



EPA

Department of
Toxic Substances
Control

700 Heinz Avenue,
Bldg. F, Suite 200
Berkeley, CA
94710

March 31, 1998

Pete Wilson
Governor

Peter M. Rooney
Secretary for
Environmental
Protection

Commanding Officer
Engineering Field Activity, West
Naval Facilities Engineering Command
Attn: Mr. George Kikugawa, Code 1831.2
900 Commodore Drive
San Bruno, CA 94066-2402

**ALAMEDA POINT, ALAMEDA, CALIFORNIA: IR SITES 1, 2, 5,
AND 10 RADIOLOGICAL REMOVAL ACTION**

Dear Mr. Kikugawa:

The Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC), in conjunction with the Department of Health Services (DHS), has reviewed several documents, listed in the enclosed table, related to the Radiological Removal Action Technical Work Document/Draft Remedial Action Plan for Alameda Point. The receipt of a second set of responses to comments, dated March 24, 1998 (received by this office on March 30, 1998), has added considerable confusion to the flow of information, and complicates the efforts of DTSC and DHS to work with the Navy as a partner to implement the removal action according to the Navy's schedule.

This letter contains the State's reply all to the Navy's responses and attempts to ensure that all State concerns are addressed in documenting and implementing the proposed action. As of this date, several issues, detailed in the enclosed comments, remain unresolved. These issues must be resolved before DTSC can approve the Navy's proposed action. Furthermore, it is imperative that the Navy obtain input from the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (U.S. EPA) on this proposed action in order to ensure that the proposed standards will satisfy U.S. EPA requirement.

Mr. George Kikugawa
March 31, 1998
Page 2

DTSC recommends scheduling a teleconference during the week of April 6, 1998 to resolve these issues so that the Navy can adhere to its proposed schedule.

If you have any questions regarding this letter, please contact me at (510)540-3814.

Sincerely,



Mary Rose Cassa, R.G.
Engineering Geologist
Office of Military Facilities

enclosures

cc: Ms. Anna-Marie Cook (SFD-8-2)
U. S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region IX
75 Hawthorne Street
San Francisco, CA 94105

Mr. Steve Edde
BRAC Environmental Coordinator
950 Mall Square, Building 1, Room 245
Alameda Point, Alameda, CA 94501

LCDR Lino Fragoso
Department of the Navy
Naval Sea Systems Command Detachment
Radiological Affairs Support Office
NWS P.O. Drawer 260
Yorktown, VA 23691-0260

Documents received by Department of Toxic Substances Control and Department of Health Services related to Radiological Removal Action Technical Work Document/Draft Remedial Action Plan for Alameda Point

Date	Document Name/Subject	Note
2/27/98	Radiological Issues Meeting with California State Regulators	
unknown	Response to Agency Comments on the IR Sites 1, 2, 5, and 10 Radiological Removal Action - Draft Technical Work Document/Preliminary Draft Removal Action Plan	
3/4/98	IR Sites 1, 2, 5, and 10 Radiological Removal Action Technical Work Document/Draft Remedial Action Plan	
3/19/98	ARARs in TWD/Draft RAP for Removal Action at IR Sites 1, 2, 5, and 10	Transmitted directly by TetraTech EMI
3/24/98	Response to DTSC and DHS Comments on the IR Sites 1, 2, 5, and 10 Radiological Removal Action - Draft Technical Work Document/Preliminary Draft Removal Action Plan	
3/27/98	Radiological Removal Action Schedule Update	

ALAMEDA POINT, ALAMEDA, CALIFORNIA: LETTER TO MR. GEORGE KIKUGAWA, FROM PETER SOLBERG (TTEMI) CONCERNING ARARs, DATED MARCH 19, 1998

These comments also apply to the "Response to DTSC and DHS Comments on the IR Sites 1, 2, 5, and 10 Radiological Removal Action - Draft Technical Work Document/Preliminary Draft Removal Action Plan" dated March 24, 1998.

1. This letter indicates it is in response to comments from DTSC and DHS dated January 15, 1998. The Navy should note that DTSC submitted a revision on January 30 that replaced the ARARs table contained in the letter of January 15. Please clarify and ensure that all changes in the January 30, 1998 letter have been incorporated.
2. Page 2 of the ARARs table: Under CCR, Title 17, Section 30253, under DESCRIPTION, change "Title 10, CFR, Section 20.2202(a)(iii)" to "Title 10 CFR, Sections 20.1001-2402." This corrects a typographical error in the letter to DTSC from DHS. Although the Navy is not bound to State regulations, it should be indicated that the 10CFR20 sections are applicable to the Navy and that they are substantive (dose limits to public, release limits for effluents, etc.).
3. Page 3 of ARARs table: "CFR, Title 10, Sections 20.1402 and 20.1404" should be rewritten to read, "Sections 20.1410-20.1404." Under COMMENT, the last two sentences should be deleted to reflect the changes made in the DTSC letter dated January 30, 1998. The Navy response was discussed with Mr. Dick Loman of RASO, and he was in agreement that the 25 mrem/yr TEDE is an ARAR; however, the more restrictive limit of 15 mrem/yr TEDE will be the numerical goal. The Navy response should be revised to include these as ARARs, with explanation. Please revise accordingly (i.e., 10CFR20.1401-1404 should be listed as an ARAR).
4. Page 6 of ARARs table - Ocean Plan: DTSC and DHS cannot verify that the referenced regulations are correct. This must be verified before the document is revised.

ALAMEDA POINT, ALAMEDA, CALIFORNIA: IR SITES 1, 2, 5, AND 10
RADIOLOGICAL REMOVAL ACTION TECHNICAL WORK DOCUMENT/DRAFT
REMEDIAL ACTION PLAN (MARCH 4, 1998)

1. Title: To avoid confusion as to the intent of this action, DTSC recommends that the title indicate that this is an interim remedial action. Additional contamination at IR Sites 1, 2, 5 and 10 will be addressed in separate Remedial Investigation reports, Feasibility Studies, and Remedial Action Plans.
2. Executive Summary, Page ES-2: In the first full paragraph, last sentence, the phrase, "Traces of level radioactive waste . . ." should be rewritten: "Trace levels of radioactive waste."
3. Various places in the text: Please check for consistency in use of abbreviations (Dod should be DoD) and capitalization (all four words in Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study are usually capitalized).
4. Section 6.1.5, page 34: DTSC's original comment requested the Navy to establish consistency between statements as to whether this is an interim action or intended to be a final action. The Navy has revised the statement to read, "This is a final action with respect to the radioactive contamination of Sites 5 and 10." DTSC's position is that it would be more accurate to state that this is intended to be a final action with respect to the radioactive contamination. Please revise accordingly.
5. Table A-4, Page A-4: Correct "60 pCi/ml" to "60 pCi/L." Add to the end of the comment, in the Comment column:
" . . . dewatering be discharged to the Bay during this removal action."
6. Table 4-1: Correct "15 mrem/yr EDE" to "15 mrem/yr TEDE."

**RADIOLOGICAL ISSUES MEETING WITH CALIFORNIA STATE REGULATORS
(RECAP DATED FEBRUARY 27, 1998)**

1. DTSC is concerned that the mechanism for establishing a deed restriction has not yet been worked out. The deed restriction should be noted in the Finding of Suitability to Transfer and the deed, but that is not sufficient without a decision document specifying an institutional control as part of the remedy. Furthermore, the notice in the deed must be a binding, perpetual restriction, modification of which is at the sole discretion of DTSC.

RADIOLOGICAL REMOVAL ACTION SCHEDULE UPDATE (MARCH 27, 1998)

1. This schedule is helpful in providing the time frame for various activities and documents involved in implementing the proposed action. Please review the schedule for consistency in "start" and "end" dates (end dates may be shown where they are not necessarily appropriate), and consider revising so that it shows the chronology of the activities.