

**NAVAL AIR STATION (NAS) ALAMEDA RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD
MEETING SUMMARY**

Building 1, Suite #140, Community Conference Room
Alameda Point
Alameda, California

Tuesday, 6 June 2000

ATTENDEES:

See attached list.

MEETING SUMMARY

I. Approval of Minutes

Mary Sutter, Community Co-chair, commenced the meeting at 6:35 p.m. and asked for changes to the May 2000 minutes. Bert Morgan noted that on page 8, second paragraph, last sentence, "June" should be amended to "July." Elizabeth Johnson, Alameda Reuse and Redevelopment Authority (ARRA), stated that on page 4, fifth complete paragraph, last sentence, "mud" should be amended to "EBMUD [East Bay Municipal Utility District]." Robert Berges moved to receive the minutes as corrected; Ken Kloc seconded the motion. Ms. Sutter declared the minutes approved as amended.

II. Co-chair Announcements

Ms. Sutter stated that Tony Dover and Kurt Peterson have excused absences. She distributed the following documents for the RABs review: her correspondence to Rick Weissenborn regarding Operable Unit 3 (OU-3) dated 2 June 2000 (to be included in the monthly mailing); correspondence from the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) dated 11 May 2000 emphasizing the EPA's position that a restrictive covenant be enforceable by the Navy as well as the City of Alameda with respect to institutional controls (ICs) for the marsh crust; EPA comments on the dense nonaqueous phase liquid (DNAPL) treatment study; EPA comments on a beneficial groundwater report; Department of Toxic Substances Controls (DTSC) internal draft of the Remedial Action Plan (RAP)/Record of Decision (ROD) concerning FISC-Alameda Annex, the marsh crust, and the former subtidal area dated 5 June 2000; a Finding of Suitability and Transfer (FOST) of east housing dated 5 June 2000; DTSC comments on an unexploded ordinance (UXO) report; e-mail from Dave Olsen, Navy, regarding the firefighters; and a RAB membership application. All documents were returned to Ms. Sutter at the close of the meeting.

Michael Torrey passed around information on the 4th Annual Base Workers Classic Golf Tournament to be held on Friday, 16 June at the Chuck Corica Municipal Golf Course, Harbor Bay. Funds raised from the tournament will be used to support new businesses of former base workers and to promote economic development throughout the region. Mr. Torrey also announced that the American Cancer Society's Relay for Life will be held on Saturday, 10 June at Encinal High School.

Michael McClelland, Navy Co-chair and Base Environmental Coordinator (BEC), introduced the following guests: Jerry Dunaway, Mare Island BEC; Michael Bloom, remedial project manager (RPM); Rick Weissenborn, RPM; and Patrick Lynch, Alameda resident.

Mr. McClelland announced the following pending documents: the Site 25 Draft Quality Assurance Plan and Field Sampling Plan will be issued by 30 June; and the Proposed Plan and ROD for the Marsh Crust and Groundwater at Alameda Point and the Annex will be issued by 19 June. Comments are due on 20 July.

Mr. McClelland reviewed the process for the marsh crust and groundwater plan, which includes a preliminary site investigation and site characterization. The proposed plan is in progress; it includes the Navys selected remedy for the marsh crust and groundwater as well as the ROD. A public comment period and public meeting will follow. Verbal or written comments are accepted anytime during the entire planning stage; they will be addressed and incorporated in the ROD. The public meeting will be held on 29 June from 7:00 to 9:00 p.m. at 950 W. Mall Square, Alameda; it will be transcribed by a court recorder.

Mr. McClelland stated that the ROD will be signed by 30 July, after which the Navy will transfer the property to the City of Alameda. The Navy will have selected ICs that will prevent exposure to the marsh crust. Any excavation will be handled under the Marsh Crust Ordinance, which is one of the three tiers/levels for enforcing the ICs, along with a covenant between DTSC and the City of Alameda; and a restriction on the deeds of transfer between the Navy and the City of Alameda which retains federal interest to ensure that the Navy can enforce the ICs. The Navy will also monitor the groundwater for at least five years to ensure that there is no migration. Mr. McClelland stated that the six- to eight-page plan will be mailed to everyone on the mailing list for Alameda Point and Alameda Annex. He encouraged attendees to review it. The ROD will also be available upon request.

Ms. Sutter asked as to the status of the plan, and Mr. McClelland replied that he was not sure. Ms. Cassa stated that DTSC submitted comments on 5 June 2000 and added that DTSC was waiting on the EPA. Mr. McClelland stated that he and Jo-Lynne Lee decided in a focus group meeting that it would be a good idea to obtain an update on the Environmental Baseline Survey (EBS) Program for Alameda Point.

Ms. Cassa, DTSC, introduced Patricia Ryan, DTSC, who has replaced Claire Best.

III. EBS Program Update

Roberta Tassej, Tetra Tech EM, Inc. (TtEMI), stated that TtEMI has been involved with the EBS program at Alameda Point since 1993, when the Community Environmental Restoration Compensation and Liability Act (CERCLA) and the 1992 Community Environmental Response Facilitation Act (CERFA) required that a plan of action for base closure be formed within 18 months. She distributed a handout that will be included in the monthly mailing.

Ms. Tassej displayed a map entitled "Parcels and Zones as Designated Through the Environmental Baseline Survey Process [for] Alameda Point [at] Alameda, California" She suggested that attendees read a write-up in the Base Closure Plan for other background and developmental information on the EBS Program.

Ms. Tassej explained that the initial task of the EBS is to designate which one of seven categories applies to a particular parcel. She reviewed the "Alameda Point 1996 Base Realignment and Closure Environmental Condition of Property Categories." In 1993, 208 parcels and 23 zones were designated through the EBS process; since then a Todd Shipyard parcel was added. Twenty-three data summary reports provide information on the activities on each parcel. The reports are updated as additional data is collected; it will be finalized in about two months, at which time a comprehensive guide will also be released in compact disc format. The existing documents are available at the Alameda repositories.

Ms. Tassej stated that Category #1 refers to those areas where no release or disposal of hazardous substances or petroleum products has occurred (including no migration of these substances from adjacent areas). Category #2 refers to those areas where only release or disposal of petroleum products has occurred. Category #3 refers to areas where release of hazardous substances has occurred, but at concentrations that do not require a removal or remedial action. Category #4 refers to those areas where release of hazardous substances has occurred, and all remedial actions necessary to protect human health and the environment have been taken. Category #5 refers to areas where release of hazardous substances has occurred, and removal or remedial actions are underway, but all required remedial actions have not yet been taken. Category #6 refers to those areas where release of hazardous substances has occurred, but required actions have not yet been implemented. Category #7 refers to those areas that are not evaluated or require additional evaluation."

Ms. Tassej reviewed the "Alameda Point 1994 Environmental Condition of Property Parcel Reclassification." She emphasized the high percentage of parcels in category #7 since, at that time, not enough investigation had been done or data collected. As the EBS Program continued, some of the 208 parcels were subdivided into various clean areas and contaminated areas; this expanded the total number of parcels and subparcels to 243, as shown in "Alameda Point 2000 Environmental Condition of Property Parcel Reclassification." Category #1 had six parcels or 3 percent of the total 208 parcels. Categories #2 thru #5 had none, or 0 percent, of the total. Category #6 had 27 parcels or 13 percent of the total, and Category #7 had 175 parcels or 84 percent of the total. By year 2000, Category #1 parcels/subparcels had increased to ten, Category #2 to six, Category #3 to 17, Category #4 to 107, and Category #6 to 105. Category #7 had decreased to zero, meaning that all of the now 245 parcels/subparcels had been evaluated.

Ms. Tassej reviewed the Alameda Point Parcel Reclassification Criteria Factors: EBS sampling data, tiered screening analysis, IR data, groundwater plumes, UST/AST information, groundwater flow direction, radiological information, beneficial use of groundwater, qualitative ecological evaluation, fuel line information, asbestos survey/abatement, LBP survey/abatement, PCB transformer survey, and Resource Conservation Recovery Act (RCRA) closure status. She explained that the 14 criteria factors reclassified various property parcels from 1994 to 2000. Ms. Tassej explained that in 1993, TtEMI began the Phase 2A screening sampling, which involved the collection of historical information about the site, review of aerial photographs of the parcels, and soil sampling and analysis. Based on the Phase 2A sampling results, Phase 2B sampling was begun. This entailed soil and groundwater sampling; the resultant data was used for risk assessment.

Phase 2C sampling was done to fill in any remaining data gaps for the sites that are within the purview of the EBS Program and RCRA. Phase 2C data was completed a few months ago and is currently in TtEMI's GIS system.

Mr. Torrey asked for additional explanation on Category #3 which deals with areas where contamination has occurred, but not at a level sufficient to require removal or remedial action. He commented that any contamination warranted remedial action of some sort. There was no response to this comment. Mr. Torrey then asked what kinds of contamination have been found. Ms. Tassej answered that it varies from parcel to parcel, and offered to provide information for a specific parcel upon request. Mr. Torrey explained that at times, dog owners allow their animals to run loose. He wondered if the dogs running freely were in any danger. Ms. Tassej replied that TtEMI could supply the information necessary to determine whether an area was safe or not.

Mr. Berges observed that the number of parcels and subparcels on the bottom line of the 2000 Environmental Condition of Property chart was not 243, but 245. Ms. Tassej apologized and said she would recheck her addition.

Ms. Tassej presented a category map and briefly discussed areas in Categories 1 through 6, adding that at present, there are no areas in Category #7. Ms. Sutter asked if the marsh crust was represented by the dark green areas on the map. Ms. Tassej said that several areas are currently under Category #6, but that TtEMI hopes that when the ROD is released, those areas will be reclassified under Category #4. Ms. Cassa stated that she felt that the answer to Ms. Sutter's query was a "yes."

Ardella Dailey asked where Miller School fit in relative to the aforementioned green area. Ms. Tassej said that it was slated to go into Conveyance Parcel A or it may become a Public Benefit transfer.

Ms. Lee and Ms. Dailey asked as to the difference between conveyance and transfer; Ms. Tassej, Ms. Sutter, and Steve Edde, Environmental Liaison, explained that it was primarily a difference in the matter of ownership.

Ms. Tassej stated that the offshore sediments are currently not considered part of TtEMI's disposal schedule, although they will eventually be included. She briefly discussed the timelines presented in the "Alameda Point Tentative Schedule for Conveyance Parcel FOST" and "Alameda Point FY2000 Tentative Transfer Dates." Mr. Job stated that the evaluation is ongoing, and that the "wheat" is still being separated from the chaff.

Phillip Ramsey, U.S. EPA, stated that the EPA is awaiting a Technical Memorandum that will specify where the Navy deems additional data is necessary.

Ms. Tassej noted that Conveyance Parcel A, which is 50 percent of the former Alameda Naval Air Station (NAS), has been slated for transfer sometime around the end of June. She added that this may be premature given that the Annex ROD has not yet been signed. She explained that TtEMI expected it to be signed almost a year ago, but that the marsh crust issue is slowing things down.

IV. Community and RAB Comment Period

Mr. Lynch asked as to the policy on storm sewers and catch basins in the Installation Restoration (IR) process. Ms. Tassej explained that an investigation is required to determine if any contamination is present and whether there is migration toward a storm/sewer drain, which is the most likely preferential pathway. She added that groundwater sampling and flow direction are

part of the EBS report. Mr. Lynch asked if the words "no further action is required" are appropriate for some of the parcels; he opined that some determinations are being hastily made, such as the east housing transfer.

In response to Lyn Stirewalt's inquiry, Ms. Cassa clarified that the EBS Program only addressed land issues. Ms. Stirewalt asked if the change in the number of units to be demolished amends the original reuse plan and the category status. Ms. Tassej stated that to her knowledge, whatever contamination existed prior to the decision to demolish the east housing would still be dealt with.

Mr. McClelland stated that the City of Alameda is responsible for the disposal of asbestos. Mr. Job, Ms. Stirewalt, and Mr. Berges discussed the Fort Ord scenario wherein several buildings were demolished and removed, but that considerable lead-based paint contaminants were left behind; this situation resulted in additional expense to complete the project. Ms. Stirewalt advised caution "in the happy rush to build beautiful things." Mr. Torrey and Ms. Sutter suggested looking into recycling possibilities for demolition debris. Ms. Tassej added that Habitat for Humanity wants recyclable materials for their own use and for resale.

Mr. Kloc stated that "the contractors don't always follow the rules" with regard to demolition activities; he voiced his concern about the resultant hazardous materials that end up in the air. He noted that, near his office in San Francisco, he had to make several phone calls to ensure that the contractors complied with the rules regarding dust. He wondered how the City was going to ensure that their contractors follow the rules.

Ms. Stirewalt and Doug DeHaan responded that contractors conducting asbestos removal will be watched carefully. Ms. Stirewalt stated that the Navy has successfully managed considerable asbestos removal over the years through constant vigilance with regard to containment and protective clothing for personnel, among other requirements.

Mr. Kloc asked what the City plans to do with regard to occupational health. Ms. Johnson stated that the City's building official would be responsible for those oversight duties. Mr. Berges inquired as to whether the RAB might ask the official to attend a RAB meeting soon. Ms. Johnson replied that she would locate the appropriate person and arrange for him or her to attend.

Returning to EBS matters, Ms. Sutter asked whether the sampling that has occurred is sufficient. Ms. Cassa and Ms. Lee replied that they were not sure, but that within the past few years, considerable data had been gathered. Ms. Sutter rephrased her question, asking if a level of fairly high assurance has been reached. Mr. Job replied that the basic question of sampling pertains to efficacy. He stated that all the samples that have been taken thus far would fill up the meeting room. The notion that a site as big as Alameda could be perfectly characterized by a sampling of that size naturally invites a fairly large element of uncertainty. Mr. Job opined that it would not be surprising, at some point in the future, to find a UST or an area where a battery spilled over that was not previously accounted for.

Ms. Cassa stated that she has spent the better part of two years reviewing data and that she is by and large satisfied with the level of competence displayed. She added that she would not hesitate to indicate that a parcel merits additional investigation.

Ms. Stirewalt inquired as to the paint stripping facility located east of the dock. Mr. Edde replied that this was located in Building 410, site # 19; chloride is the chemical of concern.

Ms. Cassa asked attendees to notify her about any information that may impact the transfer, to ensure that such concerns are addressed. Ms. Tassej reminded everyone that because of continual data collection, evaluations are subject to change. She encouraged attendees to voice their concerns about specific parcels to TtEMI; any relevant information, including documents and data, will be provided.

V. Project Teams, Round the Table

Administration

Ms. Sutter asked whether the RAB wanted to vote on Bill Mitchell, a RAB applicant. Mr. Berges moved that the RAB accept Mr. Mitchell, and Mr. Kloc seconded the motion. However, since Mr. Torrey and others expressed a desire to meet Mr. Mitchell first, Mr. Berges deferred his motion until next month's meeting.

Ms. Stirewalt wondered why it was necessary to wait to vote on Mr. Mitchell when the RAB easily voted in John Roullier during last month's meeting. Ken O'Donoghue said that he would also like to meet Mr. Roullier, as he has not attended any meetings yet.

Mr. McClelland stated that a list of the new Navy representatives will be included in the monthly packet.

OU-3 Project Team

Ms. Sutter stated that the team reviewed the Addendum and the comments from Mary Masters, TOSC. There is a significant amount of highly technical information which prompts the question of what the screening levels should be. Mr. Kloc noted another hot spot at the northern tip of Site 1, where the former oil sump was located. Mr. Job mentioned that a problem with these reported results, in consideration of the physics and the chemistry behind them, is the great concentration in the water; in essence, when there is high fluctuation in the ph level, there is likely to be dirt in the sample.

OU-4 Project Team

Mr. McClelland stated that Rick Weissenborn and Michael Bloom were assigned to offshore sediments; the Navy point of contact is Greg Lorton.

OU-1 Remedial Investigation

Mr. McClelland stated that the new Navy point of contact is Glenna Clark.

EBS/Tiered Screening Transfer Documentation

Mr. McClelland stated that the new Navy point of contact is Wendy Thornton.

OU-2 Project Team

Mr. McClelland stated that Greg Lorton will be handling OU-2A and Glenna Clark will be handling OU-2 B and C.

Radiological

There was no report on this topic.

Site 25/Estuary Park/Community Outreach

Mr. McClelland stated that Mr. Weissenborn is the new Navy point of contact.

VI. BCT Activities

Mr. Ramsey listed the following topics discussed during conference calls: updating the document tracking system; lead-based paint issues; soil underneath the water towers and the antenna tower; and UXO. On 16 May, a BCT/RPM meeting was held during which the Navy provided information on new IR sites. Concluding comments on the Marsh Crust RAP/ROD will be issued soon. Mr. Job stated that the ecological assessment for an Alameda Point skeet range (just north of the pistol range) is pending, although he was not sure whether it is within the purview of CERCLA.

VII. Public Comment

Mr. Lynch stated that in May, there were two weekends with significant rainfall during which excavations were ongoing on Sites 13 and 23. He noted that there were absolutely no controls in place on the soil stockpiles, despite the fact that they were inside an IR site. He stated that at the very least, existing City of Alameda ordinances would apply to that site, but there was no enforcement of those controls. Mr. Lynch commented that this incident is "food for thought." Mr. Job asked Mr. Lynch to inform him regarding any such possible infractions. Mr. Lynch suggested that Mr. Job drive out to see the storm drains near Building 400.

Ms. Sutter adjourned the meeting at 8:30 p.m.

The next Alameda Restoration Advisory Board Meeting will be held at 6:30 p.m. on Tuesday, 11 July 2000, in Building 1, 1st Floor, Suite #140, Community Conference Room, Alameda Point.

ATTACHMENT – ATTENDANCE LIST

**06 JUNE 2000 RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD
(RAB) MEETING SUMMARY**

**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



TRANSMITTAL/DELIVERABLE RECEIPT

Contract No. N68711-00-D-0005

Document Control No. TC . A021 . 10074

TO: Mr. Ron Fuller, Code 02R1.RF
Contracting Officer
Naval Facilities Engineering Command
Southwest Division
1230 Columbia Street, Suite 1100
San Diego, CA 92101-8517

DATE: 04/03/03
DO: 021
LOCATION: Alameda Point, Alameda, California

FROM: [Signature]
Michael Wanta, Contract Manager

DOCUMENT TITLE AND DATE:

Restoration Advisory Board Meeting Summaries for 2002, April 2, 2003

TYPE: [] Contractual Deliverable [] Technical Deliverable (DS) [X] Other (TC)

VERSION: NA REVISION #: NA
(e.g., Draft, Draft Final, Final)

ADMIN RECORD: Yes [X] No [] CATEGORY: Confidential []

SCHEDULED DELIVERY DATE: NA ACTUAL DELIVERY DATE: 04/03/03

NUMBER OF COPIES SUBMITTED TO NAVY: O/3C/4E
O = original transmittal form
C = copy of transmittal form
E = enclosure

COPIES TO: (Include Name, Navy Mail Code, and Number of Copies)

Table with 3 columns: NAVY, TETRA TECH, OTHER. Rows include M. McClelland (06Camm), Diane Silva (05G.DS)*, and File/Doc Control, Courtney Colvin.

Date/Time Received

*Admin Record Recipient