

CITY OF RICHMOND
Pt. Molate Community Advisory Committee

Tuesday, January 17, 2012 6:30 PM
Multi-Purpose Room, 440 Civic Center Plaza

AGENDA

Members:

Bruce Beyaert
Vice-Chair

Stephen M. Clark

Joan Garrett
Chair

Dorothy Gilbert

Toni Hanna

David Helvarg

Jim Hite

Jeanne Kortz

Eduardo Martinez

Steven Rosing

Charles T. Smith

Nina G. Smith

Pam Stello

Mary H. Sundance

Eileen Whitty

1. **Call to Order** (1 min.)
2. **Roll Call** (1 min.)
3. **Welcome and Meeting Procedures** (1 min.)

Individuals who would like to address the committee on matters not listed on the agenda may do so under Open Forum. Please file a speaker's card with the note taker prior to the commencement of Open Forum. Individuals who want to comment on an individual item, please file a speaker's card before the item is called. The standard amount of time for each speaker will be three minutes.

At 8:30 PM, any items remaining on the agenda that require immediate attention may be taken out of turn, as necessary. All other items will be continued to another or the following committee meeting in order to make fair and attentive decisions. This meeting adjourns at 9:00 PM. The meeting may be extended by a majority vote of the committee.

4. **Agenda Review and Adoption** (2 min.)
The order in which items will be heard may be adjusted at this time. In addition, items may be removed from or placed on the Consent Calendar at this time.
5. **Announcements through the Chair** (3 min.)
6. **Open Forum** (3 minutes per person limit)
7. **Presentations, Discussion & Action Items** (70 min.)
 - a. Presentation of Western Drive/I-580 Interchange Work and Bridge Deck Replacements through 2014 – Cristina Ferraz, PE, CalTrans (20 min.)
 - b. Presentation South Shoreline Community Advisory Group – Sherry Padgett (40 min.)
 - c. Presentation of the San Pablo Peninsula Dutra Barge Project – Bruce Beyaert (10 min.)
8. **Staff Reports** (5 min.)
Following discussion of each item, the Committee may vote to make recommendations to staff or to the City Council.
 - a. Committee Log for PMCAC inquiries to staff, contractors – Craig K. Murray (5 min.)

CITY OF RICHMOND
Pt. Molate Community Advisory Committee

Tuesday, January 17, 2012 6:30 PM
Multi-Purpose Room, 440 Civic Center Plaza

AGENDA

Members:

Bruce Beyaert
Vice-Chair

Stephen M. Clark

Joan Garrett
Chair

Dorothy Gilbert

Toni Hanna

David Helvarg

Jim Hite

Jeanne Kortz

Eduardo Martinez

Steven Rosing

Charles T. Smith

Nina G. Smith

Pam Stello

Mary H. Sundance

Eileen Whitty

9. Consent Calendar (2 min.)

Items on the consent calendar are considered matters requiring little or no discussion and will be acted upon in one motion

- a. APPROVE – December 19, 2011 minutes

10. Future Agenda Items (5 min.)

11. City Council Liaison Reports (20 min.)

- a. Report by Councilmember/Mayor McLaughlin regarding recent issues in Richmond relevant to the Advisory Committee.
- b. PMCAC appointment status – Marilyn Langlois (10 min.)

12. Chair and Sub-Committee Reports (25 min.)

Following discussion of each item, the Committee may vote to make recommendations to staff or to the City Council.

- a. Clean-Up and Restoration (20 min.)
- b. Finance
- c. Legal

13. Adjournment

14. Scheduled Meetings

- a. Committee Meeting – Tuesday, February 21, 2012, 6:30 PM, Multi-Purpose Room, 440 Civic Center Plaza

This meeting is held in a building that is accessible to people with disabilities. Persons with disabilities, who require auxiliary aids of services using city facilities, services or programs or would like information of the city's compliance with the American Disabilities Act (ADA) of 1990, contact: Rochelle Monk, City of Richmond (510) 620-6511 (voice).

Pt. Molate Community Advisory Committee Staff Liaison Contact: Craig K. Murray (510) 307-8140, craig_murray@ci.richmond.ca.us. Agenda and minute information on the PMCAC can be found on the City Clerk's web location: <http://ca-richmond2.civicplus.com/index.aspx?NID=2442>

FACT SHEET

Scofield Avenue and Western Drive Bridge Deck Replacement Project



Project Location: On Interstate 580 (I-580) at the east approach to the Richmond - San Rafael Bridge, in the City of Richmond, in Contra Costa County.

Scope: The scope of the project is to replace highway bridge decks at the Scofield Avenue Undercrossing and the Western Drive Undercrossing. The Scofield Avenue Undercrossing consists of two bridges: I-580 eastbound traveled way/Western Drive eastbound on ramp and the westbound I-580 traveled way. The Western Drive Undercrossing consists of one bridge: westbound I-580 traveled way. Three bridge decks will be replaced.

Need: These freeway bridge decks have deteriorated and must be replaced. Field inspection indicated the bridges are in poor to critical condition.

Purpose: To maintain serviceability of the bridges, as well as safety of the travelling public.

Status: The project contract documents are being prepared for construction bid advertisement.

Project Schedule: Construction is scheduled to start in the Summer 2012 and completed by early 2014.

Funding: The total cost of the project is about \$24 million, and approximately \$18 million is programmed for construction. The funding source is the 2010 State Highway Operations and Protection Program (SHOPP).

Issues of Note: 1) The project will require closure of the Western Drive eastbound on ramp for an extended period of time. Vehicles will be detoured west across the Richmond-San Rafael Bridge and back. Caltrans is looking into ways to minimize the duration of the closure and to provide an alternate detour and 2) For safety reasons, cyclists will not be permitted to ride along the outside freeway shoulders during construction. Caltrans will provide a bicycle shuttle service from points east and west of the construction site.

Contact Information: Allyn Amsk, Public Information Officer at 510-286-5445 or Cristina Ferraz, Project Manager, at 510-286-3890.

January 12, 2012

7A1

Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ)

Interstate 580 Scofield Avenue and Western Drive Bridge Deck Replacement Project

I. GENERAL PROJECT INFORMATION

1. **What is the location of the project?** The project is located on Interstate 580 (I-580) at the east approach to the Richmond - San Rafael Bridge, in the City of Richmond, in Contra Costa County.
2. **What is the scope of the project?** The scope of the project is to replace highway bridge decks at the Scofield Avenue Undercrossing and the Western Drive Undercrossing. The Scofield Avenue Undercrossing consists of two bridges: I-580 eastbound traveled way/Western Drive eastbound on ramp and the westbound I-580 traveled way. The Western Drive Undercrossing consists of one bridge: westbound I-580 traveled way. Three bridge decks will be replaced.
3. **What is the need for the project?** These freeway bridge decks have deteriorated and must be replaced. In March 2010 Caltrans' structural engineers inspected the bridges, and the inspection indicated the bridges were in poor to critical condition. For years, Caltrans Maintenance forces have patched deck holes and spalls, sometimes under emergency conditions, in order to maintain serviceability and public safety.
4. **What is the schedule of the project?**
 - Start Construction: Summer 2012
 - End Construction: Spring 2014
5. **What is the cost of the project?** The total cost of the project is about \$24 million, and approximately \$18 million is programmed for construction. The funding source is the 2010 State Highway Operations and Protection Program (SHOPP).

II. TRAFFIC HANDLING DURING CONSTRUCTION

1. **Will there be detours during construction?** Yes. I-580 currently has three lanes in each direction within the project limits. In order to provide adequate space during construction to replace the westbound bridge decks, I-580 will be reduced to two lanes in each direction. The four open lanes will be shifted to the south within the space currently occupied by the existing eastbound lanes. A concrete barrier will separate eastbound and westbound traffic. The weekday peak hour volumes for westbound and eastbound I-580 are about 2800 and 3800 vehicles per hour, respectively. The two lanes in each direction are expected to be able to handle these volumes without causing significant additional traffic delays. In order to replace the decks of the I-580 eastbound traveled way/Western Drive eastbound on ramp and also to maintain the four lanes of freeway traffic during the bridge deck replacement work on the other bridges, the eastbound Western Drive on ramp must be closed. This eastbound on ramp enters the freeway in the median area where construction work is to be performed and this is the same area where traffic must be shifted to complete the work, hence the need to close the on ramp.

2. How long will the Western Drive on ramp be closed? Has Caltrans looked at other options to minimize the ramp closure? It is anticipated that the on ramp will be closed for less than one year. In order to minimize the length of the closure, Caltrans staff is examining shifting the staging sequence so that the Western Drive on ramp deck replacement work is completed earlier. Caltrans is also looking into additional incentives/disincentives to be included in the contract documents in order to encourage the contractor to open the on ramp at the earliest possible opportunity. Employing double shifts would save time and, in addition, the use of high early strength accelerated concrete would also minimize the length of time the concrete needs to cure and therefore minimize the closure of the on ramp.

3. How will the businesses/residents be affected? There are approximately six businesses (Chevron Refinery, including Chevron Rod & Gun Club, Dutra Group, East Brother Light Station, Fury Sport Fishing, HALO Group, Inc.) that will be affected by this closure. We have contacted all the businesses to provide them information about the project and to inform them of the ramp closure. Point San Pablo Yacht Harbor has approximately 70 tenants and 33 full-time residents. There are 50 or less full-time residents on Western Drive and surrounding area. We will be working closely with the City to identify and contact those who use the Pt. Molate area for outdoor recreation. In addition, Caltrans will coordinate with the City of Richmond Redevelopment Agency's upcoming construction contract for site improvements at the old Naval shipyard area. These residents, businesses, and area visitors will be informed of the ramp closure and will be invited to an open house informational meeting to be held prior to start of construction.

4. How will the motorists taking the Western Drive on ramp go eastbound? The current proposal is to have eastbound motorists who use the Western Drive on ramp to go across the bridge, exit at the San Quentin interchange, turn left at the end of the off ramp, and turn left at the on ramp to eastbound I-580. The detour across the bridge and back is about 9 miles long and the extra travel time will be about 10 minutes regardless of the time of day. Approximately 560 and 290 vehicles per day will be affected on weekdays and weekends, respectively. Special toll-free arrangements will be made for those who live and work in the Pt. Molate area for detoured travel in the eastbound 580 direction from Western Drive. Detailed information regarding the toll passes will be provided prior to construction.

5. Why can't vehicles drive on the existing bike path that goes under I -580 to go eastbound instead of taking the 9-mile detour? The existing bike path is narrow and does not have enough vertical clearance to permit trucks on it. Caltrans is looking into the possibility of allowing passenger vehicles drive on the bike path during the day, guided by a pilot car. Caltrans is determining the geometrics and safety of the facility and addressing resource agencies permitting and right of way easement issues.

6. What happens if there is a local emergency during the closure of the eastbound 580 on ramp?

Caltrans will be working closely with the City and regional emergency services agencies in advance of construction. We will make sure our toll and traffic operations protocols are in place to allow an immediate emergency response.

III. ENVIRONMENTAL PROCESS

1. Was there a California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) review? Yes, Caltrans performed a CEQA review and determined that the project qualified for a Categorical Exemption (CE) under Class 1d (restoration or rehabilitation of deteriorated or damaged structures or

facilities). A categorical exemption/categorical exclusion (CE/CE) determination was issued on 3-16-2009. Caltrans considered but did not find any unusual circumstances that would create the possibility of the project having a significant effect requiring a higher-level environmental document.

2. Was there any outreach during the CEQA review? Although there was no public meeting and no documents were distributed as a result of the CE process, there was outreach that primarily targeted the bicycle community. Caltrans held a stakeholders meeting with the Bay Conservation and Development Commission (BCDC) on April 14, 2010. The stakeholders that participated were BCDC, the East Bay Bike Coalition and the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG). The Marin County Bicycle Coalition and Sonoma County Bike Coalition were also invited but they did not attend the meeting which was held at BCDC's office.

3. Aren't there any impacts related to air quality since vehicles will be detoured across the Richmond - San Rafael Bridge? According to our latest traffic counts collected in March 2011, the total daily traffic volumes on the eastbound Western Drive on ramp are approximately 560 and 290 vehicles per day on weekdays and weekends, respectively. The daily traffic volumes on the eastbound Western Drive on ramp that will be diverted to use the bridge during the ramp closure would be less than 2% of total westbound bridge traffic on weekdays and about 1% on weekend. The ramp closure and detour will add roughly one car per minute to bridge traffic during the morning commute period. Any air quality changes due to a detour are considered to have minimal impact. The project is exempt from the requirement of air quality conformity determination, per 40 CFR 93.126.

4. Aren't there any impacts to cyclists during construction? For safety reasons, bicycle travel is not possible on the freeway shoulders during construction. A bicycle shuttle service will be in place during construction from points east and west of the construction zone. A phone number will be provided to cyclists so that they can call for transport. Additional detailed information on the shuttle service will be provided prior to construction.

IV. OUTREACH

1. Was there any outreach done to date? Caltrans has met with City representatives, local businesses, and residents in an effort to provide project information early.

2. Will there be additional outreach? Yes, although Caltrans began outreach in late 2009, we will continue to work closely with all stakeholders as we approach summer 2012 construction. Our goal is to provide information early on so all stakeholders will be informed. Outreach will include:

- a. Contacting any other businesses/service agencies in the area that could be affected by the construction of this project.
- b. Making a presentation to the City of Richmond Redevelopment Agency and any other public meetings, as requested by the City.
- c. Creating and distributing an informational brochure or flyer, Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ) to the community, City staff and elected officials
- d. Creating a project website to post information regarding construction activities and lane/ramp closures.
- e. Holding an open house informational meeting, prior to start of construction, to inform local residents and business operators of the project scope and upcoming construction activities.

3. **Will there be outreach during construction?** Yes, the following activities will take place during construction:
- Updating the project website for construction activities and lane/ramp closures.
 - Informing the media prior to, during and after all major elements of the project
 - Sending traffic advisories concerning the project construction impacts.
 - Using Changeable Message Signs (CMS) and Highway Advisory Radio (HAR) to inform motorists during construction activities, when applicable.

V. BAY TRAIL CONNECTOR

1. **Are cyclists permitted to ride on I-580?** Yes, cyclists are currently permitted to ride along the outside shoulder of eastbound I-580 between the bike entrance south of the Richmond-San Rafael Bridge Toll Plaza and the Richmond Parkway/Point Richmond off ramp and on the outside shoulder of westbound I-580 between the Marine Street/Chevron Way bike entrance to the Western Drive/Point Molate off ramp. For safety reasons, cyclists will not be permitted to ride along the outside freeway shoulders during construction. Caltrans will provide an on-call bicycle shuttle service from points east and west of the construction site.
2. **Why didn't this project address the Bay Trail connector between Point San Pablo and Point Richmond?** This project is for the purpose of rehabilitating aging highway bridge decks and is funded from the 2010 California State Highway Operations and Protection Program, (SHOPP--Bridge Maintenance Program funds). This bridge maintenance project does not modify the highway except to replace bridge decks and related structures. There is no highway widening or other such capacity increasing modification involved. The Bay Trail connector is not part of the project scope, and SHOPP funds cannot be used for the Bay Trail connection project.
3. **Will this project impact the construction of the Bay Trail connector?** This project will in no way negatively affect the City's planned bike path project. In fact, there is new asphalt paving included in our project that extends to the freeway shoulders—this will create a better riding surface and should enhance the safety of cyclists at those locations.
4. **Is the bike community aware that the Bay Trail connector is not included in the scope of this project?** Caltrans presented this deck replacement project at the District 4 Bicycle Advisory Committee meeting in October 2010 and the Richmond Bike Path (Bay Trail) was included as a discussion topic. Caltrans also had a meeting with the City's Bike Path project team in November 2009, August 2010, and again in April 2011.
5. **Even though the Bay Trail connector is not included in the scope of this project, how can the Bay Trail Project get implemented?** The City of Richmond is preparing a Project Initiation Document (PID) to program the bike path connector project in the future. Programming funds need to be secured by the City so that the project can be designed and constructed.
6. **Will Caltrans support the implementation of the Bay Trail connector? How?** Caltrans does support the Bay Trail Connector project. The City of Richmond started the preparation of a Project Initiation Document (PID) for the Bay Trail Connector Project in November 2009. Caltrans was asked to provide oversight on the Project Initiation Document (PID), but due to the State budget shortfall in 2010, funds for state-provided oversight were eliminated. The law now requires Caltrans to charge local agencies for PID oversight. Local

agencies, including the City of Richmond, were informed of this change and of the opportunity to participate in a PID Reimbursement Pilot Program, for which they had to apply by December 14, 2010 if interested for that fiscal year. The City of Richmond did not apply at that time.

Although the City of Richmond has proceeded with the trail project, Caltrans' review and approval of the PID is pending due to the lack of funding for Caltrans' oversight.

7. Can Caltrans waive the requirement for the city of Richmond to reimburse Caltrans for PID oversight (estimated cost of \$150,000 to \$200,000)?

No. In October 2010 the State Budget Act eliminated the Department's program budget for local program oversight services. Unfortunately, while Caltrans supports the City's trail project, we do not have the reimbursement authority or resources to conduct oversight for the trail project.

PMCAC Inquiry Register and Tracking

Item	Description	Requester	Submitted On	Submitted To	Assigned To	Dept.	Subject	Response Delivered	Response Summary	Status
1	Request direct interface to Finance dept. for providing ongoing financial updates	Garrett	11/29/2011	Mayor KCRT	Jim Goins	Finance	FINANCE MINUTES	12/5/2011	Andrea Miller assigned as finance dept. liaison	Closed
2	Request posting of .mp3 files of PMCAC meeting transcripts to PMCAC web page	Garrett								Open
3	RLO - Applicability of clause 720 in Remediation Agreement to PMCAC	Garrett	12/19/2011	C. Murray	B. Goodmiller	Legal	FINANCE			Open
4	Determination of who at City receives copies of monthly reports required under Cost Cap Insurance Policy	Beyaert	12/19/2011	C. Murray		City Mgr.	COMPLIANCE			Open
5	Secure copies of the quarterly remediation progress reports submitted by Upstream as per Section 301 (A) (3) of the Remediation Agreement: Section 301. Performance and Funding Obligations of Developer (A) (3) Developer shall make reasonable progress toward performing Environmental Services and shall provide quarterly progress reports to the City.	Beyaert	1/4/2012	C. Murray		City Mgr.	COMPLIANCE			Open
6	Submit proposed agenda to Terraphase for 1/10/12 meeting with the PMCAC C&R Sub-committee	Beyaert	1/4/2012	C. Murray	B. Goodmiller	City Mgr.	REMIEDIATION	1/5/2012	Proposed agenda approved	Closed
7	Request copies of back-up invoices for all charges to Navy Grant Fund by Terraphase and Arcadis	Garrett	1/4/2012	A. Miller		Finance	FINANCE			Open
8	RLO - Must every document, spreadsheet, .ppt, image, etc. that is displayed/used in support of individual agenda items on the PMCAC agenda be included in the agenda packet? And must that agenda packet (whether containing all of the used/portrayed materials or not) be posted by the same deadline as the deadline for posting of PMCAC meeting agendas?	Garrett	1/13/2012	C. Murray		Legal	BROWN ACT			Open
9	Secure copies of monthly remediation status reports submitted by Terraphase/Arcadis since inception	Garrett	1/13/2012	C. Murray		City Mgr.	REMIEDIATION			Open
10	Secure copies of all drafts of proposed plans, studies, surveys, and other submissions required by the Water Board - as submitted by Terraphase/Arcadis/Upstream	Beyaert	1/13/2012	C. Murray		City Mgr.	REMIEDIATION			Open

8A1

City of Richmond – POINT MOLATE COMMUNITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Multi-Purpose Room
440 CIVIC CENTER PLAZA

**PROPOSED MINUTES
MONDAY, DECEMBER 19, 2011, 6:30 PM**

1. CALL TO ORDER

Garrett called the meeting to order at 6:35 p.m.

2. ROLL CALL

Present: Committee Members Beyaert, Clark, Garrett, Gilbert, Hanna, Helvarg, Hite, Kortz (6:42),
Martinez, Rosing (7:36) Smith, N., Smith, C., Stello and Whitty.

Absent: Committee Members Soto, Sundance.

Staff Present: Marilyn Langlois, Community Advocate, Mayor's Office; Andrea Miller, Budget
Administrator, City of Richmond Finance Department,; Craig K. Murray, Staff
Liaison/Development Project Manager II, Community & Economic Development
Department/Redevelopment.

3. WELCOME AND MEETING PROCEDURES

Garrett welcomed audience, explained meeting procedures, and discussed the Speaker Card process.

4. AGENDA REVIEW AND ADOPTION

Garrett reviewed Agenda items and briefed PMCAC on the Agenda order and speakers. Speaker Don Gosney on the Agenda Packet of 138 pages and making it available to the public. Beyaert then moved to accept the agenda amended as recommended by Chair Garrett. N. Smith seconded. Passed unanimously.

5. ANNOUNCEMENTS THROUGH THE CHAIR

Garrett announced the information regarding Regional Water Control Board documents relating to the San Pablo Peninsula and documents within the Board Packet. Beyaert announced information on the Dutra Quarry Site on Pt San Pablo Peninsula. Speaker Rod Satre concern on a 24-hour operation.

6. OPEN FORUM

One speaker for Open Forum. Speaker Don Gosney spoke about absences of more than 3 in a 12-month period that would be automatic resignation. Cordell Hendler, Richmond resident, spoke on need for new, smaller common-ground businesses in Richmond and expand existing restaurants; Speaker Don Gosney, Richmond resident, discussed Water Board extensions and what the City Council and PMCAC has completed during this time and to stay focused on necessary clean-up and restoration matters.

7. PRESENTATIONS, DISCUSSION & ACTION ITEMS

A. Point Molate Visioning Summary

Beyaert presented results of the Visioning Questionnaire of PMCAC. Beyaert indicated that document was originally used by 45-member BRAC (Blue Ribbon Advisory Committee) 15 years ago and compared these prior BRAC development feature rankings with the results of the current PMCAC. Speaker Don Gosney requested a copy of the Visioning Summary, discussed the BRAC and features of survey.

B. PMCAC Inquiry Log

Garrett provided summary of the development of this document, the protocol and its use by the PMCAC.

C. Document Repository

Garrett presented information to PMCAC on where prior information can be found relating to Pt Molate and presented collection of related documents including General Plan and Land Use documents that are posted on and where PMCAC can add or send to Garrett to add other documents to a Google documents site.

D. Western Drive/I-580 Interchange Work

Beyaert presented information relating to the Scofield Deck Replacement proposed by Cal Trans. Speaker Gosney voiced concern on this project and in working with Cal Trans.

E. Review of Proposed General Plan

Garrett provided information on Land Use Designations, the process within the Planning Commission and the Richmond Zoning Ordinance. Discussion regarding Open Space and amendments for residential units. N.Smith moved to send City Council same recommendation letter as sent to Planning Commission, C.Smith second. Passed 11-1. Speaker Rod Satre discussed caution in setting low standard as Open Space and Open Space would provide a less restrictive clean-up standard than Residential. Helvarg suggested friendly amendment to original proposal to send City Council a letter recommending a designation of Pt Molate as Open Space, N.Smith seconded. Proposal passed 11-1.

F. Schedule of 2012 PMCAC Meetings

Garrett indicated that this item was combined with item 14 on the Agenda. Murray presented to PMCAC probable and confirmed meeting locations for all the third monthly dates in 2012 except the regular dates of January and February that fall on a holiday. January 17 and February 21, the third Tuesday, were dates per PMCAC poll to be alternative meeting date. N.Smith moved to accept the dates provided for the 2012 PMCAC Meeting Dates, seconded by Beyaert. Passed 11-1. Murray discussed possible dates with PMCAC Clean-Up and Restoration (C&R) SubCommittee and coordinating with Terraphase. Terraphase representative could not make the December date but could make the Tuesday, January 10, 2012 date. Garrett motioned that meeting dates under Agenda 14b and 14c be taken up at the C&R meeting immediately following the December, 2011 PMCAC. Seconded by Stello. Passed unanimously.

8. STAFF REPORTS

A. Presentation Point Molate Finance Areas by City of Richmond Finance Department

Garrett introduced Andrea Miller, Budget Administrator, City of Richmond. Miller presented the 2011-012 Point Molate Operating budget, line item percentages in the current Fiscal Year and \$28.5 M Escrow Account with U.S. Navy funds. General discussion on charges. Speaker Gosney regarding over 150 line items in budget document, make it available to public well in advance, can't tell source of funds, nomenclature of fund types and charges that could be placed on general fund.

9. CONSENT CALENDAR

Speaker Gosney stated that public didn't have access to these minutes. Garrett indicated that October minutes continued from October and November were part of this Agenda Packet and its posting. Beyaert motioned to approve the Consent Calendar, Rosing seconded. Passed unanimously.

10. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

Garrett indicated a Cal Trans representative has been invited to the January meeting to present the Scofield Deck replacement project. Beyaert suggested that Planning Department send someone to brief PMCAC on the Dutra Group Project. Garrett indicated that a South Shoreline CAG Representative can be invited to present issues that they are going through and their organization in managing environmental review.

11. CITY COUNCIL LIAISON REPORTS

a. Marilyn Langlois presented a report for Mayor McLaughlin regarding a Closed Session January 10 with Upstream and three vacancies with one application received and another applicant that has expressed interest. Nothing reportable on the Summary Judgement.

12. CHAIR AND SUB-COMMITTEE REPORTS

- a. By-Laws: Helvarg reported that the By Laws have been legally accepted and PMCAC has accepted the changes provided through the By-Laws SubCommittee. Garrett thanked Helvarg and the By-Laws SubCommittee for their work and motioned that the By-Laws SubCommittee be terminated, Beyaert seconded. Vote was unanimous.
- b. Clean Up and Restoration: Garrett discussed the Tentative Order (TO) and talk with the Water Board. Whitty summarized actions taken by the Committee and meeting with State Water Resource Control Board Staff. Whitty indicated that PMCAC was fine with their process and will not be attending their December meeting. Speaker Gosney charge from City Council to this Committee is first Environmental then Development and caution of using too much time at Committee rather than Sub Committee level and full body of Committee needs to get reports and be informed prior to reviewing development options. Discussion tasks as part of the SubCommittee and what entire body of Committee would like to see. Speaker Satre provided his professional background and interest in serving on the PMCAC.
- c. Finance: No report.
- d. Legal: No report.

13. ADJOURNMENT

Whitty moved to adjourn the meeting at 8:52 pm, seconded by Kortz. Passed unanimously.

14. SCHEDULED MEETINGS

Committee Meeting –

Tuesday, January 17, 2011, 6:30 p.m., Multi-Purpose Room, 440 Civic Center Plaza

Tuesday, February 21, 2011, 6:30 p.m., Multi-Purpose Room, 440 Civic Center Plaza

SubCommittee Meeting – Clean-Up and Restoration –

Tuesday, January 10, 2012, 6:30 p.m., Multi-Purpose Room, 440 Civic Center Plaza

Minutes respectfully submitted by:

Craig K. Murray, PMCAC Staff Liaison

TIMETABLE OF SITE CLEANUP REQUIREMENTS
FORMER POINT MOLATE NAVAL FUEL DEPOT

Calif. Regional Water Quality Control Board Order No. R2-2011-0087

<u>Compliance Date</u>	<u>Site/Topic</u>	<u>Deliverable to be Approved</u>
Feb. 13, 2012	soils more than 10' bgs	cleanup goals
March 15, 2012	management of soils & groundwater cleanup	plan
April 3, 2012	Site 4	Interim RA Plan
May 4, 2012	Site 3	Feasibility Study & Remedial Action (RA) Plan
Nov. 2, 2012	Site 4	Interim RA Completion Report
March 4, 2013	USTs	Management Plan
June 3, 2013	USTs	begin quarterly status reports
Nov. 4, 2013	Site 4	Human health risk assessment
Feb. 3, 2014	Site 3	RA Completion Report
Feb. 3, 2014	Site 4	Feasibility Study & RA Plan
Feb. 3, 2015	Site 4	RA Completion Report
90 days before demolition	USTs	removal plan
environmental closure	areas not meeting unrestricted use standards	land use controls
monthly 30 days prior to start of remediation	all site areas	remediation status reports
60 days from discovery	all sites	report discoveries of previously unknown pollutants exceeding cleanup goals
long term	Site 1	monitoring/maintenance
prior to construction	all sites	stormwater permit

SF RWQCB Revised Final Order dated 12/14/11

If Discharger fails to comply with TO, SF RWQCB gives Navy 60 days to negotiate revised due dates for task submittals

DATE	Comment	DATE	Comment
<p>Task Task 1. Soil Cleanup Goals Compliance Date: February 13, 2012</p>	<p>The Discharger (City of Richmond and the Navy) shall propose soil cleanup goals, acceptable to the Executive Officer (Bruce Wolfe), for contaminated soils. The cleanup goals developed to date by the Navy for the Pt. Molate NFD (FPALs), describe goals for pollutants situated less than 10 ft below ground surface only. The cleanup goals for this task shall include petroleum hydrocarbons as well as other chemicals of concern and shall include any reasonable expected decomposition byproducts, for all depths greater than 10 ft below ground surface.</p> <p>This Order requires the development of Soil Cleanup Criteria (Task 1) for all depths greater than ten (10) ft below ground surface, protective of human health and the environment for different land use scenarios.</p>	<p>Task Task 2. Soil and Groundwater Management Plan Compliance Date: March 15, 2012</p>	<p>The Discharger shall propose a Soil and Groundwater Management Plan for the Facility, acceptable to the Executive Officer, identifying how soils and affected groundwater will be managed for any phase of cleanup activities at the Facility, including initial cleanup as well as cleanups related to discoveries during any future development of the Facility.</p> <p>The plan must propose how soil and groundwater will be sampled and analyzed during all phases of remediation and development, and how test results will be used to protect Facility workers and future occupants and visitors from residual pollutants. The plan shall describe the protocol to be followed for all sampling, field measurements, analytical techniques, and the sequence and methods of any proposed remediation.</p> <p>The plan shall be consistent with and incorporate all applicable mitigation measures set forth in the certified EIR. The plan shall address equipment and the schedule of activities, proposed measures to limit fugitive emissions from site remediation and trucking activities, general soil removal and backfilling specifications, dewatering and discharge activities during the remedy process, and the proposed groundwater treatment activities to protect surrounding groundwater and surface water resources.</p>

DATE	Comment	DATE	Comment
<p>Task 3. Site 3 Treatment Pond Area** a. Feasibility Study and Remedial Action Plan Compliance Date: May 4, 2012</p>	<p>The Discharger shall propose a final FS/RAP, acceptable to the Executive Officer, to clean up Site 3. The final Site 3 FS/RAP shall incorporate the applicable cleanup goals for the Facility and shall include a time schedule for sub-actions to attain the final cleanup.</p> <p>** Site 3 Treatment Pond Area – at the time the Navy began operations at the Facility in 1942, Site 3 was a single pond formed by diking off a small embayment just west of the Winehaven Building. The pond was approximately ten to eleven (10-11) acres in surface area, and was used to capture oily waste from facility operations. In 1973, the pond was reconfigured into three (3) smaller ponds with its use changed to sewage treatment and stormwater control for the Facility. In 1991, petroleum product as well as oil sheen was observed along the shoreline of the Bay adjacent to these ponds. The petroleum discharge was determined to be coming from the oil and sludge deposited prior to the 1973 conversion.</p> <p>In 1995, the Navy installed a subsurface groundwater extraction trench approximately 1,000 ft long and 20 ft deep along the shoreline to capture oil and oil-contaminated groundwater coming from the Site 3 ponds as an emergency interim remedy. The result of that remedy was that the oily discharge to the</p>	<p>Task 3. Site 3 b. Remedial Action Completion Report Compliance Date: February 3, 2014</p>	<p>Upon completion of the Final FS.RAP, the discharger shall prepare a Remedial Action Completion Report for Site 3, acceptable to the Executive Officer. The Remedial Action Report shall include LUCs (land use control document) as needed. The report shall identify the location of all remedial actions and describe the volume of soil excavated, describe the specifics of the disposal of that material, and present all test date generated during the remedial process and how the remediation activities met or did not meet remediation goals.</p>

DATE	Comment	DATE	Comment
Task	Comment	Task	Comment
<p>Task 4. Site 4 *** a. Interim Remedial Action Work Plan Compliance Date: April 3, 2012</p>	<p>Bay was stopped. In 2003, the ponds were removed from service and backfilled after removal of contaminated material to a depth of ten (10) ft below ground surface (bgs). High concentrations of petroleum-contaminated material remained below ten (10) ft bgs. The groundwater extraction treatment system has continued to be operated to date. However, since the contamination at Site 3 remains, a potential threat to water quality exists if the extraction trench fails to function effectively. Although the groundwater extraction treatment system has generally contained the oily source, a more permanent remedy is needed to abate the long-term threats to water quality. This Order requires the development of cleanup Criteria for contamination greater than ten (10) ft below ground surface (Task 1) and a Final Feasibility Study and Remedial Action Plan (FS/RAP) describing a remedy for Site 3 (Task 3.a.).</p>	<p>Task 4. Site 4 b. Interim Remedial Action Completion Report Compliance Date: November 2, 2012</p>	<p>The Discharger shall conduct the interim action in a manner acceptable to the Executive Officer and provide a completion report by the compliance date. This shall be followed by eight (8) consecutive quarterly rounds of groundwater monitoring to assess the interim remedy chosen according to the accepted work plan described in Task 4.a. above for Site 4.</p>
<p>Task 4. Site 4 *** a. Interim Remedial Action Work Plan Compliance Date: April 3, 2012</p>	<p>The Discharger shall prepare an interim remedial action work plan, acceptable to the Executive Officer, as an initial remedy for Site 4. *** Site 4 – Site 4 consists of Drum Lot 1 and Drum Lot 2. this Order requires an Interim Remedial Action Plan (Task 4) to assess what technologies will best restore impacted groundwater to beneficial uses. This Order also requires a Human Health Risk</p>		

DATE	Comment	DATE	Comment
Task	Task	Task	Task
	<p>Assessment and, if interim actions are not successful in achieving acceptable risk reductions, a FS/RAP is required for a final remedial action, and a Remedial Action Completion Report (Task 4.a. thru 3.).</p> <p>Drum Lot 1 – This area is directly south of Site 3. Contamination is generally petroleum related. Groundwater continues to be impacted from historic discharges at this location, although at concentrations that are below the approved cleanup goals for industrial use.</p> <p>Drum Lot 2 – Drum Lot 2 is located at the southern portion of the Facility. Drums of liquid product were historically stored there. Groundwater monitoring as well as soil and soil-gas data indicate that trichloroethylene (TCE) is present in soils and groundwater. TCE in groundwater beneath Drum Lot 2 was recently measured at 400 ug/L Oct 2007.</p>		
<p>Task 4. Site 4 c. Human Health Risk Assessment Compliance Date: November 4, 2013</p>	<p>The Discharger shall prepare a human health risk assessment for Site 4 to be used in determining if additional remedial measures are necessary to mitigate risks at the Site. If additional remedial measures are required for the expected land use, a Feasibility Study and Remedial Action Plan will be developed (Site 4 FS/RAP, Task 4.d.), which shall include a time schedule for sub-actions to attain the final cleanup and shall be submitted to the Executive Officer for approval.</p>	<p>Task 4. Site 4 d. Feasibility Study and Remedial Action Plan Compliance Date: February 3, 2014</p>	<p>If Interim Actions implemented per Task 4.b. above are not successful in achieving the acceptable risk reductions per Task 4.c., the discharger shall propose a final FS/RAP, acceptable to the Executive Officer, to cleanup Site 4. The final FS/RAP shall incorporate cleanup goals for the Facility and shall include a time schedule for sub-actions to attain the final cleanup.</p>

DATE	Task	DATE	Task
<p>Task 4. Site 4 Remedial Action Completion Report Compliance Date: February 3, 2015</p>	<p>Comment Upon implementation of the final FS/RAP described in Task 4.d., the Discharger shall prepare a Remedial Action Completion Report for Site 4, acceptable to the Executive Officer. The report shall identify the location of all remedial actions and describe the volume of soil excavated, describe the specifics of the disposal of that material, and present all test date generated during the remediation process and how the remediation activities met or did not meet remediation goals. If additional remediation is required but an acceptable LUC provision can be implemented to the satisfaction of the Executive Officer, the existing LUCs shall be amended per Task 8 below.</p>	<p>Task 5. UST**** Management Plan Compliance Date: March 4, 2013</p>	<p>Comment The Discharger shall propose a management plan and schedule, acceptable to the Executive Officer, to close the remaining USTs at the Site. Environmental case closure has been approved for nine (9) UST cases. Eleven (11) UST cases remain open at the time of this Order because of elevated concentrations of hydrocarbons associated with the USTs. The intent of the UST Management Plan is to document the extent of contamination remaining at the eleven (11) USTs and determine if active remediation is needed or to determine if monitored natural attenuation is adequate to achieve cleanup goals in a reasonable time frame. ****UST – Large petroleum underground storage tanks (USTs) at the Facility are generally located on its hillside. Soil and groundwater contamination detected adjacent to the USTs and former valve boxes are the result of historic spillage and leakage. Free-phase product has been observed at some UST locations, however, those observations are generally limited in extent. As of July 2011, the Regional Water Board had approved closure for nine (9) out of 20 USTs. The UST structures remain. The ETCA contains provisions and funding for the City to complete the regulatory closure of all the remaining USTs. Monitoring and maintenance of the remaining eleven (11) tanks will continue into the future. This Order requires a UST Management Plan</p>

DATE		DATE	
Task	Comment	Task	Comment
<p>Task 6. UST Removal Plan Compliance Date: 90 days prior to UST demolition</p>	<p>If any UST will be demolished during the course of redevelopment, the discharger shall prepare a UST Removal Plan, acceptable to the Executive Officer, describing the tank demolition. The plan shall be consistent with the UST Management Plan and the Soil and Groundwater Management Plan required by the Order and shall incorporate all the relevant mitigation measures set forth in the certified EIR and the LUCs recorded for this Site.</p>	<p>Task 7. UST Status Report Compliance Date: June 3, 2013</p>	<p>Quarterly UST status reports shall outline the progress of UST closure activities undertaken pursuant to the plan developed for Task 5. Status reports shall include the results of monitoring and closure activities undertaken during the prior quarter, and include any proposed activities for the upcoming quarter.</p>
<p>Task 8. Amended Land Use Controls (LUCs) Compliance Date: Due at the time Environmental Closure is requested by the discharger</p>	<p>The Discharger shall submit amended LUCs, acceptable to the Executive Officer, for any area of the Facility that does not meet "unrestricted use standards" after an acceptable cleanup has been implemented. In areas with existing LUCs, the Discharger may submit amended LUCs to reflect the completed cleanup or may propose eliminating land use restrictions, as appropriate, after cleanup activities are completed.</p>	<p>Task 9. Remediation Status Reports Compliance Date: Monthly beginning 30 days after the start of the remediation activities and ceasing 30 days after completion of all field activities related to this Order</p>	<p>The Discharger shall submit a report to the Regional Water Board, 30 days prior to the start of any onsite remediation activities, and then on a monthly basis beginning 30 days after the start of the remediation activities, outlining the onsite remediation activities accomplished during the past month and those planned for the following month. The first monthly report at the beginning of each quarter shall include monitoring and test results and any conclusions or proposed changes to the remediation process based on those results. If any changes to the remediation are proposed during any monthly report, applicable supporting monitoring or test date will be submitted at that time. The status report shall also verify that the Prohibitions in Section A, stipulated above, have been adhered to. (A: Prohibitions</p>

DATE	Comment	DATE	Comment
Task	Comment	Task	Comment
			<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The discharge of wastes and/or non-hazardous or hazardous substances in a manner which will degrade, or threaten to degrade, water quality of adversely affect, or threaten to adversely affect, the beneficial uses of the water of the State is prohibited. 2. Further migration of wastes of hazardous substances through subsurface transport to waters of the State is prohibited. 3. Activities associated with the subsurface investigation and cleanup that will cause adverse migration of wastes or hazardous substances are prohibited. 4. The tidal marsh habitat and wetland habitats onsite shall be completely avoided unless encroachment on these areas is required to implement Facility remediation work and resultant impacts to the affected habitat are mitigated through a plan approved by the Executive Officer. A setback of 50 feet shall be established around the tidal marsh and any wetland area as a means of preventing any unintended impacts to it from the remediation. 5. The Site's offshore eel-grass habitat shall be completely avoided during any remedial work to the maximum extent practicable.) Should any of those prohibitions be trespassed, the report shall propose a recommendation acceptable to the Executive Officer to correct trespass.)
<p>Task 10. Discoversies During</p>	<p>After the initial remedies have been implemented as ordered by the above tasks,</p>	<p>Task 11. Site 1 * ROD (Record of Decision)</p>	<p>This Order requires the continuance of long-term monitoring and maintenance for the Site 1</p>

DATE	Comment	DATE	Comment
Task	Comment	Task	Comment
<p>Facility Redevelopment Compliance Date: 60 days from initial discovery</p>	<p>and Facility redevelopment begins, discoveries of otherwise previously unknown pollution that exceeds the Facility's Cleanup Goals shall be reported to the Executive Officer within 48 hours of its discovery. A cleanup shall be promptly implemented according to Task 2, Soil and Groundwater Management Plan. The initial reporting shall be followed up by a Cleanup/Investigations Report submitted to the Regional Water Board and acceptable to the Executive Officer, documenting cleanup actions and residual contaminant concentrations achieved, describing the situation and its status, and any further actions needing resolution.</p>		<p>landfill* in accordance with the June 2005 ROD for the landfill and any amendments to the ROD. * Site 1 landfill – Waste from the operation of the Pt. Molate NFD was disposed of in a steep ravine area known as Site 1. The thickness of the waste may extend as much as 50 feet below the present ground surface. Volatile organic compounds (VOCs) and semi-volatile organic compounds (SVOCs), pesticides, jet fuel, diesel, motor oil, and drums have all been documented to be in the landfill waste. Pursuant to a 2005 ROD, the waste was capped and groundwater monitoring is conducted to confirm waste containment. This Order requires the continuance on long-term monitoring and maintenance for the Site 1 landfill in accordance with the 2005 ROD for the landfill.</p>
<p>Task 12. Construction Storm Water General Permit Compliance Date: Prior to commencement of any field work</p>	<p>The Discharger shall comply with the State Water Board's Construction General Permit (CGP), Order..., prior to commencement of any cleanup activity that will include disturbing greater than one acre of land. Proof of coverage under the CGP may consist of a NOI (Notice of Intent) after being assigned a WDIID number for that NOI. As required by the CGP, a stormwater pollution prevention plan must be implemented and maintained at the Facility and shall be submitted to the Regional Water Board in digital format (preferably PDF).</p>		