

**NAS ALAMEDA RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD
MEETING SUMMARY**

**NAS Alameda Officer's Club
NAS Alameda, California**

Tuesday, September 6, 1995

ATTENDEES

See attached list.

MEETING SUMMARY

I. Introductions/Minutes

The meeting was called to order at 7:06 p.m.

Ken O'Donoghue opened the meeting and explained the meeting agenda. LCDR Mike Petouhoff explained that James Ricks, the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) representative on the BRAC Cleanup Team (BCT) is not able to attend tonight's meeting and Jane Diamond, Chief of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Region 9's Superfund Program Navy Section, is attending in his place. Additionally, LCDR Petouhoff introduced Jim Sullivan, the Base Environmental Coordinator (BEC) from Naval Station Treasure Island.

Mr. O'Donoghue asked whether any RAB members had comments on the August RAB meeting minutes. Bert Morgan stated that he has no comments on the August meeting minutes; however, he received copies of the July RAB meeting minutes which are missing page 4. Additionally, Mr. Morgan stated that the least tern study he received is missing page 54.

Tom Oakey requested that the second bullet on page 2 of the August minutes be revised to insert before the first comma, "but not the general public."

Karen Hack clarified that the last action item listed, "Are compliance issues within the purview of the RAB," should not be presented as a question or concern; but rather, she is requesting that compliance issues, henceforth, be considered within the purview of the RAB.

Mr. O'Donoghue made a motion to approve the August RAB meeting minutes pending the above revisions; RAB members approved Mr. O'Donoghue's motion.

II. Action Item Updates and Co-Chair Announcements

Action Item Updates

Heidi Gitterman referred RAB members to the last page of the August meeting minutes that presents a list of action items.

Action Item #1: Ms. Hack requested results of the annual storm water monitoring report. Completed; LCDR Petouhoff submitted the results to Ms. Hack.

Action Item #2: Sherri Withrow requested RAB members complete the community relations plan (CRP) questionnaire by August 15, 1995, and provide their responses to PRC. Stacey Lupton explained that PRC had received five completed questionnaires; she gave RAB members an additional week (until September 13, 1995) to complete the questionnaires. Completed questionnaires should be faxed to Ms. Lupton at 415/543-5480.

Action Item #3: Lyn Stirewalt requested a report on the source of clean fill for Site 16. A Navy representative advised that the source of the clean fill would not be determined until a company is contracted for the work.

Action Item #4: Ms. Stirewalt requested RAB training on the concept of addressing multiple chemical effects. LCDR Petouhoff responded that human health risk guidelines and the concept of multiple chemical effects is on the October RAB meeting agenda for discussion.

Action Item #5: Ms. Stirewalt requested an update on one-time compliance and transfer-related compliance actions. LCDR Petouhoff responded that these issues are on the October RAB meeting agenda and will be discussed at that meeting. He further noted that the question of future training will be deferred until the first training series is completed. Mr. O'Donoghue added that a lot of effort has been put forth to conduct the series of RAB training workshops, and "frankly the turnout was disappointing." The final workshop of the series is scheduled for the end of September and will focus on cleanup technologies.

Action Item #6: Roberta Hough requested information on background concentrations at NAS Alameda. LCDR Petouhoff explained that this topic is also included for discussion on the October RAB meeting agenda.

Action Item #7: Mr. Oakey requested information on whether the Navy is conducting direct measurement of tissue residues in organisms. LCDR Petouhoff responded that this question will be addressed as part of the ecological and terrestrial risk assessment presentation slated for the October RAB meeting.

Action Item #8: Ms. Hack requested that compliance issues be considered within the purview of the RAB. LCDR Petouhoff explained that the Installation Restoration Program (IRP) is the Navy's implementation of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA). Although compliance issues are not necessarily a part of the IRP, they may be of direct interest to the RAB. He cited, for example, least tern and leasing issues as issues of real importance to RAB members. LCDR Petouhoff stated his willingness to consider non-IRP issues for RAB discussion on a case-by-case basis.

Co-Chair Announcements

Mr. O'Donoghue reminded RAB members that the next RAB meeting is scheduled for October 10, 1995, the second Tuesday of the month. He noted that Wayne Mayer will be out of town for a couple of months but will keep in touch with Bill Smith to communicate comments and keep apprised of RAB activities.

Mr. O'Donoghue announced that the RAB focus group chairs held an inaugural meeting a couple of weeks ago. These meetings will now be held on a regular basis, preferably two weeks following the full RAB meetings. The purpose of these meetings is to (1) bring the focus group chairs together with the RAB Community Co-Chair (and LCDR Petouhoff, as necessary), (2) determine future agenda items, (3) solicit feedback on the RAB's direction, and (4) foster independent and open discussion in an informal setting. He added that these meetings should make future RAB agenda's much more meaningful to the RAB members.

Mr. O'Donoghue cited examples of some of the topics discussed at the inaugural meeting as potential agenda items:

- the need for more media coverage possibly through RAB articles for local newspapers or a speaker's bureau
- off-base soil sampling to establish background levels
- the role of the RAB in advising the Navy on one-time compliance

Mr. O'Donoghue also reminded RAB members that the Navy is conducting the technology workshop this Saturday, September 9, at the Officer's Club. LCDR Petouhoff explained that the workshop will describe various cleanup technologies and their associated benefits and limitations.

LCDR Petouhoff announced that a removal action is tentatively planned for the fall at Site 18, the storm drain system. He pointed out that the removal process at Site 18 will be different than the process implemented at Site 16 (which was discussed at the August RAB meeting). Because Site 18 is a time-critical removal action, there will not be a public comment period. He noted that Ken Rosenblum, the chair of the Early Action Focus Group, receives copies of removal action documents which he can share with interested RAB members.

LCDR Petouhoff made a few additional announcements:

- Sherri Withrow, the community relations coordinator, is on vacation this week and the next two weeks.
- Mariette Shin, a former intern, has gone back to school; LCDR Petouhoff is in the process of hiring a replacement.
- President Clinton visited NAS Alameda and announced that Cal Start will receive a grant from the federal government.
- September 30, 1995, will be the last installment of the RAB workshops; this will complete the first series of RAB training workshops.

III. Environmental Baseline Survey Status

Anne Klimek made a presentation on the objectives, status, results, and future direction of the environmental baseline survey (EBS) being conducted at NAS Alameda (attached).

Key points of the presentation include the following:

- Key goals of the EBS include (1) protecting public health and the environment, (2) facilitating property reuse, (3) establishing the environmental condition of 100 percent of the base property, and (4) determining the suitability of leasing/transferring property for a specific use.
- Phase 2A of the EBS consisted of conducting initial sampling and screening of all properties within NAS Alameda. This phase was completed in July 1995.
- During Phase 2B of the EBS, specific property parcels identified during Phase 2A will be targeted for further evaluation. This phase began in August 1995 and is expected to be completed by the end of 1995.
- NAS Alameda properties have been placed in one of seven categories (category no. 1 representing the cleanest properties). Properties within category 7 are those with inadequate data and which cannot be categorized until further information is obtained. Phase 2A placed 55 percent of NAS Alameda acreage in property category no. 7. During Phase 2B properties within category no 7 will be evaluated further for the purpose of placing them in categories 1 through 6.
- The EBS forms the basis for the finding of suitability to lease (FOSL), which seeks to match the environmental condition of a property parcel with reuse goals.
- Priority leasing goals for 1995 have been established (outlined in the attached presentation).
- Interested parties have easy access to all the EBS as well as IRP information through the Geographic Information System (GIS), available in the RAB library.

LCDR Petouhoff stated that there has been a lot of interest expressed in the plating shop; he has heard of at least two potential reuse interests. Although no applications for reuse of the plating shop have yet been received, the Navy will begin the process for leasing the plating shop.

Following Ms. Klimek's presentation, RAB members asked a series of questions:

- Malcom Mooney inquired whether the Navy has information on the potential seismic impact on existing structures within NAS Alameda, especially in light of the term "suitability" in the FOSL. LCDR Petouhoff replied that seismic information is not included in the EBS. Although he cannot speak to the integrity of the existing structures, which is beyond the scope of his office, LCDR Petouhoff stated that the general plan is to document as much available information on the environmental

condition and make that information available to the reuse entities. He recommended that the Base Reuse Advisory Group (BRAG) consider this issue.

- Ms. Stirewalt asked for clarification on how property parcels and IRP sites are configured. Ms. Klimek explained that the number of IRP sites remain the same, the overall EBS was conducted by dividing NAS Alameda acreage into property parcels for evaluation. While the parcels may include an IRP site subject to CERCLA cleanup, much of the properties evaluated under the EBS are not IRP sites and, therefore, not subject to CERCLA.

LCDR Petouhoff further explained that NAS Alameda has been divided into 214 property parcels, representing 100 percent of the base property. During the EBS process of sampling and evaluating each of these parcels, additional contaminated sites may be identified and folded into the IRP process.

Ms. Klimek offered to provide more details on the EBS process to interested RAB members; she may be contacted at 415/244-2714.

- Mr. Oakey inquired whether the Navy is sampling only those areas where they have a reason to believe there may be some sort of contamination. He stated that government guidance on sampling calls for a more systematic and random approach, rather than a more selective approach; he expressed concern that a selective approach to sampling may miss hot spots. Ms. Klimek explained that the Navy conducted both selective sampling coupled with random sampling.

- Ms. Hack inquired about the sampling and analytical methodology implemented. Ms. Klimek stated that she would fax Ms. Hack information describing the Navy's methodology as the explanation is too detailed for discussion at the full RAB meeting.

- Roberta Hough asked to what extent immunoassay field screening techniques were used as an analytical method. She pointed out concerns raised by the Naval Station Treasure Island (NAVSTA TI) RAB regarding use of the immunoassay technique. Mr. Sullivan, the NAVSTA TI BEC, explained that at NAVSTA TI, immunoassay test (manufactured by EM Science for benzene, toluene, ethylbenzene, and xylenes, [BTEX]) had 50 percent false positive results. False positive means that the immunoassay result indicated a higher concentration of BTEX than the result reported for the comparison sample analyzed by a standard laboratory method. This type of error is less of a problem than a false negative result where the immunoassay would report less contamination than the comparison sample.

- Ms. Hough asked about the extent of the base subject to the EBS Phase 2A and Phase 2B evaluation. Ms. Klimek reiterated that 100 percent of the base property was evaluated under the EBS Phase 2A; Phase 2B will involve evaluation of targeted properties based on results from Phase 2A. The Navy is still evaluating the results of Phase 2A and has not yet determined the exact acreage to be evaluated under Phase 2B.

IV. Least Tern Study

Doug Pomeroy, from the Navy's Engineering Field Activity (EFA) West Environmental Planning Branch, provided a presentation on the status of the NAS Alameda Least Tern Buffer Zone Study (attached). He noted that the final study is available through his office or the Alameda Reuse and Redevelopment Authority (ARRA). Key points made during the presentation are highlighted below:

- The results of Least Tern Buffer Zone Study will be reflected in a National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) environmental impact statement (EIS) that will evaluate potential impacts of various reuse plans on the least tern population at NAS Alameda. He noted that the study is not a regulatory compliance document. It is likely that the ARRA will prepare a joint Federal EIS and California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) environmental impact report (EIR) document to present the proposed reuse plan for NAS Alameda.
- An Endangered Species Consultation Report will also be prepared concurrent with the EIS/EIR document.
- Data used to generate the report include the California Department of Fish and Game annual site report, interviews with base personnel who monitor the least tern sites, and individual measurements of the sites. For example, some of the measurements included how open the sites are, whether sites with buildings nearby have more consistent problems than sites without structures.
- The study's results reflect two major themes: (1) predator management and (2) human-related disturbance. Predator management includes location of the least tern site in relation to predators and ability/access to manage predation on terns. Human-related disturbances include indirect and direct disturbances of tern nests and disturbances by pets/animals.
- The study could not conclude that a particular distance of a structure to a least tern population may impact the success of that population.

A questions and answer period followed the presentation:

- Mr. Mooney asked what is meant by "intense management." Mr. Pomeroy explained that the level of management will vary between sites depending on available funds and the size and circumstances of a given population. Site visits may vary between three visits per week and six to seven times per week.
- Jim Haas asked if comparing data regarding least terns at other locations with the terns at NAS Alameda would be helpful. Mr. Pomeroy replied that some comparisons have been made; however, they did not feel comfortable making a conclusion based on the findings because there is too much variability among locations.

Mr. Pomeroy noted that a program was initiated in 1988 to address feral cat predators by prohibiting any feeding of the cats on base; this policy significantly reduced the cat population on base. He explained that this initiative, coupled with increased site management activities and extension of the breakwater to reduce anticipated dredging, resulted in an annual increase in the least tern population.

Mr. Pomeroy explained that if the base property remains under a federal agency, management of the least tern must comply with the Federal Endangered Species Act. Mr. Haas explained that if the land is taken out of federal ownership, the new owner must apply for a permit for an "incidental take." Such a permit requires development of a habitat conservation plan that describes how the owner will protect the habitat.

- Richard King asked how other bases are handling least tern populations or other endangered species. Mr. Oakey referred Mr. King to page 38 of the least tern study which provides a case study of a situation similar to that at NAS Alameda. Mr. Oakey pointed out that the study indicates that sites with structures close to the center of the least tern colony experienced the most potential for heavy predation. He asserted that the NAS Alameda least tern population has been particularly successful because of the open nature of the habitat's site.
- Ron Basarich asked how the Navy determines whether a colony is simply expanding due to migration of birds from other colonies (for example, the Oakland Airport). Mr. Pomeroy stated that least terns at NAS Alameda are being born at a higher rate than "replacement" rates. He further noted that most birds, if their original nesting site is disturbed, will migrate to an alternate site within the same general vicinity.
- Mr. Basarich inquired why the Oakland Airport is not subject to the Endangered Species Act. Mr. Haas reiterated that non-federal owners must apply for a permit for an incidental take and prepare a habitat conservation plan. The plan must include some mitigation measures to offset impact to the habitat. Furthermore, Mr. Haas pointed out that there is currently no least tern population at the Oakland Airport; therefore, the airport is not subject to the Endangered Species Act.
- A member of the general public asked how many least terns currently exist at NAS Alameda. Mr. Pomeroy replied that there are currently about 140 pairs; in 1988, there were about 85 pairs, reflecting an increase of about 10 per year.
- A member of the general public (Corrine Stephanic) noted that the report seems to indicate that the "tighter you squeeze them [least terns], the more problems and more expensive it is to monitor and protect them." Mr. Pomeroy agreed that is an accurate depiction.
- A member of the general public inquired if the birds have been tested to determine whether their offspring are contaminated. Mr. Pomeroy replied that the Navy has not conducted such tests. Mr. Pomeroy explained that capturing the birds to administer testing would cause more trauma than the results would justify. Mr. Haas referred to a study conducted by the University of California at Davis which analyzed least tern eggs for contaminants; only non-detect levels of contaminants were identified, hence, contamination of offspring does not appear to present a problem.

- Ms. Hough inquired whether the colder weather in northern California may impact the least tern population and should be considered in comparison studies with populations in southern California. Mr. Pomeroy responded that this factor will be considered in preparation of the EIS/EIR.
- Bill Smith asked whether a golf course may have a positive impact on the least tern population. Mr. Pomeroy stated that any reuse plan will need to consider the number of buildings and distance between the bird population and the buildings. Birds survive better in an open setting without people.

V. Budget Update

LCDR Petouhoff gave a presentation on the status of funding for NAS Alameda. He stated that Congress is still deliberating on the fiscal year (FY) 1996 budget; hence, the future budget for military environmental cleanup is still unclear. He described the budget process as a "tug of war" within the Navy, among the three services within the Department of Defense (DoD), between DoD and the Executive Branch, and between the Executive Branch and Congress.

He noted that the direction of budget discussions have made a major shift for FY 96. In the past, the focus usually centered on establishing a "floor" or minimum amount of funds that should be spent; now the discussion is focused on establishing "ceilings," setting a maximum amount of funds that cannot be exceeded. He further stated that his discussions in Washington, D.C. indicate that there is "simply no constituency or advocate in D.C. for cleanup funding."

LCDR Petouhoff stated that while NAS Alameda has a written commitment that funding is coming, the installation has yet to receive the funding. He noted that the installation may not be funded to conduct as many early actions as planned to accommodate reuse needs; however, the basic building blocks in the IRP process will be funded, possibly over an extended period of time. For example, the funds will be provided to prepare a record of decision (ROD) on cleanup actions; however, the ROD completion may be delayed.

He explained that essentially there are three categories of funding (1) IRP activities, funded by the Naval Facilities (NAVFAC) in Washington, D.C., (2) property transfer-related compliance activities, also funded by NAVFAC; and (3) one-time compliance actions funded by the individual installations. He noted that funds provided by the installations for one-time compliance actions are hidden in the overall installation's budget and, therefore, survive better than the more visible NAVFAC funds.

Karen King commented that the Department of Energy (DOE) has streamlined its cleanup and closure activities by folding relevant information generated during preparation of the EIS directly into the remedial investigation and feasibility study (RI/FS). LCDR Petouhoff explained that the Navy is exploring options for streamlining the EIS and RI/FS process; with respect to NEPA and CEQA, the CERCLA public notice requirements satisfy NEPA public notice requirements. He explained that California agencies are responsible for conducting CEQA public notification procedures concurrent with the CERCLA/NEPA notification process.

Mr. Smith commented that although the funding is tight, the tools (for example, the laws and courts) are still in place to ensure cleanup is completed.

Ms. Hack inquired about the status of the DoD banding scheme for allocating funds. LCDR Petouhoff stated that "banding is essentially dead." He noted that although the banding scheme had good goals, it missed many of the nuances associated with determining appropriate levels of funding. The banding process has been superseded by a more generic process in which each installation submits its funding priorities to Navy headquarters.

A member of the general public inquired what the Navy plans to do in light of the expected funding shortfalls. LCDR Petouhoff explained that the Navy had established priorities for funding back in April 1994 which included identification of activities which could potentially be deferred. For example, he noted that the groundwater at NAS Alameda is not currently used for drinking water; hence, remediation of the groundwater could possibly be deferred. However, he noted that the groundwater may be a future potable source; plus, the potential for contaminant migration to the San Francisco Bay must be considered.

Mr. Smith made an observation that once the base closes, the sole source of funding will come from NAVFAC; therefore, "anything that needs to get done, must be done in the next two years before the base closes, or else it won't get done." LCDR Petouhoff explained that once the base closes, a core group of people will act as caretakers to continue the cleanup and monitor the base facilities.

Mr. Basarich commented that delay in ROD completion will mean a delay in long-term reuse of the base property. LCDR Petouhoff agreed with this comment but noted that there will continue to be interim leasing on the base. He pointed out that according to the law, the federal government cannot transfer property by deed until "all necessary remedial action has been taken."

Mr. Mooney inquired whether partial transfer of clean properties would be possible. LCDR Petouhoff replied that the Navy still has funds to complete the EBS and he expects that much of the base property will not require cleanup. He pointed out that the more the reuse plan deviates from the base's current use, the more likely costs and time necessary to complete cleanup will increase. He emphasized the need to consider such trade-offs in the reuse planning process.

Jane Diamond noted that all military installations are feeling the pain of budget cuts.

Mr. O'Donoghue urged RAB members and the public to write or fax their own representatives as well as members of the U.S. Appropriations Committees regarding the need for continued and adequate base cleanup funding.

At this point Ms. Hack inquired about the status of the Federal Facility Site Remediation Agreement (FFSRA). LCDR Petouhoff stated that the FFSRA has been negotiated and is pending signature by all parties to the agreement. Ms. Hack requested that the RAB be provided copies of the FFSRA portions agreed to by all parties and be provided a status report at the next RAB meeting.

VI. Focus Group Reports

Early Action Focus Group

Ken Rosenblum stated that Ms. King had prepared an article for the Alameda newspapers to inform the community on RAB activities.

Ms. Hough inquired whether a deadline has been set for receipt of comments on the Parcel 144 (soccer field) FOSL. LCDR Petouhoff replied that no date has been set, yet the FOSL will not be made final or the property leased until the property is adequately clean. Ms. Hough requested as an action item that no decisions be made on the Parcel 144 FOSL until her comments are addressed; her comments relate to the adequacy of sampling techniques used at Parcel 144, the use of background levels, and other concerns. LCDR Petouhoff agreed that no final decision will be made until her comments are responded to.

Technology Focus Group

Mr. O'Donoghue provided an update for Mr. Smith who had to leave. The Removal Action Scoping Document for Site 18 was received and "looks good;" the focus group had a few minor comments on the report.

The next Technology Focus Group meeting will be held on September 12 in the RAB library.

Reuse Focus Group

Mr. Basarich announced that the ARRA will be presenting its draft reuse plan on Saturday, September 9. The ARRA expects to complete a final reuse plan by January 1996. He noted that it "seems tenuous" to encourage cleanup for long-term reuse given the multitude of factors impacting the cleanup (for example, funding reductions).

Organizational Focus Group

Ms. Stirewalt stated that the Organizational Focus Group is planning a joint meeting with Mr. Oakey, LCDR Petouhoff, and Mr. Basarich, possibly on September 11, 1995, in the RAB library to iron out the RAB charter.

Natural Resource Focus Group

Mr. Oakey distributed a summary of selected quotations from the least tern study (attached).

Community Outreach Focus Group

Ms. King requested comments on the draft article (described above by Mr. Rosenblum). She noted that based on some of the information discussed at this meeting, she may make further changes to the article; for example, she believes that it may be more pertinent to discuss the least tern study and the Seaplane Lagoon IRP site.

VII. Action Items and Closing Remarks

Mr. O'Donoghue reminded the RAB that the next meeting of the focus group chairs is planned for the week of September 18, 1995; the next RAB meeting is scheduled for the second Tuesday of the month, October 10, 1995.

Ms. Hack inquired when comments are due for the Site 18 scoping document. LCDR Petouhoff responded that there is no formal public comment period associated with the Site 18 work plan; however, he would like any comments by September 20, 1995.

Ms. Hack next reiterated her perception that cleanup and conversion issues outside of the IRP should be within the purview of the RAB. Mr. O'Donoghue stated that the issue of the RAB's scope will be raised at the next focus group chair meeting. He noted that many issues are outside of CERCLA and the IR programs and "the fact that we are a child of CERCLA does not sit well." Any RAB member who is not a focus group chair but would like to comment on this issue should call Mr. O'Donoghue. LCDR Petouhoff indicated that he "remains open to discussion" on this issue.

ACTION ITEMS

- 9/6 Ms. Hack requested that the RAB be provided copies of portions of the Federal Site Remediation Agreement portions agreed to by all parties and be provided a status report at the next RAB meeting.
- 9/6 Ms. Hough requested that no decisions be made on the Parcel 144 FOSL until her comments are addressed. LCDR Petouhoff agreed that no final decision will be made until her comments are responded to.

The meeting adjourned at 9:49 p.m.

The next meeting will be held on Tuesday, October 10, 1995, at 7:00 p.m., at the Officer's Club, NAS Alameda.

ATTACHMENT

ATTENDANCE LIST

RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD
MEETING SUMMARY - SEPTEMBER 6, 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