

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

<http://www.efdsww.navfac.navy.mil/environmental/AlamedaPoint.htm>

Building 1, Suite 140, Community Conference Center

Alameda Point

Alameda, California

November 4, 2003

**ATTENDEES**

See attached list.

**MEETING SUMMARY**

**I. Approval of Minutes**

George Humphreys, Community Co-chair, called the meeting to order at 6:35 p.m.

Mr. Humphreys asked for comments on the October 7, 2003, Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) meeting minutes. The minutes were approved, with the following corrections:

Dale Smith, RAB, made the following comments:

- On page 6 of 15, fourth paragraph, ninth line "...restrict people from digging below the orange marker..." should be revised to "restrict people from digging below the orange webbing...."
- On page 12 of 15, second paragraph, "...sample the community vegetable garden or the greenhouse area since they are such small areas. Mr. Weissenborn responded that the size of the area is not what matters; it is the risk of exposure." should be revised to "...sample the community vegetable garden or the greenhouse area on the normal grid because they are such small areas, and that she believes denser sampling should be conducted in such a sensitive area. Mr. Weissenborn responded that the size of the area is not what matters; it is the risk of exposure, and the sampling areas are adjusted accordingly."
- On page 12 of 15, third paragraph, second sentence, "She inquired if there is plans to conduct anymore lead..." should be revised to "She inquired if there are plans to conduct any more lead..."
- On page 13 of 15, first paragraph, fourth line, "...the Navy to test for break down products, as the products break down..." should be revised to "...the Navy to test for breakdown products, as the products break down...."

Mr. Humphreys, made the following comments:

- On page 5 of 15, sixth paragraph, third line, "...also equates to a 50,000 chance..." should be revised to "...also equates to a 1 in 50,000 chance..."
- On page 8 of 15, first paragraph, fifth line, "...if the City wants to redevelop they would be responsible for spending..." should be revised to "...if the City wants to redevelop, either they would be responsible for spending..."
- On page 8 of 15, first paragraph, nineteenth line, "...leave CGH in the federal government hands..." should be revised to "...leave CGH in the federal government's hands..."
- On page 10 of 15, eighth bullet, "...soil identified as non-RCRA hazardous waste, was disposed at Chemical Waste Management located in Kettleman, California." should be revised to "...soil identified as California hazardous waste was disposed of at Chemical Waste Management, Inc., located in Kettleman City, California."
- On page 13 of 15, third paragraph, second sentence, "He stated that everyone..." should be revised to "Mr. Ripperda stated that everyone..."

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

Mr. Humphreys made the following announcements.

Bert Morgan, Community Co-Chair, and Michael John Torrey, RAB, have excused absences from the RAB meeting tonight.

Mike McClelland, Navy Co-Chair, made the following announcements.

Two new Alameda Point team members are in attendance. Claudia Domingo of the Navy is a newly appointed Remedial Project Manager (RPM). Ms. Domingo will be assuming Rick Weissenborn's RPM duties at Alameda Point. Thomas Macchiarella of the Navy is Alameda Point's newly appointed Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) Environmental Coordinator (BEC). Mr. Macchiarella will be taking over Mr. McClelland's position on November 19, 2003.

Comments on the draft Groundwater Remedial Investigation (RI)/Feasibility Study (FS) for Alameda Annex and Operable Unit (OU) 5 are due on December 6, 2003.

The open house and poster board meeting for the polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbon (PAH) removal action was held at the Alameda Point Collaborative (APC) on October 15, 2003. The meeting was considered a success with approximately 15 to 20 people in attendance.

Mr. McClelland stated that he would like to address a few comments that community member Patrick Lynch made during the October 2003 RAB meeting. Mr. Lynch

commented that the Initial Assessment Study (IAS) for Alameda Point states that the Pan Am and Army wells are contaminated with mercury. Mr. Lynch also commented that groundwater from both wells is being used by the City of Alameda (City) for irrigation purposes. Mr. McClelland stated that groundwater from the Army well is being used to irrigate common areas around the City buildings. Mr. McClelland has spoken with Elizabeth Johnson of the City, and neither he nor Ms. Johnson was able to locate analytical results for groundwater from the Army well. As a result, the City has agreed to analyze the groundwater from the Army well for mercury.

Mr. McClelland stated that Ms. Johnson provided him with a 1977 report written by the Navy Public Works Center (PWC) detailing testing of groundwater from the Pan Am well, which he understands draws from the same aquifer as the Army well. Mercury was detected in the Pan Am well at 0.011 milligrams per liter (mg/L). The maximum contaminant level (MCL) for mercury in drinking water is 0.002 mg/L. Although the groundwater is not being used as a drinking water source, there could be risks associated with dermal exposure from the current irrigation use. The current irrigation practices will be evaluated after the City samples the groundwater.

Ms. Smith asked if it would be reasonable to analyze the groundwater for other constituents in addition to mercury, even if the analysis is expensive. Mr. McClelland stated that groundwater from the Army well previously was analyzed for a full suite of analytes in 1977; at that time the only contaminant of concern was mercury. Ms. Smith remarked to the Navy and to the City that the Sierra Club and the Audubon Society are concerned about the ecological and human risks associated with potential contaminants being pumped out of these wells. Ms. Smith noted that there is no groundwater-monitoring program identifying slope and gradient, so there is no information on where the contaminants are going.

Doug DeHaan, RAB, inquired when ecological receptors become a concern, and why chemical exposure limits are always compared to human exposure limits. Mr. McClelland stated that ecological risks also are evaluated as part of a RI. Because groundwater from these wells was not being investigated prior to Mr. Lynch's comment during the last RAB meeting, the next step is to collect and analyze groundwater samples to determine what levels are present. Mark Ripperda of the U. S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) added that when the results come back they will not just be compared to the MCLs but will also be compared to both human health and ecological risk contaminant levels.

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

Mr. Humphreys announced that the nominees for the Co-Chair positions are RAB members Jean Sweeney and Jim Sweeney. Kurt Peterson, RAB, stated that both nominees are excellent choices for the positions and are very conscientious and hard working, and both have been RAB members for a number of years. Mr. Humphreys motioned for the vote to elect Jean Sweeney and Jim Sweeney, and they were elected unanimously.

### **IV. Community Relations Plan Overview**

Tracy Craig of Tetra Tech EMI (Tetra Tech) stated that the Navy plans to add an overview of its community relations plan (CRP) to the agenda for the RAB and provide the RAB with a summary

of what was learned during the revision of the CRP. The CRP has been provided to RAB members, and some comments already have been received from them. Highlights and key points from the document are summarized below.

The CRP was prepared as part of the Alameda Point Installation Restoration (IR) Program. The original CRP was prepared in 1986, and an update was prepared in 1996. Between 1996 and 2002, when the revision process began, the base was no longer active, Alameda Point was listed as a National Priority List (NPL) site, and the City developed a reuse plan.

The CRP outlines methods to inform and engage the public in the cleanup and investigation process and is considered a living document. Various individuals provided support and guidance during the CRP process, including Patricia Ryan, California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC), and David Cooper, EPA. Jesus Cruz, DTSC, also was involved in the CRP process. Ms. Ryan is no longer with DTSC.

The CRP process was lengthy. Several public comment periods were extended, and the public surveys were time consuming. Four people were involved with the survey process: Ms. Craig recorded notes; Steve Edde, former Navy Community Liaison, conducted the interviews; Mr. Cooper, provided EPA guidance and oversight; and Ms. Ryan also provided oversight.

The first draft of the updated document was provided to the Navy in December 2002. After Navy comments were incorporated, the document was released for agency and RAB comments in February 2003. In September 2003, the final CRP was issued. A responsiveness summary was prepared in conjunction with the final CRP and was included as an attachment in the document. The responsiveness summary itemized how each comment was addressed within the document.

Ms. Craig briefly described the interview process for the CRP. The 27 individuals interviewed included residents of Alameda and Alameda Point, on-site tenants, city staff, federal and state staff, school district staff, and RAB members. The Navy prepared the interviewee list, which was approved jointly by EPA and DTSC. The purpose of the interviews was to gain an understanding of what people knew or wanted to know regarding the environmental cleanup activities at Alameda Point.

Based on information obtained during the interviews, the average community member has a low to moderate level of interest in the environmental cleanup. Half of the individuals interviewed believed that they were not adequately informed and that the average Alameda citizen also was not well informed. Interviewees requested more information on cleanup progression, cleanup duration, the redevelopment plan, and the early transfer process. The most preferred methods of communication included fact sheets, newspaper articles, summary updates, and possibly an interactive map on the Navy website. Interviewees also suggested that all Navy communication be coordinated with the City and local organizations like the APC and local schools that serve the area.

Community relation goals include keeping the community informed about the cleanup projects; providing an opportunity for informed public input; allowing lateral communication among the Navy, regulatory agencies, and the public; and remaining sensitive to changes in public concerns and interests.

Community relation activities required by the Navy include providing a Navy point of contact;

maintaining a RAB throughout the cleanup process; maintaining an administrative record (located in San Diego) and an information repository throughout the cleanup process (Alameda Point has two - Alameda Library and City Hall Library); providing fact sheets, public notices, and public meetings at technical milestones; and maintaining a mailing list for the site. The Navy has complied with all the required activities. Additional recommendations for community relation activities include distribution of a newsletter twice per year; enhancing the Navy website (in process); providing work notices and field activity updates on a timely basis; briefing local organizations and officials as needed; providing work shops and open houses as needed; working with the local press to obtain media coverage; and maintaining the Technical Assistance for Public Participation (TAPP) Grant Program.

The following major comments were received during the public comment period: (1) reorganize the executive summary and sections of the document for easier comprehension, (2) reconstruct the language interpretation section to relate to actual student numbers and not percentages, (3) and create measurement tools to ensure that community relations activities are conducted.

Recent community relations activities include; (1) distributing a newsletter to 24,000 homes during summer 2003 by way of the *Alameda Journal*; (2) conducting the PAH open house on October 15, 2003; (3) creating the event/information sandwich boards; and (4) the creation of the community relations focus group. Future community relations activities include distributing of another newsletter, probably January 2004; community relations as a RAB agenda item every 3 months; and the next CRP update in 2004 to 2005.

Bill Smith, RAB, commented that the *Alameda Journal* works well for distribution to parts of the island; however, most of the people in the west end do not receive the *Alameda Journal*. Ardella Dailey, RAB, stated that when she was interviewed for the survey she suggested using students as a delivery mechanism for the newsletters. The newsletters could be included with the students' weekly school information packets. Ms. Craig stated that newsletters also were provided to the APC, Gallagher and Lindsay, and local schools for distribution. In the future, a mailing list could be created for the west end. Neil Coe, RAB, stated that although the *Alameda Journal* is a free publication he pays \$25 per year to ensure that he receives it at his house. Ms. Craig stated that because the *Alameda Journal* is circulated at no cost, it is common to have inconsistent coverage. Mr. Peterson inquired about the cost to mail the newsletter. Ms. Craig stated that postage for this particular newsletter would have been \$0.54 per mailing, and was not cost effective to mail 24,000 newsletters. The *Alameda Journal* was considered the most efficient and cost-effective way to deliver the newsletters. Mr. Peterson stated that the newsletter would be less expensive to mail if it was condensed into one tri-fold flyer. Ms. Craig agreed that Mr. Peterson's suggestion would be helpful, and she suggested he join the community relations focus group. Mr. Peterson stated that there was too much information in the last newsletter; people did not want to read it because it was too long. Ms. Craig stated that a lot of information was in the newsletter because it had been a while since information was communicated. The Navy would like to hear suggestions from the RAB on newsletter subject matter and length for the next distribution.

Mr. DeHaan commented that the City held a Town Hall Meeting on October 25, 2003, but the Navy did not attend. Mr. DeHaan stated that the Navy missed a great opportunity to conduct community relations. Mr. McClelland stated that he was invited but could not attend. Ms. Craig stated that she was aware of the meeting but had a prior commitment on that day. Mr. DeHaan stated that he was disappointed that the Navy or supporting staff including the State were not in

attendance. Ms. Craig replied that Mr. DeHaan's point is noted and that the community relations group will have to do better in the future.

Ms. Smith inquired why the City's mailing list of 4,000 west-end residents (which was used for the golf course presentation) was not used for the newsletter mailing. Elizabeth Johnson, of the City, stated that she did not mail 4,000 newsletters; instead, she mailed 500 from a selective list that included apartments in a smaller geographical area. Ms. Smith asked if there was a reason the City would not share the list with the Navy. Ms. Johnson replied there is not. Ms. Smith then asked why the *Alameda Journal* was used as the only major distribution tool when it is known that it would not reach the west-end residents. Ms. Craig stated that she was informed that the *Alameda Journal* does deliver to west-end residents; and that distribution numbers for the east end and for the west end were about equal. Ms. Craig stated the Navy is making every effort to improve the process. She stated that the last newsletter was probably too long, too detailed, and might not have been distributed to all the right people; however, it was distributed to most interested parties. Ms. Smith stated that she was not criticizing the effort, just the distribution. Ms. Craig replied that the point was well taken.

Ms. Craig stated that the community relations newsletter focus group could use this kind of input. Membership in the focus group will only require a 1-hour commitment from each person to provide his or her ideas or comments. Ms. Craig will summarize the suggestions for the next newsletter and will distribute them to the RAB for review. Ms. Dailey asked how the focus group meetings would be set up. Ms. Loizos stated that the focus group first needs to be started with members. Ms. Craig stated if RAB members were interested, a sign-up sheet would be available during the meeting.

Mr. Humphreys announced that RAB members who want to be on a RAB member contact list should write their contact information on the sign-up sheet. The contact list will allow the RAB members to communicate with each other outside of the RAB meetings. The Navy will print the contact list for distribution at the next RAB meeting.

Ms. Craig stated that copies of the CRP executive summary, responsiveness summary, and community survey results were available on the back table. Mr. Cooper commented that the document ended up being much better quality and more readable, after everyone's comments were incorporated, and that the EPA is pleased with the commitment shown by the Navy to distribute the final document.

## **V. Presentation of TAPP Grant Review of Draft OU-5 Soil Feasibility Study**

Mr. Humphreys introduced Kenneth Conner of SCA Environmental (SCA) to present the TAPP grant review results for the draft OU-5 soil FS prepared by Camp Dresser & McKee Inc. (CDM). A handout also was provided. Mr. Conner stated that he is a senior project manager for SCA, and that he is familiar with projects like the draft OU-5 soil FS.

Mr. Conner provided some background on the OU-5 FS and stated that the report was released to the public on August 15, 2003. SCA received the report for review on September 8, 2003. The comment period was originally scheduled to end on October 15, 2003, but an extension was granted until November 1, 2003.

Mr. Conner's presentation is summarized below; the handout is included as Attachment C.

### Summary of Draft FS

During environmental investigations, PAHs were identified in soil and groundwater at OU-5. Based on sampling and risk assessment results, the Navy decided to perform a time-critical removal action (TCRA) for the upper 2 feet of soil in portions of OU-5 to minimize risk to residents. The TCRA was conducted at all of Parcels 182 and 183 and decision areas (DA) 4, 5, and 7 of Parcel 181. After completion of the TCRA, OU-5 was evaluated further, which included a post removal action risk assessment, to determine if additional remedial action is necessary. PAHs were evaluated using a benzo(a)pyrene (BaP) equivalency factor. A toxicity assessment (TA) and risk characterization (RC) were prepared using site data and available PAH data. Results of the TA/RC indicated that additional soil removal was needed from DAs 2 and 6 in Parcel 181. Therefore, an FS was prepared. In the FS, the Navy considered applicable, relevant, and appropriate requirements (ARARs) and set remedial action objectives (RAOs) for the project. One of the RAOs is to mitigate exposure to soil exceeding BaP-equivalent concentrations of 1.8 milligram per kilogram (mg/kg). Remedial technologies were then identified and screened. Three remedial alternatives were developed, and a detailed analysis was conducted for each alternative. Based on the detailed analysis, a comparison of the alternatives was performed. Alternative 3 was selected as the preferred alternative; it consists of excavation and disposal of soil from selected areas, with institutional controls (IC) on all of OU-5.

Mr. Peterson asked what the risk would be from a BaP equivalent of 1.8 mg/kg. Mr. Conner replied that the target goal was a  $3 \times 10^{-6}$  lifetime cancer risk, which will be explained later in the presentation.

### TAPP Grant Review Comments

Mr. Conner stated that the report is consistent in format and content with other soil FS reports and meets the general standards of the environmental industry. Overall, the report is technically sound, random calculation audits in the report were correct, and no logic gaps or other problems were found. Based on the TCRA, an apparent precedent is set for remedial action to be limited to PAHs in soil to a depth of 2 feet bgs. According to the soil FS and preliminary review of the draft groundwater remedial investigation (RI)/FS for Site 25, areas within OU-5 could also be affected by volatile organic compounds (VOCs).

Mr. Peterson asked for clarification on the perceived agreement between the Navy and regulators limiting the remedial action of PAHs in soil to a 2-foot depth. Based on other documents reviewed, Mr. Peterson asked if the perceived agreement was consistent with Mr. Conner's observations. Mr. Conner replied that a TCRA is time critical, which means contaminants are removed quickly from the site. With these types of situations, the remedies are not always meant to be permanent. Other remedies may become available after TCRA completion. When removal actions occur before other studies are complete, the removal action criteria have a tendency to take precedent over the other studies. This approach tends to be consistent with other sites like OU-5. Otherwise an agreement would have to already be in place between the stakeholders prior to the removal action events. Ms. Loizos commented that regardless of whether an agreement existed between the regulators and the Navy, by law the Navy could conduct a TCRA to help achieve cleanup objectives. However, following the TCRA, the regulators and the community can differ with the Navy on the adequacy of the result and require additional cleanup if necessary. Mr. Ripperda commented that the TCRA was conducted to reduce potential risk to the public with limited funds for the action. The current concern is that the Navy will consider this a final action when in fact it was an interim action. Mr. Conner stated that it is not unusual to reconsider

an interim removal action and conduct additional remediation.

Mr. Conner stated that the calculations for soil vapor to indoor air were conducted with mathematical models; however, it was not verified that crawl spaces were measured directly to confirm model results. The selected remedy is based on the reuse plan for the area, and the reuse plan should be discussed in the FS. The site is subject to CERCLA and guided by the CERCLA process, but other DTSC and RWQCB risk-based screening levels also might apply and should be reviewed with respect to PAH concentrations and the depth(s) of the main mass of the contaminant. The FS document refers to the use of institutional controls (ICs). ICs are commonly used for commercial and industrial sites where monitoring protocols can be implemented easily through a permitting process. Mr. Conner said that the use of a 2-foot IC on residential property does not appear to be easily enforceable when normal residential activities could easily surpass the 2-foot IC (such as gardening, post digging, and utility maintenance).

Ms. Smith asked Mr. Conner if he considered the orange webbing placed at 2 feet a sufficient IC. Mr. Conner replied that the orange webbing is not a complete IC and that it is a marker or a boundary indicating that residents should take caution.

Mr. Conner inquired if a record of decision (ROD) is in place for reuse of the soil. Mr. McClelland stated that a ROD exists for the Marsh Crust, and a City ordinance restricts excavation. However, ICs for OU-5 probably would consist of an agreement between the City and DTSC, or the Navy and DTSC, similar to the Marsh Crust ROD.

Mr. Conner continued his presentation and stated that everyone most likely agrees that PAHs at the site originated from other areas as contaminated fill. Normally when soil originates from another location, there is no clear pattern of delineation where the soil is placed. Subsequently sampling results at one point could be different from a point just 5 feet away. Because of the way the fill was placed on site, there is no way to extrapolate or interpolate the concentrations of contaminants. Therefore, the hot spot removal, as suggested in the FS, might not be an appropriate remedial action. It may be more appropriate to remove soil to 2 feet below surface in areas near the hot spots. The cancer risk for the site is  $2 \times 10^{-5}$ , which is greater than a risk of  $1 \times 10^{-6}$  associated with residential sites.

Mr. Humphreys stated that some cross sections of the site show that the fill is very heterogeneous. Because the soil is not uniform, sampling on a grid might miss hot spots. Mr. Conner responded that the FS states that the deeper soil may be more contaminated because of the time period that the fill was brought in.

#### TAPP Grant Review Recommendations

Mr. Conner stated that after the review of the draft FS, SCA would like to present the following recommendations to the RAB, the regulators, and the Navy:

- The RAB should ask the BRAC Cleanup Team (BCT) to clarify the regulators' stance on the overall scope of the draft soil FS report.
- The RAB should ask the Navy to comment on the connection (if any) between the OU-5 soil FS report and the draft groundwater RI/FS for Site 25. If the sites and plumes overlap, the OU-5 soil FS report should discuss the RI/FS for Site 25.

- The RAB should request that the Navy conduct air monitoring in crawl spaces to verify results from indoor air modeling.
- The reuse plan for OU-5 should be discussed fully in the OU-5 soil FS.
- The RAB should ask the BCT if the RWQCB risk-based screening levels or other negotiated action levels used at similar properties (such as Oakland Army Base or Catellus Properties) are applicable to the site.
- The RAB should ask the BCT if the use of ICs at residential properties is sufficient.
- The RAB should ask the Navy to consider removing the upper 2 feet of soils in the identified parcel DAs, because PAHs may be randomly distributed.
- The RAB should ask the Navy to reconsider using a cancer risk factor of  $1 \times 10^{-6}$  rather than  $2 \times 10^{-5}$ .
- The RAB should request that the Navy reconsider the depth of soil removal to at least the upper 3 feet, rather than the upper 2 feet, to prevent disturbance of contaminated soil in normal residential use and utility maintenance.
- The RAB should request that the Navy consider these comments and recommendations and incorporate them into the draft final and final versions of the OU-5 soil FS.

Ms. Smith inquired when comments on the draft soil FS are due. Ms. Loizos replied November 17, 2003.

A focus group meeting for comments on the draft soil FS was planned for November 11, 2003 at 6:30 p.m. in the school district's superintendent office.

## **VI. BRAC Cleanup Team Activities**

Mr. Ripperda presented a summary of the October 14, 2003 BCT meeting. A handout was provided and is included as Attachment C.

Mr. Ripperda stated that many of Mr. Conner's concerns regarding the soil PAH issue are shared by the regulators. Mr. Ripperda stated that a portion of the next RAB meeting should be set aside for (1) a Navy response to comments and (2) a discussion between the Navy, the regulators, and the RAB on these issues.

Mr. Ripperda stated that Ms. Sweeney recently has been working with EPA personnel and Mr. Weissenborn on health issues around the Kollman Center in West Housing Area. A resolution has not been reached yet but the Navy and EPA are working together to find a solution. Ms. Smith asked Mr. Ripperda to explain the health issues. Mr. Ripperda replied that he believes it is mold and indoor air quality issues, which have nothing to do with the Navy or the regulatory agencies. Ms. Loizos stated that there is a concern because the residents are having respiratory problems and other symptoms and were questioning whether these were associated with the removal action. Mr. Ripperda stated that during the PAH poster board meeting several people

attended with physical ailments; the toxicologist did not believe the symptoms to be caused by PAHs.

Mr. Ripperda stated that EPA received a finding of suitability to transfer (FOST) for a 200-acre offshore parcel that is located beyond the breakwater. No releases are known to have occurred on the parcel, so EPA signed off on the FOST and expects that the other regulatory agencies will do the same, and that the parcel will transfer to the City.

Mr. Ripperda stated that the Navy submitted a draft RI/FS for groundwater at the Alameda Annex. As previously cited by Mr. Conner there is groundwater contamination there. The Navy is proposing to use biosparging to remediate the groundwater. Biosparging uses low-pressure air injection to enhance natural bioremediation. The method is slow but it works well, and has low incidence of secondary impacts. One of the regulators' concerns is that indoor air could be affected. To avoid this concern, there needs to be adequate air monitoring during remediation.

At the last BCT meeting the Navy proposed 3 new CERCLA sites, Sites 33, 34, and 35.

Mr. Ripperda stated that the IC for OU-5 soil is difficult to enforce, and that more time will be needed to discuss the issue. The regulators agree that removal of 2 feet of soil is sufficient for a removal action but might not be sufficient for a final action. Risk from soil at different depths, not just 0 to 2 feet or 0 to 8 feet bgs, should be evaluated, along with additional exposure scenarios. The EPA toxicologists are reviewing some other options. Mr. DeHaan inquired if a 2-foot removal is a standard practice, or has there been a 2-foot standard. Mr. Ripperda stated there is no standard practice; it would depend on the type and degree of contamination.

## **VII. Community and RAB Comment Period**

Ms. Smith stated that the City promised several months ago to provide the Sierra Club with a list of native grasses for proposed use on the golf course. Ms. Johnson stated that she would get the list to Ms. Smith and that she apologizes for the delay.

Mr. DeHaan asked when the Sweeneys would be taking over as the Community Co-chairs. Mr. McClelland stated that their term would start in January 2004.

Susan Boyle, U.S. Coast Guard (USCG), stated that she has comments concerning reuse of the Coast Guard Housing (CGH) property. The USCG's preference in the local region is to continue an interim agreement with the Navy until the property passes to the City, and then occupy the housing with a long-term lease agreement. It is the USCG's expectation that the housing will be demolished and redeveloped in a relatively short period of time in the future. If for some reason a decision is made outside of the USCG control, which did not include residential redevelopment, and then the USCG acquires control, the USCG would still consider that property to be a target for redevelopment. The USCG believes that an IC for residential property is suitable as a short-term solution. However, when it is time to facilitate redevelopment, there will be a need to cleanup the property in all areas.

Corrina Gould, community member and previous resident, stated that she has concerns, because her and her children used to live here on Alameda Point. She asked if the Navy could remove soil to 3 feet bgs and not just to 2 feet bgs. The removal action was conducted so rapidly that the people living in the transitional and permanent housing did not receive timely information on the

issues. She stated that she would be willing to hand out the information door to door so that people could understand the issues.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:50 p.m.

**ATTACHMENT A**

**NAVAL AIR STATION ALAMEDA  
RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD MEETING AGENDA  
November 4, 2003**

**(One Page)**

**ATTACHMENT B**

**NAVAL AIR STATION ALAMEDA  
RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD MEETING SIGN-IN SHEETS**

**(Four Pages)**

## **ATTACHMENT C**

### **NAVAL AIR STATION ALAMEDA RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD MEETING HANDOUT MATERIALS**

Community Relations Plan Overview, Presented by Tracy Craig, Tetra Tech EMI.  
November 4, 2003

Technical Assistance Public Participation Grant Review of Draft Feasibility Study for  
Operable Unit-5, Presented by Kenneth Conner, SCA Environmental.  
November 4, 2003. (10 pages)

BRAC Cleanup Team Update of the Meeting held October 14, 2003, Presented by Mark  
Ripperda, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. November 4, 2003