

**Fort Bragg, California
March 28, 2005
Town Hall**

The Agency Members of the Fort Bragg Redevelopment Agency met in regular session on the above date at the hour of 7:21 p.m., in Town Hall, southwest corner of North Main and Laurel Streets (363 North Main Street), Fort Bragg, with Chair Dave Turner presiding.

ROLL CALL as acknowledged by Chair Turner

Present: Agency members Dan Gjerde, Brian Baltierra, Doug Hammerstrom, Jere Melo, and Dave Turner.

AGENDA REVIEW

CHAIR'S RECOGNITION AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. PUBLIC HEARING

2. CONDUCT OF BUSINESS

A. Receive Presentation from Georgia-Pacific's Environmental Consultants (Acton Mickelson Environmental, Inc.) Regarding Environmental Remediation on the Mill Site Property

Mayor/Chair Turner convened the Fort Bragg Redevelopment Agency in joint session with the Fort Bragg City Council at 7:21 p.m.

Mayor/Chair Turner noted that the intent of this presentation is to inform the Council and citizens about Georgia-Pacific's Site Assessment activities. Although this item is not a public hearing, the Council is requesting public comments and questions this evening be submitted in writing. The Question Cards are available at the back table and may be given to the City Clerk or Police Chief. The Council asks that people refrain from comment and submit any questions on the Question Cards.

Presentation: Carol Stephens, Georgia-Pacific, thanked the Council for giving them time on the agenda tonight and noted that their goal this evening is to brief the community on the environmental activity conducted to date. She Introduced Julie Raming from Georgia-Pacific's Atlanta office, and the representatives from Acton Mickelson Environmental, Inc. Barbara Mickelson reviewed their presentation as contained in the handout.

Mayor/Chair Turner recessed the meeting at 7:59 p.m., reconvening at 8:10 p.m.

Mayor/Chair Turner introduced Tuck Vath from North Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB). Vath noted that he is the Senior Engineering Geologist, and the RWQCB's job is to see to the clean-up of the Georgia-Pacific mill site. They see this as a very high priority site and have assigned two staff members to work on the project; also, the Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA) has been brought on board. Craig Hunt, RWQCB, stated that their office began looking at data in 2003 and is responsible for the Phase 1, 2 and 3 studies and reports. Various information is available on the RWQCB website and he would be happy to add anyone to the cc list for information. The following question were asked and answers given by the consultant:

No.	Question	Answer
1.	What is the process in terms of assessment and remediation?	After assessment is completed a Remedial Action Plan (RAP) will be prepared and approved prior to remediation. There are opportunities to do interim remedial measure if appropriate.
2.	What happens if something is found during remediation that wasn't included in the RAP?	The consultant doing the remediation would need to work with the RWQCB and risk assessment group to determine what should be done. The RAP has to be somewhat

Redevelopment Agency Minutes

March 28, 2005

Page 2

<u>No.</u>	<u>Question</u>	<u>Answer</u>
		flexible.
3.	What are the limits for soil sampling under the foundations?	Spots are identified on the foundation that are likely areas for contamination and those are sampled before the foundation is removed. A grid is then prepared over the site and core samples are taken.
4.	At what point does the "end use determination" come in the process? It was noted that the City's General Plan encourages residential development in the commercial zone; it was suggested that the commercial area should be cleaned to the higher residential level.	When the risk assessment levels for cleanup are determined. This will be a decision between Georgia-Pacific, the City and an ultimate end user. OEHHA will also be involved in determining the risk assessment.
5.	Is there a schedule for removal of the transite pipe?	Not at this time but the contractor hired to remove the pipe will need to follow procedures for asbestos removal.
6.	The environmental concern regarding burning of un-allowed items doesn't seem to be adequately addressed; does the consultant acknowledge that substances were burned that were not permitted?	They understand that did happen but no residue of these substances were found in the soil.
7.	How deep are the soil borings?	It depends on the groundwater level. They range in depth from 4' to 40'.
8.	Who establishes the standards for cleanup?	The RWQCB and OEHHA.
9.	Have you ever worked on projects performed under the Polanco Act process?	No, we have not.
10.	When do you think the RAP will be approved?	By August 2006 but it depends on the approving agencies.
11.	How long do you anticipate the cleanup will take?	Excavation and hauling of soils will take a matter of months but other areas with hydrocarbons that reached the groundwater may take longer (perhaps a number of years).
12.	Any idea of the cost?	The preliminary estimates on the work to be performed this summer – removal of foundations and soil excavation – is in excess of \$1 million.
13.	Would you be willing to come back and provide presentations as you go through the assessments under Work Plans 1 and 2?	Believe that Georgia-Pacific would support that.
14.	How do you decide what type of remedial action is proposed?	We look at the cost and timing and balance that with the end result that is most reliable.
15.	A statement from Thais Mazur was read which, among other things, mentioned the use of Penta and the Lowe's operation on the mill site.	Samples of soil and groundwater have been done and no Penta was detected but additional sampling will be done during Work Plan 2. Lowe's operation is using a fungicide type product in a secure building with an asphalt foundation.
16.	Who signs off on the remediation plan?	The RWQCB.

Redevelopment Agency Minutes

March 28, 2005

Page 3

No.	Question	Answer
17.	How will the consultant determine the exposure area of the contamination where spot samples measured significant levels of pollutant?	Additional samples will be taken until a level of acceptance is reached.
18.	What Aroclors were in the spilled PCBs? Why was Aroclor 1254 not measured? Are analyses of PCBs congener specific?	The report reviewed by consultant didn't have that level of details. She read the list of Aroclors found on the site (1242, 1248, and 1260) Aroclor 1254 was measured and none was detected. Mickelson stated she would need to check on whether the analyses were congener specific.
19.	North Coast Action was told the mill pond was cemented over before the EPA arrived. This is where the PCB capacitors were thrown. How could they have done a sample?	The report from the Health Department stated that they tested at the location the capacitors were said to have been. They also checked the dredge materials.
20.	Why were samples for PCBs most commonly tested at the shallower depths since there was a newsworthy PCB spill there in 1989?	Sampling was conducted based on work plans prepared by TRC and approved by the RWCQB.
21.	How can the public access all of these datasets in raw and processed form?	The RWCQB maintains a website where the information can be obtained.
22.	Regarding the collection of concrete and soil samples in Work Plan 1, how dense is the grid and how deep are the samples?	They vary depending on the site. The depth depends on how quickly groundwater is reached or when non-detection readings are reached.
23.	Can the consultant provide a list of COPCs?	This can be provided but was not available at the meeting.
24.	What is the depth of the monitoring wells?	Depends on the depth of the water.
25.	There were numerous reports of hazardous waste burning, cementing over of toxic dumps, and deep burial of toxins; have these been taken into consideration in selecting sites and depths of sampling?	Areas have been identified, geophysical surveys conducted and the depth will be determined when the excavation is done.
26.	Which breakdown products (of PCBs) were detected)? Name the methods, equipment and standards used for testing.	Unable to answer without more data; the database and lab results will be checked and answers provided to staff at City Hall and/or RWQCB.
27.	Have studies been proposed on the estimation of dioxin that has bonded with water to form sulfurous acid?	That dioxin chemical formation would not happen.
28.	What detection limits were used in all analytical work?	The laboratory limits vary by constituent; this information would need to be pulled from the database. Some of this information is on the RWQCB website and some is on an ftp site.
29.	How were materials used for cleanup of the PCB spill disposed of?	Records show it was bagged or drummed, manifested and hauled off-site by Ensco.
30.	On the TPH analysis – what column was used, length, carrier gas, detection limits,	This information would need to come from the laboratory's quality assurance manual which

Redevelopment Agency Minutes**March 28, 2005****Page 4**

<u>No.</u>	<u>Question</u>	<u>Answer</u>
	replicates?	is an Appendix to the reports and work plans they submitted.
31.	Where are the control samples and where were they taken from?	USGS data was used for control samples.
32.	Was TPH the only HC tested?	PAH was also tested.
33.	Have any bioremediation techniques been considered such as Paul Stammer's work with oyster mushrooms for oil clean-up?	This has been discussed and could be done by either excavating the soil and doing it above ground or by adding oxygen to the subsurface. No method has been determined yet.
34.	Did they test for dibenzodioxins; if not, why not?	They did not test on-site for dibenzodioxins but that will be done in the next phase.
35.	Has there, or will there, be any testing of the Solider Bay sediment or fish?	That will depend on discussions with RWQCB and OEHHA.
36.	What have been the shallowest soil core samples obtained and what percentage of samples were obtained at each depth?	Shallowest is 6" to 1'; would need to go back to the database for the percentages.
37.	How can the public be sure the toxic reports and soil samples are thorough and valid?	Various regulatory agencies review the information including the RWQCB and OEHHA.
38.	How was sampling effort allocated on the site?	Sampling was determined based on operations on the site; determined by looking at photographs, buildings and records, interviews with former employees, and areas identified by the RWQCB.
39.	Was there any use of SPMDs?	Would need to check database.
40.	Is the question of toxics reaching open waters (ponds, streams, ocean) being addressed in the ecological assessment? Is the partial movement of contaminants into the pond and ocean being addressed?	Believe it is.
41.	How big are the detection areas (i.e. how small is "small")?	Varies by constituents. Some encompass the area of the mobile equipment shop and will be evaluated to determine the extent of contamination.
42.	The depth of some bore holes appear to vary; where does the sample come from?	Soil samples are collected every five feet to a depth of 20 feet. Groundwater wells are purged and then water is sampled as it comes into the well.
43.	Looking at the Phase 2 Report, it doesn't mention the Aroclor asked about earlier unless it is in the "Other Aroclor" section.	Would need to review the report and database.
44.	How were samples collected and stored? Where are the samples archived?	Some were collected using a "direct push" method using a hollow stem auger. Groundwater samples were sometimes collected in a grab method. In some cases monitoring wells were constructed and sampled. There is a specific protocol used

Redevelopment Agency Minutes

March 28, 2005

Page 5

<u>No.</u>	<u>Question</u>	<u>Answer</u>
		for each type of sample collected. Mickelson was not sure where the samples were archived.
45.	How did the sampling plan come about?	It was developed after reviewing operations of the site; it was then reviewed and approved by RWQCB.
46.	What hydrogeological databases were used?	Unsure of specifics; stored in an Access Database.
47.	What geophysical anomalies were found?	This was done by others and a number of anomalies were identified.
48.	Are historical sites, including the Indian burial grounds, being cordoned off?	Archeological study was done and those areas with high potential for prehistoric and cultural significance have been identified. An archeologist will be on-site, as well as a representative of the Native American community.
49.	Is any of the subsurface transite pipe under the building foundations being removed?	Not sure at this point. If found, then a licensed contractor will be hired to remove them.

Mayor/Chair Turner recessed the meeting at 9:08 p.m., reconvening at 9:15 p.m.

<u>No.</u>	<u>Question</u>	<u>Answer</u>
50.	Will all transit pipe be removed?	Not sure at what point, but it will be removed by a licensed contractor.
51.	Does Acton Mickelson plan to meticulously investigate the last 17 points of community knowledge in the March 25 letter of the RWQCB to Julie Raming of Georgia-Pacific?	The consultant has not had enough time to thoroughly review the letter so is not prepared to answer at this time.
52.	3 D's geophysical report was only for parcels 3 and 10; will the rest of the site be done?	Additional work will be done as part of Work Plan 1 and 2.
53.	Is the area below North Cliff Hotel (where the dredgings from the Noyo Harbor are) part of the Georgia-Pacific site?	No.
54.	What is TPHd? What levels were found?	TPHd stands for Total Petroleum Hydrocarbons as Diesel. 720 parts per million were found in groundwater as well as a small amount of diesel floating on the water surface.
55.	How were foundations to be removed identified?	They were identified based on the need for permits and the long lead time to remove the foundations.
56.	How were buried debris identified.	With geophysical studies.
57.	Earlier you said Aroclor 1254 was tested for and not detected; then you said you don't know if it was tested for. Which is true?	Would need to go back to review databases but the ones on the slides are ones that were detected; others were tested for but not detected.
58.	At 13 sample points soil cores were taken down to a certain depth and samples were analyzed for different toxins at both 6" and	Acton Mickelson was not involved in the work plan but assume the logic was that the PCBs didn't migrate far in the soil. Additional

Redevelopment Agency Minutes

March 28, 2005

Page 6

<u>No.</u>	<u>Question</u>	<u>Answer</u>
	that greater depth. Why were PCBs tested for only in the 6" soil and not the greater depth?	sampling and review of data will be determined as they move into Work Plan 2.

Mayor/Chair Turner thanked Acton Mickelson for their presentation. Tuck Vath, RWQCB, stated that they heard a lot of concern tonight from the Council and Community. He noted that copies of all reports are provided to the City, are available in hard copy at the RWQCB office, and are available electronically on the RWQCB website. There will be an opportunity for public input when the Remedial Action Plan is ready for review. Council/Agency Member Melo thanked the staff members from the RWQCB for attending noting that it is a rare thing to have them take an interest in a problem that is specific to Fort Bragg. Council/Agency Member Hammerstrom thanked the public for the great questions and urged them to stay involved, ask question, and inform the Council so they can make good decisions. #200

Mayor/Chair Turner recessed the Fort Bragg Redevelopment Agency at 9:26 p.m., reconvening at 10:53 p.m.

3. COMMENTS ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS

- A. Staff Comments**
- B. Public Comments**

4. CONSENT CALENDAR

Moved by Baltierra, seconded by Gjerde, to accept the Consent Calendar, as received, with the actions noted, namely:

- A. Matters from Committees**
- B. Approval of Minutes**
 - (1) Minutes of March 14, 2005.**

VOTE: Ayes: Councilmembers Gjerde, Baltierra, Hammerstrom, Melo, and Mayor Turner.

5. MATTERS FROM AGENCY MEMBERS

6. CLOSED SESSION

Chair Turner adjourned the meeting at 10:54 p.m.

DAVE TURNER, Chair

ATTEST:

**Cynthia M. VanWormer, CMC
Secretary**

INDEXED: _____(____)

IMAGED: _____(____)