

NAS ALAMEDA RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD  
MEETING SUMMARY

N00236.001266  
ALAMEDA POINT  
SSIC NO. 5090.3

NAS Alameda Officer's Club  
NAS Alameda, California

Tuesday, May 2, 1995

**ATTENDEES**

See attached list.

**MEETING SUMMARY**

The meeting was called to order at 7:05 p.m.

**I. Introduction and Minutes**

Ken O'Donoghue, interim community co-chair, introduced Heidi Gitterman, the RAB facilitator. Ms. Gitterman briefly explained her role as facilitator as one of helping the RAB accomplish its goals. She said that she serves at the pleasure of the co-chairs, and she expects to serve for 6 months, at which time a new facilitator will transition in.

The six new RAB members were introduced and given RAB information packets.

Revisions to the April 4, 1995, meeting summary included the following:

- An attendee list was not attached.
- The third bullet on page 1 should be revised to clarify Roberta Hough's comment regarding the least tern buffer zone study.
- Under Co-Chair Announcements, RAB Training Workshops, it should be mentioned that Kathy Teller announced the resignation of Dr. John Healy, the Navy League representative, and no replacement has been identified.
- The memo to Captain Dodge was not attached to the meeting summary as indicated on page 2 of the summary.
- The third bullet under the heading Memo to Captain Dodge should be revised to say, "The Navy is proceeding with printing the community outreach brochure."
- Under Focus Group Reports, Organizational Focus Group, it should be noted that Kathy Teller was reporting for Pam McCallum in her absence. The same section should also indicate that "they discussed the RAB charter," not the mission statement. Finally, no mention should be made about reevaluating the need for future focus group meetings.
- On page 4, the spelling of names of new members should be corrected for accuracy.

Kathy Teller also commented that she had not seen a public notice of tonight's meeting in today's Alameda Journal.

Malcolm Mooney said he would give Sherri Withrow a markup of his comments on the meeting minutes. He said the BRAG found this procedure effective in approving that organization's minutes.

The facilitator and LCDR Petouhoff said the meeting minute process needs to be revisited.

The RAB will review the revised April 4, 1995, meeting summary at the next RAB meeting.

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

LCDR Petouhoff made the following announcements:

- A RAB member previously asked if RAB training would be video taped. LCDR Petouhoff said yes.
- LCDR Petouhoff provided a handout detailing the copy service and other administrative support services available to the RAB. He also referred to two handouts: one listing proposed dates for upcoming workshops and one showing RAB milestones accomplished and scheduled to date.
- LCDR Petouhoff announced two new members of his staff: Larry Ramos, an environmental engineer that will work on closure related issues, and Robert Gibson, who provides office management services.
- LCDR Petouhoff circulated a flyer describing an event called Preserving the Legacy that will be held May 20, 1995.

In response to the handout on RAB training, a RAB member asked if the May training had been cancelled. LCDR Petouhoff said it was held last weekend (April 29).

In response to the handout on RAB milestones, the facilitator pointed out that the RAB has accomplished a great deal since the group's formation.

An additional handout was distributed listing upcoming deliverables. Duane Balch, PRC Environmental Management Inc., invited RAB members to comment on the format of the list if they had desired changes.

Kathy Teller read a note from Bert Morgan expressing his appreciation for recent get well wishes from RAB members.

## **III. Co-Chair Selections**

Prior to casting paper ballots for electing a community co-chair, RAB members discussed procedures for selecting a vice-co-chair or community co-chair assistant. Suggested procedures included (1) letting the top vote-getter be co-chair and the runner up be vice co-chair, (2) letting elected co-chair select his/her assistant, (3) giving the elected co-chair the authority to call on all RAB members when delegating tasks, and (4) letting elected co-chair recommend a plan for selecting or nominating the assistant. Much discussion ensued. Although no procedure was formally adopted through a vote or consensus, the RAB members appeared to agree to the option of letting the elected co-chair select his/her own assistant or present at the next meeting a plan for selecting an assistant.

The two community co-chair nominees gave statements regarding their qualifications, goals, and priorities for the position. In a paper ballot process, Ken O'Donoghue received 9 votes and Tom Okey received 7 (only community RAB members present at the meeting voted).

Ken O'Donoghue's term as co-chair is for one year beginning at the end of tonight's meeting.

Break 7:50 to 8:00 p.m.

Heidi Gitterman, RAB facilitator, indicated that Steven Fee would not make a presentation on the reuse plan at tonight's meeting as some RAB members expected. Malcolm Mooney indicated that the presentation would be made to the Alameda Reuse and Redevelopment Authority at the Alameda High School Little Theater on Wednesday, May 3 at 5:30 p.m. He said another presentation to be made the same night will focus on an economic analysis that shows the reuse proposal for a wildlife refuge would generate income for the City of Alameda.

#### **IV. BRAC Cleanup Plan Guiding Principles**

The RAB facilitator introduced the BRAC Cleanup Plan (BCP) guiding principle presentation by urging RAB members individually to think about how the BRAC Cleanup Team's (BCT) guiding principles compare to how RAB members view the RAB's role.

LCDR Petouhoff presented the BCT's guiding principles from the 1995 BCP, and indicated that these were different from the principles listed in last year's BCP:

- Protect public health and the environment.
- Support the community's reuse plan.
- Promote active public involvement.
- Enact a bias to begin cleanup where necessary as early in the process as sensible.
- Keep an open mind toward the potential advantages of innovative technologies.

The first two are core principles; LCDR Petouhoff said they are looked at simultaneously in the context of each other. The next three principles support accomplishment of the first two. He elaborated on each of the principles.

Tom Lanphar, DTSC, said the first principle is the mission statement of DTSC and EPA. The agencies also assume responsibility for the second principle when dealing with a closing base.

A RAB member asked what is meant by "where necessary" in the fourth principle. LCDR Petouhoff said that where we have enough information to do so, we should try to figure out what the record of decision (ROD) will say, then start early to implement it. In some cases we don't have enough information to do this, in other cases we don't know if cleanup will be necessary.

Bill Smith, a RAB member, offered his estimation of how the environmental community has traditionally viewed these ideas.

- There's a faction of the environmental community that doesn't trust the Navy to honor principle 1 or principle 2.
- The environmental community believes that an additional principle is needed: ultimate restoration to allow unrestricted land use.
- The environmental community does expect the Navy will honor principle 4 because it helps the Navy leave the property.

- The environmental community does support principle 5. However, Mr. Smith's personal concern over principle 5 is that money spent developing innovative technologies at NAS Alameda will be unavailable for the final cleanup.

Mr. Smith also added that the environmental community looks to DTSC and EPA to do principles 1 and 2. He also said on a personal note (which is supported by much of the environmental community but not formal yet) that they recognize that principles 1 and 2 can't be accomplished immediately by cleaning up everything to background level, so what they want from DTSC and EPA are some insights to what is really necessary to protect human health and the environment and what needs to be done to still provide the incentive to meet short term reuse while recognizing the goal of long term cleanup to background. He also added that the environmental community does not believe the legislation is adequate to safeguard fishermen from contamination in the bay area waters. He said there is not yet a strong scientific link between the contaminated water entering bay water, contaminating sediments that affect water and consequently become toxic to fish, but the presumptive evidence is very strong.

Tom Lanphar said that he sees "where necessary" as a prioritization issue that DTSC takes very seriously.

Tom Okey, RAB member, said he wanted to add to Mr. Smith's use of the term "presumptive evidence." He said informed marine scientists believe the contamination of fish and the exposure to humans come from contaminated sediments.

Ardella Dailey, RAB member, asked Mr. Smith to clarify his statement about background. Mr. Smith said that much of the thinking of the environmental community is that our understanding of toxicology and ecology are currently insufficient to say that any level is safe.

Karen King, RAB member, said she was surprised that the cost effective management of taxpayer dollars for cleanup isn't one of the principles. LCDR Petouhoff said it may be an additional principal in next year's BCP.

Ken O'Donoghue, RAB member, said he was uncomfortable putting the discussion of protecting human health and the environment on the same page as money.

Tom Lanphar, DTSC, gave an example of the effectiveness of innovative technology and active public involvement by saying that for the Site 15 removal action, the community didn't accept the landfill option. In response the BCT found an innovative solution that didn't require transporting contaminated material off site and it also saved money.

LCDR Petouhoff continued his presentation with overhead slides outlining the events/documents that lead to property transfer.

Tom Okey asked whether the Navy would continue to be liable for future human health and environmental risk issues if it had cleaned up to the record of decision (ROD) requirements.

Tom Lanphar said there is a 5 year period after signing the ROD during which time the cleanup plan is evaluated to determine if the ROD objectives are being met and if new information has been made available. DTSC conducts the reviews.

LCDR Petouhoff said that if the ROD meets reuse requirements and in 5 years the desired reuse changes, the Navy is not necessarily responsible for meeting new reuse plans.

Bill Smith said he senses the Navy and BRAG see the ROD as the "end game."

Jim Haas, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, said the Navy has to meet certain requirements to transfer property, and a ROD doesn't relieve the Navy of those responsibilities.

Roberta Hough, RAB member, said her understanding from CERFA is that all that is required for transfer is that a cleanup system be started and shown to be effective.

The facilitator and community co-chair interrupted and said they would meet with interested parties after the meeting to identify how to best continue this dialogue.

#### V. Mission/Charter Update

Heidi Gitterman, RAB facilitator, said RAB members would receive a revised charter in the mail. She asked everyone to read it carefully and give comments to Pam McCallum, RAB member.

Ms. Gitterman reviewed handouts that (1) summarize the results of her interviews with RAB members, (2) identify RAB issues to review and classify, and (3) provide useful information about mission statements. She said a vision/mission workshop is tentatively scheduled for June 3, 1995. This is the same day as the "Getting on Board II" workshop, so Lyn Stirewalt of the Organizational Focus Group will try to find an alternate date for the mission/vision workshop.

#### VI. Soccer Field/Cal Start Leasing Update

LCDR Petouhoff said the soil sampling for the environmental baseline survey for Parcel 144 has been completed. The Navy, with regulatory concurrence, considers it safe to play soccer on Parcel 144. He then explained how the investigation was conducted: soil samples were collected from Parcel 144 and were compared to samples taken from the College of Alameda to represent background. He also showed a graph of how the Parcel 144 sampling results compare to The College of Alameda for arsenic and benzo(a)pyrene.

Roberta Hough: Where from the College of Alameda were samples collected; the Alameda Annex, another contaminated site, borders the college.

LCDR Petouhoff: They were not collected near the fence line.

Tom Lanphar: They were collected purposefully to represent background.

RAB Member: How many samples were collected from Parcel 144?

LCDR Petouhoff: Originally two soil samples were collected from one boring (at the surface and at 4 feet below ground surface). Later several additional samples were collected from various points around the parcel. (The specific sampling program as reported in the survey documentation included 4 surface soil samples, 4 subsurface soil samples, and 5 soil vapor samples in the original sampling effort. The second sampling effort included 4 surface soil samples analyzed for chrome and 3 surface soil samples analyzed for arsenic. Surface samples are those collected from a depth of 0.5 to 1.0 feet below ground surface; subsurface soil samples are those collected from 3.0 to 4.5 feet below ground surface.)

Karen Hack: Were samples analyzed on site or at an off-site laboratory?

LCDR Petouhoff: All samples were analyzed at an off-site laboratory.

Roberta Hough: Quaternary marine sediments (e.g. Pleistocene epoch) would seem to be very different from U.S. averages. Why use U.S. averages; isn't there enough information available about the bay area soils?

LCDR Petouhoff: The College of Alameda was used to represent similar soil.

Tom Okey: Where does the national average come from? Contaminated sites? Backyards?

LCDR Petouhoff: The national average represents a diverse cross section of soil types and the average concentrations of metals found in that cross section.

The facilitator suggested people ask LCDR Petouhoff their questions after the meeting and have him report back next meeting.

In response to a question from Ardella Dailey, LCDR Petouhoff said comments are due May 9, 1995, and the finding of suitability to lease will be prepared shortly after that.

## VII. Focus Group Reports

### Natural Resources Focus Group

The group distributed a written update, and Roberta Hough announced two corrections to the update: George Kikugawa's phone number should be 1-415-244-2549; the date of the meeting to discuss the ecological risk assessment work plan should read Thursday May 18, 1995.

### Early Action Focus Group

Kent Rosenblum is the new focus group chairperson.

### Technology Focus Group

The technology and early action focus groups will have a joint meeting on May 16.

### Organizational Focus Group

New RAB members should join a focus group.

The facilitator asked RAB members to provide Ken O'Donoghue feedback on tonight's meeting, especially whether they liked extending the meeting time or would have preferred tabling certain agenda items.

The meeting adjourned at 9:25 p.m.

The next meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, June 6, 1995, at 7:00 p.m. in the NAS Alameda Officer's Club.

**ATTACHMENT**  
**ATTENDANCE LIST**

**RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD  
MEETING SUMMARY - MAY 2, 1995**

**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**