



FINAL NAVAL AIR STATION ALAMEDA Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) Meeting Minutes

January 6, 2011

www.bracpmo.navy.mil

Building 1, Suite 140, Community Conference Center
Alameda Point
Alameda, California

The following participants attended the meeting:

Co-Chairs:

Derek Robinson	Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) Program Management Office (PMO) West, BRAC Environmental Coordinator (BEC), Navy Co-chair
Dale Smith	Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) Community Co-chair

Attendees:

RAB Members

George Humphreys	Joan Konrad	James Leach
Kurt Peterson	Jean Sweeney	Jim Sweeney
Michael John Torrey		

Community Members/ Public Attendees

Mary Abusaba	Richard Bangert	Alex Boskovich
Eldon Brodie	Susan Galleymore	Carol Gottstein, MD
Gretchen Lipow	Darcy Morrison	Harvey Wilson

Navy Members

Amy Jo Hill	Navy Deputy Base Closure Manager
Bill McGinnis	Navy Lead Remedial Project Manager (LRPM)
Mary Parker	Navy Remedial Project Manager (RPM)

City of Alameda Representatives

Peter Russell	Alameda Reuse and Redevelopment Authority (ARRA)
Doug deHaan	Alameda City Council
Jennifer Ott	Deputy City Manager

Regulatory Agencies

James Fyfe	California Environmental Protection Agency Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC)
Melinda Garvey	EPA
Xuan-Mai Tran	EPA
John West	San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board (Regional Water Board)

Contractors

John McMillan	Shaw Environmental, Inc.
Campbell Merrifield	Trevet Environmental Consultants
Andrew Bullard	Battelle
John Hardin	Battelle

The meeting agenda is provided as Attachment A.

MEETING SUMMARY

Dale Smith (Community Co-chair) called the January 2011 former Naval Air Station Alameda (Alameda Point) RAB meeting to order at 6:28 p.m. Derek Robinson (Navy Co-Chair) welcomed all to the meeting.

I. Approval of December 2010 RAB Meeting Minutes

Ms. Smith asked for comments on the December 2010, RAB meeting minutes.

Michael John Torrey (RAB member) provided the following comments:

- Page 10 of 10, Action Items; all applicable dates need to be changed from 2010 to 2011

- Page 5 of 10, section III, fourth full paragraph, first sentence, “Jean Sweeney (RAB member)...” should be revised to, “Mrs. Sweeney...”.

Ms. Smith provided the following comments:

- Page 4 of 10, section II, fifth paragraph, first sentence, “Ms. Smith reported she had recently toured all the sites and encouraged all RAB members to take the time and tour the sites as well..” will be revised to read “Ms. Smith reported she had recently toured some of the sites and encouraged all RAB members to take the time and tour sites as well.”
- Page 5 of 10, section III, third paragraph, second sentence, “Mark Kylo (Tetra Tech) explained that a boat based type of sonar is used to survey the bottom of the ocean floor, a detailed explanation of which is included in the draft work plan.” will be revised to read, “Mark Kylo (Tetra Tech) explained that boat based sonar is used to survey the bottom of the ocean floor, a detailed explanation of which is included in the draft work plan.”
- Page 6 of 10, section IV, fifth paragraph, fifth sentence “Ms. Cook said she did not mean to imply that it did and the City of Alameda would need to have a seismic engineer assess each building.” will be revised to read, “Ms. Cook said she did not mean to imply that it would and the City of Alameda would need to have a seismic engineer assess each building.”
- Page 8 of 10, section VI, fifth paragraph, second sentence...“She asked why the turbidity sensors are not being placed closer to where the velocity of the exchange will take place.” will be revised to read, “She asked why the turbidity sensors are not being placed deeper to better monitor the velocity of the current and the material carried by it.”
- The term “lead-based” needs to be hyphenated throughout document.

Mr. Humphreys provided the following comment:

- All page numbers need to be changed to reflect the “x of 10 pages”, the December 2, 2010 minutes currently show “x of 8”

The December 2010 RAB meeting minutes were approved with the above requested modifications.

II. Co-Chair Announcements

Ms. Smith said the City of Alameda cleaned storm drains prior to heavy December rains following Navy guidance.

Mr. Robinson noted that he no longer has a conflict in his schedule with the March RAB Meeting, so the March RAB meeting will occur on March 3, 2011 as originally scheduled.

Ms. Smith said she had not received many documents during the last month and asked if documents were delayed. Ms. Smith asked for an update on the Strategic Environmental Research and Development (SERD) Program work plan discussed at the December 2010 meeting. Mr. McGinnis reviewed the document tracking sheet and made a general statement that some documents had been delayed for a number of different reasons. Attachment B-1, the document tracking sheet, presents the updated document schedule.

Ms. Smith requested copies of the Site 35 comment letter signed by RAB members be provided to RAB members in hard copy. Mr. Robinson said he would add the request to the action item list and distribute the letter.

Mr. Robinson said in 2010, there were five RAB members who had not attended the last six meetings and asked the RAB if they would like to vote to remove them from the RAB as per the RAB rules. Doug deHaan (Alameda City Councilman) asked Mr. Robinson to contact the members and inquire if they wanted to continue as RAB members, remain on the mailing list, or be removed. Mr. Robinson said he would make an action item to contact the five members that had not attended the last six meetings and report back to the RAB at the February meeting to discuss the results.

Mr. Robinson said Richard Bangert has expressed interest in joining the RAB. Mr. Robinson said he will provide a copy of the RAB application to Mr. Bangert as an action item. Ms. Smith requested the application be included in the February meeting packet so RAB members can discuss and vote on the application at the February meeting.

Melinda Garvey (EPA) announced that Anna-Marie Cook (EPA) is leaving the project after 13 years of service and invited all present to sign a plaque for Ms. Cook.

III. OU-2C Feasibility Study

Mary Parker (Navy Project Manager) and Andrew Bullard (Battelle) presented a summary of the Alameda Point Operable Unit (OU)-2C Feasibility Study (FS) (Attachment B-2). Ms. Parker summarized the project, then introduced Mr. Bullard who presented the specifics of the study.

During the review of slide 3, Mr. Humphreys asked if a portion of OU-2C, near Installation Restoration (IR) Site 5 had been zoned residential, not commercial/industrial, as at the rest of the site. Mr. Bullard stated those plans have not been approved.

During the review of slide 4, Ms. Smith stated that the small buildings (bunkers) near Building 400 do not appear to be addressed in the report. Mr. Bullard said that is correct.

Mr. Humphreys asked how shallow groundwater versus deep groundwater is identified. Mr. Bullard said shallow groundwater is up to 20 feet below ground surface, per the risk assessment. Ms. Smith asked how shallow soil is defined. Mr. Bullard said shallow soil is up to 8 feet below ground surface.

Ms. Smith said she was unclear from reviewing the document how the Navy plans to address radiological concerns, and was aware the California Department of Public Health has concerns with the radiological plans as well. Mr. Robinson said the Navy will comply with all federal Applicable or Relevant and Appropriate Requirements (ARAR) under the Comprehensive Environmental Compensation and Liability Act (CERCLA) to address radiological contamination.

Mr. Bullard discussed the remedial alternatives presented on slides 6, 7, and 8. There was considerable discussion regarding the alternatives considered. Specifically, there is concern that the alternatives considered are not the most appropriate, or have not been appropriately evaluated within the comparative risk table. Kurt Peterson (RAB member) said he did not think the engineering controls and institutional controls alternatives would be considered as “good” for long-term effectiveness and permanence, and asked that the table be revised.

Mr. Torrey asked what the contaminants of concern are in soil and groundwater. Mr. Bullard reviewed the contaminants of concern in both soil and groundwater as presented in the FS. Jim Sweeney (RAB member) asked if any radiological concerns had been identified in groundwater. Mr. Bullard said no groundwater sample results have exceeded screening criteria for radiological concerns at OU-2C.

RAB members expressed concerns about engineering and institutional controls, including the suitability of pavement to act as a barrier and its long term effectiveness, and the degradation of such controls over time. They also expressed concerns about redevelopment and impacts from large buildings on groundwater zones.

Jean Sweeney (RAB member) asked why the underground piping under Building 400 is included in the FS. Ms. Parker stated the underground piping was initially a separate IR site, and has since been included within OU-2C.

RAB members expressed concerns about the cost of the remedial actions, and the number of removal actions already completed in IR Site 5. Mrs. Sweeney asked if it would be less expensive to remove the buildings.

Ms. Smith said she is concerned that the Navy is leaving radiologically contaminated soil in place for the City of Alameda or the developer to address. Mr. Robinson stated that is not a valid statement, radiologically contaminated soil cannot be addressed by the developer.

Mr. Bullard reviewed the radiological concerns as discussed in the FS Report. Mr. Robinson said any radiological concerns not addressed in the current FS Report will be addressed in an FS

Report addendum or by the basewide radiological program. Mr. Humphreys asked if the ventilation ducts in Building 5 were part of the radiological evaluation. Mr. Robinson said the ventilation ducts are being evaluated. Mr. McGinnis explained there are a series of projects ongoing that will investigate radiological concerns and results will be reported either in the FS addendum or in the basewide radiological report.

Ms. Smith expressed concern about the adequacy of sampling in soil and groundwater and analysis for hot spots. Mr. Robinson said numerous samples had been collected and were discussed in the FS Report. Ms. Smith asked if the remedial actions include plans for hot spot removals. Mr. Robinson said some of the alternatives do.

Ms. Smith asked if the underground storage tanks (UST) in OU-2C have all been investigated. Ms. Parker and Mr. Bullard responded that the USTs were investigated under the petroleum program, and will continue to be the responsibility of the petroleum program.

Ms. Smith asked how the RAB members/community members can get clarifications to questions before making comments. Mr. Robinson said he will answer any questions forwarded to him by electronic mail before comments are due.

Mr. Robinson restated that the goal for this presentation is to provide a general understanding of the FS Report. He recommended and encouraged attendees to take the information home and review it and submit any questions or comments. Mr. Robinson said a copy of the report is available for review in the information repository, and reviewed the schedule for finalizing the OU-2C FS Report.

IV. Conveyance Status and Redevelopment Planning Status

Mr. Robinson introduced Amy Jo Hill, Deputy Base Closure Manager, to present an update on Conveyance Status and Redevelopment Planning Status. Ms. Hill began the presentation discussing the Navy mission for cleanup and transfer (Attachment B-3).

During the review of slide 3, Ms. Smith asked if the Sports Complex Site has been assessed for radiation. Mr. Robinson stated no. Mr. Humphreys asked why a third party, the Department of the Interior, was involved in the transfer of the sports complex to the City of Alameda. Ms. Hill explained it is based on the conveyance mechanism used to request the property; through this public benefit conveyance the Navy is required to transfer the property to the Department of the Interior and who then deeds the property, with certain use requirements, to the City of Alameda.

During the review of slide 6, Mrs. Sweeney said a wildlife interpretive center project would be part of the Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) transfer parcel, with staff knowledgeable about wildlife on site. Ms. Smith said there are wetlands in the VA transfer parcel that the Navy has not recognized. Ms. Hill said the Navy will review the status of wetlands in the parcel as part of the transfer process, and any impacts to wetlands as part of the construction process will be assessed and dealt with in the VA National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) document. Mr.

Sweeney asked about the status of utilities in the VA transfer parcel. Ms. Hill said meetings between the VA, the City of Alameda and the community are planned to address infrastructure. Ms. Smith asked if the burrowing owl will be addressed in the Biological Assessment for the VA transfer parcel. Ms. Hill said she did not believe the federally listed species being analyzed included the burrowing owl.

During the review of slide 8, Ms. Smith asked if the City of Alameda would be a possible alternative owner for Miller School and the child development center. Ms. Hill stated yes, if the City so desired to acquire the property, the Navy and the Department of Interior could take that under consideration. Mrs. Sweeney asked about confusion about the water bills at the Miller School. Ms. Hill explained that 14 years of water supply bills have not been paid by the school district and there are currently negotiations ongoing to resolve the issue.

During the review of slide 9, Ms. Hill clarified for the community that the North Housing Area will remain vacant until the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) completes a review of the Reuse Plan Amendment.

Jennifer Ott (Deputy City Manager, City of Alameda) continued the presentation at slide 10 with a “going forward” summary. Ms. Ott said based on a review of the past four reuse plans, it appears there is consensus with eighty-five percent of the plans. Ms. Ott provided RAB members with a copy of the community workbooks to solicit public comments on lessons learned and new plans (the file is too large to attach, copies can be accessed online at www.alamedapoint-goingforward.com). Mrs. Sweeney suggested that commercial and industry reuse needs be added to the ‘online’ workbook, as she had commented at the public meetings. Ms. Ott said she had forwarded the comment and will follow-up to make sure it has been completed.

Mr. Peterson suggested an additional public service ad announcing the close of the comment period and availability be created to encourage more community feedback. A number of RAB members and community members present expressed concern that East Alameda had little or no input in the review process and might not support the plan during an election.

V. Community and RAB Comment Period

Jim Fyfe (DTSC) stated that a new Public Participation Specialist, Wayne Hagen, has been assigned to the Alameda RAB and should be at the February meeting.

Mr. Robinson thanked the BRAC cleanup team (BCT), RAB members and community for their ongoing support on the project. The meeting adjourned at 9:09 p.m. The next RAB meeting will occur at 6:30 p.m. on February 3, 2011, at 950 W. Mall Square, Alameda.

Action Items:	Previous Item #/ Action Item Status/ Action Item Due Date:	Initiated by:	Responsible Person:
1. Request for Presentations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Site 1 Radiological RD/RA work plan b. Injection-extraction field design c. Site 25 Plume Status Tracking 	a./ Pending / January 6, 2011. b./ New / January 6 2011 c./ New/ January 6, 2011	RAB	Mr. Robinson
2. Provide as-built specifications on the Sites 5 and 10 storm drain replacement to Mr. Matarrese.	2./ Pending/ January 6, 2011	Mr. Matarrese	City of Alameda Public Works
3. Hard copies of Site 35 letters requested from RAB Members	6./Pending / February 3, 2011.	Ms. Smith RAB	Mr. Robinson
4. Contact individual RAB Members that have not been present for six meeting in 2010 – Determine their status	7./Pending / February 3, 2011	Mr. deHaan	Mr. Robinson
5. Forward RAB application to Mr. Bangert. A copy of the completed application will be included in the February packet for RAB members if it is received by Mr. Bangert in time for that mailing.	8./ Pending / February 3, 2011	Mr. Robinson	Mr. Robinson

ATTACHMENT A

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

January 6, 2011

(1 page)

RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD

NAVAL AIR STATION, ALAMEDA

AGENDA

JANUARY 6, 2011, 6:30-8:30 PM

ALAMEDA POINT – BUILDING 1 – SUITE 140

COMMUNITY CONFERENCE ROOM

(FROM PARKING LOT ON W MIDWAY AVE, ENTER THROUGH MIDDLE WING)

<u>TIME</u>	<u>SUBJECT</u>	<u>PRESENTER</u>
6:30 – 6:45	Approval of Minutes	Dale Smith
6:45 – 7:00	Co-Chair Announcements	Co-Chairs
7:00 – 7:30	OU-2C Feasibility Study	Mary Parker
7:30 – 8:00	Conveyance Status	Navy / ARRA
8:00 – 8:30	Community and RAB Comment Period	Community and RAB
8:30	RAB Meeting Adjournment	

ATTACHMENT B

NAVAL AIR STATION ALAMEDA RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD MEETING ATTACHMENTS

- B-1 List Recent and Upcoming Deliverables, December 14, 2010 and Active and Upcoming Fieldwork, December 14, 2010. Distributed by Bill McGinnis, Navy Lead Remedial Project Manager (2 pages)
- B-2 Alameda Point Operable Unit 2C Feasibility Study, January 6, 2011. Distributed by Mary Parker, Navy Project Manager (5 pages)
- B-3 Conveyance Status and Redevelopment Planning Status, January 6, 2011. Distributed by Amy Jo Hill, Deputy Base Closure Manager, Navy (8 pages).

ATTACHMENT B-1

LIST RECENT AND UPCOMING DELIVERABLES, DECEMBER 14, 2010 AND
ACTIVE AND UPCOMING FIELDWORK, DECEMBER 14, 2010.

DISTRIBUTED BY BILL MCGINNIS,
NAVY LEAD REMEDIAL PROJECT MANAGER

(2 pages)

**Recent and Upcoming Deliverables, December 14, 2010
Alameda Point, Alameda, CA**

Recent		
Site	Document	Transmittal Date
Basewide	Basewide Groundwater Monitoring SAP Addendum	12/8/2010
OU2B	Draft Work Plan Treatability Study of In Situ Thermal Treatment on Chlorinated Solvents in Groundwater OU-2B	11/19/2010

Upcoming		
Site	Document	Transmittal Date
Site 17	Final Remedial Action Work Plan	12/15/2010
OU-1	Draft ISCO Baseline and First Progress Monitoring Report	1/5/2011
Site 2	Final Work Plan and SAP for Data Gaps in support of RD	1/11/2011
Site 35	Draft Final RD/RA WP and SAP	1/20/2011
OU-2A	Final Feasibility Study OU-2A	1/24/2011
OU-2B	Draft Final FS	1/31/2011

Active and Upcoming Fieldwork, December 14, 2010
Alameda Point, Alameda, CA

Sites	Start	End*	Description of Fieldwork
Site 4	11/8/2010	11/17/2010	Plume 4-1 TS DNAPL/Hydrogeological assessment: Installing Plume & Source Well Transects and injection/extraction wells. 5-8 day duration
Site 27	11/16/2010	12/1/2010	Decommission ISCO injection and extraction wells; return property to leasee (NRC).
Basewide	12/9/2010	12/22/2010	Basewide Groundwater Monitoring to include IR Sites 9, 14, & 27, 3rd quarterly monitoring
Site 26	12/28/2010	12/29/2010	Post-ISB Monitoring for GW Quality Parameters, Full Monitoring at 6 weeks
Site 14	1/10/2011	1/14/2011	Bi-annual sampling and deconstruction of monitoring wells
Site 1	9/30/2010	on going	Groundwater Pilot Test
Basewide	10/13/2010	2/16/2011	Radiological Final Status Surveys of Designated Buildings ongoing.
Site 28 RA	2/18/2011	2/21/2011	Ongoing groundwater monitoring (2nd "quarterly" round)
OU-1 RA	11/15/2010	2/28/2011	Groundwater monitoring (post-ISCO) to occur December 2010. Add'l building demolition and excavation at Site 7 to be completed in Dec. Pesticides remain at Site 16, further sampling to be performed in December.
Site 2 Pre-design Investigation	2/7/2011	2/28/2011	Pre-design investigation in support of RD (soil gas sampling, geophysical sampling, trenching, etc).
Site 35 RA	3/1/2011	3/11/2011	Pre-excavation sampling
Basewide	10/1/2010	6/14/2011	Five-year Review of Post-ROD sites (10). Initial interviews complete.
OU-5/FISCA IR02 Remediation	10/6/2008	10/6/2011	Biosparge / vapor extraction system Eastern Biosparge Area construction completed May 2009; Marina Village Western Biosparge Area biosparge area construction completed 10/6/2009. Treatment system running well. Calculated mass reduction of 2,822 pounds of benzene and 69,961 pounds of naphthalene after ~1 year of operation for the Eastern Biosparge Area. Variable frequency drives contributing to efficiency. End date based on running the system for two years, per the FS Report.
Site 17 Remediation	9/13/2010	12/31/2011	Fencing and radiological background surveys for land support facilities area completed. Land support facilities construction began October 18, 2010. Mobilization for IR Site 17 source control remedial activities to begin the week of November 29, 2010. Dredging to start in early January 2011.

* Ordered by End Date

ATTACHMENT B-2

ALAMEDA POINT OPERABLE UNIT 2C FEASIBILITY STUDY

JANUARY 6, 2011.

DISTRIBUTED BY MARY PARKER, NAVY PROJECT MANAGER

(5 pages)



Welcome



Alameda Point Operable Unit 2C Feasibility Study

Restoration Advisory Board Meeting

Mary Parker - Navy
&
Andrew Bullard - Battelle

January 6, 2011



Operable Unit 2C Presentation Overview



- General description of Operable Unit (OU) 2C
- Overview of Operable Unit 2C Feasibility Study (FS) Report
 - Remedial action objectives (RAOs)
 - Chemicals of concern (COCs) and preliminary remediation goals (preliminary RGs)
 - Remediation footprints
 - Remedial alternatives
 - FS Report schedule



Operable Unit 2C Description



- Consists of Installation Restoration (IR) Sites 5, 10, and 12
- Previous remedial actions at OU 2C include excavations, removal of dense, non-aqueous phase liquid (DNAPL), steam-enhanced extraction (SEE), six-phase heating (SPH), and radiological surveying/decontamination
- Future use for OU 2C, according to Alameda Point General Plan (2003) and Preliminary Development Concept (2006), is commercial/industrial



3



Operable Unit 2C Remedial Action Objectives



- Protect future commercial human receptors within IR Site 5 from potentially unacceptable risks associated with the presence of COCs in soil and shallow groundwater that exceed occupational preliminary RGs
- Prevent exposure within IR Sites 5 and 10 to radionuclides of concern associated with known or potentially radiologically-impacted drain lines/piping and surrounding soil present beneath Buildings 5 and 400
- Prevent human exposure associated with downgradient migration of contaminants in deep groundwater and potentially unacceptable risks to downgradient human receptors

4



Operable Unit 2C

Chemicals of Concern/Preliminary Remediation Goals



COCs

- Soil
 - Volatile organic compounds (VOCs)
 - Metals
 - Radium-226 (Ra-226)
- Groundwater
 - VOCs

Preliminary RGs

- Soil and shallow groundwater
 - Risk-based concentrations (RBCs)
 - Background levels
 - Published levels
- Deep groundwater
 - Groundwater transport modeling (also used to demonstrate the protectiveness of RBCs for shallow groundwater)



Operable Unit 2C

Remedial Alternatives - Soil



National Oil and Hazardous Substances Pollution Contingency Plan (NCP) Criteria	ALTERNATIVE				
	S1 No Action	S2 Engineering Controls, Institutional Controls (ICs), and Monitoring	S3 Partial Excavation, Engineering Controls, Off-site Disposal, ICs, and Monitoring	S4 Excavation, Off-site Disposal, ICs, and Monitoring	S5 Excavation, Soil Vapor Extraction (SVE), Off-site Disposal, ICs, and Monitoring
Overall protectiveness	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Compliance with Applicable or Relevant and Appropriate Requirements (ARARs)	NA	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Long-term effectiveness and permanence	NA	†	†	†	†
Reduction of toxicity, mobility, or volume through treatment	NA	↓	↓	→	→
Short-term effectiveness	NA	†	→	→	→
Implementability	NA	-	-	-	-
Cost (\$M)	NA	† 0.56	→ 1.76	↓ 68.95	↓ 68.92




Operable Unit 2C Remedial Alternatives – Shallow Groundwater

NCP Criteria	ALTERNATIVE				
	GS1 No Action	GS2 In Situ Chemical Oxidation (ISCO), Enhanced Bioremediation, ICs, and Monitoring	GS3 In Site Chemical Reduction (ISCR), Enhanced Bioremediation, ICs, and Monitoring	GS4 Air Sparging(AS) -SVE, Enhanced Bioremediation, ICs, and Monitoring	GS5 Electrical Resistive Heating (ERH), ISCO/ISCR/AS- SVE, Enhanced Bioremediation, ICs, and Monitoring
Overall protectiveness	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Compliance with ARARs	NA	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Long-term effectiveness and permanence	NA	†	†	†	†
Reduction of toxicity, mobility, or volume through treatment	NA	†	†	†	†
Short-term effectiveness	NA	→	†	→	→
Implementability	NA	†	→	†	→
Cost (\$M)	NA	† 2.19	→ 6.86	→ 3.55	→ 4.30

7




Operable Unit 2C Remedial Alternatives – Deep Groundwater

NCP Criteria	ALTERNATIVE				
	GD1 No Action	GD2 ICs and Monitoring	GD3 ISCO, ICs, and Monitoring	GD4 ISCR, ICs, and Monitoring	GD5 ERH, ICs, and Monitoring
Overall protectiveness	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Compliance with ARARs	NA	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Long-term effectiveness and permanence	NA	‡	†	†	†
Reduction of toxicity, mobility, or volume through treatment	NA	‡	†	†	†
Short-term effectiveness	NA	†	→	†	†
Implementability	NA	†	†	→	→
Cost (\$M)	NA	† 0.51	† 1.15	→ 2.27	‡ 2.89

8



Operable Unit 2C Current Status of Feasibility Study Report



- Revised Draft FS Report submitted for agency review on November 5, 2010
- Agency comments expected by January 7, 2011
- Draft Final FS Report will be prepared following receipt of agency comments, and will be submitted for agency review
- Final FS Report expected in April 2011

For More Information Contact:

Derek Robinson
BRAC Environmental Coordinator
BRAC Program Management Office West
1455 Frazee Road, Suite 900
San Diego, CA 92108
(619) 532-0951
derek.j.robinson1@navy.mil



Operable Unit 2C



QUESTIONS ??

ATTACHMENT B-3

CONVEYANCE STATUS AND REDEVELOPMENT PLANNING STATUS

JANUARY 6, 2011.

DISTRIBUTED BY AMY JO HILL, DEPUTY BASE CLOSURE MANAGER, NAVY

(8 pages)



Presentation
to NAS Alameda RAB

Conveyance Status and Redevelopment Planning Status

January 6, 2011

Amy Jo Hill, Deputy Base Closure Manager, Navy BRAC PMO
Jennifer Ott, Deputy City Manager, City of Alameda

1



BRAC PMO Mission – Cleanup and Transfer

- Realign, close and transfer the former installation
- Conduct the necessary remedial investigations/actions to comply with Environmental laws
- Facilitate interim leasing with the local reuse authority to generate revenue during the pre-transfer actions
- Collaborate on the transfers with all recipients, including informing them of the environmental condition of the property

2



Real Estate Transactions to Date



- City of Alameda Transfer – 233 acres
 - Reversion of Term-1
 - Bayport Housing Area (former East Housing parcel)
- United States Coast Guard Transfer – 28 acres
 - Marina Village and Housing Administration Office
- Department of Interior Transfer – 44 acres
 - Sports Complex (PBC-1 parcel)
- Lease in Furtherance of Conveyance – 1046 acres
 - Lease of main base, minus VA parcel, to City of Alameda
 - Lease offered at no-cost with requirement that the City secure and maintain the premises through active subleasing

3



NAS Alameda Conveyance Plan



Remaining Transfer Parcels

- Veterans Affairs (VA Fed to Fed)
- Department of Education (PBC-3)
- City of Alameda (ARRA Parcels Upland and Submerged)
- North Housing Area

4



ARRA Parcels (ARRA Parcels Upland and Submerged)



- SunCal departure requires identification/preparation of a new redevelopment plan
- Conveyance terms between Navy/ARRA (i.e., land value, phasing, mechanism, early transfer) under preliminary discussion and depends, in part, on redevelopment plan
- Possibility there will be an early transfer (a deferral of the covenant while remedial actions are conducted by the Navy or a private party). Early transfer allows redevelopment to occur simultaneously with the cleanup.
- Depending on the level of variation from the 1996 reuse plan prepared by the City of Alameda, supplemental NEPA may be necessary
- Timing of transfer of the ARRA parcels is dependent on use of early transfer, availability of FOST parcels and time to conduct any additional NEPA review

7



PBC-3 (AUSD) Public Benefit Conveyance to Department of Education



- Proposed transfer to Alameda Unified School District (AUSD) via a Department of Education (DoEd) PBC
 - Miller Elementary School
 - Woodstock Child Development Center
- Remedial actions for Site 30 groundwater in progress under the OU5/IR-02 GW project.
 - “Remedial actions complete” expected in 2013
 - Treatment system is running well; Continued groundwater monitoring
- Strong possibility that AUSD may withdraw its request with Department of Education due to budget issues.

8



North Housing Area/Estuary Park (Parcels not yet defined)



- U.S. Coast Guard originally requested property; withdrew request in 2006
- ARRA prepared Reuse Plan Amendment to address the “new” surplus property
 - Submitted to HUD in March 2009
 - HUD reviews homeless component and ultimately approves/disapproves the reuse plan
 - HUD review not complete and thus transfer cannot occur
 - Plan includes conveyances to:
 - Alameda Housing Authority, Alameda Point Collaborative, Building Futures with Women and Children and Habitat for Humanity for residential uses
 - City of Alameda Parks and Recreation for Estuary Park
 - OU-5 GW plume impacts transferability of some portion of property; remedial action underway
- Potential remainder parcel for Navy’s disposal (conveyance method TBD)



Alameda Point Going Forward Summary



- City agreement with previous master developer expired in July 2010
- City to create redevelopment plan without a master developer
 - Visioning Process – July 2011
 - Entitlement Process – July 2013
- Community Forums held in November and December; boards and commissions in January and February
- Goal is to solicit community input on lessons learned and new vision
- Workbook prepared and distributed by staff here
 - Overview of Workbook format and topics
 - Online workbook at www.alamedapoint-goingforward.com
 - Comments due by end of January



"Going Forward" Next Steps



1. Workbook discussions with Boards and Commissions – January/February 2011
2. Alameda Point Tenant Forum – February 8, 2011
3. "Market Testing" interviews with development professionals – February/March 2011
4. Presentation to ARRA on community feedback – March 2011
5. Discussion of land use alternatives with ARRA – April 2011
6. Further community stakeholder discussions and interviews – March – July 2011

11



"Going Forward" Next Steps



7. Ongoing updates to ARRA – April – July 2011
8. Acceptance of Alameda Point vision and project description – July 2011
9. Commence CEQA/NEPA and entitlement process
 - Specific Plan
 - Master Infrastructure Plan
 - Conveyance Agreement
 - Statelands Agreement

12



Questions?



How to Contact Us:

- Amy Jo Hill – 619-532-0918 or amy.hill@navy.mil
- Jennifer Ott – 510-747-4747 or jott@ci.alameda.ca.us