N00236.002167
ALAMEDA POINT
SSIC NO. 5090.3

Department of Toxic Substances Control

Terry Tamminen
Agency Secretary
Cal/EPA

Edwin F. Lowry, Director
700 Heinz Avenue, Suite 200
Berkeley, California 94710-2721

Arnold Schwarzenegger
Governor

January 22, 2004

Claudia Domingo
Department of Navy
Southwest Division
Naval Facilities Engineering Command
Attn: Code 06CA.cd
1220 Pacific Highway
San Diego, CA 92132-5190

DRAFT GEOTECHNICAL FEASIBILITY STUDY REPORT, INSTALLATION RESTORATION SITE 2, ALAMEDA POINT, ALAMEDA, CALIFORNIA

Dear Ms. Domingo:

Attached please find DTSC comments on the draft geotechnical feasibility study report for Installation Restoration Site 2 dated November 21, 2003. If you have any questions, please contact me at 510-540-3767.

Sincerely,

Marcia Y. Liao

Marcia Y. Liao, Ph.D., CHMM
Hazardous Substances Engineer
Office of Military Facilities

Enclosures

cc: see next page

The energy challenge facing California is real. Every Californian needs to take immediate action to reduce energy consumption. For a list of simple ways you can reduce demand and cut your energy costs, see our website at www.dtsc.ca.gov.

Printed on Recycled Paper

cc: Thomas Macchiarella, SWDiv
Mark Ripperda, EPA
Judy Huang, RWQCB
Elizabeth Johnson, City of Alameda
Peter Russel, Northgate Environmental
Jean Sweeney, RAB Co-Chair
Lea Loizos, Arc Ecology

MEMORANDUM

TO: Marcia Liao
Office of Military Facilities
Northern California Region
Berkeley

VIA: John Hart, P.E.
Chief, Engineering Services Unit

FROM: Ram Ramanujam, P.E.
Hazardous Substances Engineer
Engineering Services Unit

DATE: January 12, 2004

SUBJECT: Draft - Geotechnical Feasibility Study Report - IR Site 2 - Alameda Point, Alameda, CA

Per your request, I have reviewed the following Report:

Draft - Geotechnical Feasibility Study Report, Revision 0 - Installation Restoration Site 2, Alameda Point, Alameda, CA (Prepared by Foster Wheeler Environmental Corporation, dated November 21, 2003).

Based on the review, my comments are as follows:

GENERAL COMMENTS:

G1. Abbreviations and Acronyms section should include the Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC).

G2. The Report considers various geotechnical methods to improve the shear strength values of the subsurface materials at the site. The Report should also consider other methods such as:

. Dynamic consolidation will improve the shear strength of the onsite subsurface materials. Dynamic consolidation is very effective on flat areas and shallow subsurface materials (provided no explosive ordnance).

. Reinforced earthen slopes at the shoreline areas.

SPECIFIC COMMENTS:

S1. Section 1.2: The site background section should include a brief summary of the contamination problems at the site area.

S2. Section 1.2.1: Site description should include the end-use of the site.

S3. Section 1.2.3, Design Basis:

. Page 1-9: "For seismic stability, a pseudo-static factor of safety greater than 1.0 is considered acceptable when designing for the PHGA." CCR Title 27 (§21750(f)(5)) requires that the pseudo-static factor of safety be equal to or greater than 1.5 when designing for the PHGA. The Report should be revised to satisfy the requirements of CCR Title 27.

. Page 1-10: The following factors should be included for the allowable seismic design displacements:

. Release of waste and its consequences, and
. Remediation time for the repair (no restrictions in mobilizing the repair work).

S4. Section 2.2.1: See General Comment No: G2.

S5. Section 2.3: See Specific Comment No: S3.

S6. Section 3.1: See General Comment No: G2.

S7. Table 3-1, Applicable or Relevant and Appropriate Requirements:
The table should include the requirements of California Code of Regulations (CCR) Title 22, in developing the design basis (seismic) for the site.

I will be available to attend any project meeting to resolve the technical issues identified in this memorandum. In the meantime, if you need any clarification on this memorandum, please contact me at (916) 255-6662.

Show Desktop.scf