NAVAL AIR STATION (NAS) ALAMEDA RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD MEETING SUMMARY

Building 1, Suite #140, Community Conference Room
Alameda Point
Alameda, California

Tuesday, 11 July 2000

ATTENDEES:
see attached list.

MEETING SUMMARY

I. Approval of Minutes

Mary Sutter, Community Co-chair, commenced the meeting at 6:35 p.m. and asked for any comments on the June 2000 minutes. None were voiced. Ms. Sutter moved to accept the minutes, and no objections were made.

II. Co-chair announcements

Ms. Sutter stated that Diane Behm, Lyn Stirewalt, Tony Dover, and James Leach have excused absences. Reminding the RAB that the June 2000 Milestones had carried membership application requests, she announced that she has subsequently received six requests and two applications and has followed up by contacting several interested persons. Kevin Reilly inquired as to how Milestones was distributed. Ms. Sutter replied that it was delivered with the Alameda Journal, which has a circulation of 23,300 in Alameda, including Harbor Bay. Ms. Sutter requested that the RAB administration meet to determine not only whether the RAB had enough room for the potential applicants but also how it should best go about installing new members.

Ms. Sutter reported that she had attended the Marsh Crust Proposed Plan/Remedial Action Plan/Record of Decision (PP/RAP/ROD) public meeting on 29 June and hoped she might speak about it with the RAB later in the meeting when they addressed the marsh crust topic. She also passed around two reports she had received lately: one was Tetra Tech's April 2000 draft final of "The Determination of Beneficial Uses of Groundwater at Alameda Point," for which the comment period had already passed; the other was a draft of the Remedial Action Plan Record of Decision (RAP ROD), for which comments were due by July 20th. Ms. Sutter stated that she had made comments at the 29 June meeting which have been included in the comment forum via the meeting's legal secretary. Mike McClelland added that this RAP ROD decision document was based upon previous studies.

Mr. Torrey announced that he had been sworn in as a housing commissioner by the city council on July 5th. Ms. Sutter extended congratulations. He said he had not attended the 29 June public comment meeting because he was attending the final forum meeting of the housing board instead. He informed the RAB that the housing board had drafted a document which will be presented to the city council at the next meeting by City Manager Jim Flynn.

Ms. Sutter introduced Steve Dean, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), whom Ken Kloc, ARC Ecology, had suggested should speak to the RAB on basic radiation concepts and means of protection, as the cleanup at Alameda Point has raised various radiological concerns.

III. Radiological Update

Mr. Dean began by citing a standard dictionary definition for radiation: a stream of particles or electromagnetic waves emitted by the atoms and molecules of a radioactive substance as a result of nuclear decay. He stated that he would be speaking primarily about ionizing radiation, explaining that what sets ionizing radiation apart from other types of radiation such as light, sound, or microwaves, is that ionizing radiation can have energy to break the chemical bonds of living tissue, which can be detrimental to the tissue's health.

Accompanied by overhead slides and radiation detection equipment, Mr. Dean presented the three basic forms of ionizing radiation-alpha particles, beta particles, and gamma rays-and then demonstrated the ubiquity of background low-level ionizing radiation. The meter emitted slow clicks when he held it randomly in the air, where it was detecting background cosmic radiation and background radiation from the concrete material of the building. The meter emitted accelerated clicks when he held it close to various alpha, beta, and gamma-source demonstration samples. He showed that alpha particles travel about one inch in normal air and can be repelled by a sheet of paper; that beta particles are more penetrating, can travel up to 12 feet, and require a one-inch-thick manual to repel them. The same thickness manual does not attenuate gamma rays much and requires something heavier and thicker.

Mr. Dean also referred to information contained in the U.S. EPA's Air and Radiation (ANR-459) Ionizing Radiation Series "No. 1, General Description" (September 1990) and "No. 2, Health Effects From Exposure to Ionizing Radiation" (June 1991). He stated that in some cases with the most energetic and penetrating gamma rays, several feet of concrete or a few inches of lead are required to stop them. He explained that although gamma rays are the worst external hazard, alpha particles if ingested or inhaled are 20 times more toxic than gamma rays. He added that beta particles fall somewhere between gamma rays and alpha particles in terms of danger.

Mr. Dean passed a Ludlum Micro R meter around the room, inviting the attendees to measure background gamma radiation. He asked the attendees to examine the red-which is the lowest-scale on the meter and read how many microroentgens of radiation were present in the room. Mr. Kloc asked what the lowest exposure threshold was for the gamma meter, and Mr. Dean said that it signals a sound at a level of 300 microroentgens per hour.

Presenting an overhead slide of "Average Personal Radiation Dose," an excerpt from a National Academy of Sciences document entitled The Effects on Population of Exposure to Low-Levels of Ionizing Radiation, 1980, Mr. Dean reviewed several common sources and related amounts of background radiation which everyone incurs, regardless of where or how one lives. These are: cosmic radiation at sea level, 26 millirems; average radiation from the ground, 26 millirems; from air, water, and food, 24 millirems; and from weapons test fallout, 4 millirems. He also called attention to other dosage categories such as x-ray and radiopharmaceutical diagnosis, jet plane travel, television viewing, and how close a person lives to a nuclear plant, as variable exposures which also contribute to background radiation exposure. He noted that the U.S. annual average dosage per capita is 180 millirems.

Mr. Dean displayed a follow-up slide, "Sources of Radiation Exposure," a pie-chart from the National Council on Radiation Protection (NCRP) Report No. 93, which showed 81 percent of typical radiation exposure to be natural and 19 percent to be technologically produced. He observed that of the latter, approximately 0.3 percent emanates from nuclear-testing fallout, the largest contributors being cesium-137 and strontium-90, two radionuclides. Mr. Dean explained that life on earth now includes a prevalent remnant of whatever atmospheric nuclear tests may have occurred. He noted that radioactivity decays, and that whatever radioactivity with a half-life of 30 years entered your body will have decayed-otherwise known as half-life.

Mr. Dean cautioned that most of the radionuclides to be concerned about are naturally occurring, not technologically-produced. He said he particularly wanted to address radium, which has a background number of 1 picocurie per gram. Holding a small rock he estimated to weigh about a gram, Mr. Dean explained that 1 picocurie per gram meant that the amount of material he was holding would undergo 2.2 decay events, or disintegrations, every minute and that every 10 minutes 22 decay events would occur in the gram of material.

Mr. Berges asked Mr. Dean what his sources were for the list of decay events. Mr. Dean replied that they came from the EPA and the NCRP, agencies studying background radiation in the United States. Mr. Berges inquired how recently the studies were conducted, and Mr. Dean responded that the EPA study he cited was done in 1994. He added that the EPA does constant monitoring at the National Air and Radiation Environmental Laboratory in Montgomery, Alabama.

Ms. Sutter referred back to the small-rock model of one gram of material and queried whether somewhere in the sphere of that material one particle or wave would be released. Mr. Dean answered that two would occur every minute, although the events do not necessarily have to move outside. They could instead happen inside the material and never be emitted, in which case they would be referred to as self-absorbed. He stated that typically an alpha particle may not break past the layer of atoms over it, but that a gamma ray is certain to shoot out through.

Steve Edde inquired whether the radium was naturally-occurring, and Mr. Dean answered in the affirmative. Mr. Edde asked if the content varied depending upon locale, and Mr. Dean again answered in the affirmative. He added that the concentration of radium in the U.S. has a broad range, from .1 picocuries per gram to 4.2 picocuries per gram, and that the soil in Alameda is about .8 picocuries per gram.

Mr. Dean presented a slide which showed a graph of radiation measured from a commercial airliner departing Oakland Airport. He stated that after the plane had ascended to 35,000 feet and leveled off, the radiation measured 30 microrems per hour. This indicates that in the upper atmosphere, cosmic radiation dosage increases significantly because of the earth's air blanket being thinner. He opined that most people who travel frequently by air and have an above-average total radiation count probably have acquired it from the greater exposure to cosmic radiation at high altitude. He also noted that 30 microrems per hour is a minimum threshold for conducting some risk assessments in superfund cleanup activities.

Referring again to the pie-chart slide, Mr. Dean stated that radon accounts for over half-or 55 per cent-of all measured sources of radiation. He explained that radon gas is the "daughter" of radium 226, which is in all of our soil and, by way of the dust, in the air we breathe. He also commented that the EPA has calculated that our annual dosages of radiation are actually twice the levels

estimated by the National Academy of Sciences. Instead of the 180 millirems per year, the figure is more accurately 360 millirems per year, or 1 millirem per day.

Mr. Dean next addressed the three percent of annual radiation exposure which comes from consumer products. With his meter he demonstrated the radioactivity in an older version of Coleman lantern wicks, which contain thorium 232 and are readily available outside the state of California. He also demonstrated that in a newer version he recently purchased in California, no radioactivity is detected because of Proposition 65 prohibiting the thorium 232 coating.

Ken O'Donoghue inquired what the difference is between the wick made for California use and the previous wick. Mr. Dean answered that the old-style wick coated with thorium burns a little brighter and gives off a somewhat whiter light than the new version, which has a yellowish shine. He commented that he prefers to go with the newer version, despite its limitation, so that when the wick breaks down into dust, he will not be adding radioactivity to the soil. He noted that the major concept in the federal government regarding radiation is known as ALARA, (as low as reasonably achievable). He stated that buying the non-thorium-coated wick, which reasonably achieved the task of lighting, was the one he thought should be purchased. He also stated that the site in New Jersey where the strontium-coated wicks were produced may cost as much as $1.5 billion to clean up.

Mr. Dean showed the attendees a plate and a cup made by FiestaWare, a company which once sold products coated with uranium-based paint in colors such as orange, green, and yellow. When held next to the plate and the cup, a meter made sounds indicating that it had detected radiation. Mr. Dean advised the attendees not to eat or drink from such products, since the acids in foods and liquids will help release the uranium in the paint.

Using the meter, Mr. Dean also demonstrated that a salt substitute, known by the brand name "No Salt," contains radioactive material, specifically potassium 40, the most abundant naturally occurring radioisotope on earth. He stated that every human body has about 50,000 disintegrations per minute of potassium 40.

Mr. Dean held the meter to an unattached smoke alarm and detected weak gamma rays but mostly alpha particles. He stated that a smoke alarm contains a pellet of americium 241, which has a half-life of 400 years. He called attention to the manufacturer's attached label, which not only advises replacement of the device every ten years, but also in fine print instructs the consumer to return the device to the manufacturer for disposal. He noted that when they are not returned, they end up in the local landfill, where they are becoming the radiological concern of future generations.

Mr. Torrey commented that the fire department was no longer recommending smoke alarms that contain americium 241. Mr. Dean replied that several models now exist which rely on photo detectors rather than americium 241.

Mr. Dean recommended to the attendees that they have the radon levels of their houses checked. He directed their attention to a special National Academy of Sciences coupon for that purpose which he had included with the handout packet.

Mr. Kloc inquired whether uranium continued to be used to color false teeth. Mr. Dean answered in the negative, explaining that now plastics rather than metals are used.

Jo-Lynne Lee asked whether artists and other people who use paints should be concerned about the possibility of radioactive supplies, and Mr. Dean responded in the negative. He commented, however, that some old porcelain and other ceramic products once used uranium-238 glazes.

Mr. Dean stated that radioactive events are unavoidable, that no known physical or chemical process exists to prevent them from happening. He added that three methods of protection are available to us: time, distance, and shielding-individually or in combination.

With respect to time, he explained that a common maneuver in nuclear power plants is simply to drastically reduce the period of exposure. In other words, if a worker needs to adjust something in a radioactively hazardous area, the worker will rush in, make a quarter turn, and rush out. The worker will then not go near any radiation for the next several months. Mr. Dean cited a couple of formulaic examples: 5 minutes at a rate of 100 millirems per hour = 8.33 millirems exposure; 55 minutes at a rate of 100 millirems per hour = 91.66 millirems exposure.

Mr. Dean stated that distance is the best protection. He explained that radiation exposure decreases by a formula known as the inverse square law. This law states that every increment of distance you travel away from the source of radiation, you reduce the exposure by the inverse square of that distance. He proceeded to demonstrate this law with a meter and a small gamma source.

Mr. Dean reminded the attendees of the shielding demonstration at the beginning of the presentation, when he dealt with alpha and beta particles and gamma rays. He stated with regards to underground radioactive contaminants that a cap of three to four feet of clay qualifies as shielding, as would adding a golf course. He commented that OU-3/Site 1 is employing all three concepts-time, distance, and shielding.

To conclude, Mr. Dean addressed the Superfund Cleanup Risk Assessment Guidelines he used while developing the Preliminary Remediation Goals (PRG) included in his two 13 April 1998 documents, "Risk Comparison for Radionuclides in Soil" and "Risk Comparison for Radionuclides in Drinking Water." The PRG is a radionuclide's concentration in soil or water that generates a one in a million (1E-06) lifetime cancer risk or one extra cancer to a population of one million people.

Mr. Dean stated that radium, when its daughters are included and run through the Superfund Risk Assessment Model, is shown to be one of the most toxic materials known. He noted that current risk values allow up to 5 picocuries per gram, but that a problem arises when multiplying that number by the radium calculation of 1:6E-06-1.6 times 10 to the minus six-which results in eight excess cancers in a population of one million people and is well above Superfund's threshold in the risk range. He stated that this becomes a dilemma because it exceeds the CERCLA process, unless extra controls such as removal and shielding are put into effect-something beyond simply letting the radium sit in and/or on the ground.

Ms. Sutter inquired whether radium is a natural material, and Mr. Dean replied that radium is actually a technically enhanced, naturally occurring radioactive material (TNORM) created when radium is extracted from uranium ore. The radium was then used in luminous paints and varnishes.

Brad Job, Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB), asked what the pathway in the PRG is that drives the most risk, and Mr. Dean answered that it is external, namely gamma rays. He

added that gammas are the primary drivers for most of the radionuclides in the Superfund Risk Assessment Model. Ms. Sutter inquired what the background number is for the radium 226 daughter (Ra 226 D), and Mr. Dean replied that it is 1 picocurie per gram, also noting that the number is in great controversy and that Ra 226 D has a half-life of 1,600 years.

Kevin Reilly queried whether these numbers were averages that varied widely, and Mr. Dean answered in the affirmative, qualifying that if someone were to measure the sidewalk or the pavement, the measurements would vary from one section to another. He further noted that it would frequently depend on where the aggregate for the concrete and the asphalt came from-Rocky Mountain granite or coastal granite, etc.

Ms. Lee inquired whether despite the variations occurring naturally on the property, would the regulatory agencies nonetheless have to follow the PRG. Mr. Dean explained that the PRG has a role in preliminary assessment, but the EPA has actually moved beyond that in particular cases such as with radium, where the contaminated area needs to become as clean as the surrounding uncontaminated soil. He added that in those cases, the cleanup becomes extraordinarily expensive, and thus alternative approaches have to be developed and carefully considered.

Ms. Lee asked what ranges of measurement were found at OU-3/Site 1. Mr. Dean replied that one bucket pegged the meter at well over 5 millirems per hour. He commented that it seemed someone had collected several radioactive devices and thrown them into a paint can and then buried the can shallowly. He stated that he and James Ricks, Remedial Project Manger (RPM), had recorded that particular sampling on videotape.

Mr. Reilly queried whether background models were expensive because of the volume or because of how the material has to be relocated. Mr. Dean responded in the affirmative to both questions, adding that disposal costs are extremely high, since the U.S. has only one facility-Envirocare in Clive, Utah-that can receive radium.

Ms. Sutter asked for any further questions. None were voiced.

IV. IR Program Update

OU-2

Greg Lorton, RPM for the Navy in San Diego, handed out copies of "Operable Units and IR Sites/Alameda Point," the latest map differentiating by color Operable Units (OU) 1, 2A, 2B, 2C, 3, 4, 5, and an Area of Concern; two other areas, an Installation Restoration (IR) Site and an Environmental Baseline Parcel, were designated by a dashed-line box and a solid-line box, respectively. Mr. Lorton stated that he would be discussing the operable unit boundaries and some changes that have taken place in the designations of the operable unit.

Mr. Lorton began the presentation by reviewing the way the operable units were previously designated in 1998. OU-1 had five sites: Site 6, Aircraft Maintenance Facility; Site 7, Navy Exchange Service Station; Site 8, Pesticide Storage Area; Site 15, Transformer Storage Area; and Site 16, Shipping Container Storage Area. OU-2 consisted of 14 sites: a large group of sites referred to as the Southwestern and Eastern Area of OU-2; another group of sites referred to as the Central Area of OU-2; Site 14, Fire Training Area; and Site 25, Estuary Park. OU-3 consisted of a single site, Site 1, the Landfill. OU-4 consisted of three marine sites: Oakland Inner Harbor, Seaplane Lagoon, and Pier 1 and Pier 2 Sediments.

Mr. Lorton explained that the 1998 classification of the operable units had some inherent problems with boundary determinations, as many of the sites were designated only by a building's footprint, whereas the contamination that had occurred in a given building often spread to the soil and the groundwater in the surrounding vicinity. He stated that therefore the test criteria designates the EBS parcel-rather than just the building footprint-as the site.

Referring to the new "Operable Units and IR Sites" map, Mr. Lorton discussed the changes that have occurred to the operable unit boundaries. He explained that OU-1 in 1998 contained five sites, but because the contamination in Site 14-the Fire Training Area-seemed more consistent with that of OU-1 than OU-2, the investigation for Site 14 has now moved from OU-2 to OU-1. Also, that Site 16 of OU-1 has become larger, having had the former auto hobby shop added onto it because during recent investigations similar chlorinated solvents were found in the soil.

OU-2, Mr. Lorton noted, is now in three parts: OU-2A and OU-2B in the southeastern corner of Alameda Point and OU-2C in the center. He stated that OU-2A is primarily Site 13 (the Former Oil Refinery), along with Site 9 (the Paint Stripping Facility, associated with the use of chlorinated solvents), Site 22 (the Former Service Station), and Site 23 (Missile Rework Operations), which also has significant contamination from petroleum-based products. He commented that the size of OU-2B has increased somewhat, having gained Parcels 116 through 120 and Parcel 127, the latter having evidence of contamination to warrant making the parcel part of Site 21, Ship Fitting and Engine Repair.

Ms. Sutter inquired whether these parcels were being added because of the EBS process. Mr. Lorton replied in the affirmative, clarifying that the sampling was being done because of the EBS. He added that the parcels were being added because of finding evidence of similar forms of contamination.

Anna-Marie Cook inquired about data-gap sampling being done, and Mr. Lorton answered in the affirmative. He said that additional data-gap sampling would be done in fall 2000, possibly to prove some of the sites are not as seriously contaminated as previously thought.

Mr. Lorton stated that the central area is a fairly sophisticated situation, involving Site 5 (Building 5, Aircraft Rework Facility), and Site 10 (Building 400, Missile Rework Operations), as well as Site 12 (Power Plant). He explained that OU-2C has expanded to include Site 45A (Dry Cleaning Facility), where chlorinated solvent has been detected.

Ms. Sutter inquired about the information for Building 10/Site 12 (Power Plant) that appears on the Site Summary Chart of the latest map, listing no evidence of contamination in the soil or groundwater. Mr. Lorton opined that the Power Plant is probably going to be removed from OU-2C designation.

Mr. Lorton noted that OU-3 has expanded in Site1 (Disposal Area) to investigate the presence of radiation. He remarked that OU-4 has added Site 2, West Beach Landfill. He reported that the RWQCB has found lead shot in the Bay.

Mr. Lorton explained that OU-5 is new and was formed to handle Site 25/Estuary Park, the Coast Guard Housing where evidence of polycyclic/ polyhalogenated aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs) have been found in subsurface soil.

Mr. Lorton noted a current Area of Concern (AOC) regarding the Western Hangar Zone, a number of parcels which may become a new operable unit because petroleum products and chlorinated solvents have been detected there.

Ms. Sutter queried whether Pier 1 and 2 were going to be included with sediments off shore of Site 1, OU-3under the Sediments work group. Mr. Lorton answered that the BRAC office is trying to move things along more quickly with that cleanup. He explained that some of the delay is because other installations, such as Hunters Point and Mare Island, have similar sediment issues to deal with, and the Navy wants to be consistent in its method of affording solutions. Ms. Sutter reiterated the RAB's desire to have the sediments off shore of Site 1, OU included. Mr. Job alluded to the lead shot found offshore.

Ms. Cook asked whether Site 2 (West Beach Landfill) had a different schedule than the other IR sites. He replied that it was on a faster schedule because of concern that a terrestrial landfill was being grouped with marine sites and that perhaps that would slow down cleanup of the landfill.

Site 18

Mr. Job handed out a discussion worksheet, "Designation of Site 18 (Storm Drains)," to the RAB members for review. He began with an overview of stormwater pollution problems, noting the fact that stormwater is the largest source of pollution and the most difficult to control. He cited various chemicals found in storm water-PAHs from automotive sources, atmospheric deposition, and road runoff; organophosphate pesticides; and metals such as copper and lead. He stated that Alameda Point stormwater had all of these traditional pollutants and also others: chlorinated solvents in low concentrations, less than 10 parts per million (ppm), and petroleum.

He also listed the pollutants observed in Alameda Point offshore sediments: PCBs from industrial waste; PAHs from fill, marsh crust, and atmospheric deposition; metals such as cadmium, lead, zinc, and copper from industrial waste; and DDT from runoff.

Mr. Job briefly discussed the octanol/water partitioning coefficient, where a high coefficient means chemicals are more likely to bioaccumulate or biomagnify. In other words, the higher the number the less soluble a pollutant is in water and the more likely that pollutant will sorb to particulates. He opined that the ultimate mission of his agency for the next fifteen years is to realize no measurable level of mercury and PCB contaminants in the fat tissues of fish in San Francisco Bay. He commented that the toxic chemicals found in fish are the same ones found in sediment. Mr. Reilly inquired where dioxin fell on the coefficient scale, and Mr. Job answered that it is higher than for PCBs.

Mr. Job stated that aquatic life problems associated with solvents or petroleum are rarely seen, and he added that upland sources of pollution still exist in many areas of the Bay, and possibly at Alameda Point.

He quickly reviewed what has been done to address stormwater pollution at Alameda Point: a stormdrain video inspection in 1990; a stormdrain cleanout from 1995-1998; plugging the stormdrain site at Site 7 in 1999; the Radiological Storm Drain Removal in 1999; ongoing National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) monitoring; investigation of petroleum-polluted groundwater infiltration in 2000; and an upcoming investigation of VOC-polluted groundwater infiltration.

Mr. Job explained the rationale for dedesignating Site 18 as an IR site: 1) the sediment phase pollution in stormdrains has been removed as much as practicable; 2) rather than actually being polluted, stormdrains serve as a pathway for pollution from other sites; 3) due to the geography of Site 18, the impact upon transfer and reuse is significant; 4) remaining groundwater problems associated with stormdrains are best addressed on a plume-by-plume basis; and 5) existing (NPDES) regulations require that the Navy implement a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) and a Storm Water Management Plan (SWMP).

Mr. Job listed areas requiring improvement: the identification of upland sources of pollution; the implementation of a SWPPP and Best Management Practices (BMPs); the performance monitoring of BMPs; the coordination of redevelopment plans with stormwater pollution prevention principles; and improved enforcement of NPDES regulations.

Mr. Kloc inquired as to what documents needed to be produced to dedesignate Site 18. Mr. Job replied that he did not know. Ms. Cook commented that Site 18 will probably not officially be called "dedesignated," that it would remain an IR site and be called "reconfigured," because all that has occurred is to reduce the area of the stormdrains.

Mr. Job asked for any further questions. None were voiced.

V. Project Teams, Round the Table

Ms. Sutter suggested that since the meeting was running late, the standard format should yield to simply having any focus group members or team leaders who wished to report to do so.

OU-3

Mr. Kloc stated that 30 June 2000 he had prepared a handout, "Comments on the Draft Human Health Risk Assessment in Support of Remedial Action Objectives for Radiological Materials at Operable Unit 3, Alameda Point," and asked that it be included with the minutes in the monthly packet.

Ms. Sutter introduced the RAB to two potential new members, Bill Mitchell and Nick DeBenedittis..

Ms. Sutter stated she would like the administrative group of the RAB to meet before the next meeting and decide how to handle all the applications the RAB is receiving and how to handle the members who have not been attending meetings on a regular basis.

Ms. Sutter asked for any further comments from the focus groups. None were voiced.

VI. BCT Activities

Mr. Job reported that he had attended the Marsh Crust RAP ROD meeting, with four public representatives attending and a number of questions and comments solicited. He also noted that the BCT had met and found the new team to be working commendably as it began discussing remediation technologies and remediation approaches to various sites.

VII. Community & RAB Comment Period

Ms. Sutter asked for any further comments from the community or the RAB. None were voiced. She adjourned the meeting at 8:40 p.m.

N00236.000568
ALAMEDA POINT
SSIC NO. 5090.3

ATTACHMENT – ATTENDANCE LIST

11 JULY 2000 RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD (RAB) MEETING SUMMARY

THE ABOVE IDENTIFIED ATTACHMENT IS NOT AVAILABLE.

EXTENSIVE RESEARCH WAS PERFORMED BY NAVFAC SOUTHWEST TO LOCATE THIS ATTACHMENT. THIS PAGE HAS BEEN INSERTED AS A PLACEHOLDER AND WILL BE REPLACED SHOULD THE MISSING ITEM BE LOCATED.

QUESTIONS MAY BE DIRECTED TO:

DIANE C. SILVA
RECORDS MANAGEMENT SPECIALIST
NAVAL FACILITIES ENGINEERING COMMAND SOUTHWEST
1220 PACIFIC HIGHWAY
SAN DIEGO, CA 92132

TELEPHONE: (619) 532-3676

TETRA TECH EM INC.

TRANSMITTAL/DELIVERABLE RECEIPT

Contract No. N68711-00-D-0005 Document Control No. TC . A021 . 10074

TO: Mr. Ron Fuller, Code 02R1.RF
Contracting Officer
Naval Facilities Engineering Command
Southwest Division
1230 Columbia Street, Suite 1100
San Diego, CA 92101-8517

DATE: 04/03/03
DO: 021
LOCATION:
Alameda Point, Alameda, California

FROM: MWant

Michael Wanta, Contract Manager

DOCUMENT TITLE AND DATE:

Restoration Advisory Board Meeting Summaries for 2002, April 2, 2003

TYPE: ☐ Contractual Deliverable ☐ Technical Deliverable (DS) ☒ Other (TC)

VERSION: NA (e.g., Draft, Draft Final, Final) REVISION #: NA

ADMIN RECORD: Yes ☒ No ☐ CATEGORY: Confidential ☐

SCHEDULED DELIVERY DATE: NA ACTUAL DELIVERY DATE: 04/03/03

NUMBER OF COPIES SUBMITTED TO NAVY: O/3C/4E

O = original transmittal form
C = copy of transmittal form
E = enclosure

COPIES TO: (Include Name, Navy Mail Code, and Number of Copies)

NAVY:	TETRA TECH:	OTHER:
M. McClelland (06CAMM)	File/Doc Control	
O/1E	1C/1E (w/QC)	
Diane Silva (05G.DS)*	Courtney Colvin	
3C/3E	1C/1E	

Date/Time Received

*Admin Record Recipient

rev 07/22/02