

**NAVAL AIR STATION (NAS) ALAMEDA  
RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD MEETING MINUTES**

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

**Tuesday, 7 November 2000**

**Purpose:** 1) Approval of last month's meetings minutes, 2) Co-Chair Announcements, 3) RAB Nominations and Elections, 4) FY 01 Removal Actions, 5) Project Teams-Round the Table, 6) BCT Activities, 7) Community and RAB Comment Period.

These minutes summarize the items discussed during the RAB meeting. This is not a verbatim transcript. Attachment A provides the attendance list.

**I. Approval of Minutes**

Michael McClelland called the meeting to order at 7:05 p.m.

Ms. Sutter called for questions or comments to the October 2000 minutes. There were many corrections from the RAB members on the minutes. The changes are as follows:

Ms. Cook that *page 7, paragraph 4* should change from "Mr. McClelland responded in the negative" to "Mr. McClelland stated that the document will have a public review period." She also noted that on *page 2, paragraph 1* the words "Ground Field" should be changed to "Brown Field".

Mr. Morgan noted that *page 10, paragraphs 7, 9 and 10* should be changed from "Mr. Morgan" to "Mr. Leach" in every case. Mr. Morgan also noted that page 15, paragraph 3 "Mr. Berges" should be changed to "Mr. Morgan".

Mr. Kloc clarified on *page 9, paragraph 4*, the words "Methaphenol" and "Pentochloraphenol" should be spelled "Methylphenol" and "Pentachlorophenol".

Mr. Morgan stated that on *page 19, paragraph 1* states that "Mr. McClelland informed the RAB that the letter and the Site Summary... will be attached in the next minutes." Mr. Morgan noted that that letter was not received. Mr. McClelland assured him it would be in the coming mailing.

Ms. Johnson noted that on *page 4, number 5* the statement "Plan is envisioned as 90% marina" should be changed to "Plan is envisioned as 900 slip marina". She also noted that there should be a new paragraph and number starting with the phrase, "When the plan was originally developed..." That paragraph should be entitled "*Civic Core*". She also noted that the sentence that reads "When the plan was originally developed there was a potential for a Pan Pacific University campus which proposed taking down the entire civic core" should read "When the plan was originally developed there was a large part of the civic core was proposed for reuse on Pan Pacific University's campus."

Ms. Johnson also noted that on *page 4, number 7* "The Reuse Plan report has" should be changed to the "The Reuse Plan report has".

Ms. Johnson noted that on page 5, paragraph 1 that "general plan" should be capitalized in every case and that "general plans" should be changed to "General Plan".

Ms. Johnson noted that on *page 5, paragraph 3* that the sentence "Ms. Johnson responded that the City of Alameda will seek the developer's input about other ways to develop the base" should be changed to "Ms. Johnson responded that the City of Alameda will seek the developer's input about how to develop the base". In the same paragraph she noted that the sentence "The Reuse Plan will be finalized only after a series of public meetings, which will be held at the City of Alameda Planning Department" should read "The General Plan will be finalized only after a series of public input meetings by the City of Alameda Planning Department".

Ms. Johnson noted that on *page 5, paragraph 10* the sentence, "Ms. Johnson replied in the negative, stating that there is no further residential use anticipated in that area and that the barracks may be used for commercial purposes" should be changed to "Ms. Johnson stated that there is no additional residential use anticipated in that area beyond the Reuse Plan provisions and that the barracks may be used for commercial or residential purposes".

Ms. Johnson noted that on *page 5, paragraph 12* the sentence "Ms. Johnson replied in the negative, stating that the only changes would be acreage" should read "Ms. Johnson stated that there may be changes in acreage or land use changes developed through the general plan process".

Ms. Stirewalt commented that the process is informal, so extensive revisions are not necessarily appropriate. She said that it takes away from the accuracy of the minutes when people make extensive changes.

Ms. Sutter noted that extensive revision took place in the minutes before it was received by the RAB because there were statements made that did not get conveyed, this revision process is necessary.

Ms. Stirewalt stated that if clarification is needed, it should be done in the current meeting and be included in the upcoming minutes rather than changing the old ones.

Ms. Cassa noted that on *page 9, paragraph 5* the sentence "Ms. Cassa responded that the focus group has not discussed chemicals in the groundwater, as they are addressing more serious issues of contamination" should read "Ms. Cassa responded that the BCT has not discussed other chemicals in the groundwater because petroleum compounds seem to be the most serious problem."

Ms. Cassa also noted that on *page 9, paragraph 3* the sentence, "Ms. Cassa responded that the focus group is looking at Site 7 as part of the OU-1 using petroleum modeling program," should read "Ms. Cassa responded to Mr. Kloc that he was looking at the petroleum modeling report on behalf of the focus group because Site 7 is OU-1 and he is working on OU-1".

Ms. Cassa also noted that on *page 9, paragraph 8* the sentence, "Mr. Ramsey stated that the EPA commented several months back that there were references to the Navy indicating that Site 7 had agreed to be taken out of the CERCLA process," should read "Mr. Ramsey stated that the EPA

commented several months back that the Navy indicated that there was an agreement to take Site 7 out of the CERCLA process."

Ms. Sutter made a motion to accept the minutes. It was seconded. The minutes were accepted as final after the changes have been made.

## **II. Co-Chair Announcements**

Ms. Sutter passed out documents to the RAB regarding Coast Guard housing as well as letters that were from the DTSC and the Navy.

Mr. Torrey stated that he received some letters from the Department of Health and ---Services concerning some of the work they were doing at Alameda in March 2000. They identified issues after doing a public health assessment. The RAB confirmed that they had already received copies of these documents.

Mike McClelland noted that the letters Ms. Sutter passed around from the DTSC and the Navy were regarding Site 25 and what the Navy was doing at Estuary Park in terms of a maintenance action. These are concerns both from the agencies and the Navy. We prepared an action memo in early October and the following week the removal action was done. Currently, this action is being completed. It will be develop as a park for children including play structures. That action memo will be placed in the repositories and published in the newspaper.

## **III. RAB Nominations and Elections**

Ms. Stirewalt noted that Mr. Morgan's name should be added on the signage to the Administrative Focus Group.

She stated that Michael Torrey was the only nomination for Community Co-Chair, and she opened up the floor for any other nominations for Community Co-Chair. There were none.

Mr. Torrey stated his desire to be for the Co-Chair position and the types of things he would like to see like more participation from the RAB and in the future. He stated that he had been on the RAB for six years and that he has been the Vice Co-Chair for the last few years. He stated that he is a member of the (inaudible) Housing Commission and the City's Board Housing Commission.

Ms. Stirewalt then opened the floor for nominations for the Vice Community Co-Chair. Ms. Lee nominated Ms. Behm for Vice Community Co-Chair. Ms. Behm accepted the nomination. Ms. Stirewalt asked for other nominations. None were voiced.

It was moved and seconded that since there were no other nominees the current nominees would be accepted as officers for which they were running. The motion was seconded and accepted. The Co-Chair and Vice Co-Chair will assume their offices in January 2001.

Mr. Clement Burnap was introduced as an applicant to the RAB. Mr. Burnap stated that he is a retired engineer and that he has worked in the ports as well as being a formal Naval officer. Mr. Burnap was to be interviewed after the meeting.

Ms. Stirewalt stated that she would get a copy of the charter to everyone, so that the RAB will be aware of RAB procedures. She also noted that she had a document that showed guidelines for setting up RABs that could be viewed by the RAB if desired.

#### **IV. FY 01 Removal Actions**

Mr. McClelland introduced Michael Bloom, Lead Remedial Project Manager for Alameda Point. Mr. Bloom introduced the Navy Remedial Project Managers who would present the non-time-critical removal actions for Alameda Point.

Mr. Bloom talked about the budget for the FY2001. The team is geared for approximately \$35 million to complete the work. It is for both CERCLA and petroleum investigations and cleanups which includes data gap sampling and other actions.

Ms. Lee asked if the money had to be committed for FY 2001? Mr. Bloom responded in the affirmative.

Mr. de Haan stated that Mare Island is promised \$80 million for their Early Transfer. They have also signed an Economic Development Conveyance Memorandum of Agreement (EDCMOA) saying that they will receive additional money for parcel C & D. How is the money linked for Alameda Point like Mare Island's linked money?

Mr. Bloom stated that it is linked that is why he used the word "approximately." Alameda Point is proposed to get approximately \$35 million and we are hoping to still get that amount.

Mr. McClelland stated that Mare Island agrees \$40 million this year and \$40 million the next year. All of the bases have large budgets for this year. Right now the intention is that the money will not come out of Alameda Point's money, but it is still possible. Currently, the Navy is planning to spend \$35 million for Alameda Point. That is part of the reasons the Navy is doing some removal actions, so that we will be prepared for remedial actions which is more costly.

Mr. Bloom noted that once the Navy starts getting actions awarded that thing will then be line itemed and scheduled.

Ms. Sutter noted that the RAB in the past has asked for a line item budget, but it has not been received.

#### **EE/CA and Action Memorandum**

Glenna Clark, the Navy, explained the EE/CA and Action Memorandum:

1. An Engineering Evaluation/Cost Analysis (EE/CA) must be completed for all non-time-critical removal actions. An EE/CA is a flexible document tailored to the scope, goals and objectives of this non-time-critical removal action. An EE/CA should contain only data that is necessary to support the selection of a response alternative and rely upon existing documentation whenever possible. The Navy is currently in the process of producing that.
2. There is a thirty-day period for public comment and for the Navy to respond to comments.

3. The results of the EE/CA are then summarized in the Action Memorandum.

Ms. Clark stated that an EE/CA would include the following:

1. Executive Summary
2. Site Characterizations which includes: site description, a background, previous removal actions, source, nature, extent of contamination, analytical data, and streamlined risk evaluation.
3. Identification of Removal Action Objectives: includes statutory limits on removal actions, determination of removal actions, determination of removal schedule, and planned remedial activities.
4. Identification of Analysis of Removal Action Alternatives includes information on effectiveness, implementability, and costs.
5. Comparative Analysis of Removal Action Alternatives
6. Recommended Removal Action Alternatives

Ms. Sutter asked the size of the documents. Mr. McClelland stated that it varied based on the complexity.

Ms. Clark stated that the Action Memorandum would include:

1. Purpose
2. Site Conditions and Background which includes site description, other actions and state and local authorities' roles.
3. Threats to Public Health or Welfare or the Environment
4. Endangerment Determination
5. Proposed Actions and Estimated Costs
6. Expected Change in the Situation Should Action Be Delayed or Not Taken
7. Outstanding Policy Issues
8. Enforcement
9. Recommendation

Mr. McClelland clarified for the RAB that the EE/CA states what the problem is and the Action Memorandum shows the solution or decision. The Action Memorandum is not necessarily the final action, and it must be memorialized ultimately in a Record of Decision.

#### ***Soil Removal Actions***

Mr. Bloom talked about alternatives to soil removal. The alternatives are no action,

Mr. Job added that at Travis AFB the Advanced Oxidation Process (AOP) is used. The AOP is for pump and treat systems. Water is pulled out of the ground and treated. Many times when certain chemicals are injected in the ground other organics interfere with the breakdown of the chemicals. Mr. Weissenborn noted that the AOP is more effective.

#### *Chemical Oxidation Considerations*

Mr. Weissenborn continued that there are considerations for the Navy's approach for chemical oxidation. If chemicals are injected into the subsurface, the chemicals must circulate around the injection point. There is potential for an explosion if petroleum product is encountered.

#### *Coast Guard Housing-IR 25*

The Coast Guard Housing area is high on the Navy's priority list. The Navy does not want to use the "dig and haul" method for cleanup because it bothers the residents. The alternative methods are ElectroChemicalGeoOxidation, Enhanced Bioremediation and Chemical Oxidation.

ElectroChemicalGeoOxidation is a proven European technology. It is an electrically-induced, oxidation-reduction process that breaks down chemicals both large and small. When the process is complete, water and carbon dioxide are the end products. Ms. Daily asked if the end products would be toxic. Mr. Weissenborn assured her that they wouldn't be toxic if done properly.

Enhanced Bioremediation provides for the substrate. Methane and other nutrients are injected. When the process is complete, it yields water and carbon dioxide.

Chemical Oxidation involves injecting or tilling Potassium Permanganate. Again, water and carbon dioxide are the end products. Landscaping has to be taken into consideration, because injection is for deeper treatment overall. With pilot testing it will be determined how much of the area can be affected.

Ms. Lee asked how long will it take for the process to be complete. Mr. Weissenborn answered that the removal actions outside of Site 25 will be completed as soon as possible. However, if the Navy is still unsure after the pilot testing, an estimation will be given. He stated that it is possible to complete the process in six to nine months for final results.

Mr. de Haan asked if there would be a secondary effort to go back in to get metals. Mr. Lorton answered that with there is a removal action to reduce metals. Soil removals for Sites 4 and 5 are being done, and there will be at least two separate activities.

Mr. de Haan asked if there are other sites that will undergo the same process. Mr. Lorton answered Sites 4 and 5 have been completed, and they both have DNAPL. There are soil removal actions that have been dealt with completely. There will be excavating done at those sites.

Mr. de Haan asked if some of the prototype technology that occurred would be used to complete this process. Mr. Lorton stated that he wasn't familiar with the project. Ms. Cook stated that the project was unsuccessful and explained some of the prototype technologies. Mr. Lorton stated that those technologies work only in certain cases like commercial mining.

Ms. Cook stated that the major reason the removal action is being done in this fashion is because the Navy is trying to clean up most of the contamination in a short amount of time. If more remedial action needs to be done it will be done following the cleanup. It is a dual process.

excavation/on-site disposal or excavation/off-site disposal. Within disposal off-site alternative, soil can be put in a landfill depending on the type of contamination in the soil being removed. He introduced Greg Lorton, Navy RPM.

### ***DNAPL Removal Actions***

Mr. Lorton talked about how site boundaries have changed and passed out a memo to that effect. Mr. Lorton also addressed Dense Non-Aqueous Phase Liquids (DNAPLs). He explained that DNAPLs are oily-phased liquids heavier than water as opposed to LNAPLs which are lighter than water. He said that a good example of LNAPL is Italian dressing that hasn't been shaken up.

LNAPLs accumulate on top of the water while DNAPLs migrate down through the water which creates a problem. DNAPLs at Alameda Point result primarily from chlorinated solvents from cleaning activities including maintenance and repair. DNAPLs are pure compounds that have the potential if for pollution if dissolved into water. They do not, however, tend to dissolve in water. One gallon of Trichloroethylene (which is a DNAPL) can pollute 900 million gallons of water. It is the goal to get the DNAPL out as quickly as the process will allow.

### ***The DNAPL constituents that are of concern are:***

Perchloroethylene	1,1,1- Trichloroethane
Trichloroethylene	1,1,2- Trichloroethane
1,1-Dichloroethane	1,1- Dichloroethylene
1,2- Dichloroethane	1,2- Dichloroethylene
Carbon Tetrachloride	Chloroform
Dichloromethane	Dichlorobenzene

### ***DNAPL Characterization***

It is difficult to determine the presence of DNAPL which may be 30 or 40 feet below. The only way to find DNAPL is to install a boring and use the information from that boring to determine if there is a separate phase heavier than water. Because it is so difficult, generally, you have to make an inference based on the type of water to determine if DNAPL is present. Once you determine that DNAPL is present, it is also difficult to remove. Difficulties can occur because of the topography, soil type or the geology that separates the groundwater. If you have a hilly terrain the DNAPL can settle in the valleys and also make it difficult to locate..

Ribbon samplers are techniques that will help to quantitatively determine whether there are DNAPLS in the chlorine. A ribbon sampler is a tube that is impregnated with something similar to a toner. When you place this tube into a boring and inflate it an oily-phase material will cause a color change in the tube. The air and water are released and a measurement is taken so that you can place the DNAPLS. This will be a part of the data sampling completed in 2001.

### ***DNAPL Removal Alternatives***

#### ***No Action***

The no action alternative is mandated by the EPA regulations. It must be considered what would happen if nothing happened. If no action were to take place the problem could become worse.

#### ***In Situ Chemical Oxidation***

This is pumping an oxidation agent into the DNAPL and groundwater. The oxidizing agent oxidizes the contaminants to benign reaction products. There are several different oxidation

agents that may be used: 1) Fenton's Reagent which is a mixture of ferrous iron and hydrogen peroxide in an acidic solution, 2) Permanganate ion which is injected into the groundwater to oxidize hydrocarbons, and 3) Ozone which can be dissolved in water and is a more aggressive approach. In Situ Chemical Oxidation can be costly depending on how many oxidizing agents you must use to destroy the chlorinated compounds.

#### *Steam Stripping with Soil Vapor Extraction*

This steam process involves being injected into the DNAPL to heat up the DNAPL and groundwater to increase the DNAPL's mobility and to volatilize it. The DNAPL vapor and steam rises up through the groundwater and soil and is captured. At this point you can remove them or oxidize them.

Ms. Sutter asked how is this different from the prototype the RAB saw. Mr. Lorton responded that it is the same thing.

#### *Electrical Heating with Soil Vapor Extraction*

Electrodes are installed into the DNAPL. Electrical energy is applied to the DNAPL and groundwater to increase the DNAPL's mobility and to volatilize it. The DNAPL vapor and steam rise up through the ground water and it is captured. The captured vapor is either recovered and treated to remove contaminants. At Sites 4 and 5, these kinds of techniques will work well because this method is easy for capturing and treating these contaminants.

#### ***Dissolved-Phase Groundwater Contaminant Removal Actions***

Rick Weissenborn, the Navy RPM, stated that the purpose of dissolved-phase groundwater contaminant removal action is to reduce mass and mobility of dissolved contaminants. The target compounds being 1,1-DCE, TCE, Vinyl Chloride, and Benzene. The major sites that will undergo this technique are Sites 9, 11, 19, and 21. Sites 14 and 16 will also be done, but Site 16 needs more characterization before the Navy can do a removal action.

In the EE/CA the Navy will consider the no action alternative. There are three techniques that will possibly be used: soil vapor extraction, chemical oxidation and enhanced bioremediation.

#### *Air Sparging and Soil Vapor Extraction*

Soil vapor extraction involves installing horizontal vapor extraction wells while taking into consideration configuration and spacing. A pressure mound can be created along with a different direction of groundwater flow around these wells. The primary purpose is to capture the contaminants. Soil vapor extraction has been used for gasoline work in underground storage tanks (USTs) and pipelines. This process is very effective and inexpensive. Vapors are extracted by surface blowers and a VaporPhase Treatment System is required.

#### *Chemical Oxidation*

An oxidant is added to the groundwater. The following oxidants may be used : Fenton's Reagent, Ozone, and Potassium Permanganate. The Navy is looking at Potassium Permanganate with the most favor because it is the most innocuous of the three and is very effective. Hydrogen peroxide was considered but eliminated because it is not effective.

Mr. Leach stated in his experience, a 50 percent mixture of hydrogen peroxide is the most effective way to treat these chemicals. There are no off shoot residuals to deal with. Carbon filters are very expensive to regenerate but can be reused six times.

Ms. Stirewalt commented that she got the impression that the process would not work on the chlorinated hydrocarbons but would work on the pure hydrocarbons. She also asked if the things that were not dissolved would be blown out to volatilize the contaminants and cause them to rise to the surface. Mr. Lorton said that the process creates a gas with a vacuum. The vapors that are created must be recovered.

Ms. Stirewalt asked with that process how is one certain that all contamination is recovered. Mr. Lorton answered that for the steam stripping and the electrical heating, the groundwater is being boiled. By the time the groundwater is boiled, the DNAPL constituents will be driven off. Before electrodes are plugged in, a better characterization must be done to see where the DNAPL is and how much is present. The DNAPL must be surrounded because its mobility is increasing. The vapors have to be driven towards the middle.

Ms. Stirewalt asked how is the direction of the vapors controlled once it is in gas form. Mr. Lorton answered that it rises up. Ms. Stirewalt asked if a vacuum was being used. Mr. Lorton responded in the affirmative. He continued by stating that the technologies work on both hydrocarbons and chlorinated hydrocarbons.

Ms. Stirewalt asked once you collect DNAPLs under the surface, do you have to continue with an oxidation tube. Mr. Lorton answered that it must either be recovered or oxidized. It can be condensed and recovered but that might not be the most economically sound way of processing the DNAPLs.

Ms. Sutter decided to close all comments and questions. She asked if it were possible to schedule for the Navy to return to give more specifics on the technology at a later date. Mr. Bloom stated that it would not be a problem.

#### **V. Project Teams, Round the Table**

None of the team leaders had reports. Mr. Kloc distributed a hand out that will be included with the minutes for the next meeting minutes. Ms. Sutter stated that the team leaders need to be determined and clearly marked on the signage.

#### **VI. BCT Activities**

Ms. Cook stated that on October 11 and 12, the Federal Facilities Agreement (FFA) was completed after an extensive process. The final version was distributed today to the Navy and the State. It is the hope to send it to the EPA local offices and to Washington, DC. The State has a choice of signing the FFA or not. If the State does not sign the FFA they cannot maintain any enforcement action under their own laws against the Navy on this base.

The EPA and Navy signed the FFA, and it is a binding agreement. The State can join at any time after the schedule comes enforceable simply by amending the FFA. The discussion on the schedule is on-going. There was an all-day meeting on Oct. 18th. Four of the schedules are completed and there are five left to finish. (Inaudible).

During the BCT meeting on October 17th, there was a discussion on sediments in the morning. This was not a very lucrative discussion because there was no progress and none of the data was summarized as yet. The Navy determined which sites will need further data taken and which sites did not. The BCT did discuss the benefits of pulling out of the pier area of Sea Plane Lagoon to

see if we could expedite some of the other IR sites. A good part of the afternoon was spent on discussing how to expedite Site 25. It is seen as a time critical removal action. We also discussed doing pilot studies on Estuary Park.

## **VII. Community and RAB Comment Period**

Mr. Patrick Lynch, a community member stated his great concerns with the progress of Site 25 as well as other areas at Alameda Point:

- A copy of the Health and Safety Plan was not made available to the Community. There were over six months for the Navy and the regulators to make plans for that action. The Navy has disconnected the public from participating in decisions that were made on that excavation. This is an issue that was at Alameda Point called to the Navy's attention at the January 2000 RAB meeting.
- Petroleum contamination is a major problem at Alameda Point. Mr. Lynch then passed out pictures that showed petroleum that was not properly cleaned up. The photograph showed a water line failed and 30 tons of soil were washed away. He noted that this occurred at Site 27 six months ago. He passed out a copy of the city soil files. He stated the picture showed a despicable display of site controls.
- People are gaining access to Estuary Park, which is contaminated. He passed out pictures of Coast Guard residents drinking beers after a football game in Estuary Park. The signage says, "Welcome to Estuary Park" when it should say "No Trespassing".
- There is a need to move forward with cleanup actions on the sites. At Site 13, the Navy did not complete the removal action because the volume of soil exceeded the anticipation. The Navy is going back to clean it now. At Site 15, the Navy changed the cleanup alternative after they made the EE/CA available to the community. The Navy selected an alternative that was not evaluated. At Site 16, the Navy provided responses to public comments, a final health and safety plan and responses to the EPA's comments the day after the removal action was completed. This should have been done before the removal action. The removal action is not a formal process, and it comes at the expense of community participation. The RAB should look at those removal actions very closely to see whether or not the idea is to silence the public from participating in how the sites are cleaned up.
- Responses were not received to the comments that were submitted to the Navy. The Navy maintains that they responded to the comments I submitted two years ago. They maintain that USTs are not installed within the marsh crust area below a depth of five feet Mr. Leach continued that he would like to see the final document come out with substantial responses to the comments that he submitted. He noted that a copy of the map of the depth of the marsh crust was attached to the ordinance. Exhibit A will show that the marsh crust ordinance does not apply to George Miller School, the neighboring pre-school, the Coast Guard housing, or Estuary Park. The city has passed an ordinance that excludes that area, so it does not make sense that it is being considered a part of the remedy for the marsh crust in that area. The map sends the wrong information to people. Because of public safety, that map should show where contamination is found, not related to the marsh crust, but to other IR Sites. So that when someone looks at that map, they will know that they will encounter contamination above the marsh crust.

Mr. de Haan asked if response was received from the Navy regarding his comments. Mr. Lynch stated that responses from the Navy were not adequate. Mr. Leach continued that he would like for the EPA, at the next RAB meeting, to answer if the Navy complied with the notification requirements under CERCLA when chlordane was discovered at Parcel 168 in 1994-95.

Mr. Lynch continued that the Navy responded to the comments on Site 16, and made comments that Superfund was not an environmental justice issue. He thought that to be remarkably naïve.

Ms. Dailey stated (inaudible). Mr. Lynch responded that November 1994 was the date for the EE/CA. Mr. Job continued that the type of remedy wasn't changed but the type of treatment was.

Mr. Kloc stated that it was his understanding that there would be signage at Estuary Park indicating that it was off limits. Mr. Edde stated that signage will be produced and posted. Mr. Edde continued that there were signs that were put up before the fence was put up, but this is additional signage will be put up because of the situation that happened in the picture.

Mr. de Haan noted that in the picture it clearly shows that the sign says, "Welcome to Estuary Park". Mr. Edde noted that part of the park is still open. Mr. Edde continued that the Navy has reemphasized to the Coast Guard residents that the site is off limits. No other incidents have been heard of since that football game.

Ms. Lee asked if the area was fenced and if people were trespassing. Mr. Edde stated that the area is fenced. He continued that there was a portion of the fence that had been knocked down, and the Navy had it repaired.

Ms. de Haan stated that Site 13 was being used as a motorcycle track. He said that he didn't know if it was contaminated. But if it is, it should be blocked off. Mr. Edde said that he had no knowledge of it being used for that purpose but would do further investigation.

Ms. Sutter called for further comments. None were voiced.

*The meeting was adjourned at 8:42 p.m.*

**ATTACHMENT – ATTENDANCE LIST**

**07 NOVEMBER 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**



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: Michael Wanta, Contract Manager

DOCUMENT TITLE AND DATE:

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

TYPE: Contractual Deliverable (checkbox), Technical Deliverable (DS) (checkbox), Other (TC) (checked)

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

ADMIN RECORD: Yes (checked) No (checkbox) CATEGORY: Confidential (checkbox)

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)

Table with 3 columns: NAVY, TETRA TECH, OTHER. Rows include M. McClelland (06Camm) O/1E, Diane Silva (05G.DS)\* 3C/3E, and File/Doc Control 1C/1E (w/QC), Courtney Colvin 1C/1E.

Date/Time Received