedial action sampling determined the extent of contamination using step-out approach and off-site laboratories. The Army used a test kit on site to test for PAHs and then collected samples that we tested at an off-site lab. For the lead concentrations, a small instrument that sends x-rays into the soil and then reads the emissions coming back off of the soil was used to take the measurements.

Today the Army had some people from Sacramento doing some additional sampling in areas where the Army did not get results down to the action goal. The Army will be putting that information out in the near future.

The Army also sampled at the revetments, using a step-out type approach. The Army went back to the original location where sampling took place in 1999, and sampled both there as well as north, east, south and west from the original location. At revetments 21 and 26, there was some staining and odor so the sampling was stepped out close to 20-30 feet to start compared to 10 foot step-outs at other sites. At two of the revetments another layer of asphalt was encountered due to the depth of sampling. At Revetment 26, the layer was very hard and intact, and when the Army sampled underneath there was no jet fuel, so the asphalt layer was serving the purpose of protecting the soils underneath. At Revetment 21, the lower asphalt layer was degraded and we detected JP-4 underneath, so the Army will be removing a little bit more there and the depth of removal should be around 2-3 feet.

Matthew McCarron: On the revetments that had the asphalt below the soil, is it reasonable to expect that JP-4 is not along the edge of the old asphalt drop-off?

Ed Keller: At the revetments where we were detecting JP-4 previously, the step out samples show that it drops off quickly. Our goal for JP-4 is 12 ppm. When we step out and take samples around the edge, we are trying to collect the samples at the same depth as the detections in the middle.

The excavation was completed at the South Runway DDT Hotspot area. There are three soil stockpiles outside of hangers 3 and 5 on the tarmac. The waste profile sampling was completed and were all found to be Class II non-hazardous soils. This offload will begin in a few weeks. The Army is working on a letter notifying the neighbors. There will be about 6,600 yards of soil being taken off of the site.

Jim Davies: Is that inside the city levee?

Ed Keller: It is outside of the city levee. You can see the piles from hanger 5.

Pat Elkund: Did you notify the people that are along Todd Road?

Ed Keller: Yes.

The excavation at Building 35 excavated approximately 40 cubic yards and 5 confirmation samples were collected. The results have not been released yet. The majority of the site was excavated to a foot, although the Army excavated to four feet in one site. We hit groundwater below 2-2.5 feet.

A stockpile waste characterization was completed at the coastal salt marsh, and all Class I (hazardous waste) soils were transported offsite in a total of 102 truckloads. The remaining stockpiles are being managed on-site.

The Army completed final grading of the high marsh plain. Excavations took place last winter, in April, another 6-8 inches was cut off the plain, reducing the height. The tides come up much nicer and create a damper environment. Everything in the north end is growing back nicely and the elevations look good in that area. The Army is getting close to wrapping up work in the marsh.

Pat Elkund: How many trucks?

Ed Keller: At 24 tons per truck, it is something like 1,800 loads. All of the soil will be going Class II, about 50-60 trucks per day, about six to seven weeks of offloading. It should start in the near future. Our goal is to have everything off site this fiscal year-the end of September.

One confirmation sample came back above the ROD/RAP action goal in the unlined perimeter drainage ditch. We have gone out and collected additional samples and have a new excavation area. This excavation should complete this month. We will profile the material and add all of the DDT soils together, and they will all be taken off of the site.

Laurent Meillier: What was the concentration?

Ed Keller: 1.4 parts per million. We sampled a foot below and that measurement came out clean. On the other side of the ditch, there were some residual concentrations along the edge of the water line.

### **Next Steps**

South Runway DDT Hotspot soil offload should start in July. It should only take three days to excavate the revetments, so those should be done next week.

The unlined drainage ditch excavation should happen this month as well.

Laurent Meillier: Why was the asphalt degraded on some of the revetments?

Ed Keller: The JP4 acts as a solvent.

Lance McMahon: Will you be removing revetment pads due to scour issues?

Ed Keller: The BRAC program is not investigating removing the revetment pads.

Eric Polson: We removed the concrete revetment pads so that the concrete was not an erosional barrier. Once he removes the contamination, everything should be good to go.

Ed Keller: We have only found motor oil in the extractable range in a layer underneath the asphalt.

Eric Polson: I found two layers of roadways out there as well.

The testing range site will be excavated in July/August. The Army is directly loading and transporting these soils because they are dry enough to transport.

For the Skeet range site the Army will fully delineate the area above ROD/RAP action goals for management in place remedy.

Lance McMahon: What were the concentrations at the skeet range site?

Ed Keller: The concentrations of lead ranged around 300 parts per million. It is a matter of making sure there is cover in this area in the future. The Army has discussed this method with the Water Board, and they do not have a problem with covering the skeet range. The Army will need to delineate the area.

Long term monitoring is happening at POL Hill. The Army collected samples in February, and is trying to get the site wrapped up. Monitoring has been taking place for a long time and there have been no significant changes. The Army will be working with the Water Board to get a close out on that site. Disposal of remaining stockpiles this summer will happen in the Coastal Salt marsh, as well as final grading of the ELCDDA access road, and monitoring the re-vegetation of the backfilled excavations. The Army is in the process of determining the pickle weed cover. The Army will complete all BRAC actions this calendar year and plans on the closure of the local BRAC office early next year. At that time there is a process for adjourning a RAB. There is official notification that takes place.

## **RAB Continuation**

Matthew McCarron: I have been checking with various regulators about closing the RAB process.

Jennifer Valenzia: The purpose of the RAB is to educate the public of the environmental actions. As long as there are environmental actions happening, a RAB is appropriate. There is a little less than 40 acres to transfer. We will have a presence at the NEX gas station for a long time, whether it be monitoring or sampling. We will be sampling on a quarterly basis which will not change anytime in the near future. So there is some uncertainty on what the remaining Navy actions will be. It will be up to you to determine how long to meet further. The Navy will continue the RAB after the Navy has completed their actions.

Jim Davies: As long as we are doing the environmental actions out here, we will participate in the RAB, how frequently is up to the RAB members. We will work with the regulatory agencies on the actions that are required. We hope to enter a long term monitoring phase.

Pat Elkund: the North Antenna field will be cleaned up in 07-08?

Jim McAlister: Once the feasibility study is done, we will have an idea of the cost. FUDS is a fairly austere program in terms of annual funding.

Pat Elkund: What about the regulatory agencies?

Ed Keller: We will be looking at closing the Army office here early the next calendar year. After that, we would be looking at not participating in the RAB. If that RAB wants to hear about an issue that arises we would come back. Besides the RAB there are mandatory public participation parts of the Army process, as well as the CERCLA side, and mandatory public comment periods.

Matthew McCarron: What is the relationship with Eric after the cleanups are done?

Ed Keller: If there is something that the wetlands project decides needs to be done, then we will get involved again with the program. When the levee needs to be breached, we will be working on a long term monitoring plan. There will be some involvement down the road. If there are unknown circumstances, the BRAC program will be notified and we will come and take a look.

Jennifer: The RAB can work in any way that is helpful to disseminate information. In lieu of meeting more frequently there can be a project summary that can be mailed between meetings.

Pat Elkund: Is there some value to the DTSC and Water Board for the RAB to continue how it is?

Laurent Meillier: I think there is value for the RWQCB to be involved in the RAB. It is helpful to us as well as the community. In terms of the frequency, it depends on the

workload. We need to look at the future workloads to determine the appropriate timeline. A newsletter would be helpful, and maybe a bi yearly RAB meeting would be appropriate. We could also decrease the frequency as we go.

Lance McMahon: It might be helpful to tie the schedule of the meetings to the schedule of document deliverables. There is also a community advisory group. The DTSC has the ability to sponsor a community advisory group. I think the RAB would work just fine.

Matthew McCarron: It looks like in about a year there will be a lot less information being disseminated, except for the north antenna field, which will be going on for a number of years.

Eric Polson: The only site that we are permitting is the airfield.

Lance McMahon: There will be a report coming out in September/October which will set the stage for what follows. There is a response to comments on the Risk Assessment which will then become draft Final and Final. These are all heavy duty documents that the RAB forum would be a good place to discuss, but it will take a while to absorb all of the information.

Pat Elkund: We should think about meeting maybe 3 times in 2006, the timing of which could coincide with the release of documents as well as the antenna field and the gas station. And then maybe semi-annually or annually for the next couple of years. Can't we change the charter which says that we have to meet a certain number of times?

Jim McAlister: There will be separate public meetings for the FUDS site. In the FUDS program there is a call for the RAB.

Matthew McCarron: It seems like going to semiannually after the spring would make sense. Let's put it on the agenda to vote at the next meeting so we can take action. Maybe we can amend the charter then.

Richard Draeger: It sounds like the gas station site and the MTBE issue will go on for a while, and I think that needs to be seen through. It looks like we will be going into 2006 and further than that, but I don't think we have enough information to indicate the appropriate frequency of meetings.

Jeff Johnston: As long as there is information to be provided, we rely on the information that is provided in these RAB meetings and take this information back to the community. These meetings are important in addressing the fears in the community about the toxic cleanup. I agree that there are issues that have to be seen through, and I would like to continue to attend.

## **Regulatory Update**

Laurent Meillier: I completed the review of the corrective action Workplan at Landfill 26. I have made requests for additional information. We are concerned about the finding that groundwater elevations were detected above the RCRA type cap material at the landfill perimeter. We will have a regulatory meeting on July 19<sup>th</sup> to discuss this workplan and the potential revision of the Board orders and associated WDRs. There is some talk about modifying the Time Schedule Order. A final decision has not been made. We are satisfied that the Navy is adding more monitoring wells at the leading edge of the groundwater plume, and we feel that they should install nested wells to monitor shallow and deep water. Pending that there are no significant changes in the concentrations of MTBE in groundwater at the site and that the rebound value is found below 0.2 at all performance goal monitoring points during the month of August, Water Board staff is amenable to allow the Navy to phase into a quarterly monitoring for the two subsequent quarters. . There has not been any breakthrough on agreeing on the Navy's compliance to the 1,800 ppb threshold criteria as not to be exceeded number downgradient of State Access Road. Hamilton Square has recently completed a subsurface investigation and are negotiating with the city about the distribution of land use at the site. They are interested to use most of the site for residential purposes and the city is favoring a mixed use approach.

Lance McMahon: The USACE will be submitting an archive search report in 2005.

Laurent Meillier: In 2003 the water board sent a letter to the Navy requesting a technical report on emergent chemicals. The Navy has committed to reply to this request to certify that perchlorate one of the emergent chemical mentioned in that letter was not used at Hamilton Army Airfield.

## **Meeting wrap up and Adjournment- Matthew McCarron**

Mr. McCarron announced that the next meeting will be held on October 12<sup>th</sup>, 2005