

NAS ALAMEDA RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD
MEETING SUMMARY

NAS Alameda Officer's Club
NAS Alameda, California

Tuesday, January 10, 1995

ATTENDEES

See attached list.

MEETING SUMMARY

I. Introductions/Minutes

- The meeting was called to order at 7:11 p.m.
- RAB members agreed to hold future RAB meetings on the first Tuesday of each month. The next RAB meeting will be held on February 7, 1995. Kathy Teller, RAB community co-chairperson, will prepare and distribute a revised RAB meeting calendar to RAB members.
- The summary of the December 6, 1994, RAB meeting was approved without amendment.
- A survey of RAB training needs will be distributed to RAB members; members are requested to complete and return the survey to Sherri Withrow, NAS Alameda.

II. Focus Group Updates

Organizational Focus Group

Pam McCallum stated that a draft RAB charter will be prepared by the April RAB meeting. Prior to that meeting, OFG will need to address resignations of two RAB members. She suggested that resigning members nominate their replacements; otherwise, RAB members may submit nominations. She noted that the NAS Alameda RAB needs representation from the Asian and business communities as well as additional technical expertise.

Sherri Withrow will bring applications and a list of the original RAB applicants to the next RAB meeting.

Technology Focus Group

Bill Smith explained that the TFG is reviewing results from application of the cone penetrometer; the TFG plans to discuss the results with LCDR Petouhoff.

Reuse Focus Group

Ron Basarich noted that the RFG is holding a meeting next Monday, January 16, 1995, at 7:00 p.m. in Building 1. The RFG is reviewing new reuse elements under consideration by the Base Reuse Advisory Group (BRAG). Community members are encouraged to attend BRAG meetings.

Kathy Teller is writing a column for the Alameda Journal discussing the planned RAB workshop on January 24, 1995. She encouraged other RAB members to contribute articles to the Alameda Journal.

LCDR Petouhoff explained that the January 24 workshop is intended as a hands-on working session among RAB members rather than a public forum. The workshop will include discussion on the NAS Alameda Community Relations Plan (CRP) -- its content, goal, and approach -- as well as RAB/public review of technical documents.

Early Action Focus Group

Chris Bacina stated that the EAFG held two telephone conference calls and will submit comments on the base realignment and closure (BRAC) cleanup plan (BCP) later during the RAB meeting.

Natural Resource Focus Group

Roberta Hough stated that the NRFG met on January 3, 1995 and provided several comments on the BCP. She emphasized the importance of evaluating funding mechanisms for natural resource trustee (NRT) participation in the cleanup process and the need to explain NRT involvement in the BCP.

Ms. Hough also noted the importance of ensuring information exchange between the property cleanup and reuse planners. LCDR Petouhoff explained that the RAB charter should provide a mechanism for ongoing communication between stakeholders in the reuse process and participants in the cleanup process.

Ron Basarich cited an article in the Alameda Times Star by Kathleen Kirkwood that attributed statements to CMDR Elkins. He asked LCDR Petouhoff to invite CMDR Elkins to the next RAB meeting.

III. BCP Update

Each focus group provided comments on the draft BCP.

Organizational Focus Group

Pam McCallum provided comments to Teresa Bernhard who will distribute the OFG comments to RAB members along with all other RAB comments.

Technology Focus Group

Bill Smith explained that he has not discussed his comments with other TFG members. His comments include the following:

- Overall the draft BCP is a sound document.
- Presumptive remedies that will be considered for landfills may not be appropriate; a complete remedial investigation/feasibility study should be conducted for the landfills.
- Residential as well as industrial standards should be considered throughout the process as proposed land use plans may change.
- Risk assessments should include ecological factors and address impact to ecological and wildlife receptors.
- It is not clear when and at what level the public will be involved in the selection of remedial alternatives.
- Fast track cleanup policies need to consider providing adequate time for public review of documents and define the standard for community acceptance of those policies.

Reuse Focus Group

Ron Basarich commented that the BCP should clarify to what extent the BCT and RAB are coordinating their communication with the reuse authorities and tracking reuse developments. Additionally, Ron requested that Chapter 5 include language that ensures that the RAB receive regular updates on the progress of cleanup activities.

Early Action Focus Group

Chris Bacina explained that the EAFG did not yet have comments on the BCP to provide to the BCT.

Karen Hack offered her own comments.

- The BCP does not address the following issues: radiological sites, potential incineration and ash disposal, potential biological and chemical weapon storage areas, potential ordnance storage sites, above ground and underground storage tanks (UST), asbestos abatement, and potential heating oil USTs.

Bill Smith offered to provide other RAB members assistance in reviewing and evaluating technical documents or in addressing particular questions. Ron Basarich and Bill Smith will also coordinate a future meeting to review the BCP.

Tom Lanphar noted that the BCP is an evolving document and the RAB's comments will be valuable in ongoing efforts to improve the BCP.

Natural Resource Focus Group

Roberta Hough stated that the NRFG has no additional comments on the BCP at this time.

IV. Federal Facility Site Remediation Agreement

Tom Lanphar addressed the issue of whether the FFSRA is releasable to the public. He explained that in order to release the document, there must be agreement between the Navy and DTSC legal counsel. At this time there is no such agreement; therefore, the FFSRA cannot be released. In the interim, Tom offered to share the Naval Station Treasure Island FFSRA with the RAB, as that document is very similar to the NAS Alameda draft FFSRA.

Tom further explained that the outstanding issue in the draft FFSRA involves public comment on removal actions. He pointed out that resolution of this issue will establish a precedent for other FFSRAs, hence, the reason for protracted evaluation of how best to address the issue. In short, the Navy and DTSC are working on a framework that will incorporate state public comment and notification requirements (under the California Environmental Quality Act, "CEQA") into the Navy's existing public comment and notification periods. They are considering a "30-30-30" day period in which the DTSC has 30 days to review the proposed removal action document; the Navy has 30 days to address and incorporate DTSC's comments; and the public has 30 days thereafter to review and comment on the revised proposed removal action document. Under this proposed framework, public notification under the federal law (Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act, "CERCLA") and the state law (CEQA) would be issued simultaneously.

Tom noted that the significance of the FFSRA is that it establishes schedules for cleanup activities as well as provides a mechanism to elevate potential disputes between the Navy and regulators.

Karen Hack stated her support for the Navy and DTSC approach to the remedial action process. She stressed that a signed FFSRA is important as it will reflect the Navy's commitment to remediating NAS Alameda and funding the cleanup.

V. Alameda Annex: Establish a Separate RAB

LCDR Petouhoff provided background on planned establishment of a separate Alameda Annex (Annex) RAB. He explained that the Annex, NAS Alameda, and the Facility Industrial Supply Center Oakland (FISCO) each have a separate set of regulators and Navy personnel. Additionally, FISCO and the Annex are not BRAC facilities and so are not confronted with many of the issues associated with base closure and reuse. LCDR Petouhoff also pointed out that although the Annex and NAS Alameda share common borders, the Annex is not NAS Alameda property; the Annex is owned by FISCO and is under the jurisdiction of the FISCO Commanding Officer (CO).

The CO's of FISCO and NAS Alameda would have to agree to a combined NAS Alameda and Annex RAB; such an agreement has not been reached.

Karen Hack pointed out that it would seem logical to combine the NAS Alameda and the Annex RABs as they share common borders and common contaminant/technical issues.

Ken O'Donoghue moved to prepare a letter from the NAS Alameda RAB recommending that the Annex come under the umbrella of the NAS Alameda RAB. The motion was approved by the RAB.

VI. Environmental Baseline Survey Phase II Update

Tom Lanphar provided a package of handout materials regarding the EBS. He highlighted several objectives of Phase II of the EBS: (1) reclassify property parcels whose environmental condition is unknown (property category 7), (2) address requirements of the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) in order to maintain NAS Alameda's RCRA Part B permit, and (3) evaluate the environmental condition of each parcel to determine whether parcels may be leased or transferred for reuse.

NAS Alameda has been divided into 214 property parcels. Phase IIA of the EBS groups the 214 parcels into zones for the purpose of prioritizing the review and evaluation process. Following Phase IIA, the Navy will perform parcel-specific assessments. All information regarding the environmental condition of each parcel will be made available to the public and reuse interests.

The parcel evaluation report will provide environmental information on each parcel and will include recommendations regarding which environmental program should address any necessary remediation at each parcel. Tom noted that the BCT will complete review of each parcel in time to incorporate the information into the remedial investigation/feasibility study. He also pointed out that the BCT expects to identify new environmental issues over the course of the EBS which may impact the installation restoration (IR) schedule.

Bill Smith suggested that, given the large number of parcels, the RAB may be better equipped to review the BCT's overall approach and methodology to assessing the parcels, rather than evaluating the findings and recommendations for each parcel. Additionally, the RAB could assess a few select parcels.

The meeting adjourned at 9:40 p.m. Next meeting: Tuesday, February 7, 1995, Officer's Club, NAS Alameda.

Naval Air Station, Alameda
Restoration Advisory Board
Meeting Attendees
10 January 1995

RAB MEMBERS

<u>Name</u>	<u>Affiliation</u>
-------------	--------------------

BCT

LCDR Mike Petouhoff	NAS Alameda BEC/RAB Co-Chair
Thomas Lanphar	DTSC
James Ricks	U.S. EPA

Community RAB Members

Kathy Teller	RAB Community Co-Chair
Ron Basarich	RAB Member - Reuse Focus Group
Frank Encino, Jr.	RAB Member
Karen Hack	Alternate for Saul Bloom
John Healy	RAB Member
Roberta Hough	RAB Member - Natural Resources
Richard King	RAB Member
Ken O'Donoghue	RAB Member
Pam McCallum	RAB Member - Organizational
Bert Morgan	RAB Member
Bill Smith	RAB Member
Corinne Stefanick	RAB Member - Community Outreach
Lyn Stirewalt	RAB Member
Michael Torrey	RAB Member

Other Attendees

<u>Name</u>	<u>Affiliation</u>
-------------	--------------------

Teresa Bernhard	NAS Alameda Environmental
CDR Al Elkins	Base Trans. Coord., COMNAVBASE
John Headlee	NAS Alameda Environmental
Michele Kortyna	Alameda Resident
Stacey Lupton	PRC Environmental
Kathy Walsh	PRC Environmental
Frances Withrow	Alameda Resident
Susan Withrow	Alameda Resident