Detailed Meeting Notes
Hamilton Army Airfield Restoration Advisory Board
Novato Police Station Meeting Room
Novato, California
January 12, 2005

Attendance

RAB Members Present:

Ed Keller; Jennifer Valenzia; Jeff Johnston; Richard Draeger; Mathew McCarron; Naomi Feger; Laurent Meillier; Lance McMahan; Jim McAlister; Marucia Britto; Ross Millerick; Patricia Eklund; Sue Lattanzio

RAB Members Absent

Manuel Meir; Ray Zimny; Tunstall Lang; Theresa McGarry; Sabrina Molinari, Joan Dekelboum; Preston Cook; William McNicholas;

Others Present:

Eric Polson; Joy Lanzaro; Cara Naiditch; Jim Davies; Liz Barr; Travis Williamson; Dorthea Von Koch; Christine Theran; Christy Sloan; Nancy Foster; Susan Stompe; Liz Lewis; Pam Shinault

Welcoming Remarks

Ed Keller welcomed the community to January 12, 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 Update: Jim McAlister, USACE

Mr. McAlister provided an update on recent methane monitoring at Landfill 26 and the status of the documentation, as well as an update on the North Antenna Field.

Landfill 26

Methane Monitoring

There was a monitoring event in December 2004. None of the samples taken around the landfill contained more than .10 concentrations of methane, which is typical during the winter season. This was also the case for the vent trench monitoring. In Hamilton Meadows, there was a reading of 42% concentration of methane on lot 30. The USACE has done a massive investigation and has determined this concentration to be a naturally occurring condition because Pacheco Creek had been in this area, and there are layers of organic material beneath the soil.

The USACE finalized their report and is waiting for a response from DTSC. The USACE also sent a letter to DTSC and the regulators requesting a change to quarterly monitoring since the testing shows that methane being detected in the Hamilton Meadows area and in the Southern area of the landfill is naturally occurring and the Army cannot spend money to decrease naturally occurring

methane. This request has been made to the agencies and the USACE is waiting for a response.

Richard Draeger: Have the agencies agreed with you that the methane is naturally occurring?
Jim McAlister: No

Mathew McCarron: Have you tested for other chemicals, especially in the hotspot?
Jim McAlister: We sampled for VOCs and methane, and we found no correlation between the two. We looked at it mathematically and visually and found no connection.

Mathew McCarron: Did you find VOCs in other locations?
Jim McAlister: Yes, we found low levels of VOCs and, working with the agencies, we placed probes in each of those locations. There are 21 probes throughout the subdivision location. We sampled for VOCs and performed a risk assessment, which recommended that we go through four quarters of monitoring to determine that there were no long term impacts to the residents. We just finished up the last of those sampling events and a report is due out.

Mathew McCarron: Were the probes present before you started the investigation for other methane issues?
Jim McAlister: There were 23 probes around the perimeter of the landfill. Title 27 calls for probes every 1000 feet, and we had them every 200 feet. In 2000, we had 15 additional probes put along the boundary area between the subdivision and the landfill to close any gaps.

Mathew McCarron: Is this the quarterly monitoring that you want to suspend?
Jim McAlister: No, currently we are going out and doing field monitoring with hand-held instruments once a month to look for methane. We have done three rounds of semi-annual sampling of the entire landfill, both groundwater and soil gas. A couple of years ago, Representative Woolsey requested that we perform an intensive investigation of the whole perimeter. We should be done with that monitoring in April 2005. We have been working out here in the mid-80s, and since then there have been no big changes.

Mathew McCarron: If the state does not agree with your assessment of the naturally occurring methane that is occurring in the lot, then what?
Jim McAlister: We will have to sit down with the state and discuss it. We have a lot of data that points to the fact that the methane is naturally occurring.

Mathew McCarron: If there is a naturally occurring source, is it possible to stop it?
Jim McAlister: It is not the responsibility of the Federal government to dig up natural organics in the area. We carbon dated the methane, soil and

groundwater, and they were all 300-800 years old, which tells me that they were deposits from the streams and not from petroleum.

Pat Eklund: Wouldn't it be prudent to try to remove what is there?
Jim McAlister: That methane is naturally occurring, according to all of our reports.

Pat Eklund: If it is naturally occurring, why is it only in that area?
Jim McAlister: There are other hotspots. You can find soil gas in one place and not another. Shea Homes went out and dug about 12 feet, and at 10.5 feet we observed an organic rich lens. We have not seen a report from Shea Homes about what they found. Sometimes naturally occurring methane is present in some places and not others.

Pat Eklund: The percentage range from 5 percent to 40 percent is just odd.
Jim McAlister: I agree, during the summer months, we get 30 percent methane in another probe, and it is a seasonal condition. Methane is a naturally occurring substance. Where there are carbon substances degrading, methane will occur.

Jeff Johnston: I am assuming the homeowner at lot 30 has been notified of this condition.
Jim McAlister: Shea Homes should have put it in their disclosures.

Jeff Johnston: There is a house on that lot, so are the areas where digging was done covered up, or is there simply a house located on top of them now?
Jim McAlister: There were no homes when we were doing our probes. When they started building the house, we removed the probes because they were going to interfere with the construction. We have not done any digging on lot 30.

Jeff Johnston: Then how do you know about the high concentrations on lot 30?
Jim McAlister: Shea Homes put the probe there. On Lot 29, there are occasionally high concentrations of methane, sometimes up to 20 percent.

Document Status

- Landfill 26 Comprehensive Monitoring Report: Comments Incorporated
- Monitoring of Remedial Action Probes: Sampling Complete
- Monitoring of Trench: Reports under review
- Board Order Compliance: 2005-8

We will be working with the Water Board for completion of the Board Orders.

Jim Davies: When will these reports come out?
Jim McAlister: One monitoring report is due out this Friday, and the others will be available subsequently. We have a number of reports out at various levels of review. I am still awaiting comments from DTSC.

North Antenna Field
The USACE is in the middle of a risk assessment right now which was scheduled to go out to the agencies in December, but the USACE toxicologist has been out of the office.

Document Status
- Risk Assessment Workplan: To Agencies, Completed September 2004
- Risk Assessment: To Agencies, Completion in February 2005
- Final Risk Assessment: Completion May 2005
- Ordnance Activities Workplan: To Agencies
- Ordnance Activities Fieldwork: To Agencies
- Feasibility Study: To Agencies, Completion September 2005
- Final Feasibility Study: Completion December 2005

The USACE is in discussion with DTSC about which clean up levels will be used for the ordnances, so there is a hold on that part of the project. The USACE has found three grenades, two of which have been destroyed; there is still one there although there is a large trench plate covering the area so it is inaccessible.

Marucia Britto: So it is unexploded?
Jim McAlister: Yes, there is a small charge within the grenade, and we have isolated it with the trench plate.

Marucia Britto: So what are you going to do with it?
Jim McAlister: Once we and DTSC work out what the cleanup standards are we will have a contractor go out and explode it in place. It has a mechanical fuse so it is not possible to move it.

Pat Eklund: Have you done a thorough search to see if there are any other unexploded ordnances out there? Is there a fence surrounding the area?
Jim McAlister: No, it is more than a mile from the residences, and there is only one roadway. I didn't put the area up on my slides.

Pat Eklund: I am concerned because kids love to explore and if the area is not fenced, and we don't know how many grenades are out there.
Jim: The ordnance is in a limited use area.

Pat Eklund: Would you consider these to be a problem for young children?
Jim McAlister: I have never been around them; the actual charge unit is 40mm.
Pat Eklund: So someone could get hurt.
Jim McAlister: In theory, if they were able to move the trench plate.

Christine Theran: I live in Newport, and I would like to bring to your attention that last month kids sawed off the bolt that went to the plate for the water tower on top of Ammo Hill. Don't you think that this would be a nuisance attraction for kids?

Jim McAlister: This is a sheet of steel, that to lift you need heavy equipment. That is why we chose to place it in the area. This plate could not be picked up by 20 kids. It is imbedded in the dirt.

Mathew McCarron: We talked last time about driving in the mud, so couldn't you move it with a truck?
Jim McAlister: The off-road driving was around the Landfill, once you get to the north antenna field, there is still about a half mile to get to the location.

Lance McMahan: At present to get to the North Antenna Field, you have to make your way across the airfield parcel, and it is my understanding that people are not being allowed out there due to construction. We thought about putting a sign out there but did not.

Pat Eklund: Why is the cleanup to be determined?
Jim McAlister: My management and the management at DTSC need to work out a cleanup standard. When you go out looking for ordnance you do a surface walk with a metal detector to check the surface. Once that is done, then you take a geophysical unit to look below the surface. Anything that is different below the soil will show up, and then needs to be dealt with. We do not dig every anomaly; we dig a percentage and then determine the odds of finding everything. The standards of DTSC are to handle every one.

Pat Eklund: So that could take a long time.
Jim McAlister: We have a wetlands deadline coming up, but I will talk to my management as soon as possible.

Lance McMahan: The issue of whether you dig a few holes or handle every one is above the project manager level. However, the site review information should be released before the whole issue is resolved.

Sue Lattanzio: I was out taking some pictures of the flooding at Pacheco Creek, and there are still people out there. It is possible for people to get out there, a biker could bike there.
Jim McAlister: Even if we put a fence up, people can still get through fences.
Sue Lattanzio: Well, fences are better than no fences.

North Antenna Field Environmental Cleanup

- Decision Document: Completion 2006
- Remedial Design: Completion 2006
- Remedial Action: Completion 2007-2008

Overview of the Pacheco Creek Restoration Project: Liz Lewis, Marin County Flood Control

Ms. Lewis provided an overview of the Pacheco Creek Restoration Project.

The Pacheco Creek restoration project is a joint venture between the Flood Control District and the City of Novato. This is a 1200 linear foot area of Pacheco Creek right next to the skate park. The channel was put into concrete liner by the Army in the 1980s. Pacheco Creek drains in a 2-square mile area. It flows through Pacheco Valley under Highway 101, through the Hamilton residential area and then through a concrete pipe where it daylights at Hamilton Parkway. The City of Novato has been pursuing grant funding to restore the entire channel. The lower part of the Creek is protected through parkland by the City of Novato and the Flood Control District, so there is a lot of support for the restoration of Pacheco Creek. The section of Pacheco Creek through the concrete channel to Pacheco Pond is essentially a wildlife preserve.

The County applied for funding to the State Department of Water Resources, and they gave the City of Novato about $600,000. Parks and Recreation gave the County about $400,000 through their Urban Streams Restoration Program.

The County put together a conceptual site plan for the restoration. The project begins at the bridge at North Hamilton Parkway. The County would remove the concrete liner and put in a concrete pedestrian bridge. Once the concrete is removed, the County would have various erosion control treatments in place. The creek would be left in place.

One of the primary concerns is a 12-inch sewer force main that runs through the area. The County does not want the channel to migrate into the force main. The County would be using state of the art bank stabilization treatments to prevent this from happening. The entire channel would be covered with erosion control blankets which are rated based on the flow of the river. All of these ideas are fairly conceptual at this point. The County applied for the grants, and then learned that they would have to go through the Land Use Covenant to continue with the project. The County applied to all of the agencies here tonight about eight months ago, requesting permission through the Land Use Covenant to go ahead with the project. The County is not going to excavate below the four-foot threshold that is specified in the Covenant. The County has received letters from the Regional Water Quality Control Board, the DTSC and the Navy. Just today, the County received a letter from the Army Corps of Engineers which expressed concerns with the channel migrating towards Landfill 26, as well as the removal of the liner possibly exposing soils that were left behind to the erosive forces of the channel.

Jim McAlister: When the Army Corps transferred property to the City of Novato, there was a Land Use Covenant put on the property, which is a deed restriction that creates criteria for future owners to meet due to the location of the MTBE plume in this area. Also in the vicinity were low levels of diesel detected in the groundwater. At the edge of the creek, there was a small plume of TCE found. The Land Use Covenant was put in place to make sure that no one would interfere with the remediation of these concentrations. If you dug below 4 feet or

you created a recharge area for groundwater you would have to work with the agencies on the design and let them know what you were doing. On this project, the Army Corps has done cleanups around the area, where the base maintenance area was located. After the cleanups and confirmation sampling, there were still some low levels of contaminants found in the area. There was a Risk Evaluation done in the Decision Document and it was found that there was no threat to human health or the environment. The Army Corps of Engineers had concerns with removing the liner because the soils in Pacheco Creek are alluvial and can be eroded. The bigger issue is Landfill 26. We did not want the channel to wander into Landfill 26. The responsibility for the MTBE was the Navy's call and the diesel and TCE were the Army's call, but because the levels are so low, if the Creek came into contact with them they would not be able to be detected. We chose not to object to the project so they should be moving forward, but we would like to coordinate on the design. We don't agree that it should be done, because the liner has proved to be effective in keeping Pacheco Creek on that path.

Laurent Meillier: We sent a conditional approval letter to the County to go ahead with the restoration. Our concern is to keep the creek in the channel, and we don't want the channel to go by Landfill 26. One issue is that we are dealing with a 401 certification, which will need to be applied for.

Ross Millerick: If you change the roughness of that creek, you will change the backwater curve of the creek? Have you done any backwater curve studies on this project?
Liz Lewis: We have not done any additional hydrology studies. The Creek does and would overtop, but we first had to establish whether we had a project or not, and now those studies would be forthcoming. We would create a wider channel and compensating for the increased roughness with setback wetlands. Now we need to apply to the Army for the 404 process, the Regional Water Quality Board for 401 certification, and the California Department of Fish and Game1600 process.

Ross Millerick: My specific interests are the properties above the Creek as well as the school district and the economic impact of this project. Should the school district send a letter of interest so that we are notified of any CEQA process?
Liz Lewis: Yes.

Jim McAlister: As Liz pointed out, Marin County will have to go through the 404 process with the Corps of Engineers at the San Francisco office.

Liz Lewis: The next step is to have a project coordination meeting with all of the cooperating agencies before we start the application process.

Pat Eklund: Besides widening the channel and doing setback locations, what are you doing to ensure the Creek does not move? Secondly, who would be doing the long term maintenance?
Liz Lewis: We would be looking at the channel geometry and based on the watershed size and average velocities we would be designing the channel to accommodate a bank fold area, which is an area that would be flooded during a 1.5 year storm. The width, depth, and curvature of the channel would accommodate the movement of the channel and would prevent it from moving off course. With regards to long term maintenance of the channel for flood control, the City of Novato owns the channel, and we would proceed with a Memorandum of Agreement, and the city would grant Flood Control an easement for us to come in a remove any obstructions to flow.

Naomi Feger: Who is doing the maintenance currently?
Liz Lewis: To my knowledge, no one. We have done some cutting of cattails to get into the area to perform some surveys.

Sue Lattanzio: Friends of Novato Creek has gone in there to clean up and have removed couches and washing machines. The water does overtop that bridge.

Ross Milerick: What is the feed to this Creek?
Liz Lewis: There are about three or four culverts that are flowing into it. We are removing any concrete that could threaten the bridge. Our project begins downstream of the bridge.

Jim Davies: It seems like the flood potential is going to increase, not decrease.
Pam Shinault: A number of years ago, we worked with a steering committee, and our design was to have a number of uses out there, including public, commercial, and recreational uses. We don't see anything being successful unless we get a commercial partner.
Liz Lewis: There was a proposal for a pool.
Pam Shinault: The community was interested in having a teen-friendly area out there. A skate park and/or basketball courts were activities that were proposed. We were unsuccessful in finding a developer to build a community pool. This is not something that has ever been formalized. The site is flat and there are utilities located nearby.

Ross Millerick: When the creek floods and flows through the culverts, the actual surface of the land is depressed so that there is a surface channel over the top of the culverts to carry additional floodwater. When they improve the roads at the beginning of your project, did they raise the road level where the channel is blocked?

Jennifer Valenzia: The EPA will defer their decision to DTSC.

The next steps are to finalize the Memorandum of Understanding with the City of Novato and to revise our budget in response to comments received, especially in regards to the soil management plan. The plan is to go ahead with an Initial Study. There are not sufficient funds to do an EIR. The CEQA document would be circulated for a 30-day public review and we would submit all of our permit applications to the regulating agencies.

Jim McAlister: Has the SF District assigned anyone from the Corps?
Liz Lewis: We have been working with Brian Matsumoto who does a lot of our 404 permitting in Marin County.

Liz Lewis: The earliest time construction could occur would be 2006.

Pam Shinault: We have had to ask for a grant extension. The project is not only enhancing the creek, but creating a pedestrian bridge and trail as a community educational experience in the area.

Liz: We have worked closely with Friends of Novato Creek.

Ross Milerick: If you are working with Friends of Novato Creek, are you going to provide pathways or other structures?
Liz Lewis: There is a path that is proposed throughout the whole channel.

Naomi Feger: Wasn't there at some point in time supposed to be an interpretive center?
Pam Shinault: We have a Hamilton Public Access plan for the trail, and when we were looking at the community plan, we tried to look at the circulation system within the community park to connect with the interpretative path of the Creek. The interpretative center that has been being talked about is on the other side of the landfill, in the bulge area, to the west of the levee.

Susan Stompe: When would you anticipate an initial study being done?
Liz Lewis: Perhaps in the spring or summer of 2005 we could begin work on the Initial Study.

Navy BRAC Update: Jennifer Valenzia, DODHF Novato BEC
Ms. Valenzia presented the Navy's update on the NEX gas station, the Navy Ballfields, and the resale property transfer.

Hamilton Square was sold to West Bay Builders. The final price was $900,000. The property west of C Street is intended to go to the Novato Unified School District. This property is ready to go to the Department of Education and will transfer sometime in the next few months.

The Navy is actively treating gasoline impacted groundwater on the property located near C Street. There were two gas stations operating on the property

from the early 70's until the early 90's. The Navy operated a treatment system on the property that was recently sold, and has an ongoing treatment on the NUSD parcels. The Navy has been treating groundwater for about 27 months, and has recently been talking to the regulatory agencies about the effectiveness of the treatment system.

Biosparging update and the NEX Gas Station Site
The Navy has achieved about a 70-80 percent removal rate, and the concentrations have been consistent over the past couple of months. The Navy has met with the Water Board in late December and proposed to turn off the biosparging for one year, while continuing to monitor for changes in the groundwater concentrations. The Navy would like to turn the system off in the next couple months and restart the system at this same time next year to see if they can take advantage of the wet season. The treatment system has been more effective in some areas than others due to the heterogeneity of the soil.

Mathew McCaron: The treatment system is more effective in the rainy season, and you want to turn it off in February?
Jennifer Valenzia: From our perspective, it makes sense to turn it off this time of year to see if there are any significant changes. The system will be left in place and could be turned back on at any point.

Jeff Johnston: Are there any contingencies that are yet to be fulfilled on the Hamilton Square parcel? Has escrow closed?
Jennifer Valenzia: Escrow has not closed. I am not aware of any outstanding contingencies.

Jeff Johnston: How was it determined that one year would be an appropriate period of time for shutting off the biosparging.
Jennifer Valenzia: We suggested a year, so we could see the changes over the seasons.

Christy Sloan: How is the Hamilton Square parcel zoned?
Jennifer Valenzia: The property is intended to be used for neighborhood commercial uses, but is not officially zoned at this time.

As of December we have noted a 77% reduction in concentrations. This is consistent with the ranges of removal for the last year.

Ross Millerick: You are seeing flows of 100 feet per year of the plume movement?

Travis Williamson: MTBE was released 30 years ago and is about 3,000 feet long which indicates that the water is moving at 100 feet per year.

Ballfields Parcel
This is the property that will be part of the seasonal wetland restoration project. In order to make that property available for transfer to the Coastal Conservancy the Navy has to do a preliminary assessment and a site inspection. The Navy submitted the draft final work plan to the agencies in November, and expect the workplan to be finalized shortly.

Upcoming activities

- NEX Gas Station Site
    - Continue routine biosparging operation and monitoring
    - Test biosparging shutdown pending approval from Water Board and DTSC
    - Quarterly groundwater monitoring event to be conducted February 2005
    - Proceed with property transfer activities
- Ballfields Parcel
    - Finalize PA/SI Work Plan following agency comment resolution period
    - Conduct fieldwork in early 2005

California State Coastal Conservancy
Hamilton Wetlands Restoration Project Update: Eric Polson
Mr. Polson provided an update on the Hamilton Wetlands Restoration Project (HWRP) on Hamilton Field.

The San Francisco District of the Corps of Engineers and the Coastal Conservancy are working together to design, permit and construct the Hamilton Wetland Restoration Project (HWRP). The HWRP got quite a bit of construction done this season before the rain halted activities. They built the Bulge Levee and improved the Pacheco Pond Levee. The HWRP is in the process of developing plans and specification for the N1 levee and containment berm which will connect the Pacheco Pond Levee to the New Hamilton Partners levee. The HWRP is in the final design and permitting process for the entire airfield parcel. The HWRP also removed a lot of surface soils that had very low level DDT contamination and placed them in an area where they will not be bioavailable in the future wetlands habitat. The HWRP is about 95 percent done with those projects, and as soon as it stops raining, the contractor will be back to finish. The HWRP staff are also working on permitting and final design for the airfield, and the plans and specs for the various levee sections.

The HWRP's construction goals for FY05 and FY06 are to build the perimeter levees and berms, and fill the northern seasonal wetlands and the wildlife corridor adjacent to the New Hamilton Partners levee. Dredge material will

arrive from the Port of Oakland via an off-loader in San Pablo Bay after October 2005. It is unlikely anyone in the Hamilton area would see or hear this off-loader.

The HWRP has released the Notice of Intent to study an Aquatic Transfer Facility for dredged materials in San Pablo Bay. A public meeting will be held on Wednesday, January 26th from 7-9 pm at the bay model on Bridgeway Street in Sausalito. The HWRP will begin a SEIR/EIS and further design studies on that this year and hopes to have that permitted in late 2006, early 2007.

The HWRP was very fortunate to have received 6.1 million in FY-05 federal funds, and hopes to continue to receive full funding in future years. The HWRP has a signed Chief of Engineers' report on the Bel Marin Keys V project addition and was hoping to get that Project addition included in the Water Resources Development Act of 2004 (WRDA 04), but WRDA 04 did not make it through Congress. The HWRP is still waiting for authorization and is hopeful that there will be a WRDA-05 and that this Porject addition will be included in that legislation. The Bel Marin Keys parcel is still being actively farmed. With this last storm and series of high tides there was some minor overtopping of the BMK-V levees on Novato Creek.

Dredge material may arrive at the HWRP this fall from the Bel Marin Keys Community Service District (BMKCSD). The BMKCSD will be dredging Novato Creek, and with regulatory approval, the HWRP is hoping to use their dredge material. This may be the first material that will arrive on-site. The volumes are relatively small, probably about 60-100,000 cubic yards from Novato Creek and another 200,000 cubic yards out of the North Lagoon. The Hamilton community will probably not notice this construction since the material will be delivered through a pipeline and the dredging equipment will be several miles away.

Pat Eklund: Given that the dredge material will be delivered soon, what are you doing to keep the people who live at Hamilton up-to-date?
Eric Polson: We have talked about getting a more comprehensive public relations plan. The California Coastal Conservancy is looking into getting a contractor. The Corps of Engineers is also trying to get some staff together. We have a March time frame for deciding if we will be ready to receive the dredge material from Oakland this fall. At that point we will be able to do the public outreach.
Pat Eklund: You should do that soon, as well as direct mail. Some of the houses have turned over, and so you may get people who are not familiar with the project.
Eric Polson: Sounds like a public meeting might also be in order.

Nancy Foster: How long will the temporary offices for the seasonal wetland construction be there? Will they be moved?
Eric Polson: The trailers that were located on the City's bulge property should be gone. The fence is gone and the trailers should be taken away shortly.

Nancy Foster: They are still there. I know this is a long-term project and was wondering if these trailers would be here indefinitely.
Eric Polson: ITSI and Shaw received permission from the City to locate their office trailers on City property. I don't think that they will bring temporary offices back out. As construction progresses, we may have offices in the vicinity, in order to maintain control of the access road. The offices would appear seasonally. We might be putting in some offices right below the water tank on Ammo hill, which would be a bit further away from homes.

Naomi Feger: I would recommend some good interpretative signage on the levee about the project as a part of the community outreach plan.

Pat Elkund: I wanted to publicly thank Eric and Jim and the other agencies for getting that fence up since the last meeting. There is still an outstanding issue about trucks entering the area before and after the specified times.

Jeff Johnston: One week ago, at 4:45am, there was an 18 wheeler 40 feet from my bed loading/unloading for about an hour. We do appreciate everything that you have done and for getting the gate up on the parcel. There is still a total lack of respect by the people arriving at these early hours of the morning. There needs to be a better level of communication gotten through to the various agencies to the people who are in charge of these workers. I spoke with the city manager on this issue. There have been meetings and discussions about this issue. Christine Theran is our community leader on this subject in our neighborhood. We appreciate being heard, but we would appreciate even more some respect and courtesy.
Eric Polson: I didn't get a call on this particular incident. It would be helpful to at least identify what the truck is carrying or unloading, and then we can track it back to the source.

Jeff Johnston: Then the problem here is that we have to be held accountable, when it should be the agencies. Also, who is going to police the gate at Hamilton Parkway and Todd Road?
Eric Polson: Right now there are four locks on the Hamilton gate. The City and the North Marin Water District have locks, as well as do our current contractors and subcontractors. It may be time to think about new locks, since there have been many keys distributed. The whole point of putting up the gate and barrier was to keep kids out of the area, and also to keep trucks from pulling in there at inappropriate hours.

Jeff Johnston: The homeowners at Newport are affected by this nuisance; there are certain parameters that have to be agreed upon by the workers and the agencies. We do not want to have a vigilante system of homeowners.

Eric Polson: When something is occurring at that hour of the morning, there is nothing wrong with calling the police.

Jeff Johnston: I am on a first name basis with the police and they have better things to do.

Christine Theran: The piece of equipment that was being taken off of the truck was a piece of "heavy equipment." [Christine was holding up a photo in an informative booklet provided by SPN at a recent town hall meeting]
Eric Polson: That was a heavy off-highway truck.
Christine Theran: I think the word respect is of particular interest. There was a call made to Ed Keller's office about the early morning disruption.

Liz Lewis: When I was walking around Pacheco Creek this morning, I noticed a lot of trash out there. Can you have the contractors pick up the trash around Pacheco Creek?
Eric Polson: I was out there recently and was also disgusted about those cups. That area is Shea Homes operation, and I don't have a contact for them.

Pat Eklund: Have you talked to Shea about the trucks and the problems that we have been having?
Eric Polson: No, if you give me a contact I would be happy to call them.

Nancy Foster: Will the pipeline be installed or is it already?
Eric Polson: Both. A piece of the pipeline is already in place across the marsh. The marsh is habitat for the California clapper rail and the salt marsh harvest mouse, which are endangered species. The breeding season for the clapper rail is February 1st through August 31st, so we cannot do any work in this area during that time. Before we import dredge material from Oakland, we will install a pipeline in the bay and throughout the site. The pipeline in the bay will likely be floated in as large pieces.

Nancy Foster: Are these pipelines permanent?
Eric Polson: We may be out here for 5-7 years.

Laurent: Why are they dredging in Bel Marin Keys?
Eric Polson: They want access to the bay. Everyone has docks in that area. They have not dredged this lagoon seriously since the lock was put in during the 1960s. It is all about navigation and to some extent flood control.

Army BRAC Update: Ed Keller, BRAC Environmental Coordinator (BEC)
Documentation and Next Steps
Mr. Keller presented a report on documentation and current fieldwork.

Documentation

- Coastal Salt Marsh Remedial Action Workplan: Distributed in November 2004.
- Revegetation Monitoring and Adaptive Management Plan: Distributed in November 2004.

- Pickleweed Removal and Barrier Fence Installation Plan: Distributed in November 2004.

Both the Revegetation Monitoring and Adaptive Management Plan and the Pickleweed Removal and Barrier Fence Installation Plan were delivered to the Fish and Wildlife Service and the agencies for the Biological Opinion. The agencies have to approve these plans before we start our fieldwork out there. The Army performed an excavation in the unlined perimeter drainage ditch and stockpiled those soils.

Field Work

- South of Runway DDT Hotspot Investigation: Complete
    - Excavation scheduled for next Summer
- Unlined PDD DDT Hotspot
    - Initial Excavation and supplemental excavation were completed.
    - Additional confirmation samples indicated that the excavation was successful.
    - All soils were transported off site. Eighty percent disposed of as Class II and twenty percent disposed of as Class I (hazardous).

The Army tried to keep tight controls on the hours that our contractors were on site taking off our loads of soil. There were 12 different trucking companies that came that day to transport 12 loads. The hazardous waste went to a landfill in Kettleman City and the Class II soils went to the Altamont landfill.

Lance McMahan: How many cubic yards is that?
Ed Keller: Just less than 1,000 cubic yards total.

Matt McCarron: Where did the Class I soils come from?
Ed Keller: Out of the ditch. All of the soils came out of the same general area. It was the drainage ditch on the north corner of the property that had some elevated DDTs. This portion of the ditch was not lined with concrete, and we found some residuals in that area.

Nancy Foster: Is Ignacio Reservoir Pacheco Pond?
Ed Keller: Yes.

Ross: On what criteria were they classified as Class I soils?
Ed Keller: They were greater than 1 part per million total DDTs.

<u>Coastal Salt Marsh</u>
Approximately 30,000 cubic yards of material is being excavated out of the coastal salt marsh. A majority is coming from an area that sits outside of the pump stations in the northern end of the Army BRAC parcel. There are some other smaller removals by the boat dock, along the historic drainage ditch, Area 14, and a former sewage treatment plant outfall by the bay. There are some

heavy metal concerns around the former sewage treatment plan outfall pipeline, and at the burn pit there were concerns for PCBs and some metals. The other excavations are small.

The Army is scheduled to complete the excavations by January 31st because the clapper rail nesting season begins February 1st. The Army also has a clapper rail survey taking place which will let them know the actual parts of the marsh where they can continue to excavate.

Nancy Foster: Are the clapper rails here all year round, or do they migrate?
Ed Keller: I don't know if they migrate, but they are here February 1st through August, so the only time we can excavate and avoid them is September through January, which is also the worst time to excavate since it is the middle of the winter. Our BA does not preclude us from working during the nesting season, but we do have to take measures to make sure we are not impacting them.

Once we complete the excavations, several of them will be backfilled. We have one acre of permanently destroyed habitat, and 5 acres of temporary destroyed habitat, and we are at that 6 acre limit with the sites that we have right now. One acre will not be backfilled, that property is adjacent to existing ditches, or adjacent to the bay. It would be difficult to maintain a backfilled area in these spots. Basically a small pond will be created.

Once the soils are all excavated, right now they are going into a plastic lined cell that is covered once filled; we will sample all of the material to characterize the soils. If any of the soil comes up as being Class I (hazardous waste), then it will be disposed of off-site within 90 days. The rest of the soils will be held onsite until the end of the summer. The soil should dry out significantly by then, and that will reduce the cost for disposal because we pay by the ton. Also, I can time it so that we can get all of the soils offloaded at the same time from the various excavations. That would happen late next summer.

Susan Stompe: Where are you getting the materials for the backfill?
Ed Keller: We are pulling all of the material from the onsite borrow pit. We had criteria on those materials that we had to meet. We did a grain size analysis to make sure that the soils were appropriate for a coastal salt marsh. The chemical analyses were quite broad. The only thing not sampled for were VOCs and PCBs. All of the soils came out as useable. The soils passed the Water Board's criteria.

Marucia Britto: What about the berms that are on the airfield that are closer to the levee?
Ed Keller: All of those were sampled. There was one pile up near this north end that Jim had offloaded off of the property because it was not suitable for use on site. About half of those piles were approved by the Water Board for unrestricted use on site, and half were approved for use on site with 3-feet of cover. A lot of

those piles still exist. The Coastal Conservancy is working on monitoring a test fill on the levee. There is some activity in the area where we are keeping the stockpiles because we are using some of the restricted material to build our bathtubs, which is a berm of soil with the contaminated materials inside. All of the soil is earmarked for onsite use.

Eric Polson: We are currently constructing the new Hamilton Partners levee test fill. They aren't doing much now because of the weather, but they will be using some of those soil piles and have cleared some of the riprap off of the Hamilton Partners levee. All of the soil they are using is approved for unrestricted use.

Pat Eklund: That might be very interesting for the homeowners to know.
Eric Polson: It would be prime for an interpretive site.

Laurent Meillier: What is a "bathtub"?
Ed Keller: They create a cell using a berm about 3-4 feet tall. These containment cells are rectangular and about 45 feet wide and 750 feet long. They line this with plastic and dump the contaminated material within the cell until they get to 750 feet in length and then cover it in plastic so that rainwater will not percolate through the material. The bathtub will then hold in the moisture. The material does not stack more than about 4 feet tall, so the cells are about maybe 4-5 feet at the centerline.

Naomi Feger: You are characterizing this soil?
Ed Keller: We will have a sampling protocol to characterize this soil as I described earlier. You can only hold Class I soils on-site for 90 days.

Sue Lattanzio: How do you guarantee you have removed all toxins after an excavation?
Ed Keller: We sampled prior to excavating and we are excavating out to edges that are agreeable.

Naomi Feger: Ed did a lot of sampling in October trying to delineate those boundaries. It has eroded the construction season.
Ed Keller: We had an onsite lab running 10-12 hours a day for two weeks running samples. On the large areas, we have done some sampling to limit the depth of excavation.

Matt McCarron: Does the excavation include the burn pit area? What about the east levee construction debris disposal area? I couldn't tell how deep that was.
Ed Keller: Yes, it does include the burn pit area. We had the east levee construction debris disposal area at four feet depth but continue to sample.

Marucia Britto: What are the contaminants of concern?
Ed Keller: Pesticides (DDT) and metals are common, some petroleum has been found. There were some low level PCBs and some petroleum that will be left at

depth. At the end of the former sewage treatment plant, there is some mercury and silver that was found. These levels were comparatively high. Petroleum was found around Area 14 and metals were found along the outfall ditch.

The Army has a requirement from the Fish and Wildlife Service to remove all of the pickelweed vegetation, which is salt marsh harvest mouse habitat, by hand. The Army has a biologist on site that works to clear the mice from the areas before we begin clearing them. During the operation the Army came across 32 salt marsh harvest mice. Twenty-four were relocated, six were driven out of the area, and there were 2 fatalities. The types of activities that you might see at a distance are some long reach excavators that are out in the marsh plain which are supported on top of crane mats which distribute their weight. Up on the levee there is a clamshell crane that is taking materials and loading them into trucks that are taking the material to the holding cells.

Laurent Meillier: The pipeline will not be used for the project?
Ed Keller: We removed the FSTP pipeline as a potential source of pollution. The supports will stay in place since I have no money to do any site improvements. The supports are creosote treated wood.

Once all the sites are backfilled, the Army will talk to the Water Board about removing the fences. The fences are initially erected because of the mice, so when they remove their vegetation they do not enter the worksite. The Army constructed a rock road out to the burn pit, and once they are done with their project, the road will be used by the Coastal Conservancy.

Laurent Meillier: Why did you not use the composite material?
Ed Keller: We could have used crane mats to do this, but there was a consistency determination from BCDC to construct the road to maintain the dredge pipeline. This road has been degraded from other operations, and is almost impassible. Building the road will help us in the future, since it was needed for the wetland project also.

Nancy Foster: When was the pipeline constructed?
Ed Keller: Three years ago. There are areas of the structure where we are not excavating that will remain there.

The boat dock, at least the portion that we will be excavating under, has been removed by Army excavators. All of the material that they are excavating under is being removed. There are areas of the structure that will remain, where the Army is not excavating.

Naomi Feger: It looks better, but there are still portions of the boat dock there, further away from the levee.
Ed Keller: They are much more difficult to get onto now.

On the main airfield the Army is completing the sampling required by the ROD/RAD for the removed revetments. The wetland project removed half a dozen of these revetment pads that were in the potential path of the future channel. Under some of those revetments there was some petroleum. The Army will wait until the spring to sample those and determine if there is action required to remove soils at those sites. There is a skeet range site, and a testing range. A firing range had some high lead concentrations along the levee, so the Army will be doing some sampling there in a couple of months. They will also be doing some work on the DDT hotspot. If excavations are necessary, the Army will need to prepare Remedial Design documents. We hope to offload all soils around August, and then close the doors to the office. The Army is still working on POL Hill: there is a yearly monitoring that occurs in February and this should be our last monitoring event there as there have been no fluctuations in the plume in the last four years. The Army will be requesting site closeout on this location this summer.

Nancy Foster: Is that an MTBE Plume and is likely to migrate?
Ed Keller: No, it is diesel and it is in the fractures of the bedrock and there is not a lot you can do with it. It hasn't migrated since the late 80s. The plume is small, about twice size of this room.

Jim Davies: Are you still getting seasonal fluctuations in those wells?
Ed Keller: We have not done quarterly monitoring in those wells for three years.

Nancy Foster: Is the old reservoir going to stay or be moved?
Ed Keller: That would be a good question for Pat.
Pat Eklund: We don't have any money right now.

Regulatory Agency Comments
Naomi Feger: The Water Board did not approve the Coastal Salt Marsh Remedial Action Work Plan and we have been working with Ed on some of those issues. If funding is not forthcoming, how will you get the work done and be out of there by September 1st?
Ed Keller: I do not have any funding earmarked in my budget right now for the east levee disposal area. There are several issues that need to fall into place, we need to get information about clapper rail nests, and we also need to find out what is going on with the debris in each of the holes we are digging and what the solution is.

Naomi Feger: What is the timing on getting additional funding?
Ed Keller: There are two major times of the year, and one is in January. The second time of year is June, when there are funding meetings. Those are not necessarily the only two time of year I can get heard though. Our estimates for construction went up from 22,000 to 30,000 yards over the last four weeks. That increase is eating up everything I have in hand, so I need to go back for more funding. Once we have a final number we will go back to management.

Laurent Meillier: We have been talking to the Navy about shutting off the biosparging on the NEX gas station as well as about the definition of the leading edge of the plume. We are also working with the Army on the submittal of the Corrective Action Work plan which is due March 2005.

Meeting Wrap-up and Adjournment: Ed Keller

Mr. Keller announced that the next RAB meeting will be held on April 13th, 2005. Tunstall Lang has not been to the last three meetings. The RAB charter states that we would select a RAB community co-chair. What is the preference of the RAB members? Should we contact Tunstall to find out what is going on, or should we nominate someone to take over as the new co-chair? The RAB guidelines specify that there just needs to be a majority of the RAB members at the meeting.

Pat Elkund: Have you tried to contact Tunstall?
Ed Keller: We have sent emails and left messages.

Jim Davies: She is a friend of mine and I ran into her and she has been taking care of some personal tragedies, so she has been unavailable.

Ed Keller: So let's make this decision at the next RAB meeting.