

— Cool your planet. In two dozen years in 1989 to cover Antarctica. Replacing chlorine refrigerators and hair spray. The idea that what contain it instead also greatly to

zone, the at- that helps pro- l's most trap the ibuting to a ace tempera-

in should problems. But first signed col 17 years iz that CFC ut the alternative. at replaced the ozone prevent ese chemi-

fective layer which traps ise. odds with the eaty, drawn in 1997 by behind the ct, the se gases cre- ie Montreal ut of CFCs times the urning Kyoto sed to elimi-

conse- the nations l. treaties, tried in arm that the g the ozone te to another lem. The re- ost," said

the Swiss Agency for the Environment, Forests and Land- scape, kept trying. Finally, the first formal, secret talks on the subject were held in Montreal last month.

"Saving the ozone layer by reducing CFCs and at the same time promoting alternatives was an urgent crisis in the early years of the Montreal Protocol," said Marco Gonzalez, the treaty's executive secretary, in Nairobi, Kenya. "Now there is always a need to find new substances which are safe, energy-efficient and also have minimal impact across a range of environmental issues."

The Montreal Protocol, which now has 189 member nations, is considered one of the most effective environmental treaties. Almost \$2.1 billion has been spent through an affiliated fund to prod countries to stop making and using CFCs and other ozone-damaging chemicals in refrigerators, air conditioners, foams and other products.

Scientists blame CFCs for poking a huge, seasonal hole in the stratospheric ozone layer about 7 miles to 14 miles over Antarctica. Last year the ozone hole peaked at about 10 million square miles, or the size of North America. That was below the 2003 record size of about 11 million square miles. Scientists expect the hole will not heal until 2065.

CFCs also are thinning the ozone layer over the Arctic and, to a lesser extent, globally. As the protective layer thins, more ultraviolet radiation gets through, increasing people's risk of skin cancer and cataracts, and threatening plants and animals with extinction.

Some of the replacement chemicals whose use has grown because of the Montreal treaty — hydrochlorofluorocarbons, or HCFCs, and their byproducts,

SOURCE: Environmental Protection Agency AP

hydrofluorocarbons, or HFCs — decompose faster than CFCs because they contain hydrogen.

But, like CFCs, they are considered potent greenhouse gases that harm the climate — up to 10,000 times worse than carbon dioxide emissions.

The Kyoto treaty's goal is to reduce carbon dioxide emissions from power plants, motor vehicles and other sources that burn fossil fuels by about 1 billion tons by 2012.

Use of HCFCs and HFCs is projected to add the equivalent of 2 billion to 3 billion tons of carbon dioxide emissions to the atmosphere by 2015, U.N. climate experts said in a recent report. The CFCs they replace also would have added that much.

"But now the question is, who's going to ensure that the replacements are not going to cause global warming?" said Alexander von Bismarck, campaigns director for the Environmental Investigation Agency, a nonprofit watchdog group in London and Washington. "It's shocking that so far nobody's taking responsibility."

"A massive opportunity to help stave-off climate change is currently being cast aside," he said.

The U.N. report says the atmosphere could be spared the equivalent of 1 billion tons of carbon dioxide emissions if countries used ammonia, hydrocarbons, carbon dioxide or other ozone-friendly chemicals, rather than HCFCs and HFCs, in foams and refrigerants. Such alternatives are more common in Europe.

"This potential of not using greenhouse gases is not fully used," said Horisberger, the Swiss official. "It's because of many reasons — technical, big commercial interests."

Industry is split over how to

replace CFCs and HCFCs. One of the biggest producers of fluorine-based refrigerants, Honeywell International Inc., says it is discontinuing its use of "the older technology, environmentally unfriendly CFC and HCFC refrigerants," and replacing those chlorine-containing chemicals with HFCs.

The Oakland Tribune 8/21/06



## NOTICE OF PROPOSED PLAN AND PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD

### Installation Restoration Site 25 Former Naval Air Station Alameda

**BRAC**  
PMO WEST

N00236.002861  
ALAMEDA POINT  
SSIC NO. 5090.3

The U.S. Navy, in coordination with state and environmental regulatory agencies, encourages the public to comment on the Proposed Plan for soil at former Naval Air Station (NAS) Alameda Installation Restoration (IR) Site 25 on Alameda Point in Alameda, California. The Proposed Plan presents the preferred alternative for the Site 25 final remedy and a summary of investigations and evaluations, including a remedial investigation and human and ecological risk assessments. Site 25 is located on the northeastern corner of Alameda Point and includes the former United States Coast Guard (USCG) North Village residential housing, Estuary Park, and the USCG Housing Maintenance Office. The Navy proposes the preferred alternative of institutional controls as the second and final phase of environmental cleanup at Site 25, where polynuclear aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs) are the soil contaminant. The PAHs are not related to a Navy release, but appear to be associated with fill that was placed at the site prior to the Navy obtaining the property. To protect the public and residents, between 2000 and 2002 the Navy removed contaminated soil during two removal actions at Site 25. Over 66,700 cubic yards of PAH-contaminated soil across approximately 26 acres was excavated and transported offsite. There is no immediate risk to children or adults in these areas. The proposed remedy, institutional controls, manages potential long-term risks associated with soil below a 4-foot depth and beneath hardscape (such as concrete or paved roads) and buildings.

**PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD**  
The Navy invites interested members of the public to review and comment on the Proposed Plan during the 30-day public comment period, held from August 21 through September 20, 2006. Public comments must be submitted in writing and postmarked or e-mailed no later than September 20, 2006, or comments may be provided during the public meeting on September 12, 2006. Please send all comments to: Mr. Thomas Macchiarella, BRAC Environmental Coordinator, BRAC Program Management Office West, 1455 Frazee Road, Suite 900, San Diego, California 92108, Thomas.macchiarella@navy.mil, (619) 532-0907, fax (619) 532-0940.

**PUBLIC MEETING**  
The Navy will host a public meeting to discuss the Proposed Plan, answer questions, and accept comments.  
Date & Time: Tuesday, September 12, 2006, 6:30 p.m. to 8:00 p.m.  
Location: Alameda Point, 950 West Mall Square, Building 1, Room 201, Alameda, CA

**FOR MORE INFORMATION**  
Copies of the Proposed Plan, Remedial Investigation Report, Soil Feasibility Study Report, and other site documents are available for review at two locations:

Alameda Point 950 West Mall Square Building 1, Rooms 240-241 Alameda, California 94502	Alameda Public Library 2200 A Central Avenue Alameda, California 94502 (510) 747-7777
---	--

If you have any questions or wish to discuss this project, please contact Mr. Thomas Macchiarella, BRAC Environmental Coordinator, by telephone, fax, or email (see above).