

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

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

**Tuesday, November 5, 1996**

**ATTENDEES**

See the attached list.

**MEETING SUMMARY**

**I. Minutes**

Ken O'Donoghue, the community co-chair, called the meeting to order at 7:07 p.m. Mr. O'Donoghue asked whether any restoration advisory board (RAB) members had comments on the October 1, 1996, meeting summary. No revisions were requested and the minutes were approved.

**II. Co-Chair Announcements**

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

- Mr. O'Donoghue announced that a memo from ARC Ecology should have been included in the mailing of the meeting minutes, but instead has been distributed at tonight's meeting.
- Mr. O'Donoghue announced that he has submitted his resignation and that this RAB meeting will be his last as community co-chair. He said that an interim co-chair will be elected at tonight's meeting.
- Mr. O'Donoghue stated that Karin King would not be attending tonight's meeting because she had been hit by a car and had suffered minor injuries. Mr. Edde stated that she suffered a scalp injury that required stitches, and that she was very bruised and sore. He said that she is recovering and will be attending meetings again soon. Hans Petersen said that Ms. King accepted the nomination for interim co-chair.
- Mr. O'Donoghue announced that Kent Rosenblum submitted a letter of resignation from the RAB. Mr. O'Donoghue read the letter, which cited time constraints as the reason for the resignation.
- Mr. Edde distributed a list of highlights from the Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) Cleanup Team (BCT) tracking meeting (Handout #1\*).
- Mr. Edde announced that the updated BRAC Cleanup Plan (BCP) is scheduled to be available for RAB review in late November 1996. Mr. Edde encouraged members to participate in the review and to submit comments.

- Mr. Edde stated that he will try to get a site-by-site matrix update prepared for RAB members by the next meeting.
- Mr. Edde announced that Norma Bishop had intended to attend tonight's meeting to discuss her letter, "Issues for NAS Alameda RAB Consideration" (Handout #2\*). Ms. Bishop was not able to attend the RAB but has encouraged members to consider the issues presented in the letter which are (1) consolidation of the NAS Alameda RAB with the Fleet and Industrial Supply Center Annex RAB and (2) attending the Base Reuse Advisory Group (BRAG) Town Meeting at 7:00 p.m. on November 13, 1996.
- Mr. Edde presented a plaque of appreciation to Mr. O'Donoghue for his service as the community co-chair for the past two years. Mr. Edde said that Mr. O'Donoghue had been ready to step down as co-chair many months ago but had agreed to continue. Mr. Edde said Mr. O'Donoghue has helped him significantly in his transition to the position of the Base Environmental Coordinator (BEC). Mr. O'Donoghue thanked Mr. Edde and said that the plaque belonged to the entire RAB. He said that he will continue to serve as a RAB member and, in leaving the post of community co-chair, will be freer to speak his mind. He said that as the co-chair he has met and worked with many great people in Alameda. He said that it has been hard work but he hopes that when the Navy leaves NAS Alameda, they will leave something that Alamedans can live with.
- Karen Hack asked that the Navy mail RAB meeting minutes and agendas to anyone who requests them whether or not they are a RAB member. She stated that she knows of people who have made such requests and have not received the materials. Mr. Edde said that anyone requesting minutes will be mailed a copy and that if non-RAB member individuals want to receive the minutes regularly, a permanent mailing list can be created. He encouraged anyone with requests to phone the environmental office. It was also suggested that a minutes mailing request sign-up sheet be created for each RAB meeting and Mr. Edde agreed.

### **III. Community Co-Chair Elections**

Mr. O'Donoghue announced that an interim community co-chair will be elected at tonight's meeting. He said that the election will be by secret ballot, and the winner must receive 51 percent of the votes. He stated that several people had been nominated. After a brief discussion, it was determined that only two members accepted a nomination. The election for interim community co-chair was between Ardella Dailey and Karin King.

RAB members voted and submitted ballots to Mr. Petersen and Mr. Lanphar for tally. Mr. O'Donoghue announced that Ms. Dailey had been elected as interim community co-chair, to serve in December 1996 and January and February 1997.

### **IV. Membership Process Action Team**

Lyn Stirewalt gave a presentation on the progress of the membership process action team (PAT). She said that the PAT had met three times since the last meeting. She said Ms. King has agreed to write an article on RAB membership to be published in the Electric Flash Newsletter. She said the basic text of the article had been approved by the entire PAT. She said that the RAB

was not able to get on the agenda for the BRAG town meeting, but Ms. Bishop is on the agenda and will mention the NAS Alameda RAB's campaign for new membership. Ms. Stirewalt said that the PAT will have an information table at the meeting to distribute RAB information and membership applications; the PAT will speak at the open microphone portion of the town meeting to announce membership opportunities.

Ms. Stirewalt said that people will be assigned to enforce the charter which states that anyone missing two consecutive RAB meetings will be removed from the RAB. She said that members who are going to miss a meeting must contact the community co-chair in advance and are encouraged to use a proxy. She explained that because of this new enforcement, it is very important that members sign in at meetings. Ms. Stirewalt said that the PAT also recommends the annual creation of an applicant pool.

Ms. Stirewalt said that the PAT discussed the issue of RAB members addressing community organizations. She stated that the PAT believes that if an individual is presenting to a group as a representative of the RAB, the material presented must be approved by the RAB. She said that if an individual is representing her or himself simply as a community member of the RAB, she/he must explicitly state that any opinions expressed are their individual opinions and do not represent the RAB as a whole.

After Ms. Stirewalt's presentation, RAB members had a brief discussion.

- Doug deHaan asked how many members the RAB needs to recruit. Ms. Stirewalt stated that a membership matrix is being used. Mr. O'Donoghue stated that there is no fixed number. Dr. Bill Smith said that there are currently 8 to 13 vacancies that need to be filled to bring total membership to at least 25.
- Ms. Dailey requested that a letter be sent, separate from the minutes, to inform RAB members that the charter attendance requirements will be enforced.

#### **IV. Proposed Charter Amendments**

Ms. Hack distributed an ARC Ecology memorandum describing proposed amendments to the RAB charter (Handout #3\*). After a brief discussion it was agreed that Section III, H: would be amended in the following ways:

- Replace the words "the co-chair will convene a selection panel" in the first sentence with "the RAB community members will convene a selection panel consisting of at least four RAB members."
- Delete the following sentence: "the RAB will forward this final slate to the commanding officer (CO) of NAS Alameda who is responsible under the guidelines for ensuring the diversity of the RAB membership."
- Replace "the CO will approve or reject the slate as a whole, based on the RAB maintaining" with "the membership selection committee will ensure that RAB membership adequately represents the diverse interests of the community."

- Insert the following after “When” in the first sentence: “the majority of the RAB determines it is necessary.”

## V. Background

Mr. Edde and Tom Lanphar gave a presentation on the progress made on issues related to determining background at NAS Alameda. They distributed a summary of the issues and what had been resolved since the last RAB meeting (Handout #4\*). Mr. Edde stated that the regulators and the Navy have been working very hard to address these issues and have made significant progress. He explained that as of the last meeting there were seven unresolved issues. He explained that the Navy and the regulators have reached resolution on all but one of these issues. He explained that the remaining outstanding issue is related to deed restriction documentation and is not affecting current cleanup activities and schedules. He said that agreement on this issue is expected to be reached by November 27, 1996.

Mr. Lanphar said that resolving these issues has been a difficult task. He said that there are many details involved in the resolutions, and the preliminary agreements that have been made will have to be played out to determine how effective the resolutions will be.

James Ricks stated that the process had been difficult but the BCT made it through. He stated that he wanted to clarify issue number 8 that although organics will be included as part of background, inorganics and organics will be considered differently. RAB members engaged in a brief discussion and asked several questions.

- Ms. Hack asked about the implications of the resolutions and when the RAB would hear more details about what has been decided. Mr. Ricks stated that the BCT has been focused on resolving the issues and now needs to focus on communicating the issues to the RAB. He said that the agreements are conceptual starting points, and much of what has been resolved must be played out to determine if it will be effective. Mr. Lanphar stated that much of what was resolved was the result of clarifying the positions of the regulatory agencies and the Navy.
- Michelle Kortyna asked if the agreements are binding and final. Mr. Lanphar said it is a consensus that allows the process to go forward. Ms. Kortyna asked who was making the decisions. Mr. Lanphar stated that legally the decisions are being made by the Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC), the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) and the Navy.
- Mr. O’Donoghue asked when the impacts of the agreements will be seen. Mr. Lanphar stated that Phase 2A and 2B of the environmental base survey (EBS) activity for 23 zones and the resulting reports will be the first significant result. He said Ann Klimek will be preparing the report. Mr. Edde stated that the resolutions will impact activities at both installation restoration (IR) sites and the environmental baseline survey (EBS) process. Mr. Lanphar added that the goal is to know the status of the property at NAS Alameda by the time of base closure which is April 1997.
- Tira Foran requested a presentation on the issues and the impact at NAS Alameda. Mr. Lanphar stated that more time is needed before the impacts can be understood.

- Ms. Hack asked why the Navy doesn't just use the preliminary **endangerment** assessment (PEA) if it is akin to a tiered screening approach. Mr. Edde stated that the PEA is not a Navy process. He said that the Navy spent a lot of time and resources creating the tiered screening approach for NAS Alameda.
- Patrick Lynch said that the tiered screening approach is **inappropriate** and is not as good as the PEA. He made several technical comments criticizing the tiered screening approach. Gina Kathuria stated that Mr. Lynch was referring to a process that is applicable only to human health and not to ecological concerns and **natural** resources. Mr. Lynch said that the tiered screening approach fails to address **volatile** compounds such as benzene. He said that he has written his comments on the draft report.
- Ms. Kortyna expressed a need to address the issues in more detail. Mr. O'Donoghue suggested a separate meeting for discussing the issues. Mr. Foran agreed to coordinate the meeting.
- Ms. Hack asked what was disputed in the unresolved issue of deed restriction documentation. Mr. Lanphar stated that the Navy wants a letter stating deed restrictions to be included in the finding of suitability to transfer (FOST), and the DTSC and EPA want a no-action record of decision (ROD). Both documents have a public comment period. The key difference is that regulators have to approve lifting deed restrictions contained in a ROD.
- Mr. Lanphar announced that he is available during the day to meet with people to discuss any environmental issues at NAS Alameda.

## VI. Site 15 Status

Mr. Edde distributed an update on the status of the Site 15 soil. He explained that the BCT is currently considering three soil handling options at Site 15 (Handout #4\*). Mr. Edde explained that Option 2 would involve creating a corrective action management unit (CAMU) on the existing landfill on Site 2. Mr. Lanphar explained that the CAMU would include clean topsoil and monitoring wells to ensure the safety of the wetlands. Mr. Edde and Mr. Lanphar encouraged the RAB to review the options and provide comments for the BCT. They explained that they are starting the process over and there will be two opportunities for the RAB to comment on the engineering evaluation cost analysis (EE/CA). RAB members engaged in discussion and asked several questions.

- Mr. Lynch expressed frustration about soil management at Site 15. He said that environmental laws were created to prevent the kind of actions taken at Site 15. Mr. Lanphar said that activities conducted at Site 15 are consistent with environmental laws.
- Mr. Edde announced that Dennis Wong is the remedial project manager for Site 15 and would be available to discuss the options with a PAT. Mr. Lanphar said that the RAB has an opportunity to provide input and potentially change the process. He said that comments can be made through a PAT before the EE/CA, as well as after the draft EE/CA has been written.

- A RAB member asked what the amount of soil is that needs to be treated or disposed. Mr. Edde stated that there is approximately 5,000 cubic yards of soil.
- Ms. Hack commented that the RAB should become involved early in the process. She said she would coordinate a discussion group to address the Site 15 issue. She encouraged interested RAB members to contact her.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:53 p.m.

**The next meeting will be held at 7:00 p.m. on Tuesday, December 3, 1996, at the Combined Officers Quarters, NAS Alameda.**

**HANDOUTS:**

1. BCT Tracking Meeting Highlights
2. Norma Bishop Letter
3. RAB Charter Amendments
4. Background Issues Progress Summary

\*Copies of Handouts are on file in the IR Library as part of the official RAB Minutes file. Mailout copies available on request to Hans Petersen or Julie Brown at (510) 263-3706.

# **Restoration Advisory Board**

## **Naval Air Station Alameda**

### AGENDA

November 5, 1996 7:00pm  
Bachelor Officers Quarters (BOQ)  
Naval Air Station, Alameda

<u>TIME</u>	<u>SUBJECT</u>	<u>PRESENTER</u>
7:00-7:05	Approval of Minutes	Community Co-Chair
7:05-7:15	Co-Chair Announcements	Co-Chairs
7:15-7:45	Community Co-Chair Election	RAB
7:45-8:00	Membership PROCESS ACTION TEAM	PAT
8:00-8:15	Proposed Charter Amendments	RAB - Karen Hack
8:15-8:40	Background Status Report	Navy, DTSC
8:40-9:00	Site 15 Status	NAVY

## OCTOBER 1996 - BCT TRACKING MEETING HIGHLIGHTS

### STUDIES

- **SEAPLANE LAGOON INVESTIGATION**

Field work is complete. Analyses of the samples are ongoing.

- **ECOLOGICAL ASSESSMENT**

Field work on the second phase began in October, and is expected to be complete in mid-November.

- **BRAC CLEANUP PLAN**

The BCT and others are working to update the BCP. The draft BCP is scheduled to be submitted for review in late November. A matrix is being developed that can be utilized to provide highlights to the RAB by site.

- **BACKGROUND**

Meetings were held to resolve the Outstanding Issues described in the September 27, 1996 letter to Mr. Ken O'Donoghue and at the October RAB meeting. A status report on the resolution of these issues is being provided in a second letter to Mr. O'Donoghue dated October 31, 1996.

### REMOVAL ACTIONS

- **SITE 15**

The BCT met to discuss soil handling option. An update of these options is being distributed at the RAB. The options discussed included Off Site Disposal, On Site Disposal, or Soil Treatment.

- **SITE 18**

The cleanup is ongoing.

## **TREATABILITY STUDIES AND TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATIONS**

- **UCB - BERC**

### **INTRINSIC BIOREMEDIATION ASSESSMENT - Site 3 & 13**

Field screening work began in June and completed in July. Sampling of Site 13 was completed in August. Sampling of Site 3 is scheduled for January.

- **SEISMIC PROFILING DEMONSTRATION - Site 5**

The field work was completed by Resolution Resources in October. Results are being analyzed, and verification sampling is scheduled to occur in January.

- **FUNNEL AND GATE DEMONSTRATION - Site 1**

The work plan is currently being reviewed. A meeting and site visit was held with the BCT, Waterloo University, and Rice University. Construction is schedule to begin in December.

## **EBS/FOSL UPDATE**

- **ZONES 11 & 18**

Sector EBS/FOSL's for Zones 11 & 18 are complete.

**NAS ALAMEDA**  
**SITE 15 SOIL HANDLING OPTIONS**  
**November 1996**

**Option 1: Offsite disposal**

- Pros:
- Fast /expeditious results
  - Most cost effective option
  - Freeing site for reuse
  - Increase protectiveness
  - No TSTA maintenance cost
- Cons:
- Modify documents
  - Moving problem/liability
  - Concerns about transportation  
(route through Posey Tube possible)

**Option 2: Onsite disposal**

- Pros:
- Cost effective (approximately 20% more than Option 1)
  - Fast /expeditious results
  - No offsite transportation
  - Placement of soils may assist reuse or future landfill remedy
  - Consolidation of soils from other sites possible
- Cons:
- Maintenance and administrative costs prior to landfill closure
  - Design necessary
  - Modify documents

**Option 3: Soil treatment**

- Pros:
- Permanent solution
  - Better community acceptance (based upon previous EE/CA)
  - Documentation complete
  - Reduces volume of contaminated soil
- Cons:
- High Cost (5 times the cost of Option 1)
  - Results Uncertain
  - More concentrated residual contamination

## **ISSUES FOR NAS ALAMEDA RAB CONSIDERATION**

**November 5, 1996**

**1. Consolidation of NAS and Fleet & Industrial Supply Center, Alameda, Annex Restoration Advisory Boards:** I have briefly summarized this issue for the NAS RAB on a previous occasion. In addition, ARRA staff, Cal-EPA/DTSC, U. S. EPA, and Engineering Field Activity West (Navy Facilities) have discussed this as a possibility. In order for this to occur, both RABs would have to submit written requests to the Naval Facilities Engineering Command. If this is an issue which the RAB would choose to explore, I propose the following for consideration:

- Convening a Process Action Team (PAT) to:

- Contact the FISC Alameda RAB
- Study the proposal or develop alternative proposals, e.g., not consolidating RABs, but perhaps networking and sharing certain types of information
- Make a recommendation to the voting RAB

If this is of interest to the membership, I would gladly offer some of my time and participation in facilitating this process.

**2. The Base Reuse Advisory Group (BRAG) Town Meeting, November 13, 7:00 P.M. at Alameda High School Cafeteria, Central Avenue:** Unfortunately, the agenda and format for this meeting do not permit a presentation by RAB members, but the BRAG is eager to have the RAB attend with the portable display boards and conduct membership recruitment. (I'm sorry I haven't had a chance to respond to Lyn Stirewalt's calls, but the past two weeks have kept all of us very busy with time critical issues.)

**3. I also apologize for missing the meeting tonight. If anyone has questions or comments, please feel free to call me at 263-3881/fax 263-3898. (I promise to make every effort to return calls.)**

**N. Bishop/Base Transition Coordinator**

# ARC ECOLOGY

833 Market Street, Suite 1107, San Francisco, CA 94103 Tel: (415) 495-1786 Fax: (415) 495-1787

---

## MEMORANDUM

TO: NAS Alameda RAB Members

FROM: Karen Hack

DATE: October 22, 1996

RE: Proposed Amendments to NAS Alameda RAB Charter

In accordance with the procedure agreed upon by the RAB at the May 1996 meeting for amending the NAS Alameda RAB Charter, I submit the following revision to the Charter for a vote at the next RAB meeting on November 5th. The proposed Charter amendments apply to the procedure for the selection of new RAB members in Section III, H of the Charter. This section is attached, with the proposed amendments highlighted. If you have any questions, please feel free to call me at (415) 495-1786.

### Proposed Amendments

#### Section III, H:

Replace the words "the Co-chairs will convene a selection panel." in the first sentence with "the RAB community members will convene a selection panel consisting of at least four RAB members."

Delete the following sentences: "The RAB will forward this final slate to the commanding officer (CO) of NAS Alameda who is responsible under the guidelines for ensuring the diversity of the RAB membership. The CO will approve or reject the slate as a whole, based on the RAB maintaining adequate representation of the diverse interests of the community. Note: After the station is closed, the Navy will designate the commanding officer with purview over the NAS Alameda RAB."

### Rationale for the Amendments

The first modification clarifies the process for choosing a RAB committee for membership selection. It allows the community members of the RAB to decide who will sit on the membership selection panel, instead of allowing that authority to rest solely with the two Co-chairs.

The second modification eliminates an error in the Charter. Section III, H inaccurately states that the guidelines give the commanding officer (CO) the authority to oversee the membership of the RAB. On the contrary, the EPA/DOD RAB Guidance only gives the CO a role in the original formation of the RAB. It then gives the RAB the authority to establish its own procedures for operating and maintaining the RAB, including adding new members. In addition, neither the Navy's RAB Guidance nor Department of Defense's proposed regulations for RAB management give the CO a role in determining the membership of the RAB.

The authority over the membership of the RAB should lie with the RAB itself. As the Charter currently is written, the Navy can veto new members that have been selected and approved by the RAB if s/he does not agree with the selection. This gives the Navy undue authority over the selection process. Under the proposed modification, the selection and approval of new members will be the responsibility of the RAB community members as intended in the RAB guidance. This includes the responsibility of ensuring that the RAB represents the diverse interests in the community as stated in the RAB guidance.

- C. Members should be willing to communicate with local community people and interest groups concerned with general or specific base cleanup issues. Members will serve as a direct and reliable conduit for information flow to and from the community.
- D. Approximately twenty (20) persons will comprise the community portion of the NAS Alameda RAB. Government membership is addressed in the "Implementation Guidelines" and in paragraph G, below.
- E. Members are expected to attend all RAB meetings or send an alternate. If a member fails to attend or send an alternate for two consecutive monthly meetings without prior notification to the community co-chair, the RAB co-chairs may ask the member to resign and a replacement will be selected to fill the empty seat. The RAB reserves the right to remove non-participating members.
- F. Members unable to continue to fully participate should submit their resignation in writing to either of the RAB co-chairs. Resigning members may nominate new members by providing appropriately completed applications.
- G. Community groups, citizens, and interest groups reflecting the diverse interests of the community may be nominated to the RAB, by any person, to act in an individual capacity. It is expected that certain government agencies should be represented and actively participate, some having mandates to do so. In each case, a specific individual will be the designated RAB member. Open nominations will take place on an as needed basis. Government members acting in an official capacity are not subject to the same selection process as community members, but the RAB may address questions about their participation as it sees fit.

*H. change* { ~~When necessary, the Co-chairs will convene a selection panel. The panel will announce the vacancy(ies), evaluate the applications and submit a slate of one or more nominees to the RAB. Nominations are to be approved by a majority vote of the community members present at the RAB meeting for which it was placed on the agenda, unless they choose to postpone the issue. (See Appendix One for detailed application, nomination, and election guidelines.) The RAB will forward this final slate to the commanding officer (CO) of NAS Alameda, who is responsible under the guidelines for ensuring the diversity of the RAB membership. The CO will approve or reject the slate as a whole, based on the RAB maintaining adequate representation of the diverse interests of the community. Note: After the station is closed, the Navy will designate the commanding officer with purview over the NAS Alameda RAB.~~

*delete* { ~~the RAB community members will convene a selection panel consisting of at least four RAB members.~~

IV. RAB Structure

- A. The RAB shall be co-chaired by a representative of the Navy and a representative of the community membership. The responsibility of presiding over each meeting will be the joint responsibility of the Navy and community co-chairs.
- B. The co-chairs may be assisted by a facilitator who would be selected jointly by the Navy and community co-chairs. The community Co-chair may designate an assistant co-chair if she or he wishes to do so.
- C. The RAB will select the community co-chair by a majority vote of the RAB community members. The RAB community membership is responsible for terminating a co-chair who is ineffective or detrimental to the progress of the RAB. Co-chair removal is determined by majority vote of the RAB community members present at the meeting for which it was

October 31, 1996

Mr. Ken O'Donoghue  
Community Co-Chair  
NAS Alameda RAB  
2000 Buena Vista Avenue  
Alameda, California 94501

Dear Mr. O'Donoghue:

This letter is to update you on the progress we have made since our last letter of September 27, 1996. All issues have been resolved, except for one outstanding item. This item is related to transfer of property with a deed restriction and is expected to be resolved by November 27, 1996.

An update of the unresolved issues noted in our September 1996 letter is also attached for your information. All items will also be updated by the BCT at your next RAB meeting on November 5, 1996.

Again, it is also important to note that leasing and eventual transfer processes and their associated timelines are of paramount importance to us and, to date, these items have not been delayed as a result of these deliberations.

If you need further assistance, please contact Mr. Steve Edde, NAS Alameda BRAC Environmental Coordinator, at (510) 263-3706, or Mr. Tom Lanphar, DTSC Remedial Project Manager, at (510) 540-3809.

Sincerely,



Vincent F. Clementi  
Director, Environmental Programs Center  
Engineering Field Activity West  
Naval Facilities Engineering Command



Anthony J. Landis, P.E.  
Chief, Northern California Operations  
Office of Military Facilities  
Department of Toxic Substances Control

Enclosure

cc: Ms. Kay Miller  
Alameda Reuse and Redevelopment Authority

Mr. Ben Williams  
Governor's Office of Planning and Research  
1400 10th Street  
Sacramento, California 95814

## **Statement of Agreements and Outstanding Issues at NAS Alameda**

### **Agreements, as of September 26, 1996:**

- 1. The Navy and regulatory agencies have agreed that the EBS Phase II Tiered Screening process meets the RFI, and "equivalent PEA" process.**
- 2. The Navy and regulatory agencies have agreed that Phase II A & B Data Summary Reports will include conclusions and recommendations based only on data collected in the Phase II A & B investigations. The conclusions that can be made are limited to the scope of the investigations. Parcels will not be re-classified (BRAC Categories 1-7) in this report.**
- 3. The Navy and regulatory agencies have agreed that information from other programs may be necessary prior to making a decision as to whether a hazardous substance release has occurred at a parcel. For example, information from the Installation Restoration, RCRA Closure, Petroleum, and Lead Based Paint Programs. Information from various programs will be assimilated in the Base Wide Environmental Baseline Survey. For example, groundwater from an IR site may affect an adjacent parcel.**
- 4. The Navy and regulatory agencies have agreed that a Parcel Reclassification Memorandum will document the classification of parcels into the appropriate BRAC Categories.**
- 5. The Navy and regulatory agencies have agreed that No Action letters from the agencies will follow the Parcel Reclassification Memorandum for BRAC Categories 1 and 2, and Categories 3 meeting the Tier 1 screen (unrestrictive/residential).**

### **Additional Agreements, as of October 30, 1996:**

- 6. The Navy and regulatory agencies have agreed on the criteria to make a determination as to whether a hazardous substance release has occurred or not, using the Tiered Screening Methodology.**
- 7. The Navy and regulatory agencies have agreed on a consistent application of "anthropogenic/ambient background" conditions at NAS Alameda by the EBS program. The team is now proceeding with implementation on specific details.**
- 8. The Navy and regulatory agencies have agreed that background includes both inorganic and organic chemicals. We are currently working on the specific details for implementing this information in the IRP and EBS Program.**

**9. The Navy and regulatory agencies have agreed that a no action letter is sufficient as the decision documentation necessary when a parcel fails the Tier 1 screen (default unrestrictive assumptions). A Tier 2, residential (unrestrictive) screen will be used to support the decision that action is not necessary.**

**10. The regulatory agencies will provide off-site reference values for comparison to the site specific background values developed by the Navy.**

**11. The Navy and regulatory agencies have agreed on the methodology for calculating background and are proceeding with implementation.**

### **Remaining Issue Requiring Additional Input:**

**1. The Navy and regulatory agencies are working toward agreement on the decision documentation necessary when a land use restriction is needed to protect public health and the environment.**

**The Navy would like a No Action letter to support a decision.**

**The State and EPA would like a RAP/ROD because the State and EPA consider a land use restriction as a remedial action.**

***Action Item: The Navy understands the federal and state regulators position. Navy needs to evaluate this position against existing DoD/Navy policy and provide comments/input towards a final resolution by November 27, 1996. This item is not impacting reuse/transfer decisions or cleanup progress at this time.***

## ATTENDANCE LIST

05 NOVEMBER 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**