

**Detailed Meeting Notes
Hamilton Army Airfield Restoration Advisory Board
Novato Police Station Meeting Room
Novato, California
January 11, 2006**

Attendance

RAB Members Present:

Ed Keller; Lance McMahan; Theresa McGarry , Jim McAlister; Jeff Johnston; Matthew McCarron;; Sue Lattanzio; Preston Cook, Joan Dekelboum, Naomi Feger, William McNicholas, Richard A. Draeger, Marucia Britto; Patricia Eklund, Michael Bloom

RAB Members Absent:

Manuel Mier; Ross Millerick

Others Present:

Joy Lanzaro; Hugh Ashley; Cara Naiditch; Travis Williamson; Jim Davies; John Kowalczyk, , Peter Theran; John Kaiser; Marie Hoch; Pam Rodgers; Dortha VonKoch; Claus VonKoch; Christine Theran; Eric Polson, Bill Naiditch.

Welcoming Remarks

Matthew McCarron welcomed the community to the January 11, 2006 meeting of the Hamilton Army Airfield Restoration Advisory Board (RAB). The meeting began at 7:05 p.m.

Formerly Used Defense Sites (FUDS) Update- Jim McAlister, USACE

The Army performed methane monitoring around the perimeter of Landfill 26 on December 19, 2005. None of the probes were above 0.1 percent methane, which is typical for this time of year due to the high levels of groundwater. The Army wants to make sure that the methane in the landfill does not go beyond the buffer trench, which was put in to intercept any migrating methane. The trench vent was also monitored in December 2005 and there was one detection of 0.44 percent methane. Five percent (5.0%) is the regulatory limit for reporting.

Jim Davies: Has that vent had high concentrations before?

Jim McAlister: We have had some detections above 0.1 before, but I can't remember in which area.

The Army's cleanup on Landfill 26 falls under the Defense Environmental Restoration Program and indicates that the Army must cleanup the site under CERCLA. This includes a variety of documents. In 1989, a Record of Decision (ROD) was signed and then modified in 1992, which led to a landfill cap with a water treatment plant. After the cap was installed it was determined that the water treatment plant was not needed. In 1997, the Army presented a report to the agencies to demonstrate that the water treatment

plant was not necessary. The plant has not been run since its initial startup. The Army is coming close to the end of the cleanup process at Landfill 26. In 2002, there was an Interim Action for methane detected at the landfill. The Army did an investigation and determined that the methane was being created by naturally occurring organics from Pacheco Creek. The Army is coming up on its periodic review and has been working with the Water Board DTSC to enter a monitoring mode. Measurement criteria were not included in the ROD, so the Army is going to establish those now with the Water Board and DTSC. The Army will then evaluate the landfill cap. The cap was put on due to the threat to groundwater. Once the Army completes the periodic review, they will prepare a feasibility study and then modify the existing ROD. The Water Board has indicated that they want to change the board order to more accurately reflect what is happening with the Landfill. The Army will sit down with the Water Board and DTSC and scope out the periodic review so that everyone is on the same page. Once the Army establishes the scope, it will be clear when the feasibility study will happen. The Army will meet all elements of the RWQCB Board orders

Matthew McCarron: Who signed the 1989 document?

Jim McAlister: It was just the DOD.

John Kaiser: The existing order is out of sync with what is happening. We are preparing a draft board order, and there will be a public comment period. The idea is to bring the board order up to date. The goal of the order is to piggyback on the ROD. Once all of the components of the order have been met by the Army, the order can then be dissolved. Laurent Meillier has transferred to the South Lake Tahoe Regional Board and we are trying to get a replacement for him. I am hoping we can get the order heard before the Board in about three months.

Sue Lattanzio: What is happening with the north side of the landfill? What has been done to confirm that there are no migrating pollutants?

Jim McAlister: Our sampling has indicated that there is no methane in the soil gas on the north end. There are different VOCs inside the landfill that we don't see outside the landfill. The Army goes out every six months and does extensive sampling. The Army agreed upon two years of semi-annual sampling. The order that was put out in 2001 primarily addressed soil gas. There was a data gap on diesel fuel in the wells around the perimeter landfill. The Army wanted to put in an additional well and has not received concurrence from the Water Board. Whether the diesel originates from the landfill is not clear.

John Kaiser: Are you waiting for the Board's concurrence on the location of the monitoring well? I will get you an answer within a week about the well.

Theresa McGarry: Is the Corrective Action Report made available to the public?

Jim McAlister: It was sent out just before the holidays to all RAB members, and will also be made available to the public.

Jim Davies: Is there still diesel being detected in the wells north and east of the landfill? How are you going to figure out if it is coming from the landfill or the hangers?

Jim McAlister: Yes, there is still a low detection of diesel in the groundwater north and east of the landfill. When we put the well in, we will make that determination. There are some very low detections of diesel from the hangers.

Jim Davies: When do you think we will find out whether the landfill is leaking diesel?

Jim McAlister: When we put in a well, we monitor it for four quarters and we will share that data with the agencies and interested parties.

Sue Lattanzio: Have you ever sampled in the drainage ditches?

Jim McAlister: We have taken soil samples, and all of the surface samples taken around the landfill have come back non-detect, including VOCs and pesticides. Sand channels are a misnomer. When you have a low gradient, a creek will meander. There may be pockets of sand, but there is not a continuous freeway for the groundwater to travel through. We are doing a conceptual site model which we presented in the methane investigation report. We will have a comprehensive report for the entire landfill. On the southern end of the landfill there are areas of fine grain material, but to say that it is a sand channel it is a misnomer.

Jim McAlister: Since the cap has been put in place, there has been an annual monitoring of the area. The document that went out before the holidays includes all of the data thus far.

Upcoming Events

- Meet with agencies to scope Remedy Review Document.
- Various Monitoring Reports under review by agencies
- Signage for Landfill 26
- RWQCB in process of revising board orders

Theresa McGarry: The Department did write a letter to the local enforcement agency about the elevated methane levels around Lot 30. This methane does appear to be naturally occurring, and the Local Enforcement Agency agrees. We wanted to make sure that everyone working in the area is made aware of this condition.

Jim McAlister: Our investigation report showed that there is potential for naturally occurring methane south of the landfill. The Army did a number of soil testing and found fine grain material towards the western boundary of the subdivision all the way over to Pacheco Creek.

Matthew McCarron: I thought that it was only Lot 30 where naturally occurring methane was identified.

Jim McAlister: Lot 66 was bordering on five percent, and once the buffer trench went in, within two months the methane levels were down to 0.1 percent. GNP 3 was less than 0.1 percent, but in the summertime we expect there will be elevated methane there.

Jim Davies: Not all people agree with the Army's interpretation on the naturally occurring status of methane. None of us are convinced that is the only source of methane in Lot 30 and that it is naturally occurring.

Jim McAlister: We have asked to see Shea's data and they have not been forthcoming with their data.

Christine Theran: Are the people on these lots kept abreast of these detections?

Jim McAlister: We have shown that the methane generated in that area is not a result of the Army's use in the area. I am not sure if Shea is sharing the information from the sampling with the residents. Marin County Department of Health Services would be the local agency responsible for alerting the residents.

Theresa McGarry: Nobody believes that there is an eminent threat; it was simply if there would be utility work being done, which is in soil gas and not the air.

Jim McAlister: The detections of methane in soil gas are very small amounts, at a depth of up to six feet below the surface. Shea homes installed 12-15 feet deep probes on Lot 30 and, the deeper the probe the higher the methane concentration. Title 27 states that there is a 0.5 percent threshold for methane, at which point if it is in the air it can burn, or explode.

Sue Lattanzio: Are there access restrictions on the airfield area?

Eric Polson: Yes, the airfield parcel is posted No Trespassing because it is an active construction site.

Sue Lattanzio: I see lots of people on the parcel, what are you doing to keep them off?

Eric Polson: The site is not entirely fenced and there are adjacent properties that belong to the City. We cannot ask people to leave the city owned properties. The Coastal Conservancy has decided not to fence the whole site. We have some security guards on site, and ask people to leave as we can. People will be cited if they are being a nuisance.

North Antenna Field

The DTSC and the Corps will be meeting on the North Antenna Field schedule hopefully next week. There were some practice grenades found on the North Antenna field, and there is still one there which is covered by a 2,000lb steel plate. The Archives Search Report is scheduled for completion in January 2006.

Matthew McCarron: Did you find anything besides grenades on the site?

Jim McAlister: There were other metal scrap items that were found.

The Army was under the assumption that the Coastal Conservancy was going to place dredge material on the North Antenna Field, but at the last RAB Tom indicated that the Coastal Conservancy would not have the dredge material, so the Army schedule has been delayed due to the fact. Until the Army reaches the feasibility study, there will not be a duration specified on the cleanup efforts.

Lance McMahan: Will the RAB receive the ASR and RAs?

Jim McAlister: After September 11, 2001, the DOI said that we are not allowed to share the locations of ordnance with the general public, so I will check on the status of that.

Patricia Eklund: If there is going to be a change in ultimate use on the North Antenna Field, then would that change the cleanup requirements?

Eric Polson: It will still be a tidal wetland under any condition. It is just the amount of dredge material.

Naomi Feger: The Conservancy did not want to end up with a remedy that dictated that they had to have enough dredge material for a certain elevation. The Risk Assessment that the Corps produces looked at a variety of scenarios. The amount of dredge material is still up for discussion.

Peter Theran: Can you estimate if there will be contaminated soil that will need to be removed from the Antenna Field?

Jim McAlister: There will be many trucks associated with the removal of soils from the Antenna field. The FUDS program would not be bringing in material.

Eric Polson: The Hamilton Wetlands Restoration Project does not anticipate importing fill materials. The dredge material coming in would be from the off-loader and would not require any trucks.

Jim McAlister: The amount of trucks will be in the feasibility study. We will have programmatic estimates on the volume of soils. We will then fine tune those numbers in the Remedial Design documents.

Naomi: Is there an option for barging?

Jim McAlister: There is not an area to land a barge. San Pablo Bay is very shallow.

Matthew McCarron: Given that any remedial action will start in 2008-9; will there be an access road?

Eric Polson: There will be an access road, along N1 and N2 levees. Once the wetlands are completed there will be a road on the top of the levees. We have to leave a roadway for the sanitary district to access.

Navy Update – Michael Bloom/Navy BEC

NEX Gas Station

The Navy submitted a Draft Human Health Risk Assessment and is awaiting agency comments. The Navy submitted a final work plan for installing additional wells and will be submitting an Annual Site Report for 2005 at the end of January 2006. The Navy completed the last quarterly monitoring event in November 2005. The biosparging system has been turned off since March 2005.

The Navy installed a well screened deeper within weathered bedrock near the northwest leading edge of the MTBE plume to address a comment from the Water Board. The Water Board was concerned about the potential presence of a preferential channel in the weathered bedrock which might be the cause of increasing MTBE concentrations at MW-M13.

Jeff Johnston: Do you have any data on the increasing concentrations? At what point do the concentrations become a red flag?

Travis Williamson: We have quarterly data since 2000. The concentration increase is low, but it is the leading edge of the plume, so we want to make sure we have a handle on the area. The Navy in consultation with the Water Board is assessing the situation to determine what (if anything) needs to be done. The closest downgradient receptor would be Pacheco Creek and Pacheco Pond. At this point there are a lot of monitoring wells in the area, and the Navy is continuing to sample the wells to track the extent of the plume. The wells that are located in the housing development are showing stable to decreasing concentrations.

Naomi Feger: The concentrations in the housing area are higher than those found at the leading edge to begin with.

Sue Lattanzio: Have you sampled in the December, January, February time line?

Travis Williamson: The Navy sampled in November. In general there are higher concentrations of MTBE observed in the dry seasons.

The Navy will be turning the biosparging system back on in March 2006.

Ballfields Parcel

The Navy completed sampling activities during the week of April 4th, which consisted of approximately 50 soil samples and 10 groundwater samples. The data was compared to conservative regulatory criteria and then the Navy prepared the Preliminary Assessment/Site Inspection report. The Navy issued responses to regulatory comments, and hopes to get the Draft Final PA/SI issued as soon as possible.

Hamilton Wetlands Restoration Project Update- Eric Polson, CSCC

The Corps completed the N1 levee section and a containment berm that ties into the Hamilton Partners levee. The Corps completed all of the permitting and is ready for the Port of Oakland dredge material. The project will be removing Building 82 and redoing some power lines on the site. The drainage pipes are powered by an underground power line, so we will be bringing in power from the existing power lines. The Project will also reroute the perimeter drainage ditch as we build the levees. The installation of the offloader and pipeline is the big task for 2006. The placement of the offloader and the importing of dredge material from the port of Oakland will begin this fall and winter and into 2007. In 2007, the Project will be importing dredge materials from other projects. The Project is continuing to keep track of Bel Marin Keys V and are trying to get that approved. Bel Marin Keys is not a separate project, but is in addition to the authorized Hamilton Restoration Project.

Marie Hoch: Could you tell me how you will move the dredge material across the site?

Eric Polson: We installed a section of pipe throughout the site, which extends into the bay and the site. The dredge will be pumped in through a pipe and the material will be hydrologically placed in the seasonal wetlands area. The dredge will have 10-15 percent solids.

Naomi Feger: An operating plan will be forthcoming which will detail how the sediment will be placed.

Eric Polson: The plan will not be prepared until we have a contract through the Port of Oakland.

In terms of environmental permitting, the separation between the Port of Oakland and Hamilton is at the face of the offloader. Once the barge gets to the offloader, the Hamilton Restoration project is responsible for the activities moving forward. The Corps San Francisco District is involved in both projects. The construction of Hamilton Wetlands is authorized in both projects. There will not be a Hamilton contract.

Pat Eklund: You mentioned that you are getting less dredge material from the Port of Oakland. How will that impact your project? Is the operations plan going to be made available for public review? There will be some value in sharing the draft operations report with the RAB.

Eric Polson: Overall, we are seeing a reduction in dredge material. However, we are still planning to receive the 2.1-2.5 million yards of material from the Port of Oakland as originally planned. The operations plan is a submittal as part of the permit conditions. Once we submit the document, I would assume that it would be public information.

Pat Eklund: Will the arrival of material from the Port of Oakland through the off-loader create noise impacts?

Eric Polson: Hydraulic fills do not tend to be noisy unless there is rock going through the steel pipe. The pipe itself is quiet. The noisiest aspect of the process is the backup noise that the machines make. OSHA requires them for worker safety. There will be no truck movement of the dredge material. We are not hauling in any material to build the levees. We may end up going to North Antenna Field or Bel Marin Keys to get more materials.

Joan Dekelboun: Are the men wearing ear protectors out there? When the trucks back up, the noise can be heard all over Hamilton.

Eric Polson: Those noises are required by OSHA. Their decibel and pitch are required by law for workers safety. Some workers do wear hearing protection.

Theresa McGarry: How does the Ballfield parcel fit into your schedule now?

Eric Polson: We do not own that parcel thus do not have permits for it. We are in the process of building a wildlife corridor that comes close but does not include the Ballfield Parcel. There is a drainage issue with the Ballfield site because the city has pumps operating on it that can discharge 300 cubic feet of water per second. If we build a cutoff levee, we have to figure out how to get that water over the levee and into our project to manage it. The Bay Trail is shown on the levee that separates the two parcels.

Jim McAlister: What are the noise impacts of operating the pipeline?

Eric Polson: The piping operation is 24/7, and in both the EIR/EIS and the Supplemental documents there are requirements for working hours. I don't envision a large operation. During the day there will be engine noise and backup noises, but those would not be an issue at night.

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

Field Work

The Army has continued to sample at the Range sites, and the extent of lead has been delineated at the Testing Range. The Army dug potholes to collect soils to complete waste profiling to determine where the soils would go. Most of the soils were found to be Class I and will go to Kettleman City, while a small amount was found to be Class II. Over the holidays, the haul roads were under a couple feet of water. This will cause some delays on excavations.

The Army has completed excavations at Revetment 21 and confirmation sampling has indicated that clean limits were reached. All soils have been disposed of off-site.

POL Hill

An additional round of sampling was completed in November, and the preliminary results indicate that all of the values meet the GSA Phase I Residential Cleanup Goals.

Coastal Salt Marsh

The soil haul off is complete and the final grading of the ELCDDA access road is complete. The first re-vegetation survey of the backfilled excavations was completed.

Next Steps

The next step for the Army is to prepare the completion reports for SRW, Unlined PDD and Building 35 sites for the DDT Sites. At the Testing Range Site, the Army will be finalizing the excavation plan and will excavate with direct load and transport. The Army will be preparing documentation for a manage-in-place remedy for the Skeet Range site. The Army will prepare the final sampling report for POL Hill and will request site closeout. For the revetments, the Army will prepare a completion report and request site closure. The Army will also be preparing the completion report for the Coastal Salt Marsh and will monitor the re-vegetation of the backfilled excavation locations. Finally, the Army will be working to close the local BRAC office.

Lance McMahan: In the Skeet Range what were the concentrations? Did you find lead shot?

Ed Keller: We did not find lead shot but we did find skeet fragments.

The ROD/RAP identified the, Manage-in-Place, Alternative 3 sites. The Army has already taken action at half a dozen revetments where the concrete was removed by the wetland project. When the Army sampled the six sites, two came back with values below the cleanup criteria. The other four sites were excavated. The unlined perimeter ditch is covered by the new levee system. The majority of the manage-in-place sites are around the perimeter of the site, which are not thought to be high energy areas once tidal action is reintroduced to the site. The Corps removed concrete from six of the revetment pads since they are in an area that will be in the middle of the tidal area of the marsh and channel development is likely.

Pat Eklund: How many trucks are associated with your project?

Ed Keller: We will have about 17-20 trucks a day for three weeks. The trucks going to Altamont can make two trips a day.

The manage-in-place sites would be under three feet of coverage from the imported dredge material. Quite a few of the sites located on the boundaries will be covered by the levee construction.

Matthew McCarron: Will the cover material resist scouring when the wetlands are built?

Ed Keller: Our current site elevations are about six to seven feet below sea level, and they are going to a 0 or plus two, so there will be a significant amount of fill over the whole site. There are also plans for some internal berms. The channels don't deepen until the vegetation comes in. Areas may be capped with three feet of soils if there is not enough dredge material to cover the areas.

Christine Theran: I heard you mention about all of the soil that you are removing, as well as Jim and Eric's soils. This activity involves 18-wheeled trucks very close to our homes. Should this material be covered? Are these trucks a hazard to the residents in reference to dust and diesel fuel?

Ed Keller: Soils from my efforts should be covered. There are many different factors involved in the haul-off of materials. We implement dust reducing measures, by watering down, but there is definitely diesel exhaust.

Sue Lattanzio: Were there any breaks in the outboard levee during the past storms? Do you have any data on the settlement rate of the levees?

Ed Keller: Water came over at 4 or 5 locations. The city should have data on the NHP levees settlement.

Sue Lattanzio: The Bel Marin Keys V property is now a seasonal wetland.

Eric Polson: Tides are not really a big problem, it is the wind and the storm surges in the Bay. When there is a combination of those factors, there can be a break in the levee.

Pat Eklund: The NHP levee will be raised in the future. Glen Young at the City can give you more information.

Peter Theran-Hamilton Residents for Responsible Growth

Peter Theran-Hamilton Residents for Responsible Growth

I live in the Newport area of Hamilton. I want to first make it clear that we support the wetlands restoration project, and that this evening's presentation is not intended to criticize any particular agency or individual.

There are concerns from the residents about the use of Todd Road for the access to both the Hamilton Airfield Wetlands Restoration Project and the proposed Bel Marin Keys Unit V extension of this project. The Hamilton Residents for Responsible Growth (HRRG) and the neighborhood have a list of concerns, such as public safety. The trucks come down all hours of the day and they are right next to a neighborhood. We have reviewed a variety of documents, and there was no disclosure by the City of Novato, the developer or the joint EIR/EIS prepared by the Coastal Conservancy and the Army Corps

of Engineers that Todd Road would be used to the extent that it is used now. These trucks generate 83-97 decibels of noise and our homes are 10 to 20 feet from these trucks. There is a public safety issue, a dust issue, and a noise issue. The access road needs to be moved. It is totally inappropriate for the access road to be directly adjacent to a neighborhood of 254 homes in an area where there was supposed to be a park for the many children in this neighborhood. You can see in the pictures I have distributed, large 18 wheel trucks clogging Todd Road and backed up onto North Hamilton Parkway waiting to enter. You can also see the lights of trucks coming in the dark, and finally, children on bicycles sharing Todd Road with the trucks. It is projected by the federal, state and local officials involved, that Todd Road will be utilized for construction vehicles until the Bel Marin Keys Unit V Extension of the Wetlands Restoration project is completed in approximately 20 years. This project has an unacceptable negative impact on public safety and public health; the use of Todd Road is an error in judgment that needs to be corrected. We will be meeting with local, city, county and state agencies to begin the process of gaining support for moving the road. At the city level, the Novato City Council we will be initiating a feasibility study to move the access road. The access road should be moved to a location that is not adjacent to any homes.

In the handout material that I have provided, you will find excerpts from the 1998 Hamilton Wetland Restoration Plan-Volume II: Final EIR/EIS which do not identify any impact on residents, excerpts from the 2003 SEIR/EIS for the Bel Marin Keys Unit V Expansion of the Wetlands Project “amending the 1998 EIR and stating that there would only be limited commuting traffic on Todd road, and finally, the Shea Homes disclosure statement indicating the “it is anticipated that the private road will remain in its current location and be incorporated into the parking lot area of the proposed park.” This EIR/EIS needs to be amended and this access needs to be permanently relocated.

William McNicholas: I thought the trucks were not supposed to arrive before 7 a.m.

Peter Theran: This varies with who is using the road and the circumstances. Some drivers arrive early, others leave late, and When the levee broke at Pacheco Pond there were trucks going for 36 hours straight. There are times when the trucks are coming in at night. We call Ed and Eric when we see a truck there outside the appropriate hours, it is apparent that they cannot completely control the traffic; but bottom line is that the access road should be moved.

William McNicholas: The use of Todd Road has been discussed in the RAB meeting for years, and I was wondering why your group is bringing up this issue now.

Peter Theran: Our homes were built in 2003. We have been talking with the city, state, and federal agency representatives for the last year and a half. But, until recently, we were unaware of the extent of the project. The Novato City manager alerted us that the project would be going on for 20 years.

Jeff Johnston: The introduction that Todd Road is a problem is not a new issue. I am a member of the HRRG as well as the RAB and I am supportive of Peter and Christine’s position that the access needs to be moved away from homes. It is a quality of life issue for the residents.

Naomi Feger: What is the status of the North Bay Construction crushing operation?

Pat Eklund: We sent them a letter that they will have to cease operations.

Christine Theran: There are as many as 50 truck loads of dirt being brought in and out over Todd Road for North Bay Construction, and we have been told that they will be continuing for more than a year.-Mr. Ed Keller, can you assure the children and adults in this neighborhood that this traffic is not adversely affecting their health?

Ed Keller: I do not have the qualifications to make such an assurance.

Christine Theran: Thank you, Mr. Keller. And finally, have you reviewed the problem of uncovered trucks removing contaminated soil?

Mr. Keller: Yes, I have addressed that issue.

Jeff Johnston: The time is not the problem, the location is the problem.

Pat Eklund: Has anyone explored any alternative routes?

Ed Keller: The Army has not.

Eric Polson: The Coastal Conservancy is working with the city and county to discuss various access points. When the environmental document was prepared Todd Road did not exist, so the 1998 map was as accurate as possible back then. Todd Road is city property and the road by the landfill is federal property. We don't have a vested right; we don't own the properties where the relocated road might be. Any new road would have habitat impacts across Pacheco Creek. Cost, property rights, permitting and environmental issues are all involved in the discussion of moving the access road.

Naomi Feger: You would have to find a way across Pacheco Creek.

Jeff Johnston: It appears that we are more concerned about impacting the habitat than the residents of the neighborhood.

Eric Polson: I think it is doable to find a new access road, but it will be time consuming. We are working with the city in all aspects of road signage. The one conceptual problem about the document now is that it has impacts from the FUDS, BRAC and North Bay Construction on city, state and federal property.

Peter Theran: To us it is not a matter of which agency's trucks happen to be using the road on any particular day; the impact to residents is the same. The bottom line is that the road is in the wrong place.

Pat Eklund: Did the other environmental documents, the Corps, Landfill, Army, did they evaluate access to the site and the associated environmental impacts?

Ed Keller: There is not a CEQA document required for a federal agency taking action so the Army did not prepare one. You also do not need a separate NEPA document if you are carrying out actions under CERCLA. The state prepared a CEQA document for the Army BRAC actions.

Eric Polson: When the Army transferred the property to the Coastal Conservancy in October 2003, there was a ROD/RAP that planned for cleanup of the site.

Lance McMahan: Part of the reason the Coastal Conservancy was the lead agency for the CEQA was the wetland construction. That CEQA document is available and should be online.

Jim McAlister: We are working under CERCLA, so the North Antenna Field will be incorporated under our documentation.

Jeff Johnston: Someone has to be held accountable. We are looking for constructive solutions, and are not interested in finger pointing.

William McNicholas: There is not coordination happening between the agencies and all their various trucking activities.

Pat Eklund: In the meantime of the road being relocated, a calendar should be put together that details a schedule of the trucks coming and going. Can someone put a calendar together?

Eric Polson: The Wetlands Restoration project is not in a position to do that at the moment, but we do coordinate with Ed.

Marucia Britto: North Bay seems to be the problem.

Pat Eklund: I will talk to Dan Keane about that.

Regulatory Update

Department of Toxic Substances Control-Lance McMahan

Jim McAlister will not be doing a NEPA analysis for his portion of the project. However, the state and DTSC will act as lead agency in doing a CEQA analysis and a feasibility study. For that project, we could evaluate different haul routes as a part of the noise and air quality analysis. The feasibility study will be worked on this year, and the DTSC welcomes input on these reports. The DTSC will then select a remedy that will take place in 2007, and will be accompanied by a CEQA document and will include an analysis of impacts and mitigation measures. If that includes a new haul route, then it will be addressed.

Jim McAlister: There are physical limitations to changing routes. In the FUDS program, I don't believe we have options for building a bridge when there is a route nearby. The issue of Todd Road will be addressed in the environmental documents. There is a permitting issues as well as money issues that could prevent us from moving the access route.

Jeff Johnston: How much would a bridge cost?

Jim McAlister: I don't know.

Jim Davies: The Army could build one. The Army Reserves could be activated to build a temporary bridge.

Theresa McGarry: The DTSC is working with the schools program on the Navy property. These properties will be transferred for schools and we will be evaluating the property. We are in the process of working out use restrictions on the property. Digging will not be allowed without a soil management plan.

Meeting wrap up and Adjournment- Matthew McCarron

Mr. McCarron announced that the next meeting will be held on April 12th, 2006