

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

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

**Tuesday, 3 October, 2000**

Purpose: 1) Approval of last month's meetings minutes, 2) Co-Chair Announcements, 3) Reuse Update, 4) Site 25 Update, 5) Project Teams-Round the Table, 6) BCT Activities, 7) Community and RAB Comment Period.

These minutes summarize the items discussed during the RAB meeting. This is not a verbatim transcript. Attachment A provides the attendance list.

**I. Approval of Minutes**

Michael McClelland called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.

Ken O' Donoghue informed the Advisory Board that Diane Behm was present but had to leave and asked to be excused from tonight's meeting.

Mr. McClelland called for questions or comments to the September 2000 minutes.

Phillip Ramsey, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (U.S. E.P.A), commented that he read through the notes which outlined the tour of Alameda Point Installation Restoration (IR) sites. Mr. Ramsey noted that although Steve Edde did a good job of explaining some of the sites covered during the tour, he wanted to note that some of the meeting minutes only reflect Mr. Edde's personal knowledge of the site and that the information imparted is not necessarily one-hundred percent accurate. Mr. Ramsey opined that it was not his intention to be overly critical, however, some of Mr. Edde's information does not completely match that of the BCT. Mr. Ramsey cited as an example, the last sentence of paragraph one, on page three of the September 2000 meeting minutes, where the documentation reads "It was noted the West Beach Landfill was used from 1956 to the 1970s for municipal and industrial garbage, similar to that of IR Site 1, although no UXO has been found at IR Site 2."

Mr. Ramsey pointed out that although the Navy has not seen any UXO, there is suspected disposal in Site 2, more specifically the Navy has information which indicates that there may have been as much as four truck loads of munitions disposed of in Site 2. He continued that it is this kind of detail which is not one-hundred percent accurate.

Steve Edde asked Mr. Ramsey how he would change the sentence in the September 2000 minutes. Mr. Ramsey responded, that the documentation reflects accurately what Mr. Edde intended to convey, however, he just want to state for the record, that the information may not be completely accurate according to what other agencies who were involved in the site visit may have added, since he did not notice any comments from the Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC), or from the EPA representative who was at the site during the visit. Mr. Ramsey

stated that the information reflects what the Navy was indicating, and for the purpose of the site visit, that is acceptable information. Mr. Edde added that the statements were based on historical data and in that respect it is accurate information.

Mr. Ramsey also noted that there were some references to the grant for reuse as the Superfund Grant. He stated that it is the distinction of an EPA Ground Field Grant rather than Superfund, because of the source of the money.

Mary Rose Cassa noted that one can visit the EPA website for detailed information about the Superfund program.

Mr. McClelland acknowledged the comments and called for additional comments to the September 2000 minutes. None were voiced. It was moved to accept the minutes, and no objections were made.

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

Mr. McClelland informed the Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) that he would circulate documentation submitted by Mary Sutter to the RAB for review. He asked that the documentation be returned to him after all meeting participants had an opportunity to review the documentation during the meeting. The material includes:

- A letter from Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry (ATSDR) which reviews their site study;
- A document from Rick Weissenborn, Navy RPM, addressing the subject of Radiation Human Health Risk Assessment;
- A document about the draft OU3-RI addendum;
- A letter sent to Mr. Weissenborn by Ms. Sutter;
- Comments from Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) on the (inaudible) ordinance; and,
- The final fuel hydrocarbon transport model report.

Mr. McClelland broached the topic of removal actions for this next year. He stated that this matter was intended to be a topic for this evening's agenda. It was not possible to prepare for this RAB meeting.

Mr. McClelland stated that it appears that this will be a good funding year. Last year about three million dollars was allocated. This year funding is expected to be in the tens-of-millions of dollars in funding. In order to use the funds and get some product out of the ground and get some sites cleaned up, there will be removal actions. Mr. McClelland indicated that he would like to have detailed discussion about what the process involves, including engineering evaluation and cost analysis (EE/CA) and action memorandum. The removal action topic will be discussed in detail at the November RAB meeting.

The Navy is working with the EPA on a Federal Facility Agreement (FFA). Meetings will be held on October 11th & 12th, between the EPA, Navy and the State. DTSC and the Water Board are invited to attend. It is hoped that the group will "iron out" the final details of the agreement. It appears that this will be a two party agreement between the Navy and the EPA. The Navy will continue to work with the EPA, DTSC and the Water Board on the cleanup. DTSC and the Water Board will have the option of signing the FFA. If they do not, they may issue cleanup orders. The

Navy and the EPA will be working on details over the next few weeks and it is the hope to finalize the FFA, and have it signed within six to eight weeks. The Site Management Plan (SMP) will then be finalized. The SMP is a schedule for accomplishing the investigation and cleanup of Alameda Point through completion. Each year the schedule will be updated.

Mr. McClelland discussed how RAB meeting agendas are set. He stated that he will consult with Navy staff members to get ideas from them about projects and activities that are coming up, allowing more time to prepare presentations. The current preparation process is for the Navy to meet with the RAB Co-Chair two weeks before the RAB meeting to set an agenda, and often this is not enough time to prepare a presentation. Mr. McClelland stated that he will continue working with his staff and the RAB Co-Chair, and would like to solicit ideas from the RAB. If there is something that the RAB is interested in, or would like more information about, they should send the information to him via the RAB Co-Chair in order that the agendas can be set to allow time for presentation preparation.

Ken O'Donoghue inquired about the status of a letter prepared Mary Sutter on behalf of the RAB that was to have gone to Coast Guard housing residents. The letter was to have been finalized by Ms. Sutter in September.

Mr. McClelland responded that he has received the letter and the letter will be sent to the Coast Guard residents along with an information sheet, which is currently being prepared. Mr. McClelland informed the RAB that the semi-annual Residents' Town Hall will be held, Thursday, 12 October 2000, and the plan is to get the information sheet and letter distributed prior to the meeting, or if necessary distributed at the meeting.

### **III. Reuse Update:**

Elizabeth Johnson, Base Reuse Planner for the City of Alameda and the Alameda Reuse and Redevelopment Authority (ARRA), presented an overview of the two separate agencies for which Alameda City Council serves as the Board and governing body. The ARRA was formed for the purpose of providing oversight and planning for the transfer and reuse of the base from the Navy to the City of Alameda. When the property transfers it goes through the ARRA, it is then assigned to the City of Alameda. This process is a Department of Defense (DOD) requirement. This agency has powers that the City of Alameda does not have with respect to accepting federal property.

Ms. Johnson informed the RAB that the base was announced for closure in 1992, the ARRA was formed in 1994, along with the Base Reuse Advisory Group, a large group of citizens who reviewed the planning effort. A two-year planning program ensued and the result was the Community Reuse Plan. The Community Reuse Plan was required for DOD to convey the property to the City of Alameda.

The planning sub-areas were used for discussion and for identifying different areas:

1) North Waterfront: Mixed used, commercial, office and potentially light industrial.

2) Main Street Neighborhoods: Expands across Main Street and incorporates existing housing and future housing. This area is currently known as West Housing and the Reuse Plan envisions redeveloping some of the housing and refurbishing other areas to end up with 1500 single family dwellings. Ms. Johnson explained that after the reuse plan was adopted in January 1996, the City of Alameda acquired special legislation to transfer the land in a more expeditious manner. The

City of Alameda solicited proposals from developers and is now set to begin the construction of an area, which will provide housing, commercial; waterfront uses such as restaurants and eventually office space. Additionally, as the proposed plan progressed, the environmental concerns began to shape the Reuse Plan.

3) Inner Harbor: This area was known as the most heavily industrialized area of the base and was at risk for a high level of contamination, so it was anticipated that this area would continue to be used for light industrial business.

4) Regional Parks: The Regional Parks District proposed new development for Regional Park facilities and beach area. They have since modified the plan slightly.

5) Marina District: Plan is envisioned as 90% marina. There have been feasibility studies to consider other commercial uses such as restaurants, docking facilities for boats and the possibility of a hotel in the future, or when some of the housing regulations in the City of Alameda are addressed, possibly some kind of waterfront housing development. When the plan was originally developed there was the potential for a Pan Pacific University campus which proposed taking down the entire civic core. The proposal for the reuse plan anticipated that, unfortunately the Pan Pacific University plan was not a viable one, therefore, the plan has been modified and the new consideration is to look at more commercial and mixed-use development in order to generate more cash flow.

6) Wildlife Refuge: When the based closed the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service submitted a request for the federal transfer of the entire former runway. It was negotiated down to 561 acres of land and three-hundred acres of water. The area has been set aside as a refuge for the protection of the California Lest Tern, an endangered species.

7) Northwest Territories: The Reuse Plan report has a port priority designation, whereby the property has to be evaluated for use as a port facility. That designation was changed because there is no logical ground transportation route out of the City of Alameda.

The Reuse Plan visualized an industrial site and an open space recreation area as specifically a golf course and sports complex which encompasses 57 acres total for general use. The feasibility study for the golf course was good. However, the Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement (EIR/EIS) concluded that if all of various projects were completed, it would cause too much traffic congestion. The Golf Course and Sports Complex projects are in process.

Ms. Johnson informed the RAB that the City of Alameda is in the process of developing a general plan amendment to bring all of these land use categories into the City of Alameda general plans, after which the City of Alameda will be able to develop the property. The City of Alameda is also developing a Request for Proposal (RFP) for a master developer, which will go to Council in November.

Mary Rose Cassa asked what kind of development idea is the developer giving the Reuse Plan given the constraints.

Ms. Johnson responded that the City of Alameda will seek the developer's input about other ways to develop the base. The Reuse Plan will be finalized only after a series of public input meetings, which will be held at the City of Alameda Planning Department.

Ms. Johnson continued that the City of Alameda has a number of long-term leases on the base and those leases will remain in effect. However, the City of Alameda will alter some of the land uses based upon information received from the RAB.

Lynn Stirewalt inquired about modifications to the plan for Pan Pacific University campus, the issue of traffic congestion through the Northwest Territories, between that and the General Plan Amendment how does one know about minor amendments.

Ms. Johnson responded that modifications are taken to the ARRA Board after which they are a matter of public record. Additionally, Ms. Johnson noted that she prepares and sends addendum's to all interested parties.

Mr. O'Donoghue noted that it his understanding that the clean-up levels are based on the intended reuse and with these changes who is determining if these are significant enough changes to alter the clean-up criteria.

Ms. Johnson responded that she is the point of contact for the City of Alameda for clean-up issues.

Mr. O'Donoghue asked if the University Plan is going from occupational use, to residential use.

Ms. Johnson replied in the negative, stating that there is no further residential use anticipated in that area and that the barracks may be used for commercial purposes.

Mr. O'Donoghue asked if there would be any other changes.

Ms. Johnson replied in the negative, stating that the only changes would be acreage.

Mr. O'Donoghue asked if West Housing is included as part of the Master Development package.

Ms. Johnson replied in the affirmative, explaining that there is a site Preservation Overlay which is federal designation national register eligible historic district.

#### **IV. Site 25 Update:**

McClelland presented a brief update on behalf of Rick Weissenborn who was not able to attend tonight's meeting. Site 25 is a Coast Guard housing area contaminated with polynuclear aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs), which is believed to have come from the fill, which was used to create the site. The Navy plans to do more data gathering and sampling to better characterize the site and determine what needs to be done to clean the site.

Since last year the Navy has been working with EPA and DTSC to prepare a site sampling plan In June 2000 the internal draft was reviewed by the Navy's technical group. Following discussions with EPA and DTSC it was agreed that the sampling plan would not satisfy the needs of the investigation. The Navy decided to work with another contractor who is currently doing investigations at the Alameda Annex on PAHs. The Navy hired the new contractors to do the sampling plan for Site 25. Mr. McClelland indicated that he did not have a revised schedule for when the work plan will be available. Additionally, the Navy will be negotiating with EPA,

DTSC and the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) a Site Management Plan (SMP) for the Federal Facility Agreement (FFA).

Mr. O'Donoghue asked when new data for Site 25 would be available.

Mr. McClelland responded that he and the Navy staff will be working on the schedule for the SMP which will fold into the FFA. The Navy will meet with the BCT on 18 October 2000, and the hope from that meeting is to finalize the schedules and they will become part of the FFA. When the Navy and EPA sign the FFA, the SMP will become the legally enforceable schedule for the Navy's cleanup. The plan is to have the schedules in time for the December RAB.

Robert Berges asked if the RAB would get the schedules.

Mr. McClelland responded in the affirmative.

Mr. Ramsey added that this is general document tracking procedure for the Navy.

Mr. McClelland responded that it would be made available to the RAB once it is finalized.

Lynn Stirewalt asked if RAB members could get copies of the FFA.

Mr. McClelland responded in the affirmative. He noted that the FFA is a public document.

Mr. Ramsey stated that when the EPA produced the first draft of the document it was given out to various entities and the State made several copies for the RAB.

Mr. O'Reilly asked for explanation of an FFA.

McClelland stated when a federal site becomes a National Priorities List (NPL) site like Alameda Naval Air Station (NAS) in the last year, one of the requirements is to have a Federal Facility Agreement (FFA) which is like a FFSRA which we previously had for Alameda. It is an agreement between the Navy, EPA and possibly with State that establishes guidelines about how to settle disputes and provides an enforceable schedule. Part of the enforceable schedule is there are stipulated penalties if the Navy misses a due date, which can be up to \$10,000 per day assessed against the Navy for missing a date. It is a formalized process that goes up the chain to decide, and the ultimate arbitrator is the head of the U.S. EPA, if a matter advanced to that level, which is not a usual occurrence.

Mr. O'Reilly asked if the City of Alameda is a party to the FFA.

Mr. McClelland responded in the negative. He stated that it is just the EPA, Navy and State agencies. Even though the State does not currently plan to sign the FFA, the Navy will still work closely with the State, and the City of Alameda.

Mr. O'Donoghue asked if the document will go into a public review period before becoming a final plan.

Mr. McClelland responded in the negative.

Mr. Ramsey stated that several months ago there was a presentation given about how the FFA works. He stated that the public review process of the FFA comes after the agencies sign the document. The FFA is a legal discussion on the part of the attorneys of the various entities, he suggested that what would probably be of interest to the public is the schedule. Ms. Cassa noted that the schedule gets updated every year.

Mr. Kloc stated that he brought up the review matter because he is interested in making suggestions on changing the language regarding RABs, as he felt that it was not inclusive enough about the RABs responsibilities and wanted to verify that some changes have been made in those sections.

Mr. Ramsey stated that he and his counterpart Anna-Marie Cook share different responsibilities for Alameda, and that Ms. Cook has been working through this process to get the FFA finished. Mr. Ramsey stated that Ms. Cook did receive Mr. Kloc's comments and the changes have been made.

## **V. PROJECT TEAM, ROUND THE TABLE**

Ms. Stirewalt suggested since there are new RAB members, and prospective RAB members in attendance tonight, when team members are making presentations and come up on the number type and letter identification of a location, the site be identified on the map and specified so that people know where the site is located.

Ms. Stirewalt asked about the status of the Environmental Baseline Survey (EBS).

Mr. McClelland explained that the EBS is a snapshot of the environmental condition of the property. He further stated that the EBS is a requirement that the Navy has and the process by which property is transferred. The EBS is due to be finalized in November and a copy will be put in the libraries.

### **1. OU-3:**

Mr. O'Donoghue indicated that there is nothing new to report.

### **2. Radiological**

Mr. McClelland reported that the Navy is trying to set-up a meeting with the EPA and Department of Health Services (DHS) radiological representatives, as well as, the Navy's Radiological Support Officer who processes all radiological issues for the Navy. Meeting participants will talk about what needs to be done with Site 5, as there was a removal action in Site 5, which was the former aircraft repair facility. There are sewer lines that go out to Sea Plane Lagoon have been removed, however, there are still some areas that need to be looked at, and at least one line remains within the building. There are also some radiological concerns at Site 1 and Site 2. Each of the areas being looked at have landfill in them and were areas were radium is included among the contaminants.

### **3. Petroleum CAP**

No report.

McClelland stated that this should be a good project year, as long as funds do not have to be diverted to other projects.

#### 4. OU-1 Redevelopment Investigation -

Mr. Kloc asked if Site 7 is still part of OU-1.

Ms. Cassa responded in the affirmative.

Mr. Kloc reported that the Fuel Hydrocarbon Transport Modeling Report for Site 7 has been received. The site is part of Operable Unit (OU) 1, which also includes Area 37, an area in the East Central corner of the base adjacent to the Seaplane Lagoon. Both of the sites have petroleum and hydrocarbon contamination in the ground water. The focus group received a final document and want to make comments on it even though it is a final document. The focus group did not receive the draft, therefore, could not comment earlier. The document does ground water modeling using relatively simple ground water models. So far the focus group does not have a complete set of comments. Mr. Kloc stated that he has been reviewing the document and does have a couple of issues with the simplicity of the model. He opined that given the fact that Area 37 is along the Sea Plane Lagoon, it probably experiences strong tidal effects that the model being used probably cannot handle the kind of effects that the tide would have on contamination flow. Also at Site 7, in looking at the models used, one of the problems is that the report did not model contaminant flow into a nearby drainage ditch which is about 150 feet away from the site. The report assumes that the nearest surface water body was either the Oakland Channel or the Sea Plane Lagoon which is a problem in this document. The OU-1 focus group will have comments within the next month on this document and will send them out to the BCT and make a copy available to the RAB members.

Ms. Cassa suggested that since Area 37 is going to be part of the Petroleum CAP, the OU-1 focus group may want to talk with the Petroleum CAP group to exchange information.

Mr. Kloc stated that the only agency, which has reviewed this document to date, is the Water Board. He inquired about why other agencies are not looking at Site 7, and asked if other agencies are planning to review the site.

Ms. Cassa responded that the focus group is looking at Site 7 as part of OU-1 using petroleum modeling program.

Mr. Kloc asked Ms. Cassa if there would be a separate modeling exercise for Methaphenol and Pentochloraphenol.

Ms. Cassa responded that the focus group has not discussed chemicals in the groundwater, as they are addressing more serious issues of contamination.

Mr. Ramsey stated that the EPA commented several months back that there were references to the Navy indicating that Site 7 had agreed to be taken out of the CERCLA process. The EPA asked the Navy to document their rationale and to justify why this should only be a petroleum action. It was noted that there were data gaps for OU-1. The Navy was instructed to go back and fill in the data gaps and then reinitiate discussion. Several scoping meetings on data gap samplings for OU-1, OU2A-C and the new IR Sites, as well as, the reconfigured IR Sites have been conducted. Mr. Ramsey thanked Mr. Kloc for his comments and assured him that the EPA will review the

data and make sure the Navy is addressing the issues. As these are real trace levels of the compound and the EPA will have to go back to figure out if something at this level warrants being in a CERCLA, or could be handled in a petroleum program.

Ms. Stirewalt asked for clarification of the toxic substances in question.

Mr. Kloc responded that Methaphenol are in the ground water. He explained that pentachlorophenol was detected in ground water past the base boundary in an area near the drainage ditch. He suggested that the substance could be from telephone poles. Mr. Kloc stated that he has not checked the substance against ecological screening criteria, however, it is hot.

Mr. Ramsey stated that he was not sure about methaphenol, however, phenol has high risk numbers for human health issues.

Mr. Kloc added that he was thinking of the ecological screening, because he was looking at whether the modeling is to the drainage ditch, which then goes directly into the bay.

Mr. Ramsey pointed out that the representative from the Water Board was not in attendance tonight to address the water issues.

Mr. Kloc noted that at OU-1, Site 16, about a month ago, Patrick brought up that there was a hit of pesticide, which was quite high. He questioned if there were any new developments on the matter.

Mr. McClelland responded that the information was correct and had been added to the database. The Navy is looking at other documentation in an effort to be inclusive of all information. Mr. McClelland thanked the group for bringing the matter to the attention of the Navy.

## 5. SITE 25 Estuary Park

Mr. Kloc reported that at the BCT Meeting he found that there are more people from Coast Guard Housing who have become more aware of the RI going on in their area and they appear to be interested in the clean-up.

Mr. McClelland added that the Navy will attend the Coast Guard Meeting next week. The Navy will distribute the letter from the RAB regarding the ATSDR study.

## 6. MARSH CRUST

Bert Morgan reported that he was driving on Main Street just North of Atlantic this week when he observed Pacific Gas & Electric (PG&E) excavating below the five foot level. Mr. Morgan asked the crew if they had a permit and questioned them about their excavation procedures. The crew did have a permit and they were treating the soil as if it were contaminated and as the soil was removed, it was tested and placed in containers to be hauled away from the base.

Ms. Stirewalt asked Mr. Morgan to explain the Marsh Crust for the new members in attendance tonight.

Mr. Morgan explained that before the Navy settled on the land there was a PG&E Station and a Petroleum Recovery Refinery both of which dumped their waste into the marsh which over time formed into a thick goo that went up and down with the tides. When the Navy occupied the land they needed useable land and had to level it out to bring it up above sea level. The Navy filled with dredged material to cover the level of goo, which is now referred to as the Marsh Crust.

Mr. Morgan stated that the Navy did not create the problem they just covered it up, therefore, it cannot be economically removed. The solution was to attach a notice to land transfers to the ownership land, which alerted people to the fact, that below five feet it is potentially contaminated by the Marsh Crust. The City of Alameda passed an ordinance that applies only to Navy land that anyone digging below five feet has to have a permit to do so. Since the soil has not been tested, it is assumed to be contaminated and contractors would have to have a health and safety plan in place, as well as, a operations plan to make sure that workers in the area follow strict safety procedures.

Mr. McClelland stated that there is a covenant between the State Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) and the City of Alameda covering Marsh Crust. The Navy is working on a Remedial Action Plan / Record of Decision (RAP/ROD) for Marsh Crust which was originally scheduled to be signed in July. The Navy is preparing to submit a revised draft final to EPA, DTSC and the Regional Board and will working to finalize the document within the next month.

#### 7. ECOLOGY FOCUS/OU-4/SEDIMENTS

Mr. McClelland identified OU-4, on the map and explained that this site encompassed the Offshore area, Northside of the Base, Sea Plane Lagoon and IR Site 2 which is part of the area that will be going to the Fish and Wildlife Service.

James Leach reported that there is no current action, however, there has been a good report on testing in the last year. Although contaminants were found, they were not any worse than in other locations.

Mr. McClelland stated that the Navy will make a presentation at the November RAB on the Sediments Work Group investigation of the offshore area.

Mr. Kloc asked if the RAB could get a description of the EPA grant, which would be dealing with the sediment cleanup.

Mr. Ramsey responded that the focus will be to look at the reuse and whether to utilize the Seaplane Lagoon sediments in the landfills as base material for the landfill cap. The purpose of the money is to let the City look at consolidation issues, versus having to haul all of the sediments away.

Mr. McClelland stated that the area being discussed is IR-1 landfill cap. The discussion is to potentially be able to dispose of some of the sediments to be dredged from the Seaplane Lagoon in that area. It depends on the final elevations for the golf course, whether it can all fit under the cover for the landfill.

Ms. Cassa added that part of the grant has to do with joining the idea of the Marina development with the construction of the golf course. The project team wants the remediation of the landfill to be compatible with the City's vision for building a golf course. It has been suggested that before

the Navy gets to the point where they are going to design a landfill cap it would be best to have information on the golf course and the Seaplane Lagoon cleanup. Disposal of the Seaplane Lagoon sediments on the Site 1 landfill would be a lot more cost effective than other means of disposal.

Mr. Morgan informed the RAB about activity going on just Southeast of the road to the Oakland Airport where the golf course is being reconstructed and the contractors have used the dredged material from the San Leandro Lagoon to do this. As product is removed, it is carefully tested, the mud is separated from the sand, dried and they have been able to use all of the soil from the dredging to form the base for the golf course except for the top foot. Also, they will be able to use the some of the sand mixed with waste water sludge for that.

Mr. Morgan informed the RAB about a Port of Oakland project across the estuary at the former Navy Supply Center. The Port of Oakland is widening the estuary by 250 feet and dredging down to 50 feet. The Port has a soil control program, where the soil that is removed is stockpiled and tested.

Mr. Leach continued that as part of the Annual Civil Engineering meeting last Saturday, the group took a field trip to these areas. The contractors report that of the 6000 cubic yards of product which has been removed, they have only had to haul 2000 cubic yards to a Class II landfill. The contractors are reusing all of the concrete, recycling all of the steel and using all products, which are being removed. The final plan is for a new 37 acre park, which will face San Francisco Bay. Mr. Leach stated that the Port of Oakland got the land turned over quickly by signing papers assuming clean-up responsibility.

Mr. McClelland added that when the Port of Oakland assumed responsibility for the cleanup, the Navy paid a negotiated amount to let the Port of Oakland do the clean-up.

Mr. Morgan commented that the project is progressing very quickly and the contractors are organized.

Mr. Ramsey reported that the EPA has been waiting a while and the offshore sediments have been pushed back. There is also a process that occurred over this last year by the Sediment Work Group. There was originally a plan to do a regional look at contaminated sediments at a number of Bay Area bases to find a regional approach for disposal of contaminated sediments. The focus of the Regional Sediment Work Group was derailed when they were not able to find one disposal area for all sediments.. Additionally, a lot of time was spent starting to work on a regional feasibility study.

Overall, there has been a good effort in evaluating what the alternatives are in dealing with the issue of contaminated sediments, however, the delay has postponed any movement here in Alameda because it is a regional effort. The EPA is expecting a briefing from the Navy Sediment Group and the RAB will receive the same information. The Navy will be presenting a preview of a Technical Memorandum. Mr. Ramsey stated that the document will present the Navy's opinion based on the preliminary sampling that has been done around the base on the offshore sediments. Mr. Ramsey identified some of the areas on the map and noted that there has been a lot of discussion on new IR sites and some of these things may not be fully captured. Besides the known IR sites, offshore near Todd Shipyard and the Oakland Inner Harbor, the Navy has identified a Skeet Range site, offshore sediments off from the landfill. There was a Skeet Range here; however, the EPA has not seen the map for the new site. There is an offshore sediment issue

that needs to be verified before we move forward. Contaminants may have been pushed into the Bay from the landfill and we need to be sure about what has been done.

There is also an area called the Western Bayside where the Navy has done sampling, which we will be discussing in the near future. The Navy has sampled all around this and there needs to be a shift in priorities, the data needs to be reviewed we need to meet with the Navy to discuss their findings. Another area identified as the Pier Area has to be reviewed to make sure that all of the piers have been captured, find out if sampling has been done and is satisfactory. Mr. Ramsey stated that he noticed in looking at the data there was sampling done in 1993, 1994, 1996 and 1998. There has also been sampling done in the Breakwater Beach area. The EPA plans to meet and confer with the Navy soon to talk in-depth about the issue of offshore sediment.

Mr. Morgan commented that Cal Trans and the Port of Oakland have been recycling all their concrete. Alameda County is faced with a shortage of aggregate and all base rock has to be transported from other locations. What was reported, as being uneconomical to tear out old concrete and foundations is probably incorrect. As the natural condition of the Westend base did not have concrete remnants, the runways could be recycled. Not only is it a valuable asset, the Regional Park and City spend about \$700,000 per year shifting the sand down Southshore and there is talk about a seawall to prevent erosion. Mr. Leach opined that it would be economical to look for other ways to reuse the concrete in the runways.

Mr. Leach spoke about the fact that landfills have been debated for a long time and while working for Jacobs Engineering Group we were doing a clean-up at Castle Airforce Base and there were several acres of 15 - 20 foot pocket landfills.

One of the solutions at one time was to cover them without knowing about everything that was in the landfills. The contractor was given the option to clean it up. The contractor went in with loaders, spread the material out about 1 foot deep out over the runways, hand-picked everything and sent it to a Class II landfill. By cleaning the landfill rather than capping, they changed the use to a much higher grade and were able to sell the land. The entire operation took less than a month and about 1/20th of the projected cost of capping the landfill. Sometimes just getting in doing it is cheaper than talking about it for an extended period of time.

## 8. OU - 2 PROJECT TEAM

Mr. McClelland informed the RAB that OU2 has been split up into three units OU-2A, 2B and 2C.

Mr. Kloc noted that there is nothing new to report from his group's site. He asked if there was any report from the Navy or regulator sites.

Mr. Ramsey reported that the Navy will be sending a response for comments on the draft RI that was issued about one year ago. The Navy is set to prepare the draft RI final for this OU2A-C. The EPA hopes there will be time review it and make some essential comments. Mr. Ramsey continued that there has been a lot of discussions about the issue of data gap samplings for these three sub-OUs and discussion on removal actions. He stated that in the very near future all of the data gap sampling reports and work plans on the number of lines and where they are going to be located.

There will be documents to be generated and submitted out from the agencies and for the RAB to review. Engineering Evaluation Cost Analysis (EECAs) doing a mini feasibility study, with some of the EECAs generated prior to the data gap. In some cases the Navy has enough data to do the EECA, however, there is a need to do additional site organization to be sure to implement these removal actions they are not missing anything.

## **VI. New RAB Member Elections**

Ms. Stirewalt announced that the Membership Sub-Committee and the Administration Group agreed to combine. Ms. Stirewalt then introduced Nick DeBenedittis, who since the last time we met the Administrative Group voted to nominate Mr. DeBenedittis for membership on the RAB. At this time we would like to submit his name at this time for a vote by the membership. Ms. Stirewalt invited members of the RAB if they had any questions of Mr. DeBenedittis, or if they had any questions of the Administration Group, following which Mr. DeBenedittis will be asked to leave the room while the vote is taken.

Robert Berges asked Mr. DeBenedittis why he is interested in joining the RAB.

Mr. DeBenedittis responded that he is an attorney who recently moved from New York to Alameda and he knows personally the ravages of Love Canal in New York. He stated that it would not be favorable for either the Navy or Alameda to "get stuck" with problems. He stated that his goal is to not have that happen. He expressed his pleasure with the ideas regarding reuse of land and reiterated that he didn't want to see anyone hurt in the long run.

Ms. Stirewalt called for further questions of the candidate and stated that the committee interviewed Mr. DeBenedittis last month after the regular meeting and that they have his application.

The RAB asked Mr. DeBenedittis to step out of the room while the group took a vote.

Ms. Stirewalt called for further questions or comments.

Mr. Reilly asked if there were additional vacancies.

Ms. Stirewalt informed the RAB that the Membership Sub-Committee and Administration Group are working on a several applications at this time. She noted that one applicant has been recovering from surgery and is hoping to be proposed for next month. He continued that the current applications on file included Mr. DeBenedittis, Bill Mitchell, John Roullier and Kevin Reilly all of whom have been voted into the RAB. Another interested individual is a Mr. Bernap, a retired engineer who lives in the City of Alameda. We hope to introduce him a month from now.

Mr. Leach asked for the recommendation of the Membership Sub-Committee and Administration Group.

Ms. Stirewalt informed they are recommending Mr. DeBenedittis be approved for membership to the RAB.

Mr. Berges stated that the Membership Sub-Committee and Administration Group interviewed Mr. DeBenedittis and were satisfied that he met the criteria and moved to accept his nomination.

Mr. Kloc seconded the motion.

Mr. McClelland asked for a show of hands, and the vote was unanimous.

Ms. Stirewalt noted that the current group was recruited with the latest outreach that went with the Base Newsletter where the application was included with the newsletter and it was quite successful.

Mr. Kloc asked how many empty slots are available and if there is an official limit on the number of community members, or is there a traditional number that the board works to maintain.

Mr. McClelland stated that there is not an official limit on the number of community members.

Ms. Stirewalt added that the traditional number has been 22 slots that this group began with and there are provisions in the Charter for a quorum.

Ms. Stirewalt suggested to the new members that they familiarize themselves with the Focus Groups and join a group, which interest them.

Mr. McClelland informed the RAB about the issue of nominating a new RAB Chair and Co-Chair, noting that there has been some discussion about Michael Torrey succeeding Mary Sutter and that there may also be a nomination for a Vice Co-Chair. Mr. McClelland left the decision to the discretion of the RAB. Mr. McClelland noted that he and Mr. Kloc spoke with Mr. Torrey prior to tonight's meeting and he has expressed an interest in the RAB Co-Chair position. Mr. Torrey stated that he is involved in a considerable amount of activities and knows that he will miss at least one meeting per quarter, which is about four meetings per year. Mr. Torrey said he would be glad to serve as the RAB Co-Chair, if there was a Vice Co-Chair who could sit in during his absence. Mr. McClelland commented that it would be up to the RAB to talk with Ms. Stirewalt and Ms. Sutter about how to proceed. Ms. Sutter is interested in holding nominations in November.

Ms. Stirewalt stated that she would pull the Administration Group together to make a decision about how to proceed.

Mr. Kloc opined that he likes Mr. Torrey for the Co-Chair, however, he has found it difficult to get in touch with Mr. Torrey, as he does not have email and has been difficult to get in touch with by telephone.

Ms. Stirewalt interjected and stated that choosing the Chair and Co-Chair is a matter for the community members of the RAB. Each year the group has had an opportunity for all of the community members to consider the nomination process, whom they would like to have serve in that capacity. Furthermore, the transfer of the Vice-Chair to Chair position is not provided for in the Bylaws, and it is not an automatic process. Ms. Stirewalt stated that this group needs to open the nominations, as there are probably other individuals who are interested in those positions. Ms. Stirewalt urged the RAB members to make their interest known to Ms. Sutter, Mr. Torrey, or herself, as soon as possible. Ms. Stirewalt also suggested that the Chair and Co-Chair nomination issue be placed on the agenda for the November meeting.

Mr. McClelland informed the RAB that the next meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, 7 November 2000, which is Election Day. He asked the group if holding the meeting on that day would create a scheduling conflict for any of the members.

Ms. Stirewalt noted that this group has never moved the date of the meeting for elections.

## **VI. BCT ACTIVITIES**

Mr. Ramsey reported on the major discussions which have come out of the bi-weekly teleconference calls which take place on the 2nd & 4th Tuesday of the month between the Project Managers and the BRAC Clean-up Team (BCT) meetings held in August and September.

The BCT meeting was held August 15th and September 19th. In addition, a two-day data gap meeting was held on September 13th and 14th primarily to discuss data gaps, the OU-1 Site, (where there is a need to fill in more data), OU-2A, OU-2B, OU-2C and to deal with data gaps at the new IR Sites since there has been some reconfiguration of IR sites.

There is also a deep trichlorobenzene plume at the can site which is a storage area at the South end of the base.

Mr. Ramsey summarized some of the main topics discussed by the BCT during the teleconferences:

1) New IR sites

The Navy has already given a presentation on those sites and a general rundown about the Sites. The BCT is expecting the Navy to give more detail regarding the boundaries and the rationale for establishing those boundaries, this information will be presented to both the agencies and the RAB;

2) Dense Non-Aqueous Phase Liquids (DNAPLs)

They exist beneath the ground water and there is a need to deal with groundwater and soil contamination;

3) Site Schedules

All of these data gaps and removal strategies are changing the schedule, which has been established over the past year;

4) Site Management Plans;

5) Marsh Crust;

6) City of Alameda regarding the Reuse Plans;

7) Runway wetlands

There is limited data. The BCT has asked the Navy do an ecological risk assessment on the site to determine whether the site warrants further action.

8) OU-5

The Navy is being encouraged to begin as soon as possible. The EPA has been pushing hard on this issue. The Coast Guard housing and Estuary Park have been designated by the clean-up team to be the highest priority issue on the base and things have not been moving as quickly as possible;

9) OU-7

It is the hope to receive the update on the technical memo in the near future.

10) Information on PCB inventory

These are chemicals that are stored in oils and transformers. The Navy is doing an inventory.

11) PAHs at the former Pacific Oil Refinery, Site 13,

There is an issue of lead based paint investigations in which Navy is testing for lead underneath the water towers and antennas; and

12) Planning the Radiation Meeting.

Mr. Ramsey informed the RAB that:

- U.S. EPA Managers have written a letter to Navy Managers dated September 22nd, with a copy sent to Mary Sutter. U.S. EPA Managers are meeting with the Navy on Friday to discuss issues about various bases in the Bay Area and Alameda, Coast Guard Housing, and Site 25 are topics for discussion. The U.S. EPA has been raising concerns about things not happening fast enough since people are inhabiting the base and complete characterization has not been done and there is a lot of uncertainty about what is happening. Additionally, there are PAHs in soil, benzene in groundwater and this has to be addressed in the RIs. The U.S. EPA is trying to work with the Navy to get this work plan developed.
- U.S. EPA expects to receive a complete set of all of the OU schedules from the Navy, including OU5, on 11 October. They are also expecting a field sampling plan outline for discussion at the BCT meeting and should be getting a preview of that outline several weeks before the meeting date. The U.S. EPA started discussion with the Navy almost one year ago about the kind of work that needs to be done to complete the soil samples.
- Mr. Ramsey informed the RAB that the Golden Gate Audubon Society letter which was issued to the Navy on 12 September, expressed concern for the pace of the clean-up at Site 2 landfill and the wetlands. The letter also requested a 30-day extension on the review of the IR report for Site 2. It is expected that the work plan or a draft RI will be showing up in the near future.
- There are concerns being expressed about contamination by the Coast Guard residents, this matter was the topic of discussion at the Coast Guard Housing Town Hall Meeting. U.S. EPA plans to accompany the Navy to the next Town Hall Meeting.
- Several months ago the RAB expressed concern that they were not notified and did not receive a copy of a Site Summary, prepared by Department of Health and Human Services, Public Health Service-Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry (ATSDR). Mr. Ramsey indicated that he followed up with a representative for the local ATSDR office and understands that the Atlanta office did receive the RABs letter and has sent a reply.

Mr. DeBenedittis asked Mr. Ramsey if Gateway National Park Association has anything thing do with these discussions.

Mr. Ramsey responded in the negative. He explained to Mr. DeBenedittis that the discussions do involve multiple agencies including the DTSC, Regional Water Quality Control Board, and U.S. EPA. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, and others . He noted that all of the participants are major players who deal with ecological issues.

Mr. McClelland informed Mr. Ramsey that a letter was received from Sandra G. Isaacs, Chief of Federal Facilities Assessment Branch of the Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry (ATSDR), Division of Health Assessment and Consultation in Atlanta, Georgia. The letter was a response to a letter drafted by Mr. Kloc and sent by Ms. Sutter 28 August 2000, to Ms. Isaacs. The letter was circulated for the RAB to review during tonight's meeting and the document will be sent to all RAB members as an attachment to the October meeting minutes.

Mr. Ramsey informed the RAB that he went to the ATSDR to obtain more information about the Public Health Assessment and the Site Summary. It was explained that the Public Health Assessment is down the road, however, the document to which the RAB's letter referred was a Site Summary.

## **VII. COMMUNITY AND RAB COMMENTS**

Mr. McClelland informed the RAB that the letter and the Site Summary, which was received from Ms. Isaacs, will be attached with the minutes of this meeting.

Mr. Ramsey noted that this is not the Public Health Assessment, it is just a Sites Summary.

Patrick Lynch stated that on 20 September 2000, the Regional Water Quality Control Board Meeting the City of Alameda was assessed a \$21,400 fine for discharging pollutants at a site located within the Marsh Crust. The Regional Water Quality Control Board concluded the City did so to save cost of properly disposing of the waste. Mr. Lynch indicated that he has to question the remedy that has been selected for the Marsh Crust and the amount of trust that has been put into the City of Alameda to protect public health through the City works, in light of these violations.

Mr. Ramsey asked Mr. Lynch if the matter was related to storm water discharge.

Mr. Lynch responded that it was discharge from an underground storage tank removal project. They were told by the County Health Department not to dispose of the water on the site, however, the work crews disposed of it on the site anyway. The water went into a storm drain and into a jurisdictional wetland and into a future City Park.

Mr. McClelland called for additional comments. None were voiced. He adjourned the meeting at 9:15 p.m.

**ATTACHMENT – ATTENDANCE LIST**

**03 OCTOBER 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 columns: NAVY, TETRA TECH, OTHER. Rows include M. McClelland (06Camm), Diane Silva (05G.DS)\*, and various copy counts like O/1E, 3C/3E, 1C/1E.

Date/Time Received