

**NAS ALAMEDA RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD
MEETING SUMMARY**

**Miller Elementary School
250 Singleton Avenue
Alameda, California**

Tuesday, September 13, 1994

ATTENDEES

No attendance was taken.

MEETING SUMMARY

I. Introductory Statements

- The meeting began at 7:15 p.m.
- The CERCLA II presentation scheduled for September 20 has been cancelled. This scheduled day will be used instead for community RAB members to meet and discuss their purpose. Community RAB members will be notified of the location.
- The August 2, 1994 RAB meeting minutes were approved pending the following changes:
 - Page 6. The discussion of underground storage tanks should reflect the comment by Tom Lanphar of Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) that centralized bioremediation has not been agreed upon as a remedy nor has the proposed location of it has been selected. DTSC has concerns about these issues and will be involved in choosing the remedy and, if centralized bioremediation is selected, the location.
 - Page 4. In the discussion of CLEAN II, the phrase "competitive bid process" should be replaced with "technical proposal evaluation process."

II. Focus Group Updates

Organizational Focus Group -- Pam McCallum

Organizational Focus Group (OFG) members will follow up on RAB member biographies not yet received and continue the process of compiling biographies for circulation to community RAB members only.

Ms. McCallum announced that Lt. Petouhoff had obtained \$4,800 to print a RAB brochure. RAB members interested in contributing to the brochure should give their ideas to Lyn Stirewalt.

An updated RAB-calendar was distributed. Focus group leaders are encouraged to submit pertinent calendar information, such as focus group meeting dates, to the OFG.

Name tags were distributed to RAB members to keep and to wear at RAB events.

The OFG is looking into establishing a P.O. box and phone mail system for RAB use.

The OFG has begun discussions with the BRAC Cleanup Team (BCT) to involve RAB members in Regional Project Management (RPM) meetings.

The OFG has asked Lt. Petouhoff for an organizational chart to see to whom the BRAC Environmental Coordinator reports.

Focus group leaders were asked to pull together and act as a steering committee for the RAB. John Headlee, NAS Alameda Public Affairs Office, is available to focus group leaders in Sherrie Withrow's absence to help with administrative support.

Ardella Dailey, community RAB member, has a list of schools to pursue as locations for focus group meetings.

Kathleen Kirkwood of the Alameda Times Star asked to be added to the RAB mailing list. For parity, Lt. Petouhoff indicated the military affairs reporter for the Alameda Journal must also be added to the RAB mailing list.

Chris Bacina made business cards for community RAB members. Members should check cards for accuracy and return them to Chris for printing.

Public Education and Outreach Focus Group -- Lyn Stirewalt

The Public Education and Outreach Focus Group (PEOFG) is continuing work begun last month. RAB members are encouraged to submit columns to newspapers. A list of newspapers and their addresses was distributed. Chris Bacina wrote an article expressing his reasons for joining the RAB; the article will be printed in at least one local newspaper.

RAB Blab was handed out at two community events, and the PEOFG is pursuing an opportunity to staff a RAB/BRAG information booth at the Fleet Week open house in October.

The PEOFG and Roberta Hough mailed a letter asking former base employees with information on past hazardous substance storage or disposal practices to contribute to the environmental baseline survey (EBS). If anyone knows of current or former employees with information to contribute, instruct them to contact Sherrie Withrow to obtain the phone number of ERM-West, the contractor conducting the EBS. Lt. Petouhoff indicated employees can participate anonymously if they wish. They can also participate by commenting on the Phase I EBS report during the public comment period.

Early Action Focus Group -- Chris Bacina

The Early Action Focus Group (EAFG) met August 30, 1994. Notes from the meeting are available from Chris.

Natural Resources Focus Group -- Roberta Hough

The group met August 10 to discuss the ecological assessment report and make suggestions for follow on work. These comments and suggestions will be presented later in the meeting.

Technology Focus Group -- Bill Smith

The Technology Focus Group (TFG) met to discuss cleanup planning and the ecological assessment. Priorities for cleanup are (1) protect ecosystems, (2) make land suitable for reuse, and (3) restore land to condition suitable for any use. Responsibility for protecting the ecosystem is clearly delegated to Department of Defense and regulatory agencies through specific laws. Responsibility for making land suitable for reuse is not as clearly defined.

The TFG perceives the biggest ecological threat to be at the Seaplane Lagoon, and it is here that the TFG will turn its attention next, discussing suitable technologies for remediation at this site.

Reuse Focus Group -- Ardella Dailey

The Reuse Focus Group (RFG) is identifying ways to link the cleanup to reuse. Ardella arranged for Dave Louk, City of Alameda Base Conversion Facilities Manager, to speak at the October 4 RAB meeting. Lt. Petouhoff indicated the BRAC cleanup plan (BCP) will also include updated information on reuse plans.

At the end of the focus group reports, Pam McCallum asked the Navy to provide an 18-month timeline of scheduled events and documents to help the RAB prepare.

III. Summary of U.S. EPA RAB Workshop

Lyn Stirewalt outlined the content of the workshop and said she would make handouts and the workshop binder available to community RAB members. She said the workshop made it clear that the directive to encourage greater and more open dialogue with the community and other stakeholders was coming from Department of Defense in Washington, D.C. She also said Pat Rivera, Deputy Under Secretary of Defense (Environmental Security), indicated that she sees RABs as not only having an influence on cleanup activities, but as also paving the way for a new kind of democratic process involving greater public involvement. Lyn has two questionnaires that all RAB members are welcome to complete: one on the content of the workshop and one on fast track cleanup topics.

Lyn Stirewalt also has two videos for RAB member use: cone penetrometer testing and CERCLA training.

IV. Navy Update/Timeline

Lt. Petouhoff began by acknowledging that he hears a lot of concern and stress regarding the amount of activity occurring at one time and RAB members feeling they don't have enough time for reviews. He recognized that there is a lot happening at once and explained that he is making a strong effort to balance the fast track schedule with the public involvement needs of the community.

Lt. Petouhoff said Saul Bloom had requested more time to review the EBS report.

Lt. Petouhoff discussed the schedule of the following activities: Site 15 removal action, ongoing field work, EBS, early actions, and ecological assessment.

Following the public notice of remedy selection at Site 15, a new technology has been identified that would treat soils on site and achieve desired cleanup levels at a reduced cost. The technology, however, has not been fully demonstrated. The Navy has invited U.S. EPA's Superfund Innovative Technology Evaluation (SITE) program to evaluate the technology as it is used at Site 15. Initially, forty percent of the soil would be treated under the technology demonstration. California EPA wants to do a California Environmental Quality Assessment (CEQA) at the same time as the CERCLA action. The public's comments on the engineering evaluation/cost analysis (EE/CA), and Navy's responses, will be contained in the action memorandum. The action memorandum is currently in the Navy and regulatory review process and will be placed in the information repository when the CEQA is completed.

Installation Restoration field work is ongoing.

The EBS schedule will be discussed later in the meeting.

The BCP update will address early actions. An RPM meeting to be held October 11 will discuss early actions, and members of the early action focus group are encouraged to attend. Essentially early actions will be the priority of 1995 and the RAB can expect to see a number of them.

The ecological assessment will be discussed later in the meeting.

V. Environmental Baseline Survey -- Phase I

Lt. Petouhoff briefly described the content and purpose of Phase I and Phase II of the EBS, and reviewed the seven parcel types into which all property parcels at NAS Alameda will ultimately be placed. He pointed out that one of the objectives of the Phase I EBS is to identify those parcels that can be categorized as type 1, parcels where no storage or disposal of hazardous substances are known to have occurred. The value of identifying type 1 parcels is that these can be made available for transfer earlier. Representatives from ERM-West described the legislation enabling the EBS, the EBS survey methodology used for Phase I, and the Phase I results. ERM-West explained that Community Environmental Response Facilitation Act (CERFA) aimed to identify "clean" (type 1) properties at installations, and presented a CERFA definition of "clean":

". . . parcels where no hazardous substances and no petroleum products or their derivatives were stored for more than one year, known to have been released, or disposed of on the parcel and where contamination migration has not occurred." (excerpted from executive summary of draft Basewide Environmental Baseline Survey . . . Report for NAS/NADEP Alameda)

ERM-West explained that CERFA was designed with the assumption that installations had long tracks of land used for activities such as training rather than industrial activity. Since the Navy conducts much of its training at sea, most base property is used for industrial activity. This is the case at NAS Alameda; consequently not much base property is expected to fit the CERFA definition of "clean" (type 1).

The EBS Phase I identified 6 of 214 property parcels that meet the CERFA definition of "clean" (type 1). These tend to be clustered around the main gate. Table 4-3 of the EBS Phase I report lists all 214 parcels and the activities identified as having occurred there.

Lt Petouhoff was asked to explain the relationship among parcels, operable units, and sites. He explained that the "parcels" may be thought of as roughly referring to real estate parcels, but sites refer to areas of contamination or areas of study. Operable units are a way of grouping related or similar sites.

ERM-West was asked the number or percent of employees contacted for the EBS. ERM-West did not have a figure but said many current employees were contacted, not just in the formal employee interview step but also in the process of conducting the records reviews and site walks. ERM-West will continue to provide the opportunity for additional current or former employees to contribute to the study.

RAB members discussed additional ways of notifying employees of this opportunity, such as through credit union newsletters, RIFT notices, and retirement associations. A concern is that base closure will result in many base employees leaving the area and a concerted effort must be made to obtain information from these people as soon as possible. Lt. Petouhoff will look into using the Plan of the Day for an announcement, and also suggested it would be a good task for the public education and outreach focus group.

Lt. Petouhoff explained that Phase I protocol are very clearly set by American Standard and Test Methods (ASTM). Phase II protocol is under development by the BCT. Lt. Petouhoff provided the following schedule of additional EBS work:

- Shell Work Plan September 30, 1994
- Parcel-Specific Evaluation Plans (PEP) September 27 & 30, 1994
- Field Work November 1, 1994
- Finding of Suitability to Lease February 1, 1995

RAB members were invited to attend the September 27 and 30 meeting at DTSC to conduct onboard reviews of the PEPs. Also the next national meeting on establishing Phase II protocol will be held October 4, 1994 in the bay area. WESTDIV has obligated the money budgeted for the EBS in 1994 so the work can be carried over into 1995 without coming out of the 1995 budget. Finally, Lt. Petouhoff indicated the October 4 RAB meeting would be dedicated to the subject of the EBS and reuse.

Members took a break at 9 p.m. and decided to continue the meeting until 10 p.m.

VI. Dredging Issue

Kathy Teller presented a letter she and other community RAB members drafted presenting their concerns about a Navy proposal to dredge near the piers in the Seaplane Lagoon. The dredging is technically outside the RAB's and Lt. Petouhoff's jurisdiction. Lt Petouhoff indicated that as of September 7 the dredging project had been cancelled. The Navy cancelled it mainly because dredging and closure schedules would ultimately only allow for one carrier to be berthed there. Lt. Petouhoff also mentioned that the disposal of dredge spoils wasn't meeting the NEPA requirements. Despite cancellation of the project, the RAB will send the letter with a post script indicating the RAB's acknowledgement of the cancellation. The letter will also be attached to these meeting minutes.

Roberta Hough also explained that there are dredging technologies, such as shrouding, that are considered environmentally more sound than traditional dredging methods. The Army Corps of Engineers will begin listing use of these technologies as a contract requirement.

Lyn Stirewalt asked if the NAS Alameda information repository includes the NEPA notice on the dredging and the fact that the project would not survive the NEPA process. Lt. Petouhoff said the information repository does not contain this information but documents regarding dredging are publicly available.

VII. Ecological Assessment Report

Roberta Hough, community RAB member and natural resources focus group leader, presented three main concerns regarding the ecological assessment (EA) report. (1) The EA currently does not address the impact of contaminants on the least tern, an endangered species. (2) Ms. Hough stated that the Seaplane Lagoon is said to be the most contaminated site in the Bay Area, yet it was given a low priority in the BRAC cleanup plan (BCP). This site is seen by the community as worthy of a higher priority, and Ms. Hough asked how this site could be elevated to a higher priority. (3) Ms. Hough stated a further concern that data were not always evaluated conservatively; this concern applies specifically to the classification of sediments in the Seaplane Lagoon. She cited an example of a sample with results of 19.4 plus or minus 10 percent being disregarded because the toxicity level criterion was 20 percent. Ms. Hough also pointed out that the EA report makes comments implying wetlands lack value, and also said the EA report lacks food web modeling, an analysis of the anthropods and other generally expected features.

Lt. Petouhoff responded to these comments by stating that the EA was conceived of in 1989. Since that time standards for EAs have changed and the base has been slated for closure. The fact that base closure, therefore reuse, weren't considered in 1989 accounts for some of the assumptions regarding the value of the wetlands. The Navy recognizes that industry standards for EAs have changed since 1989, which is why the Navy is planning follow-on EA work -- to compensate for those changes. Lt. Petouhoff also indicated that the BCP did not intend to imply priorities, and that the Navy is receptive to input regarding prioritization.

A Regional Water Quality Control Board representative asked what studies of the least tern colony at NAS Alameda exist. Ms. Hough said no deformities have been noted but no studies are available regarding mortality.

June Mire, PhD., a biologist with PRC Environmental Management Inc., the contractor conducting the EA, said she and WESTDIV agree with comments that the EA report does not adequately reflect current U.S. EPA protocol for EAs. She reiterated Lt. Petouhoff's comment that the EA was planned in 1989 using 1989 industry standards, and that 1994 industry standards are different; the Navy wants to make up the difference by conducting follow-on work. Comments on the EA report will help direct that follow-on work. Dr. Mire said the follow-on work will need to include a species list, least tern information, food web modeling, contaminant pathways, and other items now required by U.S. EPA protocol. She also said that a new wetlands analysis will need to be conducted. She also stated that, regarding the Seaplane Lagoon, if there is a question whether the priority should be for further study or action, she favors early action. The Seaplane Lagoon, based on data collected, is contaminated and should now be addressed in treatability or feasibility studies. It clearly is contaminated and is clearly harmful to the environmental receptors, so further study would be inefficient.

A community RAB member asked about the term "ongoing contamination" via the storm drains used during the preceding discussion, and asked if the sources of ongoing contamination are going to be stopped. Lt. Petouhoff said the plating shops no longer

discharge to the storm drains. Dr. Mire said sediments in storm drain outfalls were collected during one rainfall event, and these samples show elevated levels of metals.

Another community RAB member asked if Superfund money is available to dam or cap the Seaplane Lagoon. Lt. Petouhoff responded that NAS Alameda falls under the Department of Defense and must therefore use BRAC dollars; no Superfund money is available to NAS Alameda.

Lt. Petouhoff explained that the EA follow-on work was intended to be formulated under the CLEAN I contract, and conducted under CLEAN II. However, because CLEAN I is approaching its spending ceiling and increasing the ceiling is unlikely due to contracting issues, formulation of the EA follow-on work may not occur under CLEAN I as originally planned. This could cause delays in conducting the work. RAB members asked Lt. Petouhoff to explain in the future how to get the Seaplane Lagoon sediments on a higher priority so delays do not occur.

Bill Smith, RAB member, said that at a meeting of the Military and Civil Engineers Society, IT Corporation, the Navy's remedial action contractor, made a presentation about the remediation technology program that failed to mention sediments. Lt. Petouhoff indicated this was likely an oversight, and emphasized that whatever mix of technology and contracting is needed to address issues will be looked at.

Dr. Mire referred to the following document to illustrate that there is existing literature regarding the handling of contaminated sediments:

- U.S. EPA. "Selecting Remediation Techniques for Contaminated Sediments." June 1993. Document No. EPA823B93-001

Dr. Mire explained that the different types of bioassays used at NAS Alameda did not produce consistent results. She said, based on chemical concentrations, one would expect the bioassays to show behavioral changes or mortality. But only one bioassay showed results consistent with the chemical data; the others were inconclusive. Therefore, the conclusions you draw would be influenced by which bioassays you look at, that's why drawing conclusions is premature. Roberta Hough asked if Phase II sampling should be done at sites where results were inconclusive; Ms. Mire said more information would be needed before drawing conclusions. Ms. Hough asked that since bioaccumulation tests were done only in the case of high mortality, would the data be treated conservatively. Ms. Mire said either one must make very conservative assumptions or conduct further sampling.

Lt. Petouhoff asked Ms. Hough to provide written comments, which she agreed to do.

Saul Bloom said the September 20 meeting of RAB community members would consist of a dialogue regarding what RABs ought to be doing and how community members can make their RABs more effective. Members will also be asked to take part in a national "rate your RAB" survey.

The meeting adjourned at 10:10 p.m.

ACTION ITEMS

- PRC will revise the August 2 RAB meeting minutes and provide a copy to the Navy for distribution.

The next RAB meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, October 4, 1994.