

**NAVAL AIR STATION ALAMEDA RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD
MEETING SUMMARY**

**NAS Alameda Combined Officers Quarters
NAS Alameda, California**

Tuesday, October 1, 1996

ATTENDEES

See the attached list.

MEETING SUMMARY

I. Minutes

Ken O'Donoghue, the community co-chair, called the meeting to order at 7:02 p.m. Mr. O'Donoghue asked whether any restoration advisory board (RAB) members had comments on the September 2, 1996 meeting summary. James Ricks requested that the minutes include his and Ken O'Donoghue's comments of appreciation for Heidi Gitterman's efforts as the facilitator. The minutes were approved with the above revision.

II. Co-Chair Announcements

Mr. O'Donoghue and Navy co-chair, Steve Edde, made several announcements.

- Mr. O'Donoghue reminded the RAB that he is stepping down as community co-chair. He stated that since his announcement at the last RAB meeting, no one has volunteered to assume the role.
- Mr. Edde distributed a sheet of highlights from the monthly Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) Cleanup Team (BCT) tracking meeting held on September 17, 1996. He said that two items were worth mentioning: (1) a seismic profiling demonstration for the area around Building 5 is scheduled to begin on October 2, 1996 and will last approximately 10 days, and (2) Waterloo University and Rice University have selected Naval Air Station (NAS) Alameda for a funnel and gate technology demonstration that is scheduled to begin in mid-November.
- Mr. Edde stated that the presentation on the underground storage tank (UST) program dirt piles at NAS Alameda is still awaiting coordination with the Alamedans Interested in Recreation and Reuse (AIRR). He said he would advise the RAB when a presentation has been arranged.
- Mr. Edde announced that the BCT has agreed that the time allotted for questions and answers after a presentation will be at least as long as the presentation.
- Norma Bishop announced that comments on the Department of Defense (DoD) RAB Proposed Rule are due by November 4, 1996. She explained that the RAB Proposed

Rule codifies existing guidance and does not present any significant changes in the administration of RABs.

- Mr. O'Donoghue announced that Patrick Lynch was attending the meeting on behalf of Saul Bloom.
- Mr. O'Donoghue said that nominations for the community co-chair position can be made up until the November 1996 RAB meeting by contacting Hans Petersen at the NAS Alameda Environmental Office. Lynn Stirewalt nominated Michelle Kortyna. Mr. O'Donoghue said he would contact nominees prior to the next meeting. Mr. O'Donoghue also suggested that a Process Action Team (PAT) be formed to work on attracting new membership. Ms. Stirewalt added that she would also like to nominate Karen King, Tom Okey, Ardella Dailey, Kent Rosenblum, Doug deHaan, and Bert Morgan.
- Jim Haas said that the Mare Island Naval Shipyard RAB has attendance as a criterion for members. If a member misses more than one meeting without notifying the RAB in advance, the member is excused from the RAB. Mr. Haas suggested such a criterion be implemented at NAS Alameda.

Mr. Petersen said that the DoD guidance on RABs suggests that policy. Mr. Petersen stated that he would call RAB members to see who would be interested in a membership PAT. He also said he would contact nominees and prepare a community co-chair ballot for the November 1996 meeting.

III. Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) Budget Cuts

Mr. O'Donoghue introduced Tom Lanphar who gave a presentation on recent budget cuts at DTSC.

Mr. Lanphar began his presentation by explaining that DoD provides DTSC with a grant to fund DTSC oversight at Navy installations. He said that 2 weeks ago, DTSC was informed that the grant had been cut by 40 percent for the entire year; as a result, DTSC RAB participation would be significantly scaled back. Mr. Lanphar said that his management instructed him not to attend RAB meetings. As a result of the cuts, only core program activities could be funded. He explained that a last-minute agreement allowed for temporary funding until further negotiations could be conducted.

Mr. Lanphar explained that the DTSC fiscal year (FY) begins on July 1 whereas the federal fiscal year begins on October 1. He said that the state had been operating under the assumption that it would be fully funded at the beginning of the federal fiscal year. He explained that because the 40 percent cut was retroactive and was to be applied for the entire state fiscal year, significant cuts would need to be made for the rest of the state fiscal year. Mr. Lanphar stated that last minute negotiations resulted in full funding through November 1996; funding cuts beyond November 1996 could be between 0 and 40 percent.

Mr. Lanphar said that if the DTSC funding is cut by 40 percent, efforts will be focused on core programs only. Sixty percent of the funding is for core programs and involves review of technical documents. He explained that DTSC involvement in activities such as involvement in

reuse activities, the California Military Environmental Coordinating Committee (CMECC), and RABs would be dramatically curtailed, which could result in delays later in the process. He explained that state involvement in these non-core programs has been at the request of the DoD in an effort to expedite the cleanup and reuse process.

After Mr. Lanphar finished his presentation, RAB members engaged in discussion and asked several questions including the following.

- Mr. deHaan asked if cleanup and reuse schedules would be affected by the cuts. Mr. Lanphar stated that it is difficult to determine if schedules would be affected. He stated that cuts may not affect core programs. Mr. deHaan asked if the Navy feels the process would be slowed by the cuts. Mr. Edde stated that it would depend on the size of the cuts and that 40 percent is a very significant cut. Mr. deHaan asked if other RABs were aware of the potential cuts. Mr. O'Donoghue stated that the RAB Caucus has also just received the news.
- Ms. Stirewalt asked why DoD is not responsible for all funding for state oversight under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA). Mr. Lanphar said that with sites being cleaned up under DoD funding, the money is provided at the beginning of the process. He explained that the costs are negotiated and then moneys are administered through a grant to DTSC.
- Mr. O'Donoghue asked if these cuts are the results of shrinking government budgets. He expressed concern that the process would be hindered by budget cuts resulting in future litigation.
- Karin King asked why the cuts were made. Mr. Lanphar explained that California receives 50 percent of the national grant because California has a number of open and closing bases needing cleanup. He said that because of concern about California receiving such a high percentage of the funding, the state has had to show what was being done with the money. He explained that DTSC has shown DoD and Congress what has been done with the funding and that there is still plenty of cleanup work to be done at NAS Alameda.
- Mr. O'Donoghue asked if the 40 percent cut was applied nationwide or only in California. Mr. Lanphar stated that the cut was nationwide. He said that the environmental budget is part of the greater DoD budget so it is in competition with other programs. He added that the state wants to negotiate the budget. Mr. Lanphar stated that some DTSC activities are not part of the core programs but are done at the request of the DoD to foster partnering and help the process.
- Michael Torrey asked if there are funding alternatives if the state is not successful in negotiating the restoration of the budget. Mr. Lanphar said that the state could seek cost recovery, or pursue other legal avenues which would take years.
- Mr. Haas asked if the DTSC ecologist and toxicologist are part of the core programs. Mr. Lanphar said that he considered them "core," but he could not speculate on where cuts may be made. He explained that he believes it would be impossible to do his work without the support of an ecologist and a toxicologist. He said that community

involvement may be cut. He explained that DTSC has already reviewed its budgets and cut funding where there is duplication of effort.

- A RAB member asked if there is anything RAB members can do to encourage DoD to continue funding the noncore programs at DTSC. Mr. Lanphar encouraged anyone interested in expressing support for funding the programs to take action. Ms. Bishop suggested writing the DoD and Congressman Ron Dellums. Ms. Stirewalt encouraged all RAB members to write letters in support of full funding for DTSC. Mr. O'Donoghue stated that he would write a letter as the RAB community co-chair.
- Mr. Edde stated that it is important to remember that the Navy's cleanup actions will continue regardless of the funding status of DTSC. He stated that the Navy is committed to cleaning up NAS Alameda and is mandated by law to do so.

IV. RAB GOALS REVIEW

Mr. O'Donoghue introduced Ms. Stirewalt, who gave a presentation on the recent headway made by the RAB in defining and understanding the RAB's roles and responsibilities.

Ms. Stirewalt provided an overview of RAB activities throughout the summer including the formation of Process Action Teams (PATs). She explained that the original workgroups that arose from the brainstorming sessions at the June 1996 RAB meeting decided to tackle one issue at a time. The issues identified as needing to be addressed are the following:

- Mission statement
- Membership committee
- Retreat
- Information/communication
- Organization

She explained that it was decided that the first issue to be addressed was the creation and implementation of the RAB mission statement. A mission statement PAT was formed and a draft statement was created. The RAB approved a final mission statement in September 1996. She explained that the mission statement PAT achieved all its goals and adhered to its self-imposed timelines.

Ms. Stirewalt continued that the next issue to be addressed is increasing membership and monitoring performance of current membership. She said that the RAB charter indicates that if a member misses two meetings without a proxy, they will be removed from the RAB. She also said that the PAT will notify members that the RAB will be implementing the new charter. Michelle Kortyna suggested the PAT also consider establishing a quorum for a RAB meeting.

Mr. Lanphar suggested that an interim community co-chair be established until the PAT attracts new membership and elects a permanent co-chair. Mr. O'Donoghue stated that he strongly supported the idea. The RAB approved the motion to establish an interim community co-chair for a three month term. Mr. Lanphar clarified that the election will take place at the November 5, 1996 meeting, and the term will last for December 1996 and January and February 1997.

V. COMMUNITY RELATIONS CONTRACT

Mr. O'Donoghue introduced Hans Petersen, who gave a presentation on the pending contract for "Navy Support for RABs and Community Relations in Northern and Central California, and Nevada" (CR contract). Mr. Petersen presented the general scope of the CR contract, including installations covered and the objectives and provisions of the contract. Mr. Petersen also distributed a questionnaire to find out whether RAB members want a facilitator, and if yes, whether they want the position to be filled by a volunteer or a contractor. After Mr. Petersen's presentation, the RAB engaged in a discussion and asked questions including the following.

- Ms. Stirewalt asked if the contract included funding for a facilitator. Bernard Tong from Engineering Field Activities (EFA) West stated that the funds could be used to hire a facilitator, but the decision would be left to the individual RABs. Ms. Bishop stated that the contract is a funding mechanism to allow RABs to hire a facilitator.
- Mr. Haas asked if the RAB would still have the same amount of money to use if a facilitator was not hired. Mr. Tong stated that the money would not be lost because the facilitator is not in the fixed-price part of the contract.

Mr. Petersen asked RAB members to return the facilitator questionnaires to him.

VI. BACKGROUND UPDATE

Mr. O'Donoghue introduced Mr. Edde and Mr. Lanphar, who gave a presentation on the background issue. Mr. Edde began by announcing that James Ricks was unable to attend the RAB because of a personal emergency. Mr. Edde said that great effort had gone into resolving the dispute regarding background and the related issues. He explained that two levels of management in the Navy, EPA, and DTSC have been involved in addressing the issues. Mr. Edde distributed a letter to Mr. O'Donoghue from Vincent Clementi (EFA West) and Anthony Landis (DTSC), which expressed the commitment of the Navy, DTSC, and EPA in resolving disputed issues and streamlining the process to meet the needs of all parties (see attached). Attached to the letter was a description of agreements between the Navy and the regulators as well as outstanding issues. Mr. Edde then introduced Mr. Lanphar.

Mr. Lanphar began his presentation by stating that background is only one component of the issues that need to be addressed at NAS Alameda. Mr. Lanphar gave an update on the progress of recent meetings between regulators and the Navy. He presented a summary of the update distributed with the letter from Mr. Clementi and Mr. Landis. Mr. Lanphar said that some of the issues presented are technical and he is available for answering any questions.

- Ms. Kortyna asked for clarification on the word "ambient" as a condition of fill. She asked what comparison would be used for the fill at NAS Alameda in determining ambient levels. Mr. Lanphar said that the term "ambient" is used by the state to distinguish between (a) what is naturally occurring and (b) contamination created by human activity. He continued that DTSC wants off-site references to determine background for the area and assess changes caused by the creation of the base. Camille Garibaldi of EFA West said that the Navy will calculate the background levels for NAS Alameda and that the state is providing the regional background levels. She explained that this data will be used in risk management decisions. Mr. Lanphar said that if

ambient conditions on base are not the same as area background, then the fill will have to be evaluated considering the differences.

- Pat Lynch asked if NAS Alameda is the first installation to be conducting this sort of comparison. Mr. Lanphar stated that the guidance requires a literature search for references and that this search is underway, but only for metals off site.
- Ms. Bishop asked how many other bases might this process affect. Ms. Garibaldi said that the Navy is working hard to make sure this issue is cross checked. Ms. Bishop asked if NAS Alameda is using the same methodology that is being used at Mare Island and Treasure Island. Mr. Edde said that the BCT is breaking new ground and that these approaches could be used elsewhere. Ms. Bishop asked if DTSC sees these approaches as applicable at other installations. Mr. Lanphar said that there could be application in other locations and that is why this issue at NAS Alameda has received so much attention.
- Mr. Haas said that NAS Alameda was created over many years and has a fill history that is progressive. He asked if this, in combination with contaminant use history, can provide some clarification on ambient conditions. Ms. Garibaldi said that the Navy is currently identifying and considering fill histories and the result may be that there is more than one background level. Mr. Lanphar said that DTSC does not see organic constituents as ambient because they are synthetic and because a pathway was potentially changed by the creation of NAS Alameda. Although there are exceptions, Mr. Lanphar said organic constituents would not be considered background at NAS Alameda. Both Mr. Edde and Mr. Lanphar said that the Navy and DTSC expect to resolve these issues within the coming weeks and they will continue to keep the RAB informed.

VII. FUNNEL AND GATE TECHNOLOGY

Mr. O'Donoghue introduced Ken Spielman who gave a presentation on the funnel and gate technology to be demonstrated at NAS Alameda. Mr. Spielman began his presentation by announcing that NAS Alameda had been chosen by Rice University and the University of Waterloo as a demonstration site for this technology at the 1943-1956 Disposal Area located in the northwest corner of NAS Alameda. A contaminant plume in the groundwater below the site has resulted because of industrial waste generated from Navy activities at that time. Mr. Spielman explained that the technology involves funneling the groundwater through a treatment gate situated in the ground. The treatment gate contains an iron reaction wall and a biosparging area which the water will pass through. The water will be analyzed before and after passing through the treatment gate. After the demonstration is completed, the results will be evaluated for possible full-scale remediation. The results of the study will also be incorporated in the feasibility study. After Mr. Spielman's presentation, RAB members engaged in a discussion and asked several questions including the following.

- Ms. Kortyna asked if there was a decrease in the efficiency of the treatment over time. Mr. Spielman said that after 6 years of use at other sites, there has been no significant decrease in efficiency of the technology.

- Ms. Stirewalt asked about the physical dimensions of the technology. Mr. Spielman answered that the gate would be ten feet wide, the thickness of the gate containing the filings is yet to be determined, and the funnels and gates will reach approximately 20 feet deep to the impermeable layer. Ms. Stirewalt asked if the dimensions would dramatically increase if the technology were used for full-scale remediation. Mr. Spielman stated that the highest concentrations are being targeted in the current demonstration. Mr. Lanphar stated that with a narrow plume, one gate may be sufficient.
- Mr. Lynch asked if a gradient will be maintainable with tidal influences. Mr. Spielman said that University of Waterloo has conducted aquifer testing and determined that it could be done. Mr. Lynch asked if iron reaction and biosparging have been used together before. Mr. Spielman stated that they are currently being used together in Borden, Canada, with positive results. Dr. Bill Smith stated that the University of Waterloo is renowned for its research in this area and he is confident that this will be a successful venture at NAS Alameda.

Mr. O'Donoghue encouraged RAB members to volunteer for the membership PAT which will meet at 7 p.m. on Tuesday, October 8, 1996, in the RAB library.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:45 p.m.

The next meeting will be held at 7:00 p.m. on Tuesday, November 5, 1996, at the Combined Officers Quarters, NAS Alameda.

ATTENDANCE LIST

01 OCTOBER 1996 RESTORATION ADVISORY
BOARD MEETING SUMMARY

THE ABOVE IDENTIFIED LIST IS NOT AVAILABLE.

EXTENSIVE RESEARCH WAS PERFORMED BY
SOUTHWEST DIVISION TO LOCATE THIS LIST.

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