



Final

**COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT PLAN
UPDATE
ALAMEDA POINT**

Alameda, California

March 2010

Prepared for:

**Base Realignment and Closure
Program Management Office West
San Diego, California**

Prepared by:

**ChaduxTt, A Joint Venture of St. George Chadux Corp.
and Tetra Tech EM Inc.
1230 Columbia Street, Suite 1000
San Diego, California 92101**

Prepared under:

**Naval Facilities Engineering Command
Contract Number N62473-07-D-3213
Contract Task Order 048**

Final

**COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT PLAN UPDATE
ALAMEDA POINT
Alameda, California**

Contract Task Order 048

Prepared for:

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

REVIEW AND APPROVAL

Project Manager: 
Craig Hunter, Ph.D., ChaduxTt

Date: March 19, 2010

TABLE OF CONTENTS

REVIEW AND APPROVAL	i
ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS	vi
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	ES-1
1.0 INTRODUCTION	1-1
1.1 REGULATORY OVERVIEW AND ORGANIZATION OF COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT PLAN	1-1
1.2 PURPOSE OF THE COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT PROGRAM	1-2
1.3 ORGANIZATION OF THE COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT PLAN	1-2
1.4 FOR MORE INFORMATION	1-3
2.0 COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT PROGRAM.....	2-1
2.1 PAST COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT EFFORTS	2-1
2.2 GOAL OF COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT PROGRAM	2-1
2.3 ACTIVITIES FOR ACHIEVING GOALS OF THE COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT PROGRAM	2-1
2.4 COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT ACTIVITIES AND TIMING.....	2-4
2.4.1 Contact Persons	2-4
2.4.2 Information Repositories.....	2-4
2.4.3 Restoration Advisory Board	2-5
2.4.4 Newsletters	2-6
2.4.5 Fact Sheets.....	2-7
2.4.6 Work Notices.....	2-7
2.4.7 Informal Briefings	2-7
2.4.8 Media Outreach	2-7
2.4.9 Coordination with the City of Alameda	2-8
2.4.10 Public Notices.....	2-8
2.4.11 Public Meetings.....	2-8
2.4.12 Public Comment Periods.....	2-8
2.4.13 Responsiveness Summary	2-9
2.4.14 Mailing List	2-9
2.4.15 Internet.....	2-10
2.4.16 Community Meetings	2-10
2.4.17 Site Tours.....	2-10
2.4.18 Language Interpretation Needs and Translation of Key Documents	2-10

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

2.4.19	Administrative Record.....	2-10
2.4.20	Revise the Community Involvement Plan.....	2-11
2.4.21	Technical Assistance for Public Participation Grant Program.....	2-11
2.5	IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDULE	2-11
3.0	COMMUNITY INTERVIEWS	3-1
3.1	COMMUNITY REPRESENTATIVES.....	3-1
3.2	INTERVIEW TOPICS AND RESULTS.....	3-1
3.2.1	Familiarity with Navy Installation Restoration Program at Alameda Point	3-2
3.2.2	Concerns	3-2
3.2.3	Involvement.....	3-3
3.2.4	Restoration Advisory Board.....	3-4
3.2.5	Communication Needs	3-5
3.2.6	Information Repositories.....	3-7
3.2.7	Media Coverage and Usage.....	3-7
3.2.8	Other Comments and Concerns.....	3-7
4.0	COMMUNITY BACKGROUND	4-1
4.1	FORMER BASE AND BACKGROUND	4-1
4.2	CURRENT SITE DESCRIPTION AND CONTAMINANTS OF CONCERN.....	4-1
4.3	LAND REUSE AND TRANSFER.....	4-2
4.4	DESCRIPTION OF COMMUNITY	4-3
4.4.1	Profile of City of Alameda	4-3
4.4.2	Community Profile of Alameda Point.....	4-3
4.4.3	Educational Demographics.....	4-4
5.0	REGULATORY BACKGROUND AND REQUIREMENTS.....	5-1
5.1	BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE PROGRAM	5-1
5.2	REGULATIONS.....	5-1
5.2.1	CERCLA, and SARA.....	5-1
5.2.2	State Health and Safety Code, Title 22, and Public Resources Code	5-1
5.3	INSTALLATION RESTORATION PROGRAM.....	5-2
5.3.1	Remedial Action Process.....	5-2
5.3.2	Removal Action Process.....	5-4
5.4	PROPERTY TRANSFER	5-5

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

6.0 SITE DESCRIPTIONS AND INVESTIGATIONS 6-1
 6.1 FACILITY OVERVIEW AND HISTORY 6-1
 6.2 OVERVIEW OF SPECIFIC SITES 6-1
7.0 RESOURCES 7-1

Appendix

A State and Federal Statutes Governing Environmental Regulations
B Past Community Involvement Activities
C Community Involvement Interview — Questionnaire and Responses
D Interviewee List
E Key Contacts
F Information Repository Locations
G Location of the Restoration and Advisory Board Meetings
H Mailing List
I Administrative Record File Location
J Restoration Advisory Board Rules of Operation
K Responses to Comments on the Draft Community Involvement Plan Update

LIST OF FIGURES

- 1-1 Alameda Point Regional Map
- 6-1 IR Sites and Operable Units

LIST OF TABLES

- 2-1 Remedial Action Process
- 2-2 Removal Action Process
- 6-1 Alameda Point Site Status and Description

ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

AIA	Alternatives in Action
AM	Action Memorandum
AP	Alameda Point
APAC	Alameda Point Advisory Committee
APC	Alameda Point Collaborative
ARRA	Alameda Reuse and Redevelopment Authority
AST	Aboveground storage tank
AUSD	Alameda Unified School District
BCT	BRAC Cleanup Team
BEC	BRAC Environmental Coordinator
BRAC	Base Realignment and Closure
BRAG	Alameda Base Reuse Advisory Group
BREAC PMO	BRAC Program Management Office
CAA	Corrective action area
Cal-EPA	California Environmental Protection Agency
CERCLA	Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act
CEQA	California Environmental Quality Act
CHC	Chlorinated hydrocarbons
CIC	Community Improvement Commission
CIP	Community Involvement Plan
City	City of Alameda, California
COC	Contaminant of concern
DCA	Dichloroacetylene
DCE	Dichloroethene
DDT	Dichlorodiphenyltrichloroethane
DDx	Breakdown products of DDT
DERP	Defense Environmental Restoration Program
DNAPL	Dense nonaqueous phase liquid
DoD	Department of Defense
DTSC	Cal-EPA Department of Toxic Substances Control
DVE	Dual phase vapor extraction
EDC MOA	Economic Development Conveyance Memorandum of Agreement
EE/CA	Engineering Evaluation/Cost Analysis
EPA	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
ERA	Ecological risk assessment
ETL	Environmental Technical Library

ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS (Continued)

FFA	Federal Facilities Agreement
FISCA	Fleet and Industrial Supply Center Oakland, Alameda Facility/Alameda Annex
FOSET	Finding of Suitability for Early Transfer
FOST	Finding of Suitability to Transfer
FS	Feasibility study
HHRA	Human health risk assessment
HOMES	Housing Opportunities Make Economic Sense
IC	Institutional control
IR	Installation Restoration
ISB	In situ bioremediation
ISCO	In situ chemical oxidation
IWTP	Industrial Wastewater Treatment Plant
LIFOC	Lease in Furtherance of Conveyance
LUC	Land Use Control
MNA	Monitored natural attenuation
MPPEH	Material potentially presenting an explosive hazard
NAS	Naval Air Station
NCP	National Contingency Plan
NFA	No further action
NPL	National Priorities List
NTCRA	Non-time critical removal action
O&M	Operation and maintenance
OU	Operable Unit
OWS	Oil-water separator
PA	Preliminary assessment
PAH	Polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons
PBC	Public benefit conveyance
PCB	Polychlorinated biphenyls
PCE	Tetrachloroethene
PP	Proposed Plan
Ppb	Parts per billion
RA	Remedial action
RAB	Restoration Advisory Board
RAD	Radionuclides
RAP	Remedial action plan
RASO	Radiological Affairs Support Office
RAWP	Remedial action work plan

ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS (Continued)

RCRA	Resource Conservation and Recovery Act
RD	Remedial design
RG	Remedial goals
RI	Remedial investigation
ROD	Record of Decision
RTC	Response to comments
SARA	Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act
SC	Site closeout
SI	Site inspection
SMP	Site Management Plan
SVE	Soil vapor extraction
SVOC	Semi-volatile organic compounds
TAPP	Technical Assistance for Public Participation
TCA	Trichloroethane
TCE	Trichloroethene
TCRA	Time-critical removal action
Tetra Tech	Tetra Tech EM Inc.
TPH	Total petroleum hydrocarbons
USCG	U.S. Coast Guard
UST	Underground storage tank
VA	Department of Veterans Affairs
VC	Vinyl chloride
VOC	Volatile organic compound
Water Board	San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board
WP	Work plan

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Department of Defense (DoD) is committed to early and meaningful community participation. This Community Involvement Plan (CIP) outlines various methods the Department of the Navy will employ to involve the community in the cleanup process at the former Naval Air Station (NAS) Alameda in Alameda, California.

The Navy's Installation Restoration (IR) Program was developed to comply with the provisions of Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) by identifying, investigating, remediating or controlling releases of hazardous substances and reducing risk to human health and the environment. This CIP has been specifically prepared in support of the cleanup being conducted at NAS Alameda, now commonly referred to as Alameda Point. The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), the California Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC), and the San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board (Water Board) provide regulatory oversight.

PURPOSE OF THIS COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT PLAN

This CIP outlines methods to ensure that the local community has access to technical information about Navy IR Program activities and has early and meaningful input into the investigation and cleanup plans. In addition, the CIP identifies community concerns about Alameda Point, describes how the Navy will provide information to residents and interested parties, and describes how the public can communicate concerns to the Navy. The plan also provides background information on the base and environmental sites, the local community, past community involvement activities, and regulatory requirements, and summarizes the recently conducted community interviews. This document is an update to three previous CIPs issued for Alameda Point in February 1989, December 1996, and September 2003. The Navy will periodically re-evaluate the CIP and update it as appropriate.

SUMMARY OF INTERVIEWS

This CIP update was developed primarily from information obtained from 22 in-person interviews with Alameda Point residents and commercial tenants, Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) members, members of local environmental groups, elected officials, City of Alameda staff, and other community representatives. The purpose of the interviews was to gain a better understanding of community interests and concerns and the best ways to conduct outreach.

The following provides a summary of information obtained during the interviews:

Overall, the interviewees have a moderate level of knowledge about the environmental conditions and cleanup program under way at Alameda Point, the primary sources of information being from the Navy, the media, and word of mouth.

The majority of interviewees have concerns or interests in the cleanup program. The primary concerns or interests are (1) the level of cleanup; (2) health and safety from site contamination now and in the future; and (3) specific plans for reuse.

Interviewees expressed a preference for electronic communications, such as having access to electronic copies of documents and an updated website, as well as receiving e-mails. Interviewees also stated that site tours, fact sheets, and newsletters were good methods of communication for them.

COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT PROGRAM

Some of the components that are included in the Navy's community involvement program, based on information obtained from the interviews, for Alameda Point include:

- Preparing and distributing a periodic newsletter, project-specific fact sheets and work notices, and providing regular updates on field activities conducted under the environmental cleanup program
- Maintaining and enhancing the web page for Alameda Point through the Navy's website
- Maintaining the RAB throughout the Navy's cleanup process
- Providing accurate and timely information to the local media
- Posting public notices in local newspapers and in the local library, and e-mailing the notices to announce milestones in the cleanup process, as well as scheduled meeting dates, the availability of documents for public review, and Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) Cleanup Team (BCT) contact information
- Holding public meetings at all technical milestones, as required by current applicable regulations
- Maintaining a hard copy and electronic mailing list for Alameda Point to distribute information on the IR Program
- Maintaining a Navy point of contact for the public and publicizing this information in public notices, fact sheets, and on the Navy's website.

1.0 INTRODUCTION

The Department of Defense (DoD) is committed to regular, meaningful community participation. Throughout the cleanup process, the Department of the Navy has used various methods to inform and involve the community. This Community Involvement Plan (CIP) outlines the various methods that Navy has used, as well as new methods they will implement to continue to inform and involve the community in the investigation and cleanup process at the former Naval Air Station (NAS) Alameda.

NAS Alameda, now commonly referred to as Alameda Point, is located at the western end of the Island of Alameda, in Alameda and San Francisco Counties ([Figure 1-1](#)). Alameda Point occupies about 2,700 acres, of which about 1,100 are offshore. The petroleum cleanup program for Alameda Point is currently ongoing, but is not part of this CIP.

Alameda Point was closed in April 1997 under the Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) Program of 1993. In 1999, Alameda Point was added to the federal facilities National Priorities List (NPL). BRAC Program Management Office West has assumed caretaker status until the majority of the property is transferred to the City of Alameda, California. The mission of BRAC PMO is to provide all services necessary to realign, close, and transfer Navy BRAC properties in a timely manner.

1.1 REGULATORY OVERVIEW AND ORGANIZATION OF COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT PLAN

CERCLA (also known as Superfund) passed in 1980, created the legal mechanism for cleaning up abandoned or uncontrolled hazardous waste sites. CERCLA did not originally apply to military installations. However, in 1986, Congress passed the Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act (SARA), which mandated that DoD follow CERCLA. SARA also established the Defense Environmental Restoration Program (DERP). Through the DERP, the DoD conducts environmental restoration activities. Each military department of the DoD (Army, Air Force, Navy and Marine Corps) is responsible for implementing the DERP. The Navy created the Installation Restoration Program (IRP) to follow CERCLA by identifying and cleaning up past contamination from hazardous substances, pollutants, and contaminants in order to protect human health and the environment at both active and BRAC installations. BRAC installations are those that have been closed or realigned to sustain military readiness and improve the defense mission. Implementing the Navy's IR Program is a vital aspect to meeting the BRAC PMO mission which is to provide all services necessary to realign, close, and dispose of Navy BRAC properties.

The Navy is the lead federal agency for the cleanup under CERCLA at Alameda Point. The following regulatory agencies provide oversight:

- The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), Region IX is the lead regulatory agency and provides federal oversight for the environmental program at Alameda Point.
- The California Environmental Protection Agency (Cal-EPA) Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) acts as a support agency to EPA and provides oversight for the environmental program at Alameda Point.

- The San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board (Water Board) acts as a support agency to DTSC, and is responsible for overseeing cleanup of petroleum-contaminated sites and groundwater.

Representatives from the Navy, EPA, DTSC and Water Board make up the BRAC Cleanup Team (BCT). The BCT is responsible for the timely cleanup and transfer of Alameda Point in accordance with applicable federal and state regulations. Applicable regulations are presented in [Appendix A](#).

1.2 PURPOSE OF THE COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT PROGRAM

This CIP has been prepared in support of the IR Program conducted by the Navy for Alameda Point. The Navy understands that effective community involvement is critical to the success of any environmental program. The Navy is therefore committed to providing timely and accurate information about the investigation and cleanup of Alameda Point to the local community and to solicit public input in the development and implementation of cleanup solutions.

This CIP is prepared to:

- Describe the communities interested in, and affected by, environmental activities at Alameda Point.
- Describe past community outreach activities that have been conducted to involve community members.
- Identify the current level of community knowledge, interest, and concern about environmental activities on Alameda Point.
- Outline community involvement activities to facilitate two-way communication with the surrounding community and other interested parties.
- Meet all public involvement regulatory requirements for the IR Program at Alameda Point.

1.3 ORGANIZATION OF THE COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT PLAN

This CIP was prepared in accordance with the requirements of the IR Program, EPA, and DTSC. It is organized as follows:

- [Section 1.0](#) provides an overview of the CIP and explains its purpose and organization.
- [Section 2.0](#) sets out the objectives and goals of the community involvement program, and the approaches and activities to implement the program.
- [Section 3.0](#) provides a summary of information collected during interviews conducted with various members of the Alameda community to gauge the level of knowledge and interest to the environmental activities conducted at Alameda Point.

- [Section 4.0](#) provides information on the background of Alameda Point and presents a description and profile of the Alameda Point community.
- [Section 5.0](#) outlines federal and state requirements for hazardous waste cleanup at military facilities.
- [Section 6.0](#) presents a site history and the current status of each IR site on Alameda Point.
- [Section 7.0](#) provides a list of resources.
- Figures and tables identified in the foregoing sections.

Appendices are as follows:

- [Appendix A](#) – State and Federal Statutes Governing Environmental Regulations
- [Appendix B](#) – Past Community Involvement Activities
- [Appendix C](#) –Community Involvement Interview Questionnaire and Responses
- [Appendix D](#) – Interviewee List
- [Appendix E](#) – Key Contacts
- [Appendix F](#) – Information Repository Locations
- [Appendix G](#) – Location of the Restoration Advisory Board Meetings
- [Appendix H](#) – Mailing List
- [Appendix I](#) – Administrative Record File Location
- [Appendix J](#) – RAB Rules
- [Appendix K](#) – Responses to Comments on the Draft Community Involvement Plan Update

1.4 FOR MORE INFORMATION

For more information about this document, the IR Program, and the community involvement program for Alameda Point, contact the following:

Mr. Derek Robinson
 Navy BRAC Environmental Coordinator
 Base Realignment and Closure Program
 Management Office West
 1455 Frazee Road, Suite 900,
 San Diego, CA, 92108-4310
 (619) 532-0951
derek.j.robinson1@navy.mil

Ms. Anna-Marie Cook
 Remedial Project Manager
 U.S. EPA, Region IX
 75 Hawthorne Street, Mailcode SFD 8-3
 San Francisco, CA 94105-3963
 (415) 972-3029
cook.anna-marie@epa.gov

Mr. David Cooper
Community Involvement Coordinator
U.S. EPA Region IX
Mailcode SFD 6-3
75 Hawthorne Street
San Francisco, CA 94105-3963
(415) 972-3245
cooper.david@epa.gov

Ms. Dot Lofstrom
Department of Toxic Substances Control
8800 Cal Center Drive
Sacramento, CA, 95826-3200
(916) 255-6532
dlofstro@dtsc.ca.gov

Mr. Marcus Simpson
Public Participation Specialist
Department of Toxic Substances Control
8800 Cal Center Drive,
Sacramento, CA, 95826-3200
(916) 255-6683
msimpson@dtsc.ca.gov

Mr. John West
San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality
Control Board
1515 Clay Street, Suite 1400
Oakland, CA, 94612-1482
(510) 622-2438
jwest@waterboards.ca.gov

2.0 COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT PROGRAM

This section presents the community involvement program to be executed as part of the Navy's investigation and cleanup for Alameda Point. This program was developed using information obtained during face-to-face interviews with residents and tenants of Alameda Point and Alameda, representatives of the city, members of environmental organizations, businesses, media, elected officials, and other interested individuals.

2.1 PAST COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT EFFORTS

The Navy has conducted activities to inform interested community members about the IR Program for Alameda Point. A summary of past community involvement efforts is provided in [Appendix B](#).

2.2 GOAL OF COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT PROGRAM

The goals of the Navy's community involvement program for Alameda Point are to:

1. Keep the community informed about the cleanup projects.
2. Provide opportunities for informed public input.
3. Allow for two-way communication between the Navy and regulatory agencies, and the public.
4. Remain sensitive to changes in public concerns as the environmental restoration program progresses.

2.3 ACTIVITIES FOR ACHIEVING GOALS OF THE COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT PROGRAM

Activities to achieve each goal of the public participation program are listed below. A more detailed description of these public participation activities is provided in [Section 2.4 – Community Involvement Activities and Timing](#).

Goal No. 1: Keep the community informed about the cleanup projects. Provide community members and representatives with accurate, timely, and easy-to-understand information about the IR Program, and provide them with regular status updates on IR Program sites.

- Produce and distribute periodic newsletters that include general information and updates on the IR Program at Alameda Point. These newsletters will be developed on an annual or twice yearly basis.
- Produce and distribute site-specific fact sheets and work notices, as required or deemed necessary during the various stages of the IR Program.

- Maintain a website with Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) meeting minutes, newsletters, and fact sheets. Enhance the website by providing an updated map that is better quality and easy to read, and by adding a table describing the sites.
- Regularly inspect and update, on a monthly basis, the information repositories located at Alameda Point and the Alameda Free Library, and take corrective actions to fix them if they become disorganized or if documents are found missing.
- Continue to hold monthly RAB meetings and support the RAB in all efforts to maximize its effectiveness, including providing graphics and summary information for RAB members to use when communicating with the larger community.
- Issue periodic press releases in an effort to obtain increased local coverage of the IR Program at Alameda Point. Invite media representatives on a site tour, as appropriate.
- Post information on site regarding work that is in progress, including posting tenant work notifications at the tenant mailboxes. For larger projects, the Navy may post signs at various on-going work areas that are publicly accessible with a brief description of the project and contact information.
- Post fact sheets, newsletters, and notices as appropriate at the Alameda Free Library about where to obtain more information.

Goal No. 2: Provide opportunities for informed public input. Provide opportunities throughout the remedial action planning process for members of the public to voice concerns and express opinions about site-specific issues and proposed site activities. Provide the public with the opportunity to review and comment on documents produced during the environmental cleanup process and as appropriate during development and implementation of any remedial or removal actions.

- If requested, the Navy may provide an overview/ general information presentation to various groups to get people up to speed on the status and process of cleanup at Alameda Point. When people have this general knowledge base, they will be better able to understand site-specific issues.
- Continue to publicize Navy and BCT member contact information (by including it on all fact sheets, newsletters, e-mails, and in the information repositories).
- Continue to publicize the availability of documents for public review and the location of the information repositories where these documents can be found.
- Continue to hold 30-day public comment periods at appropriate milestones during the remedial action planning process.
- Continue to hold public meetings to explain technical issues and accept public comments at appropriate milestones during the remedial action planning process, and respond to all written comments received.

- Continue to address comments and concerns expressed by the public and regulatory agencies at RAB meetings, either through the formal comment process, by addressing comments received on feedback forms, or by tracking action items for the Navy to respond to in the meeting minutes.
- Continue to attend RAB focus group meetings to discuss technically complex issues or documents related to environmental restoration, as requested by the RAB.

Goal No. 3: Allow for two-way communication between the public and the Navy and regulatory agencies. Monitor and respond in a timely manner to community concerns, questions, and requests throughout the IR process. Accurately communicate information about the community's concerns and interests to the regulatory agencies involved.

- Remain accessible to the public through continued publication of contact information for the Navy and BCT members, including e-mail, phone numbers, and mailing addresses, along with agency websites.
- Coordinate with Navy and regulatory agency staff to provide meaningful presentations at public and RAB meetings.
- Speak to local community, business, and school organizations, as needed, in coordination with the BCT.
- Meet in person, as requested, with community members and community groups to discuss concerns and answer questions.
- Continue to post links on the Navy's website to regulatory agency websites.

Goal No. 4: Remain sensitive to changes in public concerns as the environmental restoration program progresses. Monitor changing community concerns and demographics and respond accordingly.

- Monitor the effectiveness of community involvement activities and revise, expand, or omit public participation activities based on successes and community needs.
- Revise the CIP as necessary in response to changing public needs and demographics.
- Continue to gauge public interest and concern through established communication protocols, such as by receiving public comments, discussing and planning community involvement activities at RAB meetings, providing regular briefings to interested organizations, and sponsoring public meetings.
- Periodically, but at least annually, provide a feedback form at RAB meetings for RAB members and community members. This form would allow attendees to give feedback that could help the Navy improve the RAB meetings in form and content, and well as consider content to include in newsletters and other communications.

2.4 COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT ACTIVITIES AND TIMING

The following sections describe activities that are designed to fulfill state and federal public participation requirements and meet the goals for public participation, as described in [Section 2.3](#) of this plan, and take into consideration the comments provided by interviewees.

2.4.1 Contact Persons

All information disseminated to the public will continue to provide the names and contact information for Navy representatives who will respond to questions or concerns from members of the public. The Navy's primary designated contact is:

Mr. Derek J. Robinson
Navy BRAC Environmental Coordinator
Base Realignment and Closure Program Management Office West
1455 Frazee Road, Suite 900
San Diego, CA, 92108-4310
(619) 532-0951
derek.j.robinson1@navy.mil

In addition, contact information for representatives for EPA, DTSC, Water Board, and the city are provided in [Appendix E](#). Contact information for the regulatory agencies will also continue to be provided in material disseminated to the community.

2.4.2 Information Repositories

Two information repositories have been established to facilitate community access to key technical documents; one of them is large and includes a complete set of documents, and the other is smaller with only enough space for the most recently issued documents. The larger information repository is located on Alameda Point at the city offices (Building 1, Room 240 at 950 West Mall Street). It contains program-related documents, including technical reports, fact sheets, newsletters, RAB meeting minutes, the CIP, anything currently submitted for public review, and an annotated index. The smaller information repository is located at the Alameda Free Library, and contains only the most recently issued documents, including anything currently submitted for public review. The repositories will continue to be maintained and updated as new documents become available, and will be inspected monthly to make sure they are organized.

The Navy will evaluate requests for specific documents on an individual basis. For a copy of a specific document, contact Mr. Derek J. Robinson, Navy BRAC Environmental Coordinator, Base Realignment and Closure Program Management Office West, (619) 532-0951, derek.j.robinson1@navy.mil. The exact addresses and hours of operation for each information repository are provided in [Appendix F](#).

2.4.3 Restoration Advisory Board

The Alameda Point RAB was established in 1994 to increase public participation in the environmental restoration program and facilitate the exchange of information among the Navy, regulatory agencies, and the local community. The RAB is made up of local citizens and representatives of environmental organizations. The Navy understands and appreciates the importance of the RAB and will continue to support RAB efforts, as appropriate.

RAB Navy and Community Co-Chairs

The Navy and RAB have established RAB co-chairs to facilitate communication. Working in concert, these co-chairs provide a focal point for all RAB-related work. The RAB co-chairs are:

Mr. Derek Robinson
Navy BRAC Environmental Coordinator
Base Realignment and Closure Program
Management Office West
1455 Frazee Road, Suite 900
San Diego, CA, 92108-4310
(619) 532-0951
derek.j.robinson1@navy.mil

Ms. Dale Smith
RAB Community Co-Chair
(510) 841-2115
dale2smith@yahoo.com

RAB Meetings

The Navy will continue to sponsor monthly RAB meetings, open to the public, from 6:30 p.m. to 8:30 p.m. the first Thursday of almost each month (typically the RAB does not meet in July). The Navy also will continue to publish an agenda one week before the meeting and will work proactively to follow the agenda and end the meeting on time. The agenda will be mailed hard copy to those on the RAB mailing list, and emailed to the entire community email distribution list one week prior to the meeting. If you would like to be added to those lists, please contact the RAB Navy Co-Chair. The Navy will provide a variety of speakers who will present technical information in an easily understood manner. RAB meetings will typically include a status report on various site investigation and cleanup activities; a discussion of general and specific community interests and concerns; topics of special interest or timeliness; a community comment segment; and updates from RAB members, RAB focus groups, and the RAB co-chair.

Based on feedback from the interviews, the Navy will also work with a professional meeting facilitator to keep discussions focused on agenda topics and keep the meetings on schedule. Also based on feedback from the interviews, the Navy will work to greet newcomers to the meetings and have general information such as contacts available for them.

RAB Review of Technical Documents: The Navy will continue to encourage interested members to review and comment on technical documents. The Navy will also continue to support the technical document review focus groups when requested by the RAB. At the request of members of the RAB, the Navy will provide technical documents in electronic format rather than as hard copy. The Navy will consider and respond to all written comments received on draft documents from RAB members in the same time frame as agency comments per the Site Management Plan (SMP) schedule.

RAB Meeting Agenda: The Navy will continue to solicit future RAB meeting agenda items at each meeting. The Navy and community co-chairs will work together to finalize the agenda and the Navy will continue to distribute it at least seven days prior to the meeting via mail and the community email distribution list.

RAB Meeting Attendance: The Navy will continue to monitor RAB member attendance and respond to RAB member requests to increase membership, as needed. As stated in the Alameda Point RAB Rules of Operation ([Appendix J](#)), in Section D, page 4, RAB community members who miss four or more meetings in a calendar year may be removed from the RAB.

Additionally, the Navy will work to increase the attendance of the general public. Specific actions the Navy will take include posting announcements of upcoming RAB meetings in the Upcoming Events/Calendar section of the *Alameda Journal*; strategic placement of sandwich boards that announce the RAB meeting on the day the RAB meeting is held; posting RAB applications at the library bulletin board; and e-mailing the agenda to the electronic mailing list one week in advance of each meeting. The Navy will maintain a list of RAB meeting dates, times, and meeting locations on its website.

RAB Focus Groups: From time to time, the Alameda Point RAB has formed focus groups to concentrate on specific issues. The Navy will continue to support these efforts by providing technical information and administrative support, as necessary.

RAB Membership: At the RAB's request, the Navy will continue to support the RAB in attracting and retaining new members by providing information on the RAB in newsletters and fact sheets and by including RAB applications in the information repositories and on the Navy's website.

Provide RAB Members with Agenda and Minutes: The Navy will continue to provide each member of the RAB with the minutes from the previous month's RAB meeting and an agenda for the upcoming RAB meeting. These minutes and the agenda will be mailed to each member of the RAB. On request, the Navy will provide electronic copies via e-mail rather than hard copies.

RAB Tools and Materials: The Navy will provide RAB members with copies of graphics that depict the status of the environmental cleanup program, the contaminants of concern, and the timeline for future cleanup. The Navy will work with the RAB to prepare these concise graphics so that RAB members may share them with other members of the community.

2.4.4 Newsletters

The Navy will continue to prepare and distribute newsletters to meet the request of the majority of interviewees for regular progress reports. The newsletter will be developed to inform interested parties of the progress and status of the environmental cleanup program. The newsletter will be written in easily understood language and will use graphics to enhance comprehension. It will contain, at a minimum, the following information: information on the RAB and information repositories, contact information for the Navy and BCT, the address of

the Navy's website, a mailing coupon, and articles of special interest or timeliness. The Navy will include an overview of the cleanup process and progress to date, and make it clear that the Navy is still responsible for and conducting cleanup, as requested by interviewees.

The newsletter will be distributed by U.S. mail to all residents and businesses on Alameda Point who wish to receive it, and to all individuals on the Alameda Point community mailing list. The Navy will send the newsletter by e-mail to any individuals who request it and will also post the newsletter on the Navy's website.

2.4.5 Fact Sheets

The Navy will continue to develop and issue fact sheets to inform interested parties of site-specific actions. Topics for fact sheets will be identified and discussed with the BCT and the RAB. As was requested by the majority of interviewees, all project information distributed to the public will be easy to understand to someone without technical training, and to the greatest degree possible, will be supported by graphics to enhance comprehension. All fact sheets will include contact information for the Navy representative and BCT members. The fact sheets will be distributed on a project-specific basis by U.S. mail to all affected parties, and by e-mail for those who request it. Fact sheets will also be posted on the Navy's website.

2.4.6 Work Notices

The Navy will continue to prepare and distribute work notices in the site vicinity before any activity begins that could generate nuisances such as noise, dust, road closures, extra truck traffic, or prohibitions on parking. The notices will include as much information as is possible about the conditions residents and employees at nearby businesses can expect during investigation and remediation. The Navy will decide on the need for work notices on a project-by-project basis.

In addition, it was suggested in interviews that a sign be posted at project sites that describes the project and lists who the public can contact for more information. The Navy will post these signs for larger projects, as appropriate.

2.4.7 Informal Briefings

If requested, the Navy will prepare a presentation with an overview of the cleanup program and some frequently asked questions and give the presentation in person to interested organizations. These organizations could include the Chamber of Commerce, Rotary Club, the business associations, and other organizations with regular meetings. The Navy also will gauge public interest and concern during these briefings and adjust its presentation accordingly.

2.4.8 Media Outreach

In an effort to provide timely, accurate information to the media, the Navy will submit relevant summary information on environmental issues such as public notices, fact sheets, and press releases, to the local media, including the *Alameda Sun*, the *Alameda Journal*, and the

East Bay Express. Based on information gathered during the interviews, the Navy will add several writers of local weblogs (blogs), to the email distribution list to help them get information out to the community. Frequently listed blogs include *Blogging Bayport* (<http://laurendo.wordpress.com/>); *Action Alameda* (<http://www.actionalameda.org/>); *Stop Drop and Roll* (<http://johnknoxwhite.com/>); *woblog* (<http://www.drwob.com/weblog/>); and *The Island* (<http://www.theislandofalameda.com/>).

2.4.9 Coordination with the City of Alameda

Whenever possible and appropriate, the Navy will coordinate communication efforts with the City. The Navy will continue to post on the Navy's website a link to the City's website and will continue to provide documents and other materials to the city's representative and consultant on the RAB.

2.4.10 Public Notices

At a minimum, the Navy will continue to post public notices at all technical milestones in newspapers of general circulation, as required by current state and federal regulations. These notices will be in the form of display advertisements and will include the following information: (1) the name of the document that is available for public comment, (2) the location of the information repository where the document is available for public review, (3) a summary of the proposed technical event that is triggering the public notice, (4) the beginning and end dates of the public comment period, (5) the time and date of the public meeting if one is being held, (6) the name of a contact person, and (7) and any other information the Navy believes is necessary and appropriate. Because interviewees noted they had not seen these public notices, the Navy will also e-mail a copy of the notices to its electronic mailing list and post the notices on its website.

2.4.11 Public Meetings

At a minimum, the Navy will continue to hold public meetings at all technical milestones, as required by current state and federal regulations. These meetings will be held in the evening and will include a presentation about the specific technical event that triggered the meeting and a formal period to receive comments from the public. The RAB will receive advanced notice of these meetings. Public meetings will be advertised in local newspapers, and via e-mail. The Navy will evaluate the location of public meetings, and will hold them at a location convenient for community members, as identified in the interviews for this CIP.

2.4.12 Public Comment Periods

Public comment periods are a legal requirement of the remedial action process and the removal action process, and must be open for at least 30 days. These review periods will be announced in local newspapers, and via e-mail to the e-mail distribution list. Public comment periods are required for the Proposed Plan for a remedial action; for the engineering evaluation/cost analysis for a non-time critical removal action (planning period is six months or more); and for the administrative record established during a time-critical removal action (planning period is

less than six months). The Navy will continue to provide public comment periods for all technical documents that are produced about environmental cleanup, as required by current state and federal regulations. Public comment periods are a legal requirement of the remedial action process, and sometimes the removal action process, and must be open for at least 30 days. These review periods will be announced in local newspapers, and via e-mail to the e-mail distribution list. See [Table 2-1](#) for community involvement activities during the remedial action process, and [Table 2-2](#) for community involvement activities during the removal action process.

2.4.13 Responsiveness Summary

At the close of each public comment period, the Navy will continue to prepare a responsiveness summary. The responsiveness summary will summarize the public concerns raised during the comment period and describe how the Navy plans to respond to each concern. The responsiveness summary will become part of the final decision document and will be available in the information repository after it has been finalized.

2.4.14 Mailing List

The Navy will continue to maintain a mailing list that has been specifically compiled for the IR Program at Alameda Point. This list contains the names and addresses of more than 800 individuals, as highlighted below:

- All occupied residential units and businesses on Alameda Point
- Members of the RAB
- Interview participants
- Business, environmental, and community groups
- City, county, and state elected officials
- Representatives of involved agencies

The list will be used to provide a hard copy of newsletters, fact sheets, and other information on the IR Program. The mailing list will be updated annually, whenever individuals request to be added or removed from the list, and when RAB or agency personnel change. An abbreviated version of the mailing list is provided in [Appendix H](#).

Additionally, the Navy will compile and maintain an electronic mailing list. Based on information gathered during the interviews, the Navy will attempt to distribute more items via e-mail, including RAB meeting minutes and agendas, newsletters, and fact sheets. The electronic list will be updated each time information is sent out. Those who prefer hard copies will continue to receive them.

2.4.15 Internet

The Navy will continue to update and maintain its current website, which is located at www.bracpmo.navy.mil. This website has been designed to provide the public with information on the IR Program at Alameda Point. The website contains electronic copies of all newsletters and fact sheets, a month-by-month compilation of all RAB meeting minutes and agendas, and a photograph gallery. Specifically, the Navy will keep the website updated with current information, including a map with current IR site boundaries as requested during interviews.

2.4.16 Community Meetings

The Navy will conduct community meetings as site-specific activities and RAB or community interest dictates. Information at the meetings will be developed to improve the community's understanding of the "big picture" of cleanup, and to answer frequently asked questions, clarify any miscommunications, and explain technical issues. The Navy will contact local organizations, as identified during the interviews, and offer to give a presentation at their meetings annually. For Navy-hosted meetings, the Navy will hold public meetings in location(s) that are convenient and accessible to the community; several interviewees suggested locations in downtown or mid-town may be more convenient for community meetings.

2.4.17 Site Tours

The Navy will continue to sponsor site tours to provide RAB members and the public with an opportunity to see the environmental cleanup process up close, as safety allows. The Navy is sensitive to community desire to see the environmental work up close and will attempt to provide site tours in response. The Navy will take tour attendees only to areas where it is safe to disembark the vehicle.

2.4.18 Language Interpretation Needs and Translation of Key Documents

The Navy recognizes that the city supports a diverse population. Based on reasonable requests, the Navy will provide fact sheets translated from English into various languages for community organizations that represent minority populations. Decisions on language translation will be made on a project-by-project basis.

2.4.19 Administrative Record

The Navy maintains an administrative record for Alameda Point that is located in the Environmental Technical Library (ETL) at Naval Facilities Engineering Command, Southwest, in San Diego, California. The administrative record is a legal requirement and contains all information that has been or will be used to make cleanup decisions. The documents are available for public review and include comments by the public and regulatory agencies, as well as Navy responses. The telephone number, address, hours of operation, and points of contact for the Environmental Technical Library are provided in [Appendix I](#).

2.4.20 Revise the Community Involvement Plan

The CIP may be revised at any time, if it is concluded that community concerns or public participation needs have changed significantly since the last version of the plan was written.

2.4.21 Technical Assistance for Public Participation Grant Program

The Navy will support all future efforts on behalf of the Alameda Point RAB to effectively implement activities in support of the Technical Assistance for Public Participation (TAPP) program. The TAPP grants are available through a DoD program that provides technical assistance to members of the RAB to help them understand and provide input into environmental restoration programs. The Navy administers the TAPP grant acquisition process at Alameda Point, which includes preparing a statement of work and procuring technical assistance.

2.5 IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDULE

The Navy will continue to implement public involvement activities throughout the IR Program, as appropriate and required by law. All required activities will be carried out in accordance with the Navy's Site Management Plan, which contains a schedule. The most current version of the Site Management Plan can be found at the information repository. In addition, at every RAB meeting, the Navy provides a handout of upcoming documents that will be out for review. To receive a copy of that list, contact the Navy RAB Co-Chair. The Navy will make every effort to inform and involve the community given the level of interest in the IR Program and fiscal and budgetary constraints.

3.0 COMMUNITY INTERVIEWS

This section provides a summary of the information collected during the interviews.

3.1 COMMUNITY REPRESENTATIVES

Interviews with various members of the Alameda community were conducted to assess the level of knowledge and interest related to environmental activities at Alameda Point. Interviewees were selected based on input from the EPA, DTSC, Water Board, and RAB, as well as from suggestions from other interviewees. Twenty-two individuals were interviewed in 21 separate interviews. Representatives from the Navy, EPA, DTSC, the Water Board, and the Navy's consultant, ChaduxTt, conducted community interviews collaboratively in April 2009. The following groups were represented in the interviews:

- Residents of Alameda
- Local businesses and business organizations
- Community service organizations
- Representatives of the local school district
- Representatives of environmental organizations
- Activists and other interested parties
- City and county officials
- Representative for congressional member
- RAB members
- Media

Community interviews were conducted in compliance with federal and public participation requirements and guidelines, as outlined in [Appendix A](#). A questionnaire for use at each interview was developed in conjunction with the BCT. [Appendix C](#) contains the questionnaire used for the interviews, including a summary of the responses.

The interviewees have lived or worked in the area for an average of about 13 years. Four of them reported 5 years or less, eight reported 6 to 10 years, three reported 11 to 15 years, and seven reported 16 or more years. A full list of the organizations represented by the interviewees is provided in [Appendix C](#); individual names have been kept private.

3.2 INTERVIEW TOPICS AND RESULTS

The Navy prepared the interview questions and list of interviewees with input from the regulatory agencies and the RAB. Interview questions were provided under eight general topic areas, including: Familiarity with Navy Installation Restoration Program at Alameda Point; Concerns; Involvement; Restoration Advisory Board; Communication Needs; Information Repositories; Media Coverage and Usage; and Other Comments and Concerns. The following

summaries of responses from the interviewees are presented according to each of these topic areas. Not all interviewees answered every question; therefore, the number of people responding is different for each question. A summary of responses to interview questions, selected quotes from interviewees, and a listing of the organizations the various interviewees represent are provided in [Appendix C](#). All interviews were conducted face-to-face with a Navy representative, a consultant, and typically at least one representative from the regulatory agencies. Interviewees were encouraged to ask questions and share their concerns in addition to answering the prepared questionnaire, resulting in an open dialogue during the interviews. All interviewees were provided with a list of contact information for the Navy and other BCT members, as well as websites where they could learn more about topics unrelated to the Navy's cleanup, such as redevelopment.

3.2.1 Familiarity with Navy Installation Restoration Program at Alameda Point

The majority of interviewees (21 of 22) stated that they had some awareness of contamination at Alameda Point. Some were aware of specific contaminants or IR sites. However, many interviewees had a general idea that there are environmental issues, but did not have specific information. The majority of those who had information about the environmental issues had obtained it from the Navy personnel, meetings, or documents (11); from the media (10), or from word of mouth (six).

Nineteen of 22 interviewees stated they know the Navy has an active cleanup program underway at Alameda Point. When asked to assess how much they know about the cleanup program, most felt they knew a little bit (seven) or a moderate amount (seven), while five people felt they knew a lot about the cleanup program. Some of the comments from those who know about the Navy's cleanup program include:

- “I think the Navy should be out of here by now. Cleanup isn't their business or expertise; it's not what the Department of Defense does in general. The Department of the Interior should be the one transferring the land. Places should be used for like use, which is the case in most other bases where there is reuse.”
- “I know the city and county are taking control, and the Navy is still involved somewhat, but I'm not sure to what extent.”
- “I see them take dirt from one area near my business and move it to another. They're always wearing Hazmat suits and carrying Geiger counters.”
- “I would like to know more.”

3.2.2 Concerns

Nineteen of 22 interviewees stated they have concerns or interests about the environmental cleanup at Alameda Point. The most frequently mentioned areas of interest or concern were the level of cleanup and controls or restrictions that might be put in place (14); followed by human health and safety during the current work and in the future (11); specific plans for reuse (10); and a desire to have more information or a better understanding about the cleanup (six). Also of

interest or concern are current or future financial impacts, the Navy being responsible for any contamination found after transfer, the schedule for cleanup, environmental justice, and protection of ecological receptors. Some comments include:

- “How far are you digging for cleanup? I hear it’s 2 feet, but if someone were to put even a post in the ground they would go deeper than 2 feet, so is that really getting it clean?”
- “I want it cleaned up. My concern or interest would be wanting to know if anything not cleaned up could affect our business or anyone’s health.”
- “I’m concerned when the Navy says plumes do not go under buildings. Sampling and cleanup under buildings does not happen. They sample near the building but not under it. I know it’s cheaper not to sample under a building, and that’s why they don’t do it.”
- “Background levels concern me, especially for Site 25. The Navy is using them to say they are not responsible to clean something up if it was there before them.”
- “Transfer of land between the Navy and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. I heard that maybe the Navy wants to transfer land to the Veteran’s Administration instead because the cleanup standards would be lower for them.”
- “More interests than concerns. I don’t have concerns about how the Navy is doing the cleanup. I understand the process and the many steps that must be done. But most people don’t understand. The Navy needs to educate them. They think nothing is happening. People say to me every day they think nothing is happening.”
- “There is a lot of negative information and misinformation going around about the cleanup, and it should be corrected. My main interests are: the misinformation that is going around, and I want the base cleaned up to a level that makes it economically feasible to develop it.”

3.2.3 Involvement

Thirteen of 22 interviewees stated they are aware of the Navy’s community involvement program, primarily because of the RAB. Nine of the 22 interviewees stated they had been directly involved in cleanup at Alameda Point by attending the RAB meetings or public meetings, reviewing and commenting on documents, or visiting the site.

All of the interviewees were from categories such as elected officials, business associations, residents and commercial tenants, media, RAB members, emergency or health services, environmental groups, and various other interested parties. In addition, interviewees represent or are affiliated with other groups, including transportation planning, family services, chambers of commerce, and activist groups.

Thirteen interviewees stated they had been in contact with Navy, local, state, or other officials regarding environmental cleanup. They indicated that the contact was through their job, through the RAB meetings, or contacting the Navy or other members of the BCT with specific questions. In general, these interviewees felt they had received a good response from the persons they contacted. It was indicated that knowing specifically who to contact at an agency is more helpful than simply calling and asking for anyone. Some people also noted they had questions or inquiries that still needed follow up from the Navy.

Interviewees were asked if they have confidence in the Navy's ability to adequately clean up Alameda Point with oversight from the regulatory agencies. Ten said yes, four said no, two said somewhat, and six either said they do not know or had no response. For those who said they have confidence, they cited understanding the process and comfort with regulatory oversight as primary reasons. For those who said they did not have confidence, they cited being unsure that the cleanup will be adequate, reservations about funding, and gave an example of inadequate cleanup at an unrelated military installation that caused health issues. For those who were unsure, they stated they would need more information, they are concerned about funding or cleanup standards, but that regulatory oversight makes them feel more comfortable.

When asked how the Navy might gain confidence, several people stated the Navy would have to clean up to residential levels. They also stated people should be given more and easier access to information about the cleanup, and specifically about the regulatory oversight. It was also stated that presenting a plan and schedule for cleanup would make people feel more confident. One person said, "A 1-page flier on the process and the organizations involved would make me have more confidence."

3.2.4 Restoration Advisory Board

Interviewees (who are not current RAB members) were asked about their familiarity and interest with the RAB. Thirteen of 20 had heard of the RAB, many through work or from current RAB members. Only seven had ever attended; of those, five stated the meetings were informative. Suggestions for improving the RAB meetings included dealing with the technical information by somehow helping people digest it, providing a "cheat sheet" for new attendees, and pushing technical discussions to a separate subcommittee meeting to keep the meetings less technical. Other suggestions were providing a microphone or other sound enhancement so everyone in the audience can hear and posting the meetings as webcasts so those who cannot attend can watch them anytime. Six people said they would be willing to receive some more information on possibly becoming a RAB member.

Two current RAB members were also asked some questions about the RAB. When asked who they represent with their RAB membership, one member represents a local housing activist group and another is an immediate base neighbor. They provide updates on the Navy's cleanup program by talking to various people and at the activist group meetings. Both RAB members stated they like the presentations given at the RAB meetings. One person stated an appreciation for the input from the regulatory agency representatives, and would like more of it.

When asked for suggestions to improve meetings, their comments were:

- “Getting some new people involved, like technical people who live in the community, and concerned citizens.”
- “You should ask if anyone new is attending at the beginning of the meeting, and make them feel welcome, give them an overview of the people who are there, and let them know there will be a comment period. You should also have the presentations for the next month decided earlier and advertise them ahead.”
- “We used to have more people on the RAB, but the process is taking so long that people have stopped coming; there is only so much time one can dedicate to the RAB.”
- “I sometimes feel my questions are not answered or my concerns are belittled when I’m asking about sampling. People don’t always get back to me after the meeting when they say they will get me more information.”
- “A demand for civility, though I’m not sure who should make that demand.”

3.2.5 Communication Needs

Several questions were asked to gather information about the communication needs of the community. Although some people felt they already receive enough information, 17 people said they would like more information. The most frequent request was for general information, including an overview or the “big picture” for cleanup, followed by a timeline and status for cleanup. Interviewees also asked for a good map that shows current sites with landmarks that people not familiar with the IR program will understand. One person asked for an overlay of a map with the IR sites against the city’s planned reuse. Some people requested information about specific sites or areas or specific cleanup programs. Some people requested information about the Navy’s cleanup accomplishments and about the actual process, commenting “What do you actually do when you have toxic soil?” Interviewees also asked for work notices for anything that would affect traffic, opinions from the regulators on the cleanup, and health information.

When asked how the Navy might improve their communication efforts, many people suggested various electronic communications, including:

- Updating and improving the Navy’s website, including adding more information, making it key-word searchable, making it come up as a primary result on search engines, and providing better maps where the user can zoom and pan
- Creating a list serve so people can subscribe to get automatic e-mail updates when the website is updated

- Sending e-mail updates, and having contacts forward those e-mails to their own distribution lists (such as business association, churches, and offices where one person is on the Navy's e-mail list and forwards the e-mail from the Navy as part of other regular communication)
- Providing information to bloggers (people who write Internet or web logs) who focus on Alameda
- Creating a "wiki" (a collaborative website allowing multiple users to input or edit content) which the Navy would monitor to correct any misinformation.

In addition, people also suggested posting fliers with information or to announce meetings or site tours on bulletin boards at the library, coffee houses, churches, and other gathering places. Holding community meetings in locations not on Alameda Point was also suggested, as was making presentations at other, regularly scheduled community organization meetings. Providing updates to the media (bloggers as well as newspapers and other media) was also suggested. It was also suggested that the Navy provide graphics to the RAB, so the RAB members can use those graphics to communicate with the larger community. It was also suggested that the Navy help the RAB increase their membership.

It was suggested that the Navy provide information to dispel the common misperception that work is not progressing; also, the Navy should explain how contamination occurred, and also explain the actual and potential uses of local groundwater.

Some comments included:

- "If people don't know what's happening, they will automatically assume whatever is happening is negative or bad."
- "When you provide information, make it concise."
- "It's a good message to hear that the Navy takes the cleanup seriously, but we also want to know that it won't take 100 years."

Five interviewees stated the Navy's communication efforts might not be reaching some segments of the community, while seven said no one was being missed, and 10 said they did not know. In general, interviewees stated there are people who are not interested and the Navy cannot reach those people. It was suggested the Navy try to reach the people who are most interested. It was further suggested the Navy provide more information to the media to reach a larger audience and have a greater presence in the community such as by attending events and city meetings.

Seven interviewees stated they know of language translation needs in the community, primarily Spanish, Chinese dialects, and possibly Tagalog. Many of the public agencies and groups interviewed stated they do some minor translation of materials on a case-by-case basis. It was suggested that the Navy work with the Alameda Multi-Cultural center and the mayor's office to identify translation needs and methods.

The interviewees were presented with a list of communication methods and asked to identify the best methods for providing them with information. From the list, the majority identified the best methods as site tours, fact sheets or newsletters, and sending e-mails or posting information on a website. Another suggestion for providing information involved attending community events and festivals with a professional-looking booth to encourage people to talk to the Navy, obtain information, and sign up for meetings or tours. Events where the Navy might host a booth included: the Webster Street Jam; the Pacific Coast Farmer's Market; the Walk Alameda annual Alameda Point Walk; and the Fourth of July Fair. It was also suggested that RAB members staff the booth with the Navy.

3.2.6 Information Repositories

Half of the interviewees were aware of the information repositories, while only six of 22 had visited either one. The majority felt the repositories are in convenient locations, while many suggested that posting all of the information on line so people can search from home would be preferable. Some people noted confusion about finding documents or finding the room itself at the West Mall Square (City Hall West) location. Interviewees did not realize it is not staffed, and many said the room contains an overwhelming number of documents. Some stated the documents are too technical for the average person and sending them to the repositories is not the best method to communicate this information.

3.2.7 Media Coverage and Usage

The majority of interviewees (17 of 22) had seen media coverage of environmental activities at Alameda Point. Only seven had seen any of the public notices the Navy publishes in the newspaper to advertise RAB or other public meetings. The most frequently identified source of local information was the local newspapers (hard copy and on line), followed by word of mouth and the Internet. Sixteen interviewees receive the *Alameda Sun* newspaper regularly, 15 receive the *Alameda Journal*, four read numerous publications on line, three take the *East Bay Express*, and the *Alameda Times Star*, *Oakland Tribune*, and *West County Times* were each mentioned once.

Numerous websites were mentioned as news sources. The most popular is a subscription to Google Alerts, which allows one to type in key words to receive daily e-mails with any news items that contain the key words. Several local blogs were mentioned as popular news sources, which is a change from the last time this CIP was updated.

3.2.8 Other Comments and Concerns

The interviews ended with an open solicitation for additional comments, recommendations, and concerns. Responses varied greatly, ranging from questions about specific sites or contamination, to questions about comments interviewees had heard in the media or by word of mouth. See Appendix C for full comments.

Some summary comments include:

- “I assume the Navy is interested in quickly completing its cleanup of Alameda Point as much as many people in Alameda are. I don’t know if the Navy is interested in having the air station reuse of some value to the community, but I think it would be to the Navy’s benefit if it is. There is so much controversy based on misinformation that I think it is important that the cleanup be presented in a form the community can understand. I ask that the Navy provide this information.”
- “I have questions about the letter the Navy recently sent to the city about SunCal, the developer. People are worried the Navy will auction off the land if a deal with the developer falls through. Also, people want to know why the Navy is charging Alameda to buy back land that is contaminated.”

4.0 COMMUNITY BACKGROUND

This section provides information about the community of the City of Alameda, including the history of Alameda Point, a current site description, and a description of the community.

4.1 FORMER BASE AND BACKGROUND

Alameda Point occupies 2,675 acres, including 1,100 acres off shore, at the western end of Alameda Island. About 1,600 acres are onshore land, and 1,100 acres are submerged tidelands. Originally a peninsula, Alameda Island was detached from the mainland in 1876 when a channel was cut to link San Leandro Bay with San Francisco Bay. The northern portion of Alameda Island was formerly tidal areas, marshlands, and sloughs adjacent to the historical San Antonio Channel, now known as the Oakland Inner Harbor. The U.S. Army acquired the property from the city in 1930 and began construction in 1931. In 1936, the Navy acquired title to the land from the Army and began building the air station in response to the military buildup in Europe before World War II. Construction of the base included several iterations of filling existing tidelands, marshlands, and sloughs with bay sediments. NAS Alameda was commissioned on November 1, 1940, and was turned over to a staff of 200 Navy personnel and civilians.

From the 1940s through the 1970s, standard activities associated with metal plating and paint stripping, aircraft repair, fueling and engine testing, vehicle service stations, pest control, fire response training, and disposal of various substances in two landfills caused environmental contamination.

NAS Alameda was identified for closure under the BRAC Program in 1993 and ceased operation in April 1997. In 1999, Alameda Point was added to the federal facilities Superfund list. The Alameda Point RAB was established in 1994 to review and comment on technical documents and activities associated with the investigation and cleanup efforts. The RAB consists of community members and representatives from the Navy, the regulatory agencies, and the city.

Alameda Point is bounded by Oakland Inner Harbor to the north, Main Street to the east, and the San Francisco Bay to the south and west. The former base includes a major airfield; a deepwater port; aircraft and ship maintenance facilities; 1,500 units of family and barracks-type housing; and industrial, retail, warehouse, and recreational facilities.

4.2 CURRENT SITE DESCRIPTION AND CONTAMINANTS OF CONCERN

In accordance with current federal law, the Navy must thoroughly evaluate and remediate any hazardous waste found on Alameda Point before the property can be transferred. The Navy has identified 34 sites grouped into 10 operable units (OU) with potentially contaminated soil, groundwater, or sediment from CERCLA hazardous substances. These sites are in varying stages of investigation and cleanup. Short descriptions and status updates for each of the 34 sites are provided in [Section 6.0](#) of this plan.

Although chemical contamination and levels that result from past Naval activities vary from site to site, chemical contaminants at a site may include the following:

- Compounds in industrial solvents,
- Byproducts of burning known as polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs),
- Fluids known as polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs) that were used as coolants in electrical equipment,
- Chlorinated hydrocarbons (CHCs),
- Volatile organic compounds (VOCs),
- Semivolatile organic compounds (SVOCs),
- Radionuclides,
- Pesticides,
- Material potentially presenting an explosive hazard (MPPEH),
- Various metals, and
- Gasoline, diesel, and motor oil.

4.3 LAND REUSE AND TRANSFER

In 1997, NAS Alameda was closed as an active military installation as part of the Base Realignment and Closure, under Public Law 101-510. In April 1994, the City and County of Alameda signed a Joint Powers Agreement and established the Alameda Reuse and Redevelopment Authority (ARRA). ARRA issued the NAS Alameda Community Reuse Plan in 1996 and amended it in 1997. The Reuse Plan was prepared with extensive citizen input solicited by the Base Reuse Advisory Group (BRAG), later known as the Alameda Point Advisory Committee (APAC). The ARRA has established a website providing redevelopment information at <http://www.alameda-point.com/index.html>. The city has selected a master developer, SunCal developers. SunCal maintains a website with development information at <http://www.alamedapointcommunity.com>.

The Navy and ARRA executed an Economic Development Conveyance Memorandum of Agreement (EDC MOA) in 2000. A Lease in Furtherance of Conveyance (LIFO) between the Navy and the ARRA provides the City of Alameda with an interest in the property allowing for subleases and property and infrastructure maintenance. This LIFO will remain in place until the Navy transfers the property by deed to the city. Additional parcels not subject to the EDC that are scheduled for conveyance include the western runways and surrounding area to the Veterans Administration via federal-to-federal transfer and a public benefit conveyance to the Department of Education for ultimate use by Alameda Unified School District (AUSD). Portions of NAS Alameda east of Main Street, known as North Housing, is currently subject to additional surplus screening and reuse planning as this parcel was previously identified for federal uses.

The Navy intends to convey the before mentioned parcels after environmental remediation is complete and a Finding of Suitability to Transfer (FOST) has been executed. Several transfers of the installation have already occurred. This includes the conveyance of 73 acres of property, known as East Housing, to the ARRA in 2000; conveyance of the former Marina Village Housing area (28 acres) to the U.S. Coast Guard in 2008; and assignment of 44 acres via a Public Benefit Conveyance Parcel-1 (PBC-1) to the Department of Interior for a park in 2009.

4.4 DESCRIPTION OF COMMUNITY

4.4.1 Profile of City of Alameda

Alameda occupies 12.4 square miles and is located at the geographic center of the San Francisco Bay Area. It consists of a main island just off shore from Oakland and directly across the bay from San Francisco, plus the tip of a peninsula attached to the mainland near Oakland Airport and Coast Guard Island. Alameda is accessed by four bridges, two tunnels, and two ferry terminals. Alameda has an open, approachable shoreline with 6 miles of sandy beaches. Alameda also supports marinas, first-class restaurants, two golf courses, numerous parks, a hospital, and several shopping centers.

Alameda is a charter city founded in 1872 with a city manager form of government. Five council members, including the mayor, direct the city manager’s activities. Alameda has established the Community Improvement Commission (CIC) of the City of Alameda, which acts as the city’s redevelopment agency. The members of the City Council serve as the commission members. In 1998, Alameda Point was designated a redevelopment project area. In accordance with federal base closure procedures, ARRA was established as the reuse authority for NAS Alameda, responsible for planning and reuse. The City Council serves as a member of the ARRA board, and the city manager serves as executive director of both the CIC and ARRA.

4.4.2 Community Profile of Alameda Point

The current population of the City of Alameda is estimated at 71,324. The ethnic breakdown for this population is presented below ([Nielsen Claritas 2009](#))

Caucasian Alone	Asian Alone	African American Alone	Alaskan/ American Indian Alone	Hawaiian Native/ Pacific Islander	One Other Race	Two or More Races	Hispanic or Latino
50 %	31.6%	6.8 %	0.7 %	0.7%	3.3%	6.8 %	9.4%

The median age is approximately 42. Almost 15 percent of the population over age 25 has earned a masters, professional, or doctorate degree, and 27 percent have earned a bachelor’s degree. Twenty-seven percent are employed in professional and related occupations; 26 percent in sales and office professions, and 21 percent in management, business, or financial operations. The average household income is \$91,717 per year.

There are residents living on Alameda Point property. The Alameda Point Collaborative (APC) leases 239 affordable housing units for formerly homeless clients. There are about 500 residents in APC housing. APC also provides job training, health services, and employment. APC operates a community garden, bike shop, commercial plant nursery, health center, and community center. ([Alameda Point Collaborative 2009](#)) From 1995 to 2005, USCG maintained residential units in the North Housing Parcel. In spring 2005, after the last update of this CIP, the USGS vacated the North Housing Parcel. However, in March 2008, the Navy conveyed the former Marina Village Housing area to the United States Coast Guard. In addition, a number of businesses lease space and operate on Alameda Point.

4.4.3 Educational Demographics

The Alameda Unified School District (AUSD) operates 10 elementary schools, three middle schools, and three high schools. In addition, there is the Alameda Community Learning Center, the Alameda Science & Technology Institute, and one adult school. AUSD enrollment for the 2008 and 2009 school year was 10,272. The ethnic breakdown for the school district is as follows:

Asian	White (not Hispanic)	African American	Hispanic or Latino	Filipino	Pacific Islander	One or More or No Response	American Indian or Alaska Native
32.6	30.7	12.1	11.8	9.1	1.5	1.4	.7

Note:

([California Department of Education Dataquest website 2009](#))

The AUSD assists students who are not native English speakers develop proficiency in speaking, understanding, reading, and writing English. This service is provided to more than 2,332 English language learners in the school district. ([AUSD website 2009](#))

In addition, Alameda has a program called Alternatives in Action (AIA). Since the last update to the CIP, AIA has moved off of Alameda Point to the nearby Woodstock education center. AIA sponsors an after-school and summer program for youth ages 12 to 19, a public charter high school for 110 students, and a licensed preschool for more than 20 families with children 2 to 5 years old ([Alternatives in Action website 2009](#))

5.0 REGULATORY BACKGROUND AND REQUIREMENTS

Past hazardous waste disposal methods at naval facilities such as Alameda Point have resulted in unexpected, long-term problems through the release of pollutants into soil, sediments, and groundwater. The regulatory framework for addressing these problems is discussed in this section.

5.1 BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE PROGRAM

The former NAS Alameda (now known as Alameda Point) was identified for closure under the BRAC Program in 1993 and ceased operation in April 1997. In July 1999, Alameda Point was added to the federal facilities Superfund list. The majority of Alameda Point is currently slated for transfer to the city in accordance with the BRAC Program.

5.2 REGULATIONS

DoD is required to comply with both federal and state regulations when it conducts the cleanup at its facilities. Below are listed the primary regulations that drive cleanup at Alameda Point.

5.2.1 CERCLA and SARA

In response to environmental problems that resulted from past hazardous waste disposal methods, Congress directed EPA to develop a program to manage and control past disposal sites. This program is outlined in CERCLA (1980), as amended by the Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act (SARA) (1986), and is commonly known as Superfund. These laws established a series of programs for cleanup of hazardous waste disposal and spill sites nationwide. Investigations and remedial response actions are required to be carried out in accordance with CERCLA, the NCP, and applicable state law.

5.2.2 State Health and Safety Code, Title 22, and Public Resources Code

The state Superfund law (Chapter 6.8 of Division 20 of the Health and Safety Code) was originally enacted in 1981, and DTSC is the state agency that is responsible for ensuring that public health and the environment are protected from harmful effects of releases and threatened releases of hazardous substances. On January 1, 1999, key provisions of the state Superfund law expired. Senate Bill 47 (Chapter 23, Stats. 1999) reenacted Chapter 6.8 with significant changes and made it retroactive to January 1, 1999. Title 22 of the California Code of Regulations, Division 4.5, addresses the Environmental Health Standards for the Management of Hazardous Waste. These codes define hazardous waste and how it should be handled, stored, transferred, treated, and disposed of in the State of California. These codes also cover the selection and ranking criteria for hazardous waste sites that require remedial action, hazardous waste environmental technology certification program, and corrective actions. The Public Resources Code, Division 34, addresses environmental protection, specifically covering permit assistance centers and environmental management systems.

5.3 INSTALLATION RESTORATION PROGRAM

DoD developed the IR Program in 1981 to comply with CERCLA and other federal and state requirements. The IR Program is specific to military facilities; its purpose is twofold: (1) to identify, investigate, and clean up or control releases of hazardous substances, and (2) to reduce the risk to human health and the environment in a cost-effective manner. CERCLA requires that a remedial action or removal action process be selected specifically for each site affected by CERCLA hazardous substances. (For a definition of CERCLA hazardous substances, see <http://www.epa.gov/oem/content/hazsubs/cercsubs.htm>). The site-specific process is selected by evaluating the advantages and disadvantages of each alternative and then selecting the one that best protects human health and the environment in a cost-effective manner. Discussed below are the steps of the CERCLA process for the environmental cleanup of Alameda Point, including associated community involvement activities.

5.3.1 Remedial Action Process

The CERCLA remedial action process is selected for most sites affected by CERCLA hazardous substances, because the federal law provides the most stringent regulatory requirements. In addition, similar steps in the CERCLA process can be used to meet the requirements of the State of California's remedial action process. The CERCLA process specifies the steps to thoroughly evaluate the nature and extent of contamination and to identify and evaluate cleanup alternatives. [Table 2-1](#) provides an overview of the community involvement activities that typically take place during the CERCLA remedial action process. A brief outline of each step in CERCLA follows:

- **Discovery and Notification** – Discovery and notification is the process by which a release of CERCLA hazardous substances is identified and appropriate regulatory agencies are notified. When Alameda Point was an active naval base, the installation Commanding Officer was responsible for notifying EPA and state regulatory agencies of the release of hazardous substances.
- **Preliminary Assessment (PA)** – The purpose of a PA is to (1) eliminate sites that do not pose a threat to human health or the environment from further consideration, (2) determine if there is a potential need for removal action, (3) set priorities for site inspections, and (4) gather information for the Hazard Ranking System (used to determine site eligibility for the NPL) evaluation. The PA is completed primarily through record searches and visual inspections of the area, although sampling may be appropriate if can avoid the need for a Site Inspection (SI). An SI is needed if the PA finds the release poses a threat to human health or the environment.
- **Site Inspection (SI)** – The SI is an on-site investigation intended to gather more information needed to determine if there is a release or potential release, to characterize the nature of the release, and evaluate the threats or potential threats to human health and the environment. The SI usually involves preliminary sampling and analysis of soil, surface water, or groundwater, or any combination of the three. Based on the data that result, the site will be: (1) slated for no action, (2) recommended for a removal action, or (3) investigated further.

- **Remedial Investigation (RI)** – The RI involves a comprehensive study of site soils, surface water, and groundwater to evaluate the lateral and vertical extent of contamination. The goals of the RI are to determine the nature and extent of chemicals of concern and potential threat to human health and the environment; and provide a basis for determining whether or what types of response actions are required. Based on the estimated risk posed, the site could be: (1) recommended for a removal action, (2) recommended for no action, or (3) recommended for an FS.
- **Feasibility Study (FS)** – The FS incorporates data collected during the RI to develop and evaluate cleanup alternatives. Cleanup alternatives are evaluated based on the nine criteria in the National Contingency Plan. Those are: (1) protection of human health and the environment, (2) compliance with applicable or relevant and appropriate requirements, (3) long-term effectiveness, (4) reduction of toxicity, mobility, or volume through treatment as a principal element, (5) short-term effectiveness, (6) implementability, (7) cost, (8) state acceptance, and (9) community acceptance.
- **Proposed Plan (PP)** – The PP is a fact sheet that is developed for the public in order to describe cleanup alternatives and cleanup goals, and explain why the preferred remedy was identified. This is a key milestone for members of the public to provide written and oral comments (on record at a public meeting) on the PP. The Navy considers all comments received on the PP before a final decision is made. Responses to all comments are in the responsiveness summary, which is included as an appendix to the ROD.
- **Record of Decision (ROD)** – The selected remedy is documented in a legal decision document called the Record of Decision. All those who sign the Federal Facilities Agreement (FFA), sign the ROD. The ROD contains a responsiveness summary for public comments received on the PP. After the ROD is finalized, a public notice announcing the signing of the ROD is published.
- **Remedial Design (RD)** – The design for the selected remedy is prepared and a fact sheet is distributed before the Navy begins a remedial action (or cleanup). The need for updating the CIP will also be assessed at this time.
- **Remedial Action (RA)** – The selected remedy is implemented and the public is kept informed during the RA. At a minimum, a Navy point of contact will be named for the community who can be contacted to ask questions or raise concerns.
 - Remedial Action Construction: During this period, construction occurs to implement the remedy. If the remedy is accomplished by actions taken during remedial action construction, remedial action operation (see next bullet) is not needed and does not occur. The end date for remedial action construction signifies that construction is complete, all testing has been accomplished, and the remedy will function properly. At the end of remedial action construction, the Navy considers the status of the cleanup to be “Remedy in Place.”

- **Remedial Action Operation:** The time needed to operate the installed equipment after remedial action construction is complete is called remedial action operation. At this stage, equipment is operating, or chemical or biological processes are under way to achieve the cleanup objective identified in the ROD. Remedial action operation includes continuing actions, such as groundwater treatment or soil venting, that require time to reduce contaminants to cleanup standards agreed to in the ROD. Many remedial technologies require operation and maintenance (O&M) of electromechanical components after the remedial action equipment has been installed. O&M of equipment is an ongoing process and will last until the remedial project is complete.
- **Post-Project Activities** – Post-project activities include long-term monitoring. Long-term monitoring occurs at sites where hazardous substances remain after the RA has been completed. Long-term monitoring is also used to confirm that site remediation continues to be effective. The Navy and regulatory agencies will review the long-term monitoring records every 5 years to ensure that human health and the environment are protected.
- **Site Closeout (SC)** – SC occurs when all necessary remedial action activities are complete and the Navy and regulatory agencies agree that remedial goals have been met, and that No Further Action (NFA) is warranted at the site.

5.3.2 Removal Action Process

In some cases, the Navy and regulatory agencies may conduct a removal action at a site. These actions are carried out in accordance with federal and state requirements. Any one of the following criteria must be met to implement a removal action: human or environmental health is threatened; the source of the contamination can be removed quickly and effectively; access to the contamination can be limited; or a removal action is the fastest way of cleaning up the site. The removal action process can be implemented at any time during the remedial action process. Because the removal action process represents a quick and efficient approach to cleanup, removal actions have either been conducted, or are planned, at many of the sites affected with CERCLA substances within Alameda Point. [Table 2-2](#) provides an overview of the community involvement activities that typically take place during the CERCLA removal action process.

- **Time-Critical Removal Actions:** The cleanup must begin within 6 months after the lead agency determines that a removal action is necessary. An Action Memorandum (AM) is prepared documenting the action to be taken. With a Time-Critical Removal Action, work can begin immediately, and a public notice is published within 60 days of the start of work. The public has a 30-day comment period following publication of that public notice.

- **Non-Time Critical Removal Actions:** The cleanup need not begin within 6 months after the lead agency determines that a removal action is necessary. Non-Time Critical Removal Actions require preparation of an Engineering Evaluation/Cost Analysis (EE/CA) and an Action Memorandum (AM). With a Non-Time Critical Removal Action, an Engineering Evaluation/Cost Analysis (EE/CA) is prepared, and the public has a minimum 30-day public comment period before a decision is made.
- **Engineering Evaluation/Cost Analysis (EE/CA):** An EE/CA is a focused and condensed feasibility study geared toward describing why a removal action is needed and how the removal action will mitigate actual or threatened exposure of a release to human populations, animals or the food chain. It evaluates risk and clean up objectives and develops a small number of alternatives which are compared against effectiveness, implementability and cost criteria. The EE/CA includes a 30-day public comment period.
- **Action Memorandum (AM):** The final decision about the cleanup technology selected is documented in the AM. For a non-time critical removal action, the AM includes a responsiveness summary with responses to all of the comments received on the EE/CA.

5.4 PROPERTY TRANSFER

CERCLA holds federal agencies strictly liable for cleaning up contamination at sites they either own or operate, or where they have been found to contribute to site contamination. CERCLA requires that agencies identify hazardous substances used on the property and clean up any contamination before the property can be transferred outside of the federal government. Federal agencies are likewise governed by other environmental statutes that affect, and may limit, agency use of or transfer of property. Regulations that involve wetlands, endangered species, and cultural or historic assets are examples of some statutes that may limit property transfer.

Before transfer of title to real property by deed or lease of Navy BRAC property, the Navy must ensure all applicable statutory and regulatory requirements have been satisfied. Once the property has been assessed as acceptable, it is ready for transfer. At this point, the Navy prepares a Finding of Suitability to Transfer (FOST) and it is submitted for regulatory review. A FOST documents environmental findings regarding real property that have been made available through the BRAC process. These FOSTs include documentation of the environmental condition of a property where a release or disposal of hazardous substances or petroleum products has occurred and contain a finding that the property is suitable for transfer by deed for the intended purpose. Furthermore, the FOST documents any required notices, covenants, easements, or use restrictions for the property that are necessary to support the transfer. After the FOST is signed, the Navy may proceed with the actual real estate transactions to deed the property to the new owner. In addition, the Navy may prepare a Finding of Suitability for Early Transfer (FOSET), which allows the temporary deferral of the covenant that all remediation be completed prior to property transfer in order to expedite the transfer of property.

Several transfers of the installation have already occurred. This includes the conveyance of 73 acres of property, known as East Housing, to the ARRA in 2000; conveyance of the former Marina Village Housing area (28 acres) to the U.S. Coast Guard in 2008; and assignment of 44 acres via a Public Benefit Conveyance Parcel-1 (PBC-1) to the Department of Interior for a park in 2009. In addition, the FOST for Estuary Park (7.7 acres) was finalized in September 2009, but the land has not yet been conveyed.

6.0 SITE DESCRIPTIONS AND INVESTIGATIONS

This section provides an overview of Alameda Point and each of the 34 sites undergoing investigation and cleanup.

6.1 FACILITY OVERVIEW AND HISTORY

Alameda Point occupies 2,675 acres, including 1,100 acres off shore, at the western end of Alameda Island (see [Figure 1-1](#)). The area encompassed by former NAS Alameda was historically a combination of submerged lands, tideland, and dry land. Much of the base was gradually filled in using hydraulically placed dredge spoils from the surrounding San Francisco Bay, the Seaplane Lagoon at NAS Alameda, and the Oakland Inner Harbor. The first documented filling of tidal and submerged land began in 1887. By 1927, the northern part of what later became NAS Alameda had been filled, chiefly with dredge material from U.S. Army Corps of Engineers projects associated with the Oakland Inner Harbor and other harbors in the east bay. Prior to 1930, at least two large industrial sites, a borax processing plant and an oil refinery, were located on the island, on the eastern side of the current Alameda Point.

In 1936, the Navy acquired title to the land from the Army and began building the air station in response to the military buildup in Europe before World War II. Construction of the base included several iterations of filling the existing tidelands, marshlands, and sloughs. NAS Alameda was commissioned on November 1, 1940, and was turned over to a staff of 200 Navy personnel and civilians.

NAS Alameda had a military and civilian workforce of about 18,000 personnel responsible for providing support services to naval aviation facilities. Berthing space at two piers accommodated aircraft carriers. Some ship maintenance was accomplished at Alameda. The Naval Air Rework Facility, the major industrial tenant, allowed for repair and revamping of propeller, turboprop, and jet aircraft.

From the 1940s through the 1970s, standard activities associated with metal plating and paint striping, aircraft repair, fueling and engine testing, vehicle service stations, pest control, fire response training, and disposal of various substances in two landfills, caused environmental contamination.

NAS Alameda was identified for closure under the BRAC Program in 1993 and ceased operation in April 1997. In July 1999, Alameda Point was added to the federal facilities NPL.

6.2 OVERVIEW OF SPECIFIC SITES

Alameda Point has 34 Installation Restoration sites. The 34 sites are grouped into 10 operable units (OU) (see [Figure 6-1](#)), and are in varying stages of investigation and cleanup. Originally, there was an additional site (Site 18); however, it is no longer being evaluated as a separate IR site. It originally consisted of all storm sewers at Alameda Point; instead, contaminated or potentially contaminated sections of the storm sewer system are being evaluated as part of the nearest IR sites. A brief summary of each IR Site and its corresponding OU is presented in [Table 6-1](#).

7.0 RESOURCES

Alameda Point Collaborative website. 2009. <http://www.apcollaborative.org>.

Alameda Unified School District website. 2009. <http://www.alameda.k12.ca.us>.

Alternatives in Action website. 2009. www.alternativesinaction.org/home/index.html.

California Department of Education Dataquest website. 2009. <http://dq.cde.ca.gov/dataquest>.

California Department of Toxic Substances Control. 2001. "State of California Environmental Protection Agency Department of Toxic Substances Control Public Participation Manual." October.

Department of Defense (DoD). 1994. "Department of Defense/United States Environmental Protection Agency Restoration Advisory Board Implementation Guidelines." September.

Department of the Navy (Navy). 2006. "Environmental Restoration Program Manual." August.

Navy. 2008. "Base Realignment and Closure Program Management Office Procedures for Processing Findings of Suitability to Transfer or Lease." December.


Naval Facilities Engineering Command. 2006. "Navy/Marine Corps Installation Restoration Manual." August.

Nielsen Claritas, Inc. 2009. Demographic Snapshot, City of Alameda. May.

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). 2003a. "Superfund Community Involvement Handbook." October.

EPA. 2003b. "Superfund Community Involvement Toolkit." October.

FIGURES



- Former Naval Air Station Alameda
- County Boundary
- Urban Area*
- Interstate
- Highway
- Major Road


Note:
 * Darker shading indicates greater population density



Alameda Point, Alameda, California
 Department of the Navy, BRAC PMO West, San Diego, California

FIGURE 1-1
ALAMEDA POINT REGIONAL MAP

Draft Final Community Involvement Plan Update



Operable Unit

1	2b	3	4b	5
2a	2c	4a	4c	6

- IR Site
- Building
- Road or Airfield Surface Area
- Wetland
- Water

Notes:
 * Site 35 is composed of 22 distinct areas of interest.
 Ave Avenue
 IR Installation Restoration
 St Street
 W West



Alameda Point, Alameda, California
 Department of the Navy, BRAC PMO West, San Diego, California

**FIGURE 6-1
 IR SITES AND
 OPERABLE UNITS**

Draft Final Community Involvement Plan Update

TABLES

**TABLE 2-1: REMEDIAL ACTION PROCESS
COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT ACTIVITY REQUIREMENTS**
Community Involvement Plan Update, Alameda Point, Alameda, California

Community Involvement Activity	CERCLA Steps ^a							
	PA	SI	RI	FS	PP	ROD	RD	RA
Administrative Record	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Involve Restoration Advisory Board	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Contact State and Local Officials	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Community Interviews ^b			X				X	
Information Repository	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Public Meetings					X			
Public Notice (via local newspaper)					X	X		
Fact Sheet or Summary ^c				X	X	X	X	
Direct Mailing					X			
Public Comment Period					X			
Responsiveness Summary (see Section 2.4.13 for definition)						X		

Notes:

- a The work for all of these milestones is presented and discussed at RAB meetings.
- b Community interviews during the remedial action process are conducted in advance of the remedial investigation and, if necessary, before the remedial design.
- c Fact sheets or summaries may be prepared for those checked, but are always prepared for the PP and RD.

CERCLA Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act
 FS Feasibility study
 PA Preliminary assessment
 PP Proposed plan

RA Remedial action
 RD Remedial design
 RI Remedial investigation
 ROD Record of decision
 SI Site inspection

**TABLE 2-2: REMOVAL ACTION PROCESS
COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT ACTIVITY REQUIREMENTS**
Community Involvement Plan Update, Alameda Point, Alameda, California

Activity	Time Critical^a Removal Actions	Non-Time Critical^b Removal Action
Administrative Record	X	X
Involve Restoration Advisory Board	X	X
Contact State and Local Officials	X	X
Information Repository	X	X
Public Notice (via local newspaper)	X	X
Provide 30-day Comment Period on the AM and EE/CA ^c		X
Provide 30-day Comment Period on the Administrative Record File and AM ^d	X	
Response to Comments	X	X

Notes:

- a Releases or threats of releases that require cleanup to begin within 6 months after the lead agency determines that a removal action is necessary.
 - b Releases or threats of releases that do not require cleanup to begin within 6 months after the lead agency determines that a removal action is necessary.
 - c EE/CA is not required for a time critical removal action
 - d Action memorandum is required for both time critical and non-time critical removal actions
- AM Action Memorandum
EE/CA Engineering Evaluation/Cost Analysis

TABLE 6-1: ALAMEDA POINT SITE/AREAS DESCRIPTION

Community Involvement Plan Update, Alameda Point, Alameda, California

IR Site Number/ Operable Unit	Site Name	Historic Use	Current Contaminants of Interest	Current CERCLA Status	Planned Future Reuse	Work Performed
IR Site 1 (OU-3)	1943 – 1956 Disposal Area	Principal waste disposal area for all waste generated at NAS Alameda between the years 1943 to 1965, including old aircraft engines, cables, scrap metal, waste oil, paint waste, solvents, cleaning compounds, construction debris, incinerator ash, and low-level radiological waste.	Soil: PAHs, pesticides, PCBs, metals, RAD Groundwater: Vinyl Chloride Surface Water: VOCs, SVOCs, arsenic	Final ROD signed November 2009. Final TCRA Completion Report submitted August 2009. Pre-Design field work to begin in Winter 2010.	Recreational	TCRA to address radiological contamination and MPPEH conducted from 2006 to 2008. 790 cubic yards of radiologically contaminated soil and 105 discrete radiological items were removed from IR Site 1 and disposed of offsite. Former Firing-Range Berm and Debris Pit containing 54,503 MPPEH items or 11,500 lbs of MPPEH was also removed.
IR Site 2 (OU-4A)	West Beach Landfill and Wetlands	Constructed as a landfill for NAS Alameda and used from 1950's through 1978	Soil: Benzo(a)pyrene, PCBs, metals, pesticides, RAD Surface Water: Metals, Pesticides, PCBs, SVOCs, PAHs	Final TCRA Completion Report submitted August 2009. PP finalized August 2009. Draft ROD submitted January 2010.	Recreational	TCRA to address radiological contamination conducted from 2006 to 2008. 48 cubic yards of radiologically contaminated soil and 11 discrete radiological items were removed from IR Site 2 and disposed of offsite.
IR Site 3 (OU-2B)	Abandoned Fuel Storage Area	Site of five aviation fuel storage tanks. Tanks cleaned and closed in place in 1987	Soil: TPH, lead Groundwater: TPH, lead	Revised Draft OU-2B FS anticipated March 2010.	Residential and commercial/ industrial	DVE system in operation since 2007 to remove TPH. Successfully removed 115,000 pounds (lb.) of TPH at CAA 3; 4,000 lb removed at CAA 6; and 9,000 lb. removed at CAA 7.
IR Site 4 (OU-2B)	Building 360, Aircraft Engine Facility	Aircraft engine and airframe overhaul facility	Soil: lead, cadmium, PCBs, pesticides Groundwater: Chlorinated VOCs (TCE, TCA, DCE, DCA, VC), metals	Revised Draft OU-2B FS anticipated March 2010.	Residential and commercial or light industrial	1) January 2009: Removal of OWS 163 adjacent to Building 163. Approximately 47 cubic yards of soil removed from excavation. 2) A DNAPL source removal action utilizing three-phase heating occurred from 2006 to 2007 at Bldg 360. Removed approximately 2,000 lbs of total VOCs within IR Site 4. Reduced average total VOC groundwater concentrations in Plume 4-2 from 56,000 ppb to 1,600 ppb.

TABLE 6-1: ALAMEDA POINT SITE/AREAS DESCRIPTION (CONTINUED)

Community Involvement Plan Update, Alameda Point, Alameda, California

IR Site Number/ Operable Unit	Site Name	Historic Use	Current Contaminants of Interest	Current CERCLA Status	Planned Future Reuse	Work Performed
IR Site 5 (OU-2C)	Building 5, Aircraft Rework Facility	Aircraft component repair and maintenance	Soil: VOCs, Metals, RAD Groundwater: VOCs	Final FS scheduled for 2010. Radiological TCRA for storm/sewer lines is in progress. DNAPL source NTCRA completed in February 2009. Final NTCRA Completion Report submitted February 2010.	Commercial/ Industrial	1) A DNAPL source removal action utilizing six-phase heating occurred from 2005 to 2009. Removed approximately 3,250 lbs of total VOCs within IR Site 5. Reduced average total VOC groundwater concentrations in Plume 5-1 from 54,000 ppb to 120 ppb and in Plume 5-3 from 82,000 ppb to <300 ppb. 2) TCRA for storm/sewer lines with RAD currently being conducted; for IR Sites 5 and 10, over 10,000 feet of piping removed and 25,000 cubic yards of soil removed through January 2010.
IR Site 6 (OU-1)	Building 41, Aircraft Intermediate Maintenance Facility	Seaplane Hangar and aircraft maintenance facility	Groundwater: VOCs	Final RD/RAWP submitted February 2010. Remedial action being conducted.	Commercial/ industrial	1) DVE system and free product removal system operated between 2002 and 2004. In 2004, remaining piping and 1,100 tons of soil were removed. 2) Removed Oil Water Separator (OWS) 040A and excavated 4 cubic yards of soil.
IR Site 7 (OU-1)	Navy Exchange Service Station	Most recently used as automotive repair and servicing facility; before that, the site of a gas station and previously an incinerator	Soil: PAHs, metals	Final RD/RAWP submitted February 2010. Remedial action being conducted.	Residential	Excavated 3,000 cubic yards of soil and removed OWS 459.

TABLE 6-1: ALAMEDA POINT SITE/AREAS DESCRIPTION (CONTINUED)

Community Involvement Plan Update, Alameda Point, Alameda, California

IR Site Number/ Operable Unit	Site Name	Historic Use	Current Contaminants of Interest	Current CERCLA Status	Planned Future Reuse	Work Performed
IR Site 8 (OU-1)	Building 114, Pesticide Storage Area	Building 191 used as storage for Public Works Dept. Building 391 used to store paints, degreasers, pesticides, petroleum products, and hazardous waste	Soil: lead, PCBs, pesticides	Final RD/RAWP submitted February 2010. Remedial action being conducted.	Residential	5 cubic yards of soil excavated
IR Site 9 (OU-2A)	Building 410, Paint Stripping Facility	Corrosion Control Facility - paint stripping and aircraft cleaning	Groundwater: VOCs, TPH	Revised OU-2A Draft FS submitted December 2009. Final expected 2010.	Combination of business park/light industrial, open space, and civic/institutional support	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) 2002 ISCO pilot test 2) 2006 full scale ISCO on Site 9, shallow aquifer using Fenton's Reagent modified with chelated iron: average 70% reduction (DCE) and 73% reduction (VC) in wells with baseline concentrations greater than the MCL. VC was reduced to non-detect in a majority of wells with MCL exceedances. 3) 2006 full scale ISCO on Site 9, intermediate Aquifer using Fenton's Reagent modified with chelated iron: Average 41% reduction of DCA, and 33% reduction of VC.
IR Site 10 (OU-2C)	Building 400, Missile Rework Operations	Location used to repair and refurbish missile control systems and avionics.	Soil: RAD	Radiological TCRA for storm/sewer lines originating in Building 400 to be completed in 2010. RAD impacted storm drains within Building 400 will be addressed in Final OU-2C FS scheduled for 2010).	Commercial/Industrial	TCRA for storm/sewer lines with RAD currently being conducted; for IR Sites 5 and 10, over 10,000 feet of piping removed and 25,000 cubic yards of soil removed through January 2010.

TABLE 6-1: ALAMEDA POINT SITE/AREAS DESCRIPTION (CONTINUED)

Community Involvement Plan Update, Alameda Point, Alameda, California

IR Site Number/ Operable Unit	Site Name	Historic Use	Current Contaminants of Interest	Current CERCLA Status	Planned Future Reuse	Work Performed
IR Site 11 (OU-2B)	Building 14, Engine Test Cell	Aircraft and engine test facility including aircraft repair	Groundwater: VOCs	Revised OU-2B Draft FS submitted December 2009. Final expected 2010.	Residential and commercial or light industrial	—
IR Site 12 (OU-2C)	Building 10, Power Plant	From the late 1930s to the early 1970s, Building 10 was used as the power plant that generated steam and compressed air.	None	Final RI report recommended no further action for IR Site 12 soil and groundwater.	Commercial/Industrial	—
IR Site 13 (OU-2A)	Former Oil Refinery	Former site of historical oil refinery. Also includes building used for jet engine test cells.	Soil: PAHs Groundwater: VOCs, SVOCs related to Tarry Refinery Waste	Revised Draft OU-2A FS submitted December 2009. Final expected in 2010.	Business park/light industrial, open space, and civic/institutional support	(1) In 1993, 1,310 tons of soil was removed in response to a clean-up action for a JP-5 spill near Building 397. (2) Dual-vapor extraction (DVE) pilot test conducted in 2001, removed 1,148 lbs of TPH.
IR Site 14 (OU-1)	Former Fire Fighter Training Area	Maintenance facilities and fire-fighter training area	Groundwater: VC	RD/RAWP submitted December 2008.	Recreational	The application of ISCO utilizing the recirculation approach appears to have reduced the concentrations of VC in groundwater. The average concentration decreased from an average of 44 µg/L to about 13 µg/L (maximum concentration from 380 µg/L to about 39 µg/L). Additional groundwater monitoring is being performed to evaluate changes in VOC concentrations due to rebound and/or continued reductions through natural attenuation processes.

TABLE 6-1: ALAMEDA POINT SITE/AREAS DESCRIPTION (CONTINUED)

Community Involvement Plan Update, Alameda Point, Alameda, California

IR Site Number/ Operable Unit	Site Name	Historic Use	Current Contaminants of Interest	Current CERCLA Status	Planned Future Reuse	Work Performed
IR Site 15 (OU-1)	Former Transformer Storage Area	Maintenance facilities used to decommission electrical transformers	None	NFA ROD signed June 2006.	Recreational (Portions of IR 15 are included in PBC-1 which was transferred to the ARRA in 2009)	—
IR Site 16 (OU-1)	Shipping Storage Container Area Auto Hobby Shop	Auto shop, storage sheds	Soil: Lead, pesticides Groundwater: VOC	Final RD/RAWP submitted February 2010. Remedial action being conducted.	Commercial/ industrial	Removed OWS 608A and excavated 120 cubic yards of soil.
IR Site 17 (OU-4B)	Seaplane Lagoon	Ship and seaplane mooring	Sediments: Total PCBs, DDx, cadmium, lead, and chromium in sediment	RD finalized July 2008. RAWP to be finalized May 2010. Final TCRA Completion Report to be submitted in June 2010.	Commercial marina surrounded by a mixed-use marina-related district	TCRA completed to remove debris piles on northern bank of Seaplane Lagoon; removed ~50,000 tons of soil and debris (mostly Cal-hazardous waste due to metals) since September 2008.
IR Site 18	Storm Sewers	N/A	N/A	No longer a site; storm sewers grouped with other IR Sites.	N/A	—
IR Site 19 (OU-2A)	Yard D-13, Hazardous Waste Storage	Permitted hazardous waste storage area	None	Revised Draft OU-2A FS submitted December 2009. Final expected in 2010.	Combination of business park/light industrial, open space, and civic/institutional support	—

TABLE 6-1: ALAMEDA POINT SITE/AREAS DESCRIPTION (CONTINUED)

Community Involvement Plan Update, Alameda Point, Alameda, California

IR Site Number/ Operable Unit	Site Name	Historic Use	Current Contaminants of Interest	Current CERCLA Status	Planned Future Reuse	Work Performed
IR Site 20 (OU-4C)	Oakland Inner Harbor	Oakland Inner Harbor Channel is a major industrial waterway serving marine terminals and repair facilities in the Cities of Oakland and Alameda. The shoreline of IR 20 extends approx. 3,960 feet. There are four storm sewer outfalls along the IR 20 shoreline.	None	Final ROD for no further action at IR Site 20 signed in October 2008.	Water taxi/ferry stop	Storm sewer lines removed and replaced and/or cleaned in 1990s.
R Site 21 (OU-2B)	Building 162, Ship Fitting and Engine Repair	Ship and aircraft maintenance	Soil: Metals Groundwater: VOCs	Revised Draft OU-2B FS anticipated March 2010.	Residential and commercial or light industrial	—
IR Site 22 (OU-2A)	Building 547, Former Service Station	Formerly a gasoline distribution and service station, with 3 USTs	Soil: Lead, benzene related to petroleum Groundwater: Petroleum	Revised Draft OU-2A FS submitted December 2009. Final expected in 2010.	Combination of business park/light industrial, open space, and civic/institutional support	—
IR Site 23 (OU-2A)	Building 530, Missile Rework Operations	Missile control systems repair and refurbishment	Soil: Metals	Revised Draft OU-2A FS submitted December 2009. Final expected in 2010.	Combination of business park/light industrial, open space, and civic/institutional support	—

TABLE 6-1: ALAMEDA POINT SITE/AREAS DESCRIPTION (CONTINUED)

Community Involvement Plan Update, Alameda Point, Alameda, California

IR Site Number/ Operable Unit	Site Name	Historic Use	Current Contaminants of Interest	Current CERCLA Status	Planned Future Reuse	Work Performed
IR Site 24 (OU-4B)	Pier Area	Ship Berthing	Sediments: PCBs and certain pesticides and metals	Proposed Plan issued in May 2009 recommended cleanup for northeastern corner of IR Site 24 and no action for the remainder of the site. Record of Decision expected in 2010	Commercial marina	Storm sewer lines removed and replaced and/or cleaned in 1990s.
IR Site 25 Soil	Estuary Park and Coast Guard Housing Area	Used historically for military housing	Soil: PAH	Final ROD for soil signed October 2007. RD for soil LUC issued September 2009.	Residential	TCRA for Clover Park Playground completed in 2000; TCRA for North Housing and Estuary Park completed in 2002; over 66,700 cubic yards of PAH-contaminated soil removed.
OU-5/ FISCA IR Site 2 Groundwater	IR Sites 25, 30, 31, FISCA IR 2	Used historically for military housing	Groundwater: Benzene and naphthalene plume	Final ROD for groundwater issued September 2007. Remediation construction completed October 2009.	Residential and/or educational	Groundwater treatment for benzene and naphthalene plume is in progress.
IR Site 26 (OU-6)	Western Hangar Zone	Four former aircraft hangars and aircraft washdown areas. Has AST, UST, OWS, and fuel lines.	Groundwater: DCE, TCE, VC	Final RD/RAWP submitted October 2008.	Mixed-use area (industrial, residential, commercial, and open space)	Ongoing groundwater remediation from July 2008 to present; reduced chlorinated VOC concentrations significantly (an estimated 87%, 57%, and 89% reduction of DCE, TCE, and VC, respectively) after two full-scale chemical oxidation treatments. Additional treatment, which may include in situ bioremediation, is planned to further reduce chlorinated VOC concentrations.

TABLE 6-1: ALAMEDA POINT SITE/AREAS DESCRIPTION (CONTINUED)

Community Involvement Plan Update, Alameda Point, Alameda, California

IR Site Number/ Operable Unit	Site Name	Historic Use	Current Contaminants of Interest	Current CERCLA Status	Planned Future Reuse	Work Performed
IR Site 27 (OU-6)	Dock Zone	historically used for ship docking, repair, and staging, and storing painting equipment and materials; vehicle washdown; and chemical storage and handling	Groundwater: VOCs	Final RD/RAWP submitted June 2009. July 2009 - began Remedial Action.	Residential, recreational, light industrial and commercial	—
IR Site 28 (OU-6)	Todd Shipyards	Property used by Todd Shipyards for ship repair	Soil: PAHs, arsenic, and lead Groundwater: Copper	Final RD/RAWP expected March 2010.	Recreational	Pilot test in 2009 removed 19 cubic yards of soil and treated 21,000 gallons of groundwater by use of an innovative technology (MRC) for immobilizing metals.
IR Site 29 (OU-4C)	Skeet Range	Had 2 shooting ranges (Northern and Southern) actively used for 30 to 40 years until they were closed in 1993. Lead shot was discharged from guns toward clay pigeon targets projected westerly over San Francisco Bay	None	Final NFA ROD signed September 2005.	Recreational and open space	—
IR Site 30 Soil	Woodstock Child Development Center and Island High School	Formerly used for military housing, storage, parking, and for residential and educational purposes	Soil: N/A	Final ROD for soil September 2009; NFA selected.	Educational for public benefit	Soil: TCRA in November 2004 to remove 50 cubic feet of shallow soil and addition of soil cover materials.
IR Site 31 Soil	Marina Village Housing	Served as a private airfield, military housing, warehouses, and storage.	Soil: N/A	Final ROD for no action for soil signed October 2008.	Residential	—

TABLE 6-1: ALAMEDA POINT SITE/AREAS DESCRIPTION (CONTINUED)

Community Involvement Plan Update, Alameda Point, Alameda, California

IR Site Number/ Operable Unit	Site Name	Historic Use	Current Contaminants of Interest	Current CERCLA Status	Planned Future Reuse	Work Performed
IR Site 32 (no OU)	Northwest Ordnance Storage Area	Storage for diesel fuel and gasoline; runways and bunker. New boundary includes some portion of property formerly included in IR Site 1.	Soil: Radionuclides (Ra-226) Groundwater: VOCs (VC, TCE, Chlorobenzene)	Revised draft RI/FS expected December 2009 to address additional radiological contamination found in soil.	Recreational	TCRA to address RAD contamination conducted from 2006 to 2008. 222 cubic yards of radiological contaminated soil and 37 discrete radiological items were removed from IR Site 32 and disposed of offsite.
IR Site 33 (no OU)	South Tarmac and Runway Wetlands	Used as tarmac, former runway, and wetlands area	Soil: PAHs (in tarmac/runway portion only)	Draft SI submitted May 2008. Draft Expanded SI WP submitted November 2009.	Wetland/open space; located in close proximity to least tern sanctuary	—
IR Site 34 (no OU)	Former Northwest Shop Area	Maintenance shops	Soil: VOCs, PAHs, PCBs, pesticides, TPH, metals	Draft Final FS submitted February 2010.	Recreational	—
IR Site 35 (no OU)	West Housing Area	Residential, office space, pesticide use, chemical storage, fuel storage, and hazardous material storage	Soil: heptachlor, lead, and TPH	Draft RD/RAWP expected May 2010. RA expected to begin November 2010.	Mixed-use area (industrial, residential, commercial, and open space)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) TCRA for storm sewer sediment removal between 1995 and 1997 removed 194,000 linear feet of storm drain lines. 2) Previous PAH removal action: 7,600 tons of PAH-impacted soil removed in 2003. 3) Previous lead removal action: 1,620 cubic yards of lead-impacted soil were removed in 2002 to 2003. Pesticide/fertilizer storage shed (Building 195) and 203 cubic yards of soil was removed in 2004.

TABLE 6-1: ALAMEDA POINT SITE/AREAS DESCRIPTION (CONTINUED)

Community Involvement Plan Update, Alameda Point, Alameda, California

Glossary:

ARRA	Alameda Reuse and Redevelopment Authority	OU	Operable Unit
AST	Aboveground storage tank	OWS	Oil/Water separator
CAA	Corrective action area	PAH	Polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbon
COC	Contaminant of Concern	PBC	Public benefit conveyance
DCA	Dichloroacetylene	PCB	Polychlorinated biphenyl
DCE	Dichloroethene	PCE	Tetrachloroethene
DDT	Dichlorodiphenyltrichloroethane	PP	Proposed Plan
DDx	Breakdown products of DDT	Ppb	Parts per billion
DNAPL	Dense nonaqueous phase liquid	RD/RAWP	Remedial Design/Remedial Action Work Plan
DVE	Dual phase vapor extraction	ROD	Record of Decision
FISCA	Fleet and Industrial Supply Center Oakland, Alameda Facility/Alameda Annex	SI	Site Inspection
FS	Feasibility Study	SVOC	Semi-volatile organic compounds
HHRA	Human health risk assessment	TCA	Trichloroethane
IR	Installation Restoration	TCE	Trichloroethene
ISCO	In situ chemical oxidation	TCRA	Time-critical removal action
LUC	Land Use Control	TPH	Total petroleum hydrocarbons
MCL	Maximum contaminant level	UST	Underground storage tank
MPPEH	Material potentially presenting an explosive hazard	VC	Vinyl chloride
MRC	Metals Remediation Compound	VOC	Volatile organic compounds
NFA	No further action	WP	Work plan

**APPENDIX A
STATE AND FEDERAL STATUTES GOVERNING
ENVIRONMENTAL REGULATIONS**

A STATE AND FEDERAL STATUTES GOVERNING ENVIRONMENTAL REGULATIONS

The following state and federal environmental statutes and amendments require that community involvement be conducted for hazardous waste sites:

- Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) of 1980 (42 United States Code 9601, and following sections), also known as Superfund
- Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act of 1986, which amended CERCLA
- Community Environmental Response Facilitation Act of 1992, which also amended CERCLA
- California Health and Safety Code, Division 20
- Title 22, California Code of Regulations, Division 4.5
- California Public Resources Code, Section 21000 and following sections

The guidelines for conducting community involvement activities, including preparing a Community Involvement Plan, are set forth in the following:

- “Superfund Community Involvement Handbook” ([EPA 2003a](#))
- “Superfund Community Involvement Toolkit” ([EPA 2003b](#))
- “Navy/Marine Corps Installation Restoration Manual” ([Naval Facilities Engineering Command 2006](#))
- “DoD/EPA *Restoration Advisory Board Implementation Guidelines*” ([DoD 1994](#))
- DTSC Public Participation Policy and Procedures Manual ([DTSC 2001](#))

APPENDIX B
PAST COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT ACTIVITIES

B PAST COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT ACTIVITIES

A Community Involvement Plan (CIP) for Alameda Point was prepared and finalized in February 1989. This CIP was updated in December 1996 and September 2003. This document stated that the Navy would modify or revise the CIP during the course of the Installation Restoration (IR) Program to meet the changing information needs of the community. Several important events have occurred since the original CIP was finalized:

- The investigation and cleanup process is well under way.
- A Reuse Plan for Alameda Point has been developed.
- Alameda Point was listed as a National Priority List site.
- All resident military personnel have moved off of Alameda Point, and the former Navy housing is now being used for rental or Alameda Point Collaborative (APC) housing.
- The Navy is updating this CIP to continue to reflect changes and ensure that the community involvement program meets the needs of the community.

RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD

A key component of the Navy's community outreach effort under the IR Program is establishment and support of the Restoration Advisory Board (RAB). A technical review committee that consisted of community members, Navy and regulatory personnel, and representatives of the City of Alameda was established in September 1990. The technical review committee was converted to a community RAB in January 1994. The RAB was established to allow members of the community to have input into the investigation and cleanup process. The objective of the RAB is to provide a forum that enables community members, the Navy, and regulatory agencies to work together to openly discuss and exchange information about the Navy's environmental activities.

RAB members meet monthly to review technical documents and discuss activities related to the IR Program. The RAB is an advisory body, and members do not make decisions about the cleanup process; however, concerns and comments expressed through the RAB are important in helping the Navy and regulators in framing a cleanup approach. In support of the RAB, the Navy has done the following:

RAB Meetings: Since 2003, the Navy has hosted more than 75 monthly RAB meetings. In support of these meetings, the Navy has provided technical presentations, documents for review, updates on reuse and budget issues, site tours, and information on other pertinent issues, as requested.

Solicitation for New RAB Members: In an effort to maintain attendance and invite the public at large, the RAB meetings are advertised in the *Alameda Journal* newspaper, and an agenda and minutes are mailed to a list of more than 60 people.

Technical Subcommittee Meetings: Beyond the regular monthly meetings, the Base Realignment and Closure Cleanup Team (BCT) has provided the RAB with numerous technical subcommittee meetings, where technical experts discuss the specifics of certain sites, technologies, or documents.

Site Tours: The Navy has provided several site tours for RAB members and other interested parties since the last update of this CIP. Site tours include handout materials discussing the sites being visited, and a bus taking attendees to the sites.

FACT SHEETS

Newsletters, fact sheets, work notices, and other written communications developed by the Navy include:

- **October 2008:** OU-5/IR-02 Remedial Action Fact Sheet
- **August 2008:** IR Site 14 Remedial Action Fact Sheet
- **July 2008:** IR Site 26 Remedial Action Fact Sheet
- **February 2008:** IR Site 17 Remedial Action Fact Sheet
- **October 2007:** IR Sites 5 & 10 Removal Action Fact Sheet
- **Fall 2007:** Alameda Point Focus Newsletter, Issue 6
- **Fall 2006/Winter 2007:** Alameda Point Focus Newsletter, Issue 5
- **April 2006:** Five-Year Review for IR Site 02 and Marsh Crust at FISCA and Marsh Crust and Former Subtidal Area at Alameda Point, Fact Sheet
- **Fall 2005/Winter 2006:** Alameda Point Focus Newsletter, Issue 4
- **Winter 2005:** Alameda Point Focus Newsletter, Issue 3
- **Spring 2004:** Alameda Point Focus Newsletter, Issue 2
- **Summer 2003:** Alameda Point Focus Newsletter, Issue 1
- **Work Notices:** Various work notifications to inform area tenants and residents about site investigation or cleanup activities

PROPOSED PLAN

- **November 2008:** Final Proposed Plan, Site 30 - PDF, 260 kb
- **September 2008:** TCRA Action Memo for Site 17 Debris Piles
- **June 2008:** TCRA Action Memo for Sites 5 & 10 Storm Drain
- **May 2008:** Final Proposed Plan, Site 35

- **March 2008:** Final Proposed Plan, Site 31
- **February 2008:** Final Proposed Plan, Site 20
- **November 2006:** Final Proposed Plan, Site 27
- **September 2006:** Final Proposal Plan, Site 1
- **August 2006:** Final Proposed Plan for Soil, Site 25
- **April 2006:** Final Proposed Plan, Sites 6, 7, 8, and 16
- **March 2006:** Final Proposed Plan, Site 28
- **March 2006:** Final Proposed Plan, Site 14
- **March 2006:** Final Proposed Plan, Site OU-5/IR-02
- **February 2006:** Final Proposed Plan, Site 17
- **October 2005:** Final Proposed Plan, Site 26
- **September 2005:** Final Proposed Plan, Site 15
- **February 2005:** Final Proposed Plan, Site 29

NAVY WEBSITE

The Navy maintains a website that provides information on the environmental activities at most of the California bases that are undergoing closure. The address is:

www.bracpmo.navy.mil

A web page has been set up specifically for the Alameda Point IR program. It provides RAB meeting minutes, copies of fact sheets and Proposed Plans, a photograph gallery, public notices, contact information, and other general information. The Alameda Point web page can be found at:

www.bracpmo.navy.mil

Then click Prior BRAC, and use the quicklink drop-down menu for Former NAS Alameda.

APPENDIX C
COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT INTERVIEW QUESTIONNAIRE AND RESPONSES

C COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT INTERVIEW – QUESTIONNAIRE AND RESPONSES

Twenty-two people were interviewed from various segments of the community of Alameda. Interviewees included residents and community members, business owners, educators, community service and business organization leaders, environmentalists, and city, county, and federal officials. Provided below is a list of the responses received during the interviews.

This Community Involvement Plan (CIP) questionnaire was developed in conjunction with the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), the California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC), and the San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board (Water Board) and in compliance with federal and state guidelines. The questionnaire was used at every interview conducted. Not every interviewee answered all questions; therefore, numbers associated with comments in this appendix will not always correlate with the total number of respondents interviewed. In addition, some interviewees provided more than one response or comment to a question, resulting in more responses than the number of people interviewed.

Responses and individual comments are paraphrased and listed in bullets after each question, where appropriate.

Total number of interview sessions: **21**

Total number of people interviewed: **22**

BACKGROUND

1. How long have you worked or lived in this area?

0-5 years	4
6-10 years	8
11-15 years	3
16+ years	7

2. Do you know about the environmental conditions at Alameda Point? (Yes/No)

Yes	21
No	1

- a. If yes, what do you know?

- A lot.
- I know about some of the specific contamination, the IR sites, and I know you recently found RAD contamination at Seaplane Lagoon. I'm still trying to learn the map and really understand where everything is out there.
- There are some chemicals and cancer-causing items in the ground

- I know there is some toxic cleanup, and that there are delays conveying the land to the city.
- When I was first looking to lease space out here I saw a map of the whole base. We had to do our own asbestos abatement in the building we lease. I see cleanup going on, and assume it will be fine. I don't seek out information. Sometimes people working on the cleanup come into our business and we ask them how the cleanup is going.
- I know the city is working with someone to get cleanup done, but I'm not sure with who. I've heard the city doesn't want to pay and the Navy doesn't want to pay, so cleanup is halted. I've heard there is jet fuel, TCE, and oil contamination, and I've heard of the Least Tern colony. I thought the city owned the property now. I thought the Navy had done some cleanup but was not doing anything else.
- I know about the sites, some are clean, most are not. I know about the different processes to go through for cleanup and that Alameda is on the NPL [National Priorities List]. What I don't know is what the levels of contamination really mean.
- I have seen some of the cleanup activity.
- I'm familiar with the Alameda Wildlife Refuge. Our office keeps up with the BRAC process, but I don't know much about the specific contamination.
- I know the Navy started characterizing contamination in the 1980's in anticipation for closure and transfer. I know the Navy has studied some areas, like the Areas of Concern, but they are still going out and finding things in the same area. I feel like you're still in the discovery stage of cleanup. I feel that you are 3/5 of the way with characterizing alone. I feel that more may be found during redevelopment. I know you have spent a lot of money to test technologies, but still nothing is really cleaned up. The Navy used to say it would all be cleaned up by 2000. I know there are new dates now, but I don't think you'll meet those.
- I know there is contamination. I understand the city is concerned about reuse and whether the Navy is cleaning it up. I heard the Navy asked the U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service to rescind their letter asking for a refuge to make it easier for the Veterans Administration to get the land. I know there are issues with the least terns, and water issues.
- I know there are contaminants. I know about the Seaplane Lagoon site, though I am not sure what is there.
- I am aware that there are environmental conditions, but I have no specifics as far as types or extent of contamination.
- I know some about the lagoon site, and I've heard about the biosparging project.
- I know it is a Superfund site, there is a laundry list of contaminants, and there are plumes.
- I only know a little bit. There is some toxic waste in areas that needs to be cleaned up before redevelopment can happen. Cleanup is the blockade to development. I know my organization is in a safe zone out here.
- I know they are experimenting with treatments, and I don't know if any will work.

b. If yes, where did you get this information?

Navy (personnel, meetings, documents)	11
Newspaper/Media/Internet	10
City and their developer	10
Word-of-mouth	6
Being on-site at the NAS	3
RAB members	2
Other	2
(totals equal more than 22)	

- From city officials and at city meetings.
- From the SunCal proposal, from a site visit, and from the Navy.
- From talking to locals, from the internet, and going to a Proposed Plan public meeting. The conditions here seem similar to those at Mare Island. I have friends who work there, so I have talked to them about it.
- Local papers and reading Navy documents like RODs. I also hear things word-of-mouth. I know a RAB member. I have also been out to Seaplane Lagoon.
- Word-of-mouth, clients, sometimes the newspaper.
- The City of Alameda sends me information, I follow the newspapers, and the Navy sends me their RAB minutes and other information.
- Various RAB members. I have also attended ARRA meetings where they talk about cleanup a lot.
- Word-of-mouth from former Navy personnel who visit the base, and other tenants.
- We were contacted by Golden Gate Audubon about the least terns several years ago.
- I worked on NAS Alameda for 36 years. I was an apprentice in the instrument shop. I was the transition director when the base closed, trying to find jobs for base employees. I was on the city's Economic Development Commission. I was previously active on the RAB and am on the Alameda City Council.
- From work, minutes from RAB meetings that I get in the mail, on-line searches on Google and the Navy's website.
- I'm the designated representative from Alameda Point Collaborative to attend RAB meetings. I get information at RAB meetings, from documents in the Information Repositories, and the Navy sends me documents related to the AP Collaborative.
- RAB meetings. That is why I joined, to get information. Also, sometimes I talk to city representatives.
- I am an involved citizen and attend city meetings. Also from the local media.
- As part of my job. We have a city consultant who attends RAB and BCT meetings and reports to me.
- ARRA meetings in person or watching them on TV. I've read documents on the DTSC website; I've also read RAB meeting minutes.
- I don't remember.
- I follow it a little bit on the news, and get some information from the City Manager's office through my job.

- When I was asked to do this interview, I did web research to get information. I had no information before I was contacted for this interview.
- Talking to people, attending City Council meetings, the newspaper.
- From the newspaper and word-of-mouth.
- At RAB meetings.

3. The Navy has an environmental cleanup program underway at Alameda Point. Are you aware of this program? (Yes/No?)

Yes	19
No	3

a. If yes, how much do you know about the cleanup program? (A little bit/ A moderate amount/ A lot)

A little bit	7
A moderate amount	7
A lot	5
Not applicable	3

Comments about your knowledge of the cleanup program:

- I've seen work when I go out to Alameda Point. I also know a RAB member and she showed me a map of what the Navy has completed 2-3 years ago.
- I have driven around and seen the work going on, and I have friends that live on the base.
- I see them take dirt from one area near my business and move it to another. They're always wearing Hazmat suits and carrying Geiger counters.
- I would like to know more.
- I think the Navy should be out of here by now. Cleanup isn't their business or expertise, it's not what the Department of Defense does in general. The Department of the Interior should be the one transferring the land. Places should be used for like use, which is the case in most other bases where there is reuse.
- I know more than the average person because of my involvement.
- My understanding is that some of the worst areas have not been tackled yet. I know radium was found in the rip rap.
- I know the city and county are taking control, and the Navy is still involved somewhat, but I'm not sure to what extent.

CONCERNS

4. Do you have any interests or concerns about the former Navy base and the cleanup?
(Yes/No)

Yes	19
No	3

- a. If yes, what is your biggest area of interest or concern regarding base cleanup?

Level of cleanup/Assurance it is really clean/Controls or restrictions	14
Health and safety for people future/during cleanup	11
Specific plans for current and future use	10
General knowledge, being able to understand the process and issues, correcting misinformation	6
Current or future financial impacts to the city or Local businesses and residents	4
The Navy being responsible for anything found in the future	2
Schedule	2
Ecological concerns	1
Environmental Justice	1

- The viability of businesses on Webster Street is directly impacted by redevelopment of the base. I would like to see the Navy give the land back to Alameda for free, as the Clinton administration intended.
- My environmental concerns are that the cleanup is done to residential reuse specifications, not just commercial; that the cleanup be done faster; that it be done well. I'm also concerned that the Navy retain continued responsibility for the cleanup and conditions. If something is found in the future, they need to be responsible. They should keep monitoring to identify any problems, rather than waiting until someone else discovers a big problem and reacting to that later. The Navy should be actively present here in the community, even after conveyance, so we know they will still be responsible if something else is found.
- I don't have concerns because I used to work for another company that dealt with some contaminants, and most of us who worked there are fine, so many years later.
- That it be cleaned up for redevelopment for productive civilian use. I am concerned with the level of cleanup and the timing of cleanup. I am also concerned with environmental controls. Once those are placed, it is incredibly difficult for the city to get them lifted and get them out of the deed even after cleanup is completed. The city is concerned about what will be found under the hardscape, specifically in the North Housing Area, when redeveloping. We prefer not to have dig restrictions and land use controls. As far as timeliness, at FISCA the Navy was not timely in remediating a plume, so ARRA had to put in a sub-slab system to mitigate VOCs. The Navy should have helped pay for the costs of the system and the costs of DTSC oversight because the whole system was necessary because they had not remediated the plume in a timely manner. We need the rest of the cleanup to be timely.

- For me, this is a news interest. I am keeping tabs for people. I'm interested in understanding the contamination, the impacts, the process for cleanup, and how cleanup affects redevelopment. I'm trying to understand what is and is not a big deal. For example, is the radium found in Seaplane Lagoon a big deal, and how will that contamination spread if it gets in water? It's also hard to understand where everything is; I can't get a clear understanding of the map in my head.
- Not really any concerns about the environmental cleanup, but I wish they would clean up some of the falling-down houses out there. None of my tenants ask me anything about it or talk about it.
- My interest is what you wind up doing with the land. I want low-income people to be able to stay here. I assume housing could not happen here during my lifetime because of environmental issues, including soil contamination. Also, the housing market is bad right now, and there are special interests who want space, such as homeless advocates and the historic preservation society.
- We don't have concerns about cleanup. That is not within our scope of responsibilities. We do want to see both current and future beneficial use for the community.
- As far as redevelopment, I hope they don't build houses. They should keep Alameda small, and have running trails or a campground out there.
- We do law enforcement training in the abandoned buildings out there. I'm concerned about the safety of training in contaminated buildings, specifically with asbestos contamination.
- I'm concerned that the Navy is a business; they want to try to clean the base and get it off their hands as quickly as they can. I also know they have budget issues.
- I want the Navy to clean to levels so that the city does not have to take on cleanup they cannot afford. I'm concerned that the city is trying to take the property too soon, and that the city does not fully understand the extent of contamination that is here.
- When I first joined the RAB, no one wanted anything to do with Seaplane Lagoon; it was too hard to clean, and noted as the biggest nightmare or concern for cleanup. Now people are saying it can easily be cleaned, but I don't understand or trust that. I want to know what has changed; their cleanup procedures don't seem more advanced now for this site.
- I'm concerned that there be controls in place during remedial actions. Cleanup at Site 16 was done over 2 or 3 weekends, and they were kicking up dust. I came over to see the work, and got kicked off the site by the contractor. I was sent to the job site manager in a trailer, and he wasn't even there. No one would answer my questions, and I was concerned that the job site manager wasn't anywhere to be found. The wind blows to the east, so anything on Alameda Point blows to the nearby residents. We get strong winds during the summer. You need to do something to give everyone a safe feeling. Have some standard information and someone to call if there are concerns during a cleanup.

- I'm concerned about the Bayport homes and homeowners. I think the city did the transfer fast to get the money, but it may not be safe for residents. I understand the city has a tight budget, but I blame them for moving too fast with Bayport. I'm concerned that will happen again in another area, where houses will be built but then they will find something later.
- How far are you digging for cleanup? I hear it's 2 feet, but if someone were to put even a post in the ground they would go deeper than two feet, so is that really getting it clean?
- I also have concerns about the water out here. Where does it come from; do I need a water filter?
- I see the workers out here wearing hazmat suits, but I don't wear one. Should I be?
- As a commercial tenant, I'm concerned about how long I will be able to stay out here.
- Get it cleaned up. The community does not feel comfortable about the land there and rebuilding. I'm concerned with schools and the safety of children. I'm concerned that residents in Bayport had to sign something saying they won't dig more than 2-3 feet deep. There should be no restrictions on digging. The affordable housing is nearest the worst part of the plume there, and I think that is an environmental justice issue.
- The buildings are old and there are a lot of leaks that I have to repair myself. I have noticed that there is less vandalism since security has increased.
- I want it cleaned up. My concern or interest would be wanting to know if anything not cleaned up could affect our business or anyone's health.
- I'm concerned about redevelopment plans where they want to put a school and a library where the containers are. What did they really store in the containers, and why are they still there? I'm concerned anytime kids are involved, even high school aged kids.
- I'm concerned the Seaplane Lagoon does have radiological contamination. I have a hard time believing the radium did not move. The Navy needs to do a better job explaining how radium should move. I didn't get a good answer from RASO. They give canned presentations and are not always prepared to answer questions.
- I'm concerned when the Navy says plumes do not go under buildings. Sampling and cleanup under buildings does not happen. They sample near the building but not under it. I know it's cheaper not to sample under a building, and that's why they don't do it.
- I'm concerned about groundwater. I think that some of my neighbors do use their wells, and perhaps they shouldn't.
- I'm interested in anything adjacent to Encinal High School, anything along Main Street since it is an artery to our schools. I'm concerned with getting advanced notice about population changes, for example new housing or existing housing being occupied when it wasn't before, and the number of kids that the school district will have to accommodate. If you are going to be using existing housing and letting people move in, the school district really needs to know so we can have time to respond to that. We would also like early notification of any actions that will be taken near the school.

- I live 1/2 mile from Alameda Point. I had debris from a recent fire in my yard. I am concerned about the health and safety of kids on the soccer field out there, and I'm concerned about airborne contamination since the wind blows west to east. I'm also concerned about deed restrictions at Bayport, like not being able to dig or plant fruit-bearing trees. So is the land really clean there?
- I think restrictions for reuse won't work; they will not be followed or regulated for long. I know there must be some restrictions, but the Navy should try to minimize them. Individuals will probably do things in the future without getting building permits.
- I'm concerned about Site 25. A two-foot cover is not deep enough to be protective.
- Background levels concern me, especially for Site 25. The Navy is using them to say they are not responsible to clean something up if it was there before them.
- I want to make sure I know what the role of the county health agency is and who we should refer people to if they have questions about cleanup; I want to make sure the community knows the role of the health dept. as an oversight agency. If there are odors or other things from the base that would cause public concern I would like to be informed so we know before the public starts calling us.
- I want it cleaned up. My concern or interest would be wanting to know if anything not cleaned up could affect our business or anyone's health.
- Transfer of land between the Navy and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. I heard that maybe the Navy wants to transfer land to the Veteran's Administration instead because the cleanup standards would be lower for them.
- My biggest concern is the well-being of the city, both economically and environmentally. The city is losing money on leases. We had a good interim reuse plan. The developer wanted us to have short-term leases, but with redevelopment delayed, the city has lost a few million dollars a year on lease revenue. The city has had to take \$1-\$2 million out of the general fund to cover costs of public services required at Alameda Point. The city doesn't get any property tax or anything from the buildings out there. I'm also concerned about Site 25. I'm not so concerned about radium, it's the other things that are harder to find that I am concerned about. The Navy should own up to what is there, because their activities put it there. The budgets for cleanup used to be around \$8 million a year, but now it's \$40 million a year. If they had put that money in upfront, it could have been taken care of sooner. The cleanup keeps getting more complicated with considerations like climate change and changing sea levels, and the Navy keeps finding more things.
- Ecological concerns. Site 2. The lagoon. I'm concerned about dredging, fill, clean water, and preventing contaminant discharges.
- More interests than concerns. I don't have concerns about how the Navy is doing the cleanup. I understand the process and the many steps that must be done. But most people don't understand. The Navy needs to educate them. They think nothing is happening. People say to me everyday they think nothing is happening.

- My main interest is to look for ways to make a positive economic impact happen for our community. For example, having kids get 40-hour trained, or the Navy buying native plants. Some of the people in the Alameda Point Collaborative program have a high level of education and could function well in an office. Some RABs have economic subcommittees. I would like to pursue that for the Alameda Point RAB.
- There is a lot of negative information and misinformation going around about the cleanup, and it should be corrected. My main interests are: the misinformation that is going around, and I want the base cleaned up to a level that makes it economically feasible to develop it.
- The idea that cleanup may be hindering redevelopment of the base. It's not where people expected it to be at this point. How come it's taking too long?
- We have two schools in that area.

INVOLVEMENT

5. The Navy has a community involvement program for Alameda Point. Are you aware of this program? (Yes/No)

Yes	13
No	9

a. If yes, what do you know about this community involvement program?

- I have heard of the RAB.
- I've heard of the RAB; I receive Proposed Plan brochures, and notices of public meetings.
- I don't know much about it or how it works.
- I don't think the Navy is doing much, except for the RAB.
- I know about the RAB
- I used to get some information maybe quarterly, but I don't get that now.
- I think you are being more proactive than you have been before. I know you send out literature and have public meetings, but no one participates.
- Just about the RAB.
- Not much.
- I am aware of your monthly meetings. The school district used to have a representative on the RAB.
- I know about the RAB, about the Navy's newsletter, and about the public meetings for Proposed Plans or RODs.
- I know about the RAB.
- I know about the RAB meetings.

6. Have you personally been involved with environmental activities at Alameda Point?
(Yes/No)

Yes	9
No	13

a. If yes, how have you been involved?

- My consultant and I review documents, provide comments, present updates to the City Council.
- I read some of the reports and the RAB minutes.
- Via the RAB.
- Golden Gate Audubon has been very involved with Alameda Point. We've tried to encourage transfer from the Navy to the USFWS. We've commented on presentations.
- I've observed work being done. I have also requested sampling on two separate occasions.
- Through the RAB, and other groups such as the BRAG, APAC, and HOMES (Housing Opportunities Make Economic Sense).
- I took a site tour 2 or 3 years ago with the Navy and Golden Gate Audubon.
- I went to a public meeting and wrote a comment letter about a Proposed Plan.
- I've been on the RAB, I used to work on the base, now I work for the city.
- No: We have monitored aspects of the cleanup with relation to redevelopment, but have not taken an active role in cleanup.

7. Do you represent any community organizations and/or environmental groups?

a. If yes, which ones?

- Rotary Club,
- Alameda Family Services Board,
- On the City of Alameda Transportation Board
- Involved in the Chamber of Commerce
- Co-founder of Alameda Public Affairs Forum
- Action Alameda
- Save Our City Alameda
- The City Social Services and Human Relations Board
- HOMES

FEEDBACK

8. Have you had any contact with Navy, local, state or other officials concerning environmental cleanup at Alameda Point? (Yes/No)

Yes	13
No	9

- a. If so, what was the nature of this contact (who/which agency was it and why did you have contact with them)?

- I talk to the Navy and all of the regulators about various things as part of my job.
- To gather general information.
- At the RAB. I also sometimes talk to city officials casually.
- I contacted the Navy about the least terns.
- I was on the RAB, and have also contacted the Navy via the city.
- I contacted the Navy to get more information on the VA proposal
- I have regular contact with them at RAB meetings. I talked to the Navy, DTSC, and EPA about having more samples at Site 35, and it was done. I really appreciated that.
- At RAB meetings I have regular contact. I e-mailed the Navy with my concern about needing to communicate with the community.
- I have had contact for the purpose of covering news stories, usually with the city.
- I have had contact with Quentin at the Navy regarding utilities in the area. He facilitated utility use between us and the Coast Guard. I also met with SunCal about what development would mean for school facilities. I have a document from them that lists soil conditions.
- Various contacts over the past couple of years.
- I had contact with the Navy recently via e-mail.
- During RAB and community meetings

- b. If yes, what kind of response did you receive?

- The Navy was great and answered all of our questions.
- I never got an answer to my last e-mail.
- I am able to get a response anytime I have a question. The city has only really been talking about/focusing on remediation for the past 1-1/2 years. We tend to make it more serious than it is and the Navy needs to address that.
- I usually get a good response. My consultant works very well with the BCT. Anna-Marie Cook, Dot Lofstrom, and John West are all very good. This is a good BCT and Alameda is lucky to have that.
- Most of the time my questions are answered
- I usually get a good response. It has been hard to contact DTSC, but now I know who to call directly so that will make it easier. Good. They were polite and helpful, specifically Patrick McCay.

- Usually it's a good response. It used to be hard to get reports. The Navy used to direct me to the Information Repository. EPA told the Navy they had to send me the reports directly, so now they do. The Navy has been very responsive.
- Pat Brooks answered my questions. He said he might get back to me when they dredge Seaplane Lagoon, but I don't think he did. I'm also still unclear what a "debris pile" is.
- I get a good response, I get my questions answered.
- Helpful and reasonable.
- I have been getting great information.

9. Do you have confidence in the Navy's ability to adequately clean up Alameda Point with oversight from the regulatory agencies? (Yes/No/Somewhat/Don't Know)

Yes	10
No	4
Somewhat	2
Don't Know	3
No Response	3

a. Why/why not?

For those who answered yes:

- The Navy has its charge and the regulatory agencies have theirs, and they will all do their jobs. The city does not always get what we want. There is tension between cleanup and conveyance. The city would like it cleaned up without land use controls, but at the same time we understand that would take longer.
- I have been around other sites when I was a child that were undergoing cleanup, so I understand the process.
- It sounds like everything is being done. I have no reason not to have confidence. It sounds like the frustration of the city is the time it takes to get it cleaned up. I imagine it will not be redeveloped anytime during my career. What may add to the perception that cleanup is slow is that other bases in the area are already being redeveloped, like Mare Island and Concord. Perhaps because their issues are different?
- I know the Navy tries to do what's right; sometimes that just takes a long time.
- Regulators and active community members will see that it's done to a reasonable level.
- A lot of people don't understand there is oversight. Let people know there is oversight and accountability.
- I know there are a lot of steps you must take, and the cleanup is backed by the U.S. government, so I know it will have funding. I also know the city will have to do CEQA [California Environmental Quality Act], and that has a lot of steps. So I think it will be very clean.
- Because of the agencies watching what the Navy does. I imagine the cleanup will be extremely conservative.

- The city also has a shared concern in the cleanup. The county supervisor hasn't taken a role because she doesn't feel she needs to get involved.
- I understand the CERCLA process. The Navy is following the process like they are supposed to. The agencies really provide good oversight.

For those who answered no:

- I want more done than the Navy plans to do. I think they will do what they say they will do, but it will not be adequate.
- Confidence is a strong word. Reading commentary in the newspapers makes me wonder about the Navy cleaning it up. I hear that the Navy, city, and SunCal are fighting. In general, people don't seem confident that the Navy will clean it adequately.
- I don't think the cleanup can keep being funded at this level.
- Depends on what you consider "adequate." I personally would not live there. I think people will say it is clean, though it's not. Midway Village in Daly City is an example of a place where the Navy said it was clean and DTSC signed off, then people moved in and got sick.

For those who answered somewhat/don't know/no response:

- I would need more information.
- I don't know how the community feels about the cleanup. I have also heard mixed stories about Navy work on other sites. The Navy may have a reputation or legacy that people think of regardless of the quality of their work at Alameda Point.
- I think it will take a long time.
- I appreciate the Navy talking to our office about cleanup standards.
- There is confidence in the regulatory group now. It's all a discovery process. Every area you go to, you have to go back again. You've done a good job with some areas, but more is always found. For example, the sewer system was taken out a long time ago, but you're doing work with it again. I think prohibiting digging to 2 feet at FISCA is ridiculous. The Navy did the cleanup the cheapest way.
- They have the ability, not sure they will do it. If they have to do it, and they are being watched, then they will probably do it. EPA has to stay on top of them; Navy standards are not high enough.
- I need to know more.
- I think it's all very political. I was not confident in the Bush administration. I'm not sure what standards the Navy is using.

b. If not, how can the Navy gain your confidence?

- I'm not sure. They would have to clean to residential levels. I would need to be involved and to see more of what the Navy is doing to feel confidence. I would have to see the Navy give more; they would have to say they will do something just because it is the right thing to do, and follow through with that for me to feel confidence.

- Provide more information.
- Guarantee it is cleaned up to residential. Construct a map of all sites and hang it downtown so people understand where things are, that it is not just a big blob of land. Support adaptive reuse and keeping it the same, NOT putting in housing.
- I think in a push/shove situation, the DoD will always prevail over the U.S. EPA. I think DTSC will be more concerned about cleanup because they are not federal. It's like EPA and Navy basically work for the same corporation. I'd like DTSC to please keep pushing forward, but I am concerned about California state funding.
- Knowing that they are collaborating with a number of regulatory agencies gives me confidence because I know agencies will make sure you do what you are supposed to do. You should let people know about this collaboration.
- Information about the Navy's cleanup is out there, but people won't seek it out. Make it easy for people to get the information.
- The Navy should clean the sites, not transfer them to agencies with less cleanup experience. The Navy has institutional experience and a bigger budget.
- I would like to see a more rigorous timeline for cleanup.
- I think you have more of a plan and better funding than you used to. You should clean to state, not federal levels. Having a third party impartial review helped build more confidence. I see more intensity with the cleanup now, but I don't know if the community sees it. To gain confidence, you should do it right the first time; don't just do it the cheapest way. It seems the Navy's first position is to do no further work or leave things alone.
- A 1-page flier on the process and the organizations involved would make me have more confidence.
- Thirty years from now, if no one is sick, then I guess it would be safe.
- A RAB member told me the Navy does not sample enough; for example they may sample every 150 feet rather than every 100 feet. So one thing you could do to give me more confidence is to sample more.
- Don't always take the cheapest, most expedient route.
- I don't understand the whole CERCLA process. The Navy needs to translate technical information into something the layperson can understand. Do that through a public meeting or with a document.

RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD

[Two current RAB members were interviewed. They were not asked these general questions; skip to number 13 to get RAB feedback specifically from the two RAB members]

10. The Navy has established a community board called the Restoration Advisory Board, or RAB, for Alameda Point. The purpose of the RAB is to provide input to the Navy and Regulatory Agencies for environmental cleanup at Alameda Point. Are you familiar with the RAB for Alameda Point? (Yes/No)

Yes	13
No	7

a. If yes, how did you hear about the RAB?

- Had a friend who was on it.
- Through my job with the city.
- I can't remember (statement made by several people).
- Read about it on a website.
- I'm familiar with it through work.
- I used to be a member.
- From work.
- Through my job with Alameda Point Collaborative.
- Through my job at the *Alameda Journal*.
- I read about it on-line. And the school district used to have a representative there.
- Word-of-mouth.
- I received information about it in the mail.
- I was invited by a RAB member.

11. Have you ever attended a RAB meeting? (Yes/No)

Yes	7
No	13

a. If you have attended, did you find the meetings informative (Yes/No/Somewhat)

Yes	5
No	0
Somewhat	1
No response	1

b. If you have attended, what would you suggest to improve the RAB meetings?
(respondents gave multiple suggestions)

- People ask good questions there. There is so much information, it is hard to absorb. But that does not mean you should dumb-down your information.
- It is hard to hear at the meetings, there are bad acoustics. Having a microphone or some other sound equipment would help.
- The first time I went to a meeting, it was technically overwhelming. A RAB member took his own time to give me a seminar to further explain what is going on. I share the information I learn at the RAB meetings with the community, and I look at the RAB minutes and share those.
- The information is helpful. It can be confusing to follow, but it is highly complex information.
- The Navy has droll speakers with a boring speaking style give the presentations sometimes. When Sofia Serta from EPA presented, she was lively. It would be helpful to have someone from EPA not the Navy, really explain what risk is. Also, explain for new people what groundwater is. It would be helpful for new people attending to have a cheat sheet with some information.

- No suggestions
- Nothing. The RAB is doing a great job, good questions are being asked there. It's an open dialogue. The regulators and Navy have to report what they have done in the past month. Good updates are provided.
- People use the RAB meetings as a resource for information. I know there are a few folks on the RAB who drive all of the discussion. Having a technical subcommittee seems useful and helpful to discuss things in more detail.
- It's mostly the board members participating, not the general public. It's hard to understand all of the information.
- Post them as a webcast so people can watch them anytime.

12. Would you be interested in joining the RAB as a member? (Yes/No/Need More Info)

Yes	0
No	14
Need more information	6

a. Comments about possible membership

- I feel welcomed as an observer, I do not want to join.
- No, though I would like to attend a meeting. Specifically if the topic is Site 2.
- I'm not sure if it is a conflict of interest with my job. I would be interested if they started an economic subcommittee.
- I think you should have people with more technical expertise than I have to be on the RAB.
- I would try to attend some, but would not want to be a member.

CURRENT AND/OR PAST RAB MEMBERS

13. Which community members or groups do you represent?

- I represent my neighbors, who live right next to the base, and my family.
- HOMES

14. How do you share environmental cleanup information with those you represent?

- I talk to my neighbors, and to city council members.
- At regular HOMES meetings. I believe part of the RAB's commission is to act as a conduit to the community. I need to do that.

15. What do you like best about the RAB meetings?

- I like the regulator input, and I'd like more of that. I also like the combination of Navy and contractor presentations.
- The information that I get. I'm impressed with the technical presenters/the contractors; they seem very dedicated.

16. How do you think RAB meetings could be improved?

- Getting some new people involved, like technical people who live in the community, and concerned citizens.
- You should ask if anyone new is attending at the beginning of the meeting, and make them feel welcome, give them an overview of the people who are there, and let them know there will be a comment period. You should also have the presentations for the next month decided earlier and advertise them ahead.
- We used to have more people on the RAB, but the process is taking so long that people have stopped coming; there is only so much time one can dedicate to the RAB.
- I sometimes feel my questions are not answered or my concerns are belittled when I'm asking about sampling. People don't always get back to me after the meeting when they say they will get me more information.
- A demand for civility, though I'm not sure who should make that demand

17. Are the meetings at a convenient time and location? (Yes/No)

Yes	2
No	0

a. If not, what other times and/or locations would you suggest?

None

COMMUNICATION

18. Are you interested in receiving more information about environmental cleanup at Alameda Point? (Yes/No)

Yes	17
No	5

a. What topics are you particularly interested in?

General/Big Picture, Overview	7
Timeline/Schedule/Status	6
Map	4
Details about specific contamination or specific sites	3
Accomplishments	2
Explanation of cleanup process	2
Regulatory Input	1
Work notices	1
Health information	1

- I want to read about the Navy doing more than just the minimum that is required.
- I already get a lot of information.
- The big picture. What is going on, what is the timeline. Give a summary. A map of the contaminants to compare against the map of planned redevelopment would be useful. I understand some of the little pieces about cleanup, but not how they all fit together. Also, information to explain health concerns and to help people understand if certain findings are a big deal or not.
- General information.
- Any information you want to provide.
- Leaking Underground Storage Tanks, use or storage of hazardous materials, especially if they are being used in treatment, new cleanup technologies, landfills, solid waste, and anything the public might care about.
- Something in a summary format. Where the cleanup is at, where it is going, anything that affects me or my business. I am most interested in redevelopment.
- The goal date to complete cleanup. The city and Navy have been messing around with this project for years: what is taking so long? Is it just a money issue?
- Have the regulators continue to share their concerns with the RAB, and if you are not concerned, why not?
- Anything related to road closures or traffic, since it really affects my business. Also, put up signage with alternate routes, especially to the Hornet, if road closures change that route, otherwise people stop me and my employees to ask directions all the time.
- General information. Would like to know what the timeline is and what most community members are interested in or concerned about.
- I already get plenty of information, but I think the community could use more.
- Site 2.
- I already receive a lot of information, but it would be nice to get some information like a FAQ and a list of general accomplishments.
- Why the Navy is not cleaning up some areas needs to be explained. This might be the responsibility of the City of Alameda, but that should be part of the Navy's communication. An overall picture that I can share with people. A picture overlaying the 2003 reuse plan with the SunCal presentation would be great. It is also necessary to explain what the Navy is doing to clean up contaminants at the old Fleet Industrial Supply Center Alameda Annex (FISCA) property, now called Alameda Landing and Bayport.
- Because of staff turnover at this newspaper, people with knowledge about the base are gone. We don't currently have the resources to do a full background research. We need the Navy to provide us information and updates on what is going on. We would like to know what has been done, and would like to inform the public of updates on what is going on. Some folks think there is no contamination because they are allowed to drive around out there.
- It is sufficient for you to send information to my organization and my co-worker will pass it along.
- Anything related to or near the schools.

- A really good map with legible text on the Navy's website would be useful. Make it a map where one can zoom in and out or pan without losing resolution. You have on there now that I can't read the legend on. Have a definition of the sites, match the area to the legend. Show a landmark and city streets on the map to orient people. The USGS and the City of Oakland have great maps on their websites; see those as examples.
- Some general information would be appreciated.
- What do you actually do when you have toxic soil?
- What are the contaminants, and where did they come from? Was it from normal activity in the past?
- How is it going, and where are you in the process? Provide a timeline for cleanup. Let us know what has been cleaned up, and what is left.
- A recent news article raised questions about whether cleanup is progressing as it should. I would like information that cleanup is progressing and the current timeframe. This could either be at a meeting, or just mailing out an informational update.
- I already get a sufficient amount of information. I am interested in the big picture of cleanup, to know areas that are not yet cleaned up and how they would be cleaned up.

19. How do you think the Navy can improve its communication efforts?

- Put more information on the Navy's website. People do not see notices in the newspaper. Post your notices in coffee houses, or put one on the local cable access channel. Or, if you keep them in the paper, buy more prominent space.
- As a key stakeholder, I think the Navy does a good job of keeping us informed. Having information on a website is helpful.
- Make the science of the cleanup understandable to the public. The Navy has done a pretty good job of sharing information, but I have to do the work to really try to understand it.
- Assist the RAB in getting more members, do more outreach. If people don't know what's happening, they will automatically assume whatever is happening is negative or bad.
- The Navy should have a good presence at several of the events around town. People will get used to seeing you there and it will improve communication.
- E-mail updates.
- Have a list serve so people can get automatic e-mails when you update your website or get other updates. You can put items on our bulletin board and give us copies of handouts to put on our handout table here.
- Send e-mails to me personally and I will forward them to staff here.
- You are doing what you can. People believe you are doing what is right. It's better to focus on the cleanup and worry less about how you are reaching out to the community.
- Do a list serve so people get e-mails when your website is updated or when a document is out for review.

- Try sending information to bloggers; there are a lot on Alameda Point.
- Improve your website, make a more direct link to easily get to Alameda Point.
- There is distrust. People want to know you really are drilling for us as you say you will. Take people out and show them the drill rig or something else. Open it up to more than just the RAB.
- Let people know they don't drink the groundwater here.
- In order to inform the community, RAB members should be able to present clear and simple graphics and plans to explain what and where the contaminants are/were located, what cleanup has been done, what is being done, what will be done, and to what levels.
- Use churches to do outreach; they have a large membership.
- For me personally, answer my e-mails or at least let me know that you got it.
- Send good information to the newspapers with an update that they can publish.
- When you provide information, make it concise. Have contact information there so I can call someone for more detail. I don't have time to read a big pamphlet.
- Send out notices to local residents. Also, children are interested in cleaning up and being "green." Give information to kids and they will pass it along to their parents.
- List your agenda items on a website in advance so people will know what the RAB meeting topics are.
- There is a clear misperception that things are not getting done. Use the media to let people know about your progress. You could also ask for time on the agenda at business association meetings to get that message out.
- I like getting the RAB packets in the mail, but getting them over e-mail would be better.
- Run an ad to announce a public meeting.
- Advertise on the library bulletin board.
- People think that the Navy maliciously dumped stuff or polluted the area. Let them know it was standard procedure at the time, like using lead-based paint. And let them know you are getting it to current safe levels; what was done may have been safe for the time. Let people know that the Navy takes responsibility. Also, let them know that the Navy does not redevelop the land, but that you are getting it ready for redevelopment. It's a good message to hear that the Navy takes the cleanup seriously, but we also want to know that it won't take 100 years.
- Maps are hard to read. Use landmarks that everyone will know, like the Hornet, the Bladium, or label streets so I can tell right away what area I'm looking at.
- Give people a specific address for the base so they can look it up in Google earth.
- Address the fact that the community thinks nothing is moving forward.
- Use other methods to communicate in addition to RAB meetings.
- Put more information on-line. A Google search does not easily get me to the Navy's BRAC website. Make it so key words typed into a search engine get you the BRAC website. Also, try a Wiki since there are so many interested parties, bloggers, and people giving information. The Navy would just have to monitor it to correct misinformation.

- Have a community meeting about the program as a whole. Mention here is what we have done, show your accomplishments. The library or the Mastick Senior Center are good locations for a meeting. It's hard for people to get to the base.
- Do a periodic "wellness check" with the folks you are working with from various organizations. If there is turn over, make sure new folks are updated

20. Do you feel the Navy is missing any segments of the community in its communication efforts? (Yes/No)

Yes	5
No	7
Don't Know	10

a. If yes, who?

- The Navy just doesn't have enough contact with the community in general. People don't even always have a question, but it's nice to see the Navy at community events and know they are there to answer questions if you did have them. The Navy should be proactive, and interact more with the community like the Navy is a local business.
- You have a constituency of core people who are involved at a high level, some who are involved at a mid-level, and some who do not care at all because they are busy with other things.
- Maybe try to give the press more information, and make sure the City Council is informed
- I don't see the Navy doing a lot of outreach in general. Perhaps they like having a small RAB so they don't have as many people who may be critical of their work. I don't know if the Navy is purposely not doing outreach for that reason.
- The tenants are not well-informed, but we're too busy and work really long hours.
- City council. Navy should make an appearance at City Council meetings. Go ahead and take the heat from the city, and show you are not skirting the issues. Talk about your commitment to cleanup, show your success and that you're not just doing model projects and funding studies. Get out of your office and have a presence at the council. Reassure us; only a couple people at the city understand what is going on. Be transparent and honest about cleanup.
- I don't know because I'm not sure what you are already doing.
- Most people. They have access to information, but are not interested.
- There is a broad spectrum of people who do not know what is going on. People get information from letters to editor in the newspaper, and they are inaccurate.
- You have a demographic that is very involved, and then others with no interest at all.
- You have a core group of about 500 people in Alameda who actually follow what is going on. Everyone else is too busy or does not care. You cannot reach those people. They care only if it affects them.

21. Are you aware of any language translation or interpretation needs in the local community? (Yes/No)

Yes	7
No	6
Don't Know/Maybe	9

a. If yes, which languages?

Spanish	7
Chinese dialects	5
Tagalong	3
Farsi	2
Languages mentioned once: Japanese, Korean	1

- There is a large Chinese-American population in Alameda, but not on this side of the island. [near Alameda Point] Near the base there may be Tagalog speakers, but I don't think there is a need for translation.
- We have some Spanish-speaking soccer players here, and a few of our signs are in Spanish
- There may be Tagalog speakers on the western end of Alameda, but I think most of them are bilingual.
- Not sure, some Asian languages. I know some people are fishing where it is prohibited. Check those signs and see what language is on them.
- There are 35 languages spoken in this school district. We don't translate for all of those languages. But I think Cantonese is common for that area of Alameda

b. What is the best way to meet the needs of this segment(s) of the community?

- Most uni-lingual people around here have relatives who speak English
- Work with the multi-cultural center
- We used to use a translation service called babblefish (www.babblefish.com) to post notices when we do work at the apartments.
- The police department has bilingual officers that sometimes talk to people, but we don't have any of our written materials translated. It may not be necessary.
- There is a catering truck on the corner [on Alameda Point] and many Spanish speakers congregate there. Perhaps you could post information there in Spanish.
- Ask the Mayor's office in Alameda to confirm any language translation needs.
- Golden Gate Audubon does some handouts in Spanish, but not too many. It's project specific.
- Talk to their community leaders. Give fliers in their language.

22. What is the best way to provide you with information about the environmental cleanup program at Alameda Point? Select all that you prefer, and let us know your top 3 preferences.

Site Tours	16
Fact Sheets or Newsletters [2-5 page flier on a particular topic or several general topics]	15
Other [see comments below]	15
E-mails or information on a website	14
Community Meetings [held periodically on a specific topic]	5
RAB Meetings [held monthly]	5

- Open house/drop-in events; Give a talk at the Rotary Club; Have an info booth at the Webster Street Jam (a festival held every September); or at the Pacific Coast Farmers Market. She writes a blurb in the *Alameda Sun* and will put our meeting info in there. Could put info in the business assoc. newsletter.
- Post documents on your website that are searchable. Make sure if we do a search on Google or Yahoo, that we will be easily led to the Navy's documents.
- If you have newsletters or other fliers, we will put some out on a table near our entrance. We can also post things on our church bulletin board
- Post a sign where you are doing work that says what you are doing there, and maybe says "This Site is Being Cleaned."
- We have an e-mail list of about 40 people. If you send us an e-mail with information, we can forward it on to our list
- Try posting a notice on the local cable access channel. Contact Comcast for that.
- Have a driving tour. Map a driving route and have signs at each site.
- Walk Alameda has a walk on Alameda Point every August. They are well-attended; have a Navy member attend.
- Have a chart showing significant achievements on various parts of the property, like x number of tons of jet fuel removed to-date, or x number of tons of contamination removed. Put the chart on a sign at the front gate.
- Have a press briefing and include bloggers.
- Get on the newspapers calendar of events.
- Post a notice or poster board at each site or each gate listing current activities, or maybe a graphic explaining work at the site.
- Have a nice, presentable booth at one or some of the street fairs, and have RAB members staff it with you.
- Get your information out to bloggers
- Post something at the tenant mailboxes. There are about 20 mailboxes on the other side of Hangar 1. That would be a good place to post notices about traffic.
- You could possibly post announcements here at the Hornet
- Try a town hall meeting where people can come give feedback and ask questions. Have it off-island, because the location out there is confusing. Use an active group in the community to get the word out about such a meeting, like Bike Alameda, the League of Women Voters, and tell the newspaper and City Hall.

- Blogging is popular on Alameda. Share information with bloggers.
- Post your public notices at coffee houses and at the library.
- There are also two good blogs that you should send information to: bloggingalameda.com and theisland.com.
- I went to a site tour and it was awful; I was very insulted by it. The group was upset; they did not explain why people could not get off the bus. I did not go to the re-do tour.
- Start a listserv.
- Can you start sending the RAB minutes electronically instead of hard copy?
- We can put a link for the Navy's website on the county website, possibly linking it to our UST program. But the link should be direct, and it's better to have one location where people can go and get a lot of information. Provide us a couple sentences and the URL and we will link it.
- There are two big street fairs each year, so the Navy should have a booth at those and try to get people signed up for your e-mail list there. There is also a 4th of July fair where the Navy could do outreach.
- We can post notices and fliers in the laundry rooms and mail rooms here at the apartments
- If you send me information, I will distribute it to the staff here. You should set up a booth as some of the festivals held around town or maybe at the Farmer's Market.

23. The Navy has set up two information repositories for Alameda Point environmental documents; one at 950 West Mall Square, and one at the Alameda Free Library at 1550 Oak St. Are you familiar with those information repositories? (Yes/No?)

Yes	11
No	11

a. If yes, have you visited either of these information repositories? (Yes/No)

Yes	6
No	16

24. Are these locations convenient? (Yes/No)

Yes	17
No/Don't know	5

a. If not, what other location(s) would you suggest?

- I went to the one at City Hall West. No one wanted to help me there. I was trying to find some historic information.
- The library is convenient. City Hall West isn't because most people on the island don't go out there. Driving around the base is confusing. Put a repository at the Bladium or other recreational area.

- The one at City Hall West is pretty well used, we've had contractors, journalists, and others in there using it.
- The library is an especially good location.
- Put information on-line.
- Putting information on-line would be better.
- The library is good; people congregate there a lot.
- The library is convenient. I can't find the room in City Hall West where the documents are supposed to be.
- There are blue signs up around base that are helpful in directing people to things, like the Hornet. Use those to direct people to the Information Repository or other places on base if you want them to find it.
- Can you put the key index on a computer so it can be searched?
- I don't like to go to the IR; I'm overwhelmed by the material there. I would prefer to use the web from home to look up documents.
- The average person can't really use the repositories because the documents are too difficult to read.
- On-line.

MEDIA COVERAGE AND USAGE

25. Have you seen any media coverage about environmental activities at Alameda Point?
(Yes/No)

Yes	17
No	6

a. If yes, where?

Newspapers (various and on-line)	16
Internet/blogs	2
Television News	2
Other	1

26. Have you ever seen public notices about environmental or RAB activities at Alameda Point? (Yes/No)

Yes	7
No	15

a. If yes, can you remember when and where?

- I've even looked for them but don't see them.
- In the *Alameda Journal*. The Navy logo catches my eye.
- In the local newspaper/*Alameda Journal*.

27. What medium do you rely on most to get local information? (multiple responses given)

Newspaper (hard copy or on-line)	12
Word-of-mouth	5
Internet	5
Information from the City	2
TV news	1

a. What local newspaper(s) do you take regularly?

Alameda Sun	16
Alameda Journal	15
Numerous newspapers, only on-line	4
East Bay Express	3
Alameda Times Star	1
Oakland Tribune	1
West County Times	1

b. What website(s) do you visit for local news and information?

Google searches/subscription	5
San Francisco Chronicle/SF Gate (www.sfgate.com)	4
Action Alameda (http://www.actionalameda.org/)	4
The ARRA website (http://www.alameda-point.com)	4
The Island (www.theislandofalameda.com/)	3
Bloggging Bayport (http://laurendo.wordpress.com/)	3
Alameda Journal on-line www.contracostatimes.com/alamedajournal)	2
SunCal website (http://www.alamedapointcommunity.com/)	2
East Bay Express	2
Alameda Daily News (www.alamedadailynews.com)	1
Water Board website	1
DTSC website	1
SF Guardian	1
Bayarea.com	1
Stop Drop and Roll (http://johnknoxwhite.com/)	1
Woblog (http://www.drwob.com/weblog/)	1
Lexus Nexus	1

WRAP UP

28. Do you know anyone else you think we should interview? If yes, may we have their contact information?

Ten interviewees made suggestions for organizations or individuals that should be interviewed, some of whom had already been interviewed or contacted. Many of the other people were contacted, and several were interviewed.

29. Do you have any other comments, suggestions, or concerns you would like to add?
(Note: Questions were answered there during the interview, or a follow-up was provided.)

Comments and questions provided included:

- Suggestions for redevelopment and questions about planned use, or current activities by the City's developer
- Offers of meeting space for Navy public meetings
- Requests for information that is easy for the public to understand
- Specific questions about current or upcoming cleanup work
- Comments that this interview process is a good way to do outreach
- Comments and offers for information about historic activity at the base

APPENDIX D
INTERVIEWEE LIST

D INTERVIEWEE LIST

Alameda City Councilmember
Alameda County Health Care Services Agency
Alameda Journal
Alameda Point Collaborative
Alameda Police Department
Alameda Public Affairs Forum
Alameda Unified School District (2)
Atlantic Apartments, Apartment manager
Blogs (2)
Church
City of Alameda BRAC office
Golden Gate Audubon
Hornet Volunteer
Office of County Supervisor Alice Lai-Bitker
Pacific Fine Foods
RAB members (2)
Recreation facility
U.S. Senator Barbara Boxer's Office
West Alameda Business Association

APPENDIX E
KEY CONTACTS

E KEY CONTACTS

The following presents contact information for the Navy, regulatory agencies, and the City.

Name/Title	Organization	Phone	Address	E-mail
Derek Robinson BRAC Environmental Coordinator	Navy BRAC Program Management Office West	(619) 532-0951 Fax: (619) 532-0983	1455 Frazee Road, Suite 900, San Diego, CA 92108	Derek.j.robinson1@navy.mil
Anna-Marie Cook Remedial Project Manager	EPA	(415) 972-3029 Fax: (415) 744-1917	75 Hawthorne St. Mailcode SFD 8-3 San Francisco, CA 94105	Cook.anna-marie@epa.gov
Dot Lofstrom Project Manger	DTSC	(916) 255-6532 Fax: (916) 255-3596	8800 Cal Center Drive, Sacramento, CA 95826-3200	dlofstro@dtsc.ca.gov
David Cooper Community Involvement Coordinator	EPA	(415) 972-3245 Fax: (415) 947-3528	75 Hawthorne St. Mailcode SFD 6-3 San Francisco, CA 94105	Cooper.david@epa.gov
Marcus Simpson Public Participation Specialist	DTSC	(866) 495-5651	8800 Cal Center Drive, Sacramento, CA 95826	msimpson@dtsc.ca.gov
John West Project Manger	Water Board	(510) 622-2438 Fax: (510) 622-2460	1515 Clay Street, Suite 1400 Oakland, CA 94612	jwest@waterboards.ca.gov
Jennifer Ott Redevelopment Manager	City of Alameda	(510) 749-5831 Fax: (510) 749-5808	950 West Mall Square Alameda, CA 94501	jott@ci.alameda.ca.us

APPENDIX F
INFORMATION REPOSITORY LOCATIONS

F INFORMATION REPOSITORY LOCATIONS

To provide the local community with opportunities to review project documents, one complete and one partial information repository for the Alameda Point Installation Restoration Program have been established.

Alameda Point

950 West Mall Square
Building 1, Room 240
Alameda, CA 94501
(510) 749-5952

Hours:

Mondays-Fridays: 8:30 a.m. – 5:00 p.m.

(Note this information repository is not staffed. You are welcome to enter anytime during business hours and look for documents. You may review them there, or sign the check-out log to borrow the document. All documents must be returned.)

Alameda Free Library

1550 Oak Street
Alameda, CA 94501
(510) 747-7777

Hours:

Monday 12 p.m. - 8 p.m.

Tuesday - Thursday 10 a.m. - 8 p.m.

Friday & Saturday 10 a.m. - 5 p.m.

Sunday 1 - 5 p.m.

Holidays Closed

(Note this is a partial repository because of space limitations. Only the most current documents are available here. Documents are located on the second floor, to the left of the information desk.)

The Navy will evaluate requests for copies of reports on an individual basis. To request a specific document please contact Mr. Derek Robinson, BRAC Environmental Coordinator, at (619) 532-0951; derek.j.robinson1@navy.mil.

APPENDIX G
LOCATION OF THE RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD MEETINGS

G LOCATION OF THE RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD MEETINGS

The Alameda Point Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) meetings are held monthly. Agendas for each upcoming meeting and the meeting location are mailed to RAB members and other interested individuals.

Meeting locations will be accessible to persons using wheelchairs and others with disabilities. For American Sign Language interpretation, use of a reader during a meeting, a sound enhancement system, or alternative formats of the agenda and minutes, please telephone Mr. Derek Robinson (619) 532-0951 at least 72 hours before a meeting.

Current location of the RAB and public meetings:

City of Alameda Offices
950 West Mall Square
Building 1, Room 140
Alameda, CA 94501

Date: First Thursday of each month

Time: 6:30 – 8:30 p.m.

APPENDIX H
MAILING LIST

H MAILING LIST

The mailing list for the Installation Restoration (IR) Program at Alameda Point contains the names of about 500 residents and businesses on Alameda Point, as well as 300 names and addresses for local, state, and federal regulatory agencies, government offices, news media, and other interested parties. Those on the list will receive fact sheets, newsletters, meeting notices, and other important information.

An abbreviated version of the mailing list follows.

RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD COMMUNITY MEMBERS

Ardella Dailey
Alameda Resident

Tony Dover
Oakland Resident

Fred Hoffman
Alameda Resident

George Humphreys
Alameda Resident

Jeff Knoth
Alameda School District

Joan Konrad
Alameda Resident

James D. Leach
Alameda Resident

Bert Morgan
Alameda Resident

Kurt Peterson
Alameda Resident

Bill Smith
Alternate, Alameda Resident

Dale Smith, Community Co-chair
Berkeley Resident

Jean Sweeney
Alameda Resident

Jim Sweeney
Alameda Resident

Michael John Torrey
Alameda Resident

KEY CONTACTS FOR ALAMEDA POINT

For more information about this document, the IR Program, and the Alameda Point Community, contact any of the following:

Mr. Derek J. Robinson
Navy BRAC Environmental Coordinator
Base Realignment and Closure Program
Management Office West
1455 Frazee Road, Suite 900
San Diego, CA 92108-4310
(619) 532-0951
derek.j.robinson1@navy.mil

Mr. David Cooper
Community Involvement Coordinator
U.S. EPA Region IX
75 Hawthorne Street, Mailcode SFD 6-3
San Francisco, CA 94105-3963
(415) 972-3245
Cooper.david@epa.gov

Ms. Anna-Marie Cook
Remedial Project Manager
U.S. EPA, Region IX
75 Hawthorne Street, Mailcode SFD 8-3
San Francisco, CA 94105-3963
(415) 972-3029
cook.anna-marie@epa.gov

Mr. Marcus Simpson
Public Participation Specialist
Department of Toxic Substances Control
8800 Cal Center Drive
Sacramento, CA 95826-3200
(916) 255-6683
msimpson@dtsc.ca.gov

Ms. Dot Lofstrom
Department of Toxic Substances Control
8800 Cal Center Drive
Sacramento, CA 95826-3200
(916) 255-6532
DLofstro@dtsc.ca.gov

Mr. John West
San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality
Control Board
Regional Water Quality Control Board
1515 Clay Street, Suite 1400
Oakland, CA 94612-1482
(510) 622-2438
jwest@waterboards.ca.gov

CITY MANAGER OF ALAMEDA

Debra Kurita
City Manager
2263 Santa Clara Avenue, Room 320
Alameda, CA 94501

ALAMEDA CITY COUNCIL AND ALAMEDA COUNTY SUPERVISORS

Mayor Beverly Johnson
City Hall
2263 Santa Clara Avenue, Room. 320
Alameda, California 94501

Vice Mayor Doug DeHaan
City Hall
2263 Santa Clara Avenue
Alameda, California 94501

Councilmember Lena Tam
City Hall
2263 Santa Clara Avenue
Alameda, California 94501

Councilmember Frank Matarrese
City Hall
2263 Santa Clara Avenue, Room. 320
Alameda, California 94501

Councilmember Marie Gilmore
City Hall
2263 Santa Clara Avenue, Room 190
Alameda, California 94501

Supervisor, Fourth District Nate Miley
Board of Supervisors
1221 Oak Street, Room 536
Oakland, California 94612

Supervisor, Third District Alice Lai-Bitker
Board of Supervisors
1221 Oak Street, Room 536
Oakland, California 94612

CALIFORNIA STATE SENATORS

Senator Mark Leno

California State Senate (District 3)
455 Golden Gate Avenue
Suite 14800
San Francisco, California 94102

Senator Pat Wiggins

California State Senate (District 2)
1040 Main Street
Suite 205
Napa, California 94559

Senator Ellen Corbett

California State Senate (District 10)
39155 Liberty Street
Fremont, California 94538

Senator Loni Hancock California State Senate (District 9)

1515 Clay Street
Suite 2202
Oakland, California 94612

Senator Leland Yee, Ph.D.

California State Senate (District 8)
455 Golden Gate Avenue
Suite 14200
San Francisco, California 94102

CALIFORNIA STATE ASSEMBLY REPRESENTATIVES

Assemblyman Sandre Swanson

California State Assembly (District 16)
1515 Clay Street
Suite 2204
Oakland, California 94612

Assemblyman Alberto Torrico

California State Assembly (District 20)
39510 Paseo Padre Parkway
Suite 280
Fremont, California 94538

U.S. SENATE

U.S. Senator

Senator Diane Feinstein
One Post Street
Suite 2450
San Francisco, California 94104

U.S. Senator

Senator Barbara Boxer
1700 Montgomery Street
Suite 240
San Francisco, California 94111

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Congressman Mike Thompson

District 1
U.S. House of Representatives
1040 Main Street
Suite 101
Napa, California 94559

Congresswoman Ellen Tauscher

District 10
U.S. House of Representatives
2121 North California
Suite 555
Walnut Creek, California 94596

Congresswoman Lynn Woolsey

District 6
U.S. House of Representatives
1050 Northgate Dr
Suite 354
Santa Rafael, California 94903

Congressman Jackie Speier

District 12
U.S. House of Representatives
400 South El Camino Real
Suite 410
San Mateo, California 94402

Congressman George Miller

District 7
U.S. House of Representatives
Willow Pass Road, Suite 203
Concord, California 94520

Congressman Pete Stark

District 13
U.S. House of Representatives
39300 Civic Center Drive
Suite 220
Fremont, California 94538-2324

Congresswoman Nancy Pelosi

District 8
U.S. House of Representatives
450 Golden Gate Avenue
14th Floor
San Francisco, California 94102

Congresswoman Anna Eshoo

District 14
U.S. House of Representatives
698 Emerson Street
Palo Alto, California 94301

Congresswoman Barbara Lee

District 9
U.S. House of Representatives
1301 Clay Street
Suite 1000N
Oakland, California 94612

APPENDIX I
ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD FILE LOCATION

I ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD FILE LOCATION

The complete Administrative Record for Alameda Point is maintained at the Naval Facilities Engineering Command (NAVFAC) Southwest in San Diego, California, in the Environmental Technical Library (ETL).

Because of the volume of documents required for the Administrative Record, all documents may not be in the local information repositories. However, a copy of the complete Administrative Record index and pertinent documents are available for public review at the information repositories located at Alameda Point and the Alameda Library in Alameda.

Copies of documents located at the ETL are available through the following person:

Diane Silva
CERCLA Administrative Records Manager
Administrative Records Office, Code: EVR.DS

Naval Facilities Engineering Command, Southwest
1220 Pacific Highway, Building 1, 3rd Floor
San Diego, California 92132

Phone: (619) 532-3676
Fax: (619) 532-3549

ETL hours are 7:30 a.m. to 3:30 p.m., Monday through Friday. Documents may not be removed from the facility; however, they may be photocopied.

APPENDIX J
RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD RULES

Alameda Point Restoration Advisory Board Rules of Operation

A. Background

1. The Navy is responsible for implementing the Installation Restoration Program at the former Naval Air Station, Alameda, now known as Alameda Point.
2. The Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) Rules of Operation, herein referred to as the “Rules of Operation”, are entered into by the following parties; Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) Program Management Office West (Navy); U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA), Region 9; California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC), Region 4; California Regional Water Quality Control Board, (RWQCB), and RAB community co-chair.
3. The basis and authority for these Rules of Operation are contained in the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) of 1980, as amended by the Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act (SARA) of 1986, particularly Sections 120 (a), 120 (f), and 10U.S.C. 2705, enacted by Section 211 of SARA.
4. The RAB has a Mission Statement, originally authored in 1996, which is attached to these Rules.

B. Purpose and Scope

1. The purpose of the Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) is to review, comment, and make recommendations to the Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) Cleanup Team (BCT) on matters pertaining to the environmental restoration of Alameda Point to facilitate the cleanup and conversion of Alameda Point in a timely manner. In addition, the RB is the primary public forum for interest groups and regulatory agencies.
2. The Navy will provide the RAB with information and documentation that is relevant to these activities. The RAB shall be conducted in accordance with all applicable DOD and Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) guidelines.
3. The Navy developed a Community Relations Plan that outlines the details of the community involvement program. The RAB supplements the community involvement effort.
4. Each member of the RAB is encouraged to provide comments, suggestions, and recommendations and participate in open discussion about all environmental issues related to the cleanup of Alameda Point.

C. RAB Structure

1. The RAB shall be co-chaired by a Navy co-chair and a community co-chair (or Vice community co-chair). The responsibility of presiding over each meeting will be the joint responsibility of the Navy and RAB community co-chairs. In the instance that the co-chairs are unable to effectively run the meeting, the Navy will provide an independent facilitator.
2. The RAB community membership is responsible for terminating a community co-chair who is ineffective or detrimental to the progress of the RAB. Community co-chair removal is determined by a majority vote of the RAB community members present at the meeting for which it was placed on the agenda.
3. The RAB will meet once a month at a time, day and location acceptable to the RAB. More frequent meetings may be held if deemed necessary by the RAB. Schedule changes must be placed on the agenda and passed by a majority vote of the RAB community members, the Navy, City Representatives and the Regulators, affected by the change, who are present at the meeting for which it was placed on the agenda.
4. All meetings of the RAB shall be open public, and all persons shall be permitted to attend any meeting of the RAB or its subcommittees, including special meetings.
5. The Navy co-chair will prepare the draft RAB agenda after consultation with the community co-chair. The co-chairs will coordinate agenda items to permit mailing of the agenda not later than seven days prior to the RAB meeting. The Navy will provide written notification to all RAB members of the upcoming agenda, date, time, and place of RAB meetings. The agenda will provide for a comment period during which the public and RAB will make their comments. Usually, comments by the public and other community members will only be made during this period.
6. The RAB may vote to extend the agenda times at the meeting. However, the maximum length of a RAB meeting will not exceed three hours unless previously specified in the agenda as described in C.5 above. Agenda items that are incomplete will automatically be added to the next meeting's agenda or, if necessary, another future meeting at the discretion of the co-chairs.
7. The Navy co-chair shall be responsible for recording and disseminating meeting minutes. Draft copies of the meeting minutes shall be supplied to the members and the ARRA/City Council approximately seven days before the next meeting for correction at the next scheduled meeting. The Navy co-chair shall collect a written list of attendees at each meeting, which will be sent to all RAB members in the monthly agenda packet and will be made available for public review in the Navy's Information Repository (listed below).

8. The Navy will arrange for a timely presentation of current documents at RAB meetings for review and comment. The RAB may request that the Navy provide training to increase the RAB's understanding of environmental restoration issues and processes. The Navy may also suggest training opportunities.
9. Where necessary, special focus groups of the RAB may be called to review and comment on key documents. A focus group can be suggested by RAB members, and membership to the group will be by self-nomination. The RAB or focus groups should review, discuss and provide comments on a wide variety of technical documents and plans. Focus meetings will typically be held outside of the normal RAB meeting times at a location and time agreed upon by the focus group. Normally, focus groups will be comprised of community and institutional RAB members. If deemed appropriate by the focus group, the Navy, regulatory agencies, ARRA, City, or other participants may be invited to attend.
10. Written comments from RAB members, RAB focus groups, and TAPP (Technical Assistance for Public Participation) contractors will be submitted directly to the Navy co-chair, which will provide them to the BCT. Verbal discussion is to be promoted as much as possible. To facilitate communication, individual RAB members may comment directly to the Navy, if they prefer. Any written response by the Navy shall also be placed in the Information Repository.
11. The RAB may request a written response to written comments.
12. The Navy has established an information repository for public documents related to environmental restoration activities at Alameda Point and will maintain the repository. RAB members are expected to report to the Navy co-chair if the documents appear out of order or out of date. The RAB section should include minutes of RAB Meetings, member and BCT comments/responses, an administrative record index, these rules of operation, any supplemental RAB procedures, as well as all relevant technical publications arising from the environmental restoration activities. The repository is located at:

City Hall West Annex
950 West Mall Square
Alameda, CA 94501
Rooms 240 and 241
(415) 743-4713

D. Membership

1. RAB community membership is voluntary and shall serve without compensation. The community membership shall serve without compensation. The RAB should consist of the following:
 - a. Designated representatives of the Navy, Federal and State Regulatory agencies.
 - b. Designated representatives of the ARRA/Alameda City Council, and Alameda Unified School District.
 - c. Community members including representatives of environmental organizations, local businesses, community based non-profits and residents at large.
 - d. An alternate, selected by a member, will be allowed to vote.
2. Members should be willing to communicate with local community people and interest groups concerned with general or specific base cleanup issues. Members serve as a direct conduit for the flow of information to and from the community.
3. All RAB community members are expected to attend regular meetings. If any member has four or more unexcused absences in a calendar year, he or she will be automatically removed from the RAB. Inactive members may be retained at the discretion of the RAB. RAB community members who have been removed for absences can reapply.
4. Although the RAB has no power to force government agency representatives or members designated by government agencies to attend the meeting, the RAB may write letters to the respective agency to encourage their participation or request their appointed representatives(s) be replaced.
5. The community co-chair and vice co-chair shall serve a term of one year from January 1, through December 31. Prior to the expiration of the Community co-chair term, the RAB will announce the availability of the co-chair or vice co-chair position. Interested RAB members will have the opportunity to “self nominate” or nominate a member of the RAB for the co-chair and vice co-chair position. At the first regular meeting of the RAB, prior to the community co-chair and vice co-chair term expiration, a majority of the RAB members shall elect a co-chair and vice co-chair. The community co-chair or vice co-chair may be re-elected for another term. If the community co-chair or vice co-chair resigns or loses his/her seat, a new co-chair or vice co-chair will be elected and will finish out the term and then have the opportunity to run for re-election to a subsequent term.
6. When necessary, the community co-chair will convene a membership selection panel. The panel will announce the vacancy (ies), evaluate the applications and submit one or more nominees to the RAB. Community groups, citizens, and interest groups reflecting the diverse interests of the community may be referred to the RAB membership selection panel. The selection panel will seek consultation from the navy co-chair on the diversity of the RAB. Nominations are to be approved by a majority vote of the RAB community members present at a RAB meeting for which the nomination was placed on the agenda.

E. Membership Selection Criteria

1. The membership selection panel or entire RAB membership will use, at a minimum, the following criteria for selecting RAB members. Additional criteria may be established at any time by the membership subcommittee or the entire RAB. Members will be evaluated for:
 - a. Willingness to meet the purpose of the RAB.
 - b. Ability to work effectively and cooperatively with other RAB members.
 - c. Ability to make a positive contribution to the RAB by virtue of experience, education, community interest or area of expertise.
 - d. Willingness to serve for a minimum of two years.
 - e. No apparent conflict of interest.
2. Applicants are required to be present at the RAB meeting when his/her membership is being brought to vote.

F. Voting

The following general process will be followed:

1. A motion must be made and seconded by a RAB member, (or their alternate).
2. The RAB members will hold discussion on the matter.
3. The community will be afforded a reasonable amount of time to add comment on the matter, if requested.
4. The motion will be put forth for a vote by the RAB members, (or alternates).
5. Members who become aware of a potential conflict of interest will abstain from voting.
6. Navy and regulatory agency (USEPA, DTSC, and Water Board) are not voting RAB members.

G. Effective Date and Amendments

1. The effective date of these Rules of Operation shall be May 7, 2009 – subject to prior approval. These Rules of Operation shall replace the RAB Rules of Operation dated May 26, 1996.
2. These Rules of Operation may be amended by a majority vote of the RAB members present at the meeting for which it was placed on the agenda. Amendments must be consistent with the CERCLA and SARA statutes as stated previously. A Rules of Operation Committee may be appointed bi-annually to look at any proposed amendments to be then brought back to the membership for discussion and a determination.

NAS ALAMEDA RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD

MISSION STATEMENT

The mission of the Alameda Point Restoration Advisory Board is to encourage and facilitate the participation of the community in the environmental cleanup decision making process. The RAB's goal is to ensure that the cleanup of Alameda Point: 1) protects human and ecological health; 2) responds to the diverse interests, needs, and concerns of the community; and 3) promotes environmental restoration to the greatest extent possible in a manner that facilitates timely transfer of the base to civilian and public use.

The RAB endeavors to achieve its mission and goals by pursuing the following objectives:

- to serve as a forum for effective communication and consensus building among the community, the Navy, and the environmental agencies on cleanup issues*
- to promote community awareness and to educate and inform the community on issues related to the cleanup process*
- to review and comment on cleanup activities, documents and plans*
- to assist in the identification and resolution of environmental issues in a manner satisfactory to the community*

**APPENDIX K
RESPONSES TO COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT PLAN
UPDATE**

RESPONSES TO COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT PLAN UPDATE, ALAMEDA POINT, ALAMEDA, CALIFORNIA, AUGUST 14, 2009

This document presents the Department of the Navy's (Navy) responses to regulatory comments from US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), and Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) on the Draft Community Involvement Plan Update (CIP). In addition, in an email provided by John West dated 9/16/09, he stated the San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board does not have any significant comments on the Draft CIP.

The comments addressed below were received by the Navy from Anna-Marie Cook on October 19, 2009, David Cooper on December 15, 2009, Dot Lofstrom on October 19, 2009, and Marcus Simpson on October 26, 2009. The comments and responses are provided below.

RESPONSES TO EPA SPECIFIC COMMENTS – Anna-Marie Cook

Comment 1: **General Comments: EPA 1:** Overall, this document was written in an easy-to-read, informative and casual style that made for a welcome change from the highly technical and often oversize documents we usually review. I found the section on Community Interviews fascinating. It was well thought out and presented and provided some new insights into community concerns while confirming other existing concerns.

One issue that can be improved on is that throughout the document, there is a confusing mix-up of the Navy's IR Program and the BRAC Program which operate under different guidelines and regulations, although they overlap in some aspects. I have provided specific comments in the areas where this issue is a problem. Also, there are some places where non-NPL documents are cited, and these do not apply to Alameda Point because it is an NPL site. I have flagged these places for revision.

Response: The Navy appreciates the feedback. The Navy would like to clarify that the environmental restoration program conducted at active Navy installations and Navy Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) installations is the same and is known as the Installation Restoration (IR) Program. There are only minor differences of how the IR Program is carried out at BRAC bases (i.e. eligibility of petroleum clean-up, site prioritization).

The Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act (SARA) established the Defense Environmental Restoration Program (DERP). Through the DERP, the DoD conducts environmental restoration activities at sites on active installations and BRAC installations. Each military department of the Department of Defense (DoD) is responsible for implementing the DERP. The Navy created the IR Program to comply with CERCLA and the DERP by identifying and cleaning up past contamination from hazardous substances, pollutants, and contaminants in order to protect human health and the environment.

Although the source of funding for environmental restoration on active Navy installations is different than that of BRAC installations (Environmental Restoration, Navy funding versus BRAC funding), both types of installations implement the Navy's Installation Restoration Program. Language has been included as indicated in the Response to Comments (RTCs) below to provide clarification on the IR Program and the mission of BRAC.

In addition, the Navy has omitted any references to non-National Priorities List (NPL) documents and regulatory requirements throughout the document.

Comment 2: **Page ES-1, second paragraph:** Using the 1981 reference is not very relevant in the context of the CIP. Although the Navy started the IR program in 1981 for all military bases, the requirements for setting up a RAB and developing community involvement programs came out of the BRAC program. Alameda was designated for closure in 1994, at which time a RAB was formed and the concepts for community involvement were developed for this base. The CIP is therefore specifically developed as part of the BRAC cleanup program (which defers to CERCLA requirements and the NCP for cleanup as well as applicable State law) and not the IR program. The Navy calls their program "the Installation Restoration Program", but cleanup work for a BRAC base has to be performed in accordance with CERCLA and this is the reason EPA and the State provide regulatory oversight.

Response: The text has been revised as follows, "The Navy's Installation Restoration (IR) Program was developed to comply with the provisions of Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) by identifying, investigating, remediating or controlling releases of hazardous substances and reducing risk to human health and the environment. This CIP has been specifically prepared in support of the cleanup being conducted at NAS Alameda, now commonly referred to as Alameda Point. The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), the California Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC), and the San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board (Water Board) provide regulatory oversight."

Comment 3: **Page 1-1, first paragraph:** The wording in this paragraph sounds awkward given that almost all investigations on the base have been completed and more than half the IR sites are in cleanup status. Recommend rewording to be current and acknowledge where the cleanup process is.

Response: This has been revised to reflect that the program has not just begun: “The Department of Defense (DoD) is committed to regular, meaningful community participation. Throughout the cleanup process, the Department of the Navy has used various methods to inform and involve the community. This Community Involvement Plan (CIP) outlines the various methods that Navy has used, as well as new methods they will implement to continue to inform and involve the community in the investigation and cleanup process at the former Naval Air Station (NAS) Alameda.”

Comment 4: **Page 1-1, second paragraph:** The cleanup program for the IR sites is the CERCLA cleanup program, of which the petroleum program is not part. The petroleum program, I believe, does operate under the auspices of the Navy’s IR program, although from the compliance side of things rather than the cleanup side? Please replace “IR Program” with “CERCLA cleanup requirements”.

Response: CERCLA excludes petroleum from the definition of hazardous substances. However, the Navy has determined that petroleum cleanup is eligible for BRAC funding and is conducted concurrently at Alameda Point. To avoid any confusion, the last sentence of the second paragraph on Page 1-1 will be revised as follows, “The petroleum cleanup program for Alameda Point is currently ongoing, but is not part of this CIP.”

Comment 5: **Page 1-1, Section 1.1, first paragraph:** Again, clarification as to how the IR Program, the BRAC program, and CERCLA work together here would be helpful.

Response: The first paragraph has been replaced with the following, “CERCLA (also known as Superfund) passed in 1980, created the legal mechanism for cleaning up abandoned or uncontrolled hazardous waste sites. CERCLA did not originally apply to military installations. However, in 1986, Congress passed the Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act (SARA), which mandated that DoD follow CERCLA. SARA also established the DERP. Through the DERP, the DoD conducts environmental restoration activities. Each military department of the DoD (Army, Air Force, Navy and Marine Corps) is responsible for implementing the DERP. The Navy created the IR Program to follow CERCLA by identifying and cleaning up past contamination from hazardous substances, pollutants, and contaminants in order to protect human health and the environment at both active and BRAC installations. BRAC installations are those that have been closed or realigned to sustain military readiness and improve the defense mission. Implementing the Navy’s IR Program is a vital aspect to meeting the BRAC Program Management Office (PMO) mission which is to provide all services necessary to realign, close, and dispose of Navy BRAC properties.”

Comment 6: **Page 1-3, Section 1.4:** The BEC contact information will need to be updated. Also, instead of 8th floor for my address, please put “Mailcode SFD 8-3”, and my phone number should be (415) 972-3029 (the number currently given is for the Concord Naval Weapons Station EPA RPM).

Response: This has been revised globally.

Comment 7: **Page 2-1, first paragraph:** It would be more accurate to state that as part of the BRAC program, the Navy has developed a CIP. For instance, on active bases (those that are non-BRAC), the Navy has an IR program, but usually no CIP, and no RAB.

Response: The Navy’s IR Program, as stated in the “Department of the Navy Environmental Restoration Program Manual,” addresses releases of hazardous substances at both Navy active and BRAC installations. CIPs and RABs are actually components of the IR Program at both types of installations, however, the text was generalized to read: “This section presents the community involvement program to be executed as part of the Navy’s investigation and cleanup for Alameda Point.”

Comment 8: **Page 2-5, second sentence:** Typo – “Navy co-chairs” should be “Navy co-chair”.

Response: The RAB community co-chair has been added to the list with permission, and it has been changed to “RAB co-chairs”.

Comment 9: **Page 2-5, RAB Review of Technical Documents, last sentence:** Please provide a timeframe for the Navy to respond to comments from the RAB.

Response: This has been revised with the following language: The Navy will consider and respond to all written comments received on draft documents from RAB members in the same time frame as agency comments per the Site Management Plan (SMP) schedule.

Comment 10: **Page 2-7, top paragraph on page and Section 2.4.6:** Are there any plans to make information provided in fact sheets and work notices available in other languages?

Response: There is currently no plan to make information available in other languages. Based on information gathered during the interviews, there does not seem to be an overwhelming need to have information translated at this time. However, the Navy will consider requests for information in other languages on a case-by-case basis.

Comment 11: **Page 2-8, Section 2.4.12:** The Navy needs to hold public comment periods for non-time critical removal actions in advance of starting field work (the EE/CA is subject to a 30-day public review) and must provide public notice and a public comment period for TCRA within 60 days of starting field work. Please note that draft remedial action plans are documents confined to non-NPL sites, under State oversight lead, and are not used at Alameda which is an NPL site under federal oversight lead. Please delete the reference to the remedial action plan in this paragraph.

Response: Tables 5-1 and 5-2 list all of the appropriate comment periods and other relevant community involvement activities. Those tables have been renamed [Table 2-1](#) and [Table 2-2](#), and are now referred to in this section.

Comment 12: **Page 2-9, Section 2.4.15, last sentence:** Please state specifically what the “updated map” is of, e.g., most current IR Sites.

Response: This has been revised to indicate the map is of current IR Sites.

Comment 13: **Page 3-1, bullets:** There should also be a bullet for congressional representative staff since a member of Senator Barbara Boxer’s staff was interviewed for this CIP update.

Response: This has been revised to note a congressional representative was interviewed.

Comment 14: **Page 3-4, Section 3.2.4, bottom of the page:** Minor edit – there is a formatting error here with triple spacing between the last line and the preceding paragraph.

Response: This has been revised, and a final check of all formatting will be conducted before final publication in case further edits affect formatting.

Comment 15: **Page 4-3, Section 4.4.2, last paragraph:** The Coast Guard still occupies, and now owns, the Marina Village Housing area (IR Site 31).

Response: This has been noted.

Comment 16: **Page 5-1, Section 5.2.1:** The statement “CERCLA requires that contaminated federal facilities on the NPL, such as Alameda Point, comply with all applicable state laws that govern removal and remedial actions” is not accurate. The investigations and remedial response actions are required (under the FFA which is required for NPL federal facilities) to be carried out in accordance with CERCLA, the NCP, and applicable state law and meet the requirements of CERCLA section 120(e)(2).

- Response:** This has been revised as follows: “Investigations and remedial response actions are required to be carried out in accordance with CERCLA, the NCP, and applicable state law.”
- Comment 17:** **Page 5-1, Section 5.2.1:** I question the use of including the description of CERFA at this late stage in cleanup. For Alameda Point, there was no property that met the CERFA requirements and no property was transferred under this provision.
- Response:** This has been revised to exclude CERFA.
- Comment 18:** **Page 5-2, Section 5.3, first paragraph:** Recommend using “hazardous substances” rather than “CERCLA substances” for greater clarity.
- Response:** This has been revised to “CERLCA hazardous substances” in accordance with EPAs definition at: <http://www.epa.gov/oem/content/hazsubs/cercsubs.htm>.
Including the definition of a CERCLA hazardous substance does not fit within the context of the CIP, instead a link to the EPA definition will be provided for further clarification.
- Comment 19:** **Page 5-2, Section 5.3.1, first bullet:** This bullet needs clarification. A hazardous waste site falls under the purview of the RCRA program and hazardous waste is a RCRA term that carries a specific definition. The term used for an NPL site or one that will be cleaned up in accordance with the CERCLA program is “release” which encompasses a broader universe than “waste”. So, once a hazardous release is suspected or confirmed, then the EPA and state agencies are notified.
- Response:** This has been revised to use the term “release”, rather than “waste”.
- Comment 20:** **Page 5-2, Section 5.3.1, third bullet:** Define the acronym (SI) and recommend adding “The SI usually requires preliminary sampling and analysis of soil...”
- Response:** This has been revised as suggested.
- Comment 21:** **Page 5-3, first five bullets:** Please define the acronym used to head each bullet. In the bullet under “FS”, please define “Proposed Plan” instead of “PP” at the end of the sentence.
- Response:** This has been revised with all acronyms on this bulleted list being spelled out first.

Comment 22: **Page 5-3, second bullet (FS), second sentence:** Add to the end of the sentence "...cost effectiveness, ability to reach cleanup goals in a reasonable time frame, and community acceptance." In the case of the Alameda Point RAB, the duration of the cleanup is usually a big issue.

Response: This has been revised to state all nine of the NCP criteria, as follows: "The FS incorporates data collected during the RI to develop and evaluate cleanup alternatives. Cleanup alternatives are evaluated based on the nine criteria in the National Contingency Plan. Those are: (1) protection of human health and the environment, (2) compliance with applicable or relevant and appropriate requirements, (3) long-term effectiveness, (4) reduction of toxicity, mobility, or volume through treatment as a principal element, (5) short-term effectiveness, (6) implementability, (7) cost, (8) state acceptance, and (9) community acceptance."

Comment 23: **Page 5-3, third bullet:** First sentence add "...to describe cleanup alternatives and cleanup goals and explain...". Third sentence rewrite as follows "The Navy considers all comments received on the PP..." Fourth sentence rewrite as "The Navy provides a response to all comments..."

Response: The text has been revised as follows: "The PP is a fact sheet that is developed for the public in order to describe cleanup alternatives and cleanup goals, and explain why the preferred remedy was identified. This is a key milestone for members of the public to provide written and oral comments (on record at a public meeting) on the PP. The Navy considers all comments received on the PP before a final decision is made. Responses to all comments are in the responsiveness summary, which is included as an appendix to the ROD."

Comment 24: **Page 5-3, fourth bullet:** First sentence rewrite as "The selected cleanup solution is documented in a legal decision document called the Record of Decision". Note that the ROD is not available for public review during the time it is being developed. The PP is the document available to the public to review and provide comments on. RODs will be available for the public to look at after they have been finalized, but there is no allowance in the BRAC guidelines for public review of the draft ROD. The PP and the associated public meeting are advertised in local papers and mailouts, but not the ROD. The last sentence in this bullet should be deleted because Alameda Point does not use RAPs since it is an NPL site.

Response: The text has been revised as follows: "The selected remedy is documented in a legal decision document called the Record of Decision. All those who sign the Federal Facilities Agreement (FFA), sign the ROD. The ROD contains a responsiveness summary for public comments received on the PP. After the ROD is finalized, a public notice announcing the signing of the ROD is published."

Comment 25: **Page 5-4, second bullet:** Please define “NFA”. I would recommend deleting the last sentence in this bullet as well because it sounds like the regulators and the Navy can ignore the ROD and decide on NFA. NFA can only happen if remedial goals have been met, or if there is a ROD ESD or Amendment that decides that NFA is a more appropriate remedy than the previously selected active remedy.

Response: The text has been revised as follows: “SC occurs when all necessary remedial action activities are complete and the Navy and regulatory agencies agree that remedial goals have been met, and that No Further Action (NFA) is warranted at the site.”

Comment 26: **Page 5-4, Section 5.3.2, first paragraph in section:** I believe that the public comment period on removal actions is stated incorrectly here. The public has a chance to review over a 30-day period any EE/CA for a non-time critical removal action in advance of field work starting. TCRA and emergency removal actions do not have EE/CAs. However, they do have notification requirements, which for a TCRA consists of a published notice of availability of the administrative record file within 60 days of initiation of on-site removal activity and provisions for a public comment period of at least 30 days. The public does not have to comment prior to decision making for a TCRA, only for a NTCRA.

Response: The text has been revised as follows: “Time-Critical Removal Actions: The cleanup must begin within 6 months after the lead agency determines that a removal action is necessary. An Action Memorandum (AM) is prepared documenting the action to be taken. With a Time-Critical Removal Action, work can begin immediately, and a public notice is published within 60 days of the start of work. The public has a 30-day comment period following publication of that notice.

Non-Time Critical Removal Actions: The cleanup need not begin within 6 months after the lead agency determines that a removal action is necessary. Non time critical removal actions require preparation of an engineering evaluation/cost analysis (EE/CA) and an action memorandum (AM). With a Non-Time Critical Removal Action, an Engineering Evaluation/Cost Analysis (EE/CA) is prepared, and the public has a minimum 30-day public comment period before a decision is made.”

Comment 27: **Page 5-4, Section 5.3.2, first bullet:** Action Memoranda are also required for TCRAs, not just NTCRAs.

Response: This has been revised to note an AM is also prepared for TCRAs.

Comment 28: **Page 5-4, Section 5.3.2, second bullet:** The EE/CA has a required 30-day public comment period.

Response: This has been revised to reflect that comment period.

Comment 29: **Page 5-4, Section 5.3.2, third bullet:** Recommend rewriting this paragraph as follows “An EE/CA is a focused and condensed feasibility study geared toward describing why a removal action is needed and how the removal action will mitigate actual or threatened exposure of a release to human populations, animals or the food chain. It evaluates risk and clean up objectives and develops a small number of alternatives which are compared against effectiveness, implementability and cost criteria.” Please delete the reference to the RAP.

Response: This has been revised as suggested.

Comment 30: **Page 5-4, Section 5.3.2, fourth bullet:** Please double check the public notice requirements for the Action Memo. See comment #25 above. Also, please delete the reference to the RAP as it is not relevant to this site.

Response: This has been revised.

Comment 31: **Page 5-5, Section 5.4, first paragraph, second sentence:** Please revise “hazardous waste” to “hazardous substances”.

Response: This has been revised.

Comment 32: **Page 5-5, Section 5.4, second paragraph:** Please elaborate on what determines “acceptable” in the sense of property transfer. Also, I do not believe that the FOST undergoes public review.

Response: The text has been revised as follows: “Before transfer of title to real property by deed or lease of Navy BRAC property the Navy must ensure all applicable statutory and regulatory requirements have been satisfied. Once the property has been assessed as acceptable, it is ready for transfer. At this point, the Navy prepares a Finding of Suitability to Transfer (FOST) and it is submitted for regulatory review.”

Comment 33: **Page 5-5, Section 5.4, last paragraph:** Update this information to include the recent FOST for Estuary Park.

Response: This has been revised to include the recent FOST, and the conveyance of land to the USGS.

Comment 34: **Page 6-1, Section 6.2, Site 18:** Suggest revising “however, it is no longer considered a CERCLA site” to “however, it is no longer being evaluated as a separate IR Site. Instead contaminated or potentially contaminated sections of the storm sewer system are evaluated as part of the nearest IR site.”

Response: This has been revised as suggested.

Comment 35: Table 5-2 Removal Action Process the table should not be headed with “Time Critical Removal Action” with “Non-Time Critical Removal Action” as a subheading. Rather the “less than 120 days” and “more than 120 days” should be subheaded under TCRA and then NTCRA should be put alongside TCRA.

Response: This has been revised, with the table broken into TCRA and NTCRA. Please note the table is now referenced earlier in the text, and is therefore now titled [Table 2-2](#).

Comment 36: **Key Contacts – Appendix E:** The contact list needs to be updated with the new BEC information. Also, my telephone number and mailcode need to be corrected as per comment #5. Elizabeth Johnson no longer works for the City of Alameda. Perhaps Leslie Little could be the new contact?

Response: This has been revised to update the BEC and your contact information globally. Based on further review, Jennifer Ott has been added City of Alameda contact.

Comment 37: **Information Repository Locations - Appendix F:** The BEC information will need updating and perhaps it would be a good idea to include Diane Silva’s contact information the way it is included in Proposed Plans.

Response: The BEC information has been revised. Diane is the contact for the administrative record, not the information repository, so her information was not added.

Comment 38: **Mailing List – Appendix H:** Contact information for the BEC and for me needs to be updated/corrected

Response: This has been revised.

RESPONSES TO EPA SPECIFIC COMMENTS – David Cooper

Comment 1: **Appendix C** – I suggest changing the answers to question number 29 to a summary rather than a verbatim list of responses. Some, while important information to share with the Navy, are irrelevant to the CIP, and some identify the respondent.

Response: This has been revised.

Comment 2: **My contact information** - phone number, fax, and mail code, need to be corrected globally.

Response: This has been revised.

Comment 3: **Appendix D** - listing some small organizations as interviewees may not provide individuals with privacy, as people may know who was interviewed. However, there is nothing that must be corrected in this appendix, just a reminder about erring on the side of privacy.

Response: Names of organizations that could identify the individual were changed to a category (e.g., “church” instead of the name of the church).

Comment 4: Provide a table of future work for all pre-ROD sites. This would be similar to a table from CIPs at other installations. It would include 3 columns: what will be done at the site, the related community involvement activity, and the schedule. Use the dates from the SMP schedule. Since schedule change, the table can have a disclaimer that dates are tentative and subject to change.

Response: Since [Table 6-1](#) already includes details on what will be done at each site and the schedule for the next milestone and [Tables 2-1 and 2-2](#) (formerly Tables 5-1 and 5-2 in the draft version) discuss related community involvement activities, we do not think an additional table is necessary. In addition, we have noted in the text that the SMP schedule is available to the public and that a copy of upcoming documents is handed out at every RAB meeting and that the public can contact the Navy for copies of these schedules.

RESPONSES TO DTSC SPECIFIC COMMENTS – Dot Lofstrom

Comment 1: Section 2.3, “Activities for Achieving Goals of the Community Involvement Program,” consists of four goals the Navy has established for itself, with a bullet list of activities designed to achieve those goals. In order to be meaningful, the goals should have a performance measure tied to each one, and, in many cases, a schedule associated with it. The following, non-exhaustive list has examples of how goals and objectives could be rewritten so as to include both a measure of performance and a specific time period associated with achieving the goals.

Response: Where possible, the Navy has included a schedule associated with activities. See responses below for specific examples.

Comment 2: Goal No. 1, fourth bullet, states that the Navy will “continue to regularly inspect and update, as needed, the information repositories located at Alameda Point and the Alameda Free Library.” This objective would be well-served if a specific schedule were tied to it, such as, “inspect and update on a monthly basis the information repositories located at Alameda Point and the Alameda Free Library. Such inspections will be recorded monthly on a CIP checksheet of activities to be performed by the Navy and distributed to the BCT.”

Response: A schedule has been tied to the Information Repositories updates. The text is revised as follows: “Regularly inspect and update, on a monthly basis, the information repositories located at Alameda Point and the Alameda Free Library, and take corrective actions to fix them if they become disorganized or if documents are found missing.”

A checklist of all Navy CIP activities (new and ongoing) will be distributed to the RAB and BCT after finalization of this report for informational purposes.

Comment 3: Goal No. 3 of the Community Involvement Plan Update (CIP) is to “allow for two-way communication between the public and the Navy and regulatory agencies.” The text goes on to explain that this means that the Navy will monitor and respond in a timely manner to community concerns, questions, and requests throughout the IR process. This goal would be stronger if there were a specific time period associated with it rather than the vague “in a timely manner,” so that it might read, “Monitor and respond within eight weeks of receipt or notification of community concerns, questions and requests.”

Response: The goals are an overview and are somewhat general. A specific time-frame has been added to comments under [Section 2.4.3](#). The text is revised as follows: “The Navy will consider and respond to all written comments received on draft documents from RAB members in the same time frame as agency comments per the Site Management Plan (SMP) schedule.”

Comment 4: Goal No. 4, bullet 4 states that a feedback form will periodically be provided at Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) meetings for RAB members and community members. This objective would be stronger and more meaningful if it stated “Periodically, but at least annually, provide a feedback form at RAB meetings for RAB members and community members.”

Response: The text has been revised as suggested.

Comment 5: The name and contact information for the community co-chair is not included under the heading “RAB Navy and Community Co-Chairs.” This information should be provided unless the Community Co-Chair has requested that it be withheld. In the case of the latter, a statement to that effect should be made in lieu of a name or address.

Response: The name and contact information for the Community Co-Chair has been added, with permission.

Comment 6: In the first paragraph under the subheading “RAB Meetings,” the CIP states that the Navy will continue to publish an agenda before the [RAB] meeting. This would be a stronger objective if it included the specific time period of seven days (as stated in a later paragraph) associated with this action, such as, “At least one week before the RAB meeting, the Navy will publish an agenda of the meeting.” Also, it would be better to state where the Navy will be publishing the agenda, as that is not stated. Will the agenda be published on the BRAC website? Or perhaps sent by e-mail to the RAB members? If the CIP is referring to the hard copy RAB meeting minutes and agenda that are sent out a few days before the RAB meeting, than the CIP should specify that. Also, this would be a good opportunity for the Navy to commit to sending the agenda in a more timely manner, perhaps aiming for individual RAB members to receive the agenda at least seven days before the next RAB meeting, rather than committing to sending it out seven days before the RAB meeting.

Response: This has been revised to indicate the agenda will be mailed one week prior to the meeting, and sent to the RAB hard copy and to the full community email distribution list electronically.

Comment 7: The CIP states in Section 2.4.12, Public Comment Periods, that the Navy will continue to provide public comment periods for all technical documents that are produced about environmental cleanup, and then specifies that public comment periods will be held for site-specific removal actions, draft remedial action plans, and Proposed Plans. Of the three documents specified, I am only aware of public comment periods with Proposed Plans. Has the Navy been holding public comment periods for site-specific removal actions and remedial action plans?

Response: The text for Section 2.4.12 has been revised as follows: “The Navy will continue to provide public comment periods for all technical documents that are produced about environmental cleanup, as required by current state and federal regulations. Public comment periods are a legal requirement of the remedial action process, and sometimes the removal action process, and must be open for at least 30 days. These review periods will be announced in local newspapers, and via e-mail to the e-mail distribution list. See [Table 2-1](#) for community involvement activities during the remedial action process, and [Table 2-2](#) for community involvement activities during the removal action process.”

Comment 8:

The CIP states in Section 2.4.16, Community Meetings that the Navy will continue to conduct community meetings as site-specific activities and RAB or community interest dictates. Have these community meeting occurred in the past? When was the last community meeting? The stated purpose of these meetings is to improve the community’s understanding of the “big picture” of cleanup. I am not aware of any community meetings that the Navy has held in the four years that I’ve been the Project Manager for this site. This portion of the text should be rewritten so as to provide a specific timeline commitment to this task, as in “Community meetings will be conducted at least annually to improve the community’s understanding of the big picture of cleanup.” Moreover, the Navy should hold these annual Community meetings in mid-town Alameda, rather than on Alameda Point, as requested by some of the community members interviewed for the CIP update.

Response:

The Navy has only held public meetings specifically for a PP. The text has been revised as follows: “The Navy will conduct community meetings as site-specific activities and RAB or community interest dictates. Information at the meetings will be developed to improve the community’s understanding of the “big picture” of cleanup, and to answer frequently asked questions, clarify any miscommunications, and explain technical issues. The Navy will contact local organizations, as identified during the interviews, and offer to give a presentation at their meetings annually. For Navy-hosted meetings, the Navy will hold public meetings in location(s) that are convenient and accessible to the community; several interviewees suggested locations in downtown or mid-town may be more convenient for community meetings.”

Comment 9:

The interviewees often had suggestions as to how to improve the communication process, but the CIP is silent on whether any of these suggestions will be acted on by the Navy. For example, on page 3.5, the second bullet is a quote of an interviewee who recommends beginning the RAB meetings by asking if anyone new is attending and making them feel welcome. This seems like an excellent suggestion that could be easily incorporated into the RAB meetings at no cost and little time, but there is no commitment from the Navy included in the CIP update, no analysis of the recommendations that would suggest change on the part of the Navy. Along these same lines, there were several suggestions of events where the Navy might host a booth (described at the top of page 3-7), but there seems to be no follow-up to these suggestions. The four goals presented on pages 2-1 through 2-4 frequently begin with “continue to” rather than “implement” or “begin a program to”. The overall impression the reader gets from the CIP is that the public participation portion of the Alameda Point project is doing quite well, and that the Navy only needs to continue doing what it is already doing to have a successful relationship with the public. The public would be better served if the Navy were to look critically at their own program, look for ways to improve and change, and then implement the changes.

Response: The Navy has taken another critical look at the interviewee suggestions and added in several specific activities in order to respond to community interests throughout [Section 2.0](#). Those include: greeting people at RAB meetings; using a feedback form at RAB meetings annually; offering a presentation to local groups at least once a year; using email to communicate more, such as emailing RAB agendas and public comment periods; putting an updated IR map on the website; and preparing graphics for RAB members to help them communicate with the public.

Based on feedback from BRAC personnel, hosting booths at community events have not been very effective in conducting community outreach historically. The Navy supports trying this at an upcoming community event at Alameda and if it works putting it into the next CIP update. However, at this time the Navy does not want to commit to an activity in the CIP that has not proven to be effective.

The Navy is preparing a table of all community involvement activities, new and ongoing, in order to track progress of the community involvement program. That table will be shared with the RAB and BCT.

Comment 10: The Section 5.3.2, “FS” bullet states that “A preferred cleanup alternative is identified in the [Feasibility Study] FS and is distributed to the form of a [Proposed Plan] PP.” This is partially correct. Most Feasibility Studies at Alameda Point carefully refrain from identifying a preferred cleanup alternative, and it is only at the PP stage that the preferred cleanup alternative is recommended.

Response: That sentence was removed as it provided no clarity about the FS.

Comment 11: Table 5-1 states that Public Meetings and Workshops are held at the remedial investigation, feasibility study, proposed plan and remedial design stages. I am not aware of any public meetings and workshops held within the last four years for any of these documents with the exception of proposed plans. These documents are, however, discussed at RAB meetings, and a separate row titled “Involve Restoration Advisory Board,” makes that clear. Perhaps another column should be added to the table, or a footnote, to indicate that the work associated with these documents are discussed at RAB meetings rather than “public meetings and workshops.” Along those same lines, the table states that Fact Sheets or Summaries are prepared for Feasibility Studies, Proposed Plans, Records of Decision, and Remedial Design/Remedial Action Workplans. Fact sheets are sometimes, but not always, prepared in conjunction with the implementation of remedial action, such as the August 2009 fact sheet for IR Site 27 (Dock Zone), but the table implies that the Navy routinely sends out fact sheets or summaries associated with every one of the documents cited above. If the table is referring to the summary provided at the RAB meetings, than that distinction should be made.

Response: This has been revised to indicate public meetings are held during the PP process, and to note that fact sheets are optional rather than routine for actions other than the PP. A footnote has been added noting this work is discussed at RAB meetings.

Comment 12: The historic use for IR Site 1 is listed, on Table 6-1, as “Used primarily as a disposal area for waste/garbage generated on the facility. Portions of the site were also used to store aircraft parts and petroleum and as a pistol and skeet range.” This description seems a bit mild. In particular, use of the word “garbage” connotes a more benign type of waste than was actually disposed of at Site 1. The historical use would be more accurately written as “Principal waste disposal area for all waste generated at NAS Alameda between the years 1943 to 1965, including old aircraft engines, cables, scrap metal, waste oil, paint waste, solvents, cleaning compounds, construction debris, incinerator ash, and low-level radiological waste.” This statement was taken directly from the draft final Record of Decision for IR Site 1.

Response: This has been revised with the statement from the ROD. Note the years for waste disposal at the site were 1943 to 1956.

Comment 13: **Table 6-1 Alameda Point Site/Areas Description.** This table is a useful compilation of site descriptions and milestones, and it is particularly helpful to read the summary of work performed. However, the table should be updated before the CIP is final. Specifically:

- Site 2 Proposed Plan completed September 09
- OU-2A FS is scheduled to be submitted for regulatory review on 10/21/09
- OU2B FS is scheduled to be submitted for regulatory review on 12/7/09
- Update “work performed” for Site 14
- Update status of Remedial Design/Remedial Action Work plan for OU-1
- Remove the parenthetical reference to OU-5 when discussing IR Site 25 (soil)
- Include a separate and updated account of groundwater remedial activities at OU-5. Description currently states that the benzene and naphthalene plume is being addressed under the FISCA IR2/OU-5 groundwater program

- Update information for Sites 30; delete reference to OU-5 and FISCA
- State that the new boundaries for IR Site 32 include some portion of property formerly included in Site 1
- Provide anticipated due date for IR Site 33 Supplemental Site Investigation
- Update anticipated ROD date for Site 35 (October 2009)

Response: This has been revised, and all of the dates and current work status notes were verified. They will be verified again prior to final publication, as the dates have changed even since your review.

Comment 14: Appendix B, Past Community Involvement Activities, does not include the many Proposed Plans the Navy has produced and disseminated, along with the public meeting held for each plan. The Proposed Plans represent a major effort, and should be included in this section.

Response: This has been revised to include the numerous Proposed Plans produced by the Navy.

Comment 15: There is a fair amount of repetition in Appendix C, Community Involvement Interview - Questionnaire and Response. For example, the phrase, “A lot” is presented as the first bullet on page C-1, and then shows up later in the list on page C-2.

Response: This has been revised, with most duplicates removed. However, statements that are generally similar but not exactly the same were kept.

Comment 16: Appendix E - Key Contacts, includes an incorrect contact for the City of Alameda. The contact for the City of Alameda is Leslie A. Little (rather than Elizabeth Johnson), and her title is Economic Development Director (rather than Base Reuse Planner).

Response: This has been reviewed, and upon investigation, revised to reflect Jennifer Ott as the contact.

Comment 17: My telephone number has changed recently. My new telephone number is (916) 255-6532. My fax number is (916) 255-3596.

Response: This has been revised globally.

RESPONSES TO DTSC SPECIFIC COMMENTS – Marcus Simpson

Comment 1: **Page ES-1; Summary of Interviews** – As a suggestion, it would be more consistent with the purpose of the Executive Summary and the purpose of Section 3.0, Community Interviews, to move the ‘Summary of Interviews’ portion to Section 3.0.

Response: The [Executive Summary](#) is intended to give a good snapshot of the entire document if someone were to just read that section, and the community interviews are a key component of the document, so that summary was left in the [Executive Summary](#). [Section 3.0](#) has a more thorough review of the community interviews, though still in a summarized format.

Comment 2: **Page ES-1; Summary of Interviews; second paragraph** – Please re-write to read, “Overall, the interviewees have a moderate level of knowledge”

Response: The text was revised as suggested.

Comment 3: **Page ES-1; Purpose of This Community Involvement Plan; second sentence** – Please re-write to read, “In addition, the CIP identifies community concerns about Alameda Point, describes how the Navy will provide information to residents and interested parties, and describes how the public can communicate concerns to the Navy.”

Response: The text was revised as suggested.

Comment 4: **Page ES-2 Summary of Interviews; last paragraph** – Please re-write to read, “Interviewees expressed a preference for electronic communications, such as having access to electronic copies of documents and an updated website, as well as receiving e-mails. Interviewees also stated that site tours, fact sheets, and newsletters were good methods of communication for them.”

Response: The text was revised as suggested.

Comment 5: **Page ES-2; Community Involvement Program** – As a suggestion, it would be more consistent with the purpose of the Executive Summary and the purpose of Section 2.0, Community Involvement Program, to move the ‘Community Involvement Program’ portion to Section 2.0.

Response: The [Executive Summary](#) is intended to give a good snapshot of the entire document if someone were to just read that section, including an overview of the Community Involvement Program, so that summary was left in the [Executive Summary](#).

Comment 6: **Page ES-2; Community Involvement Program; first sentence** – Please delete the following from the sentence, “based on information obtained from the interviews” so that the sentence reads, “Some of the components that are included in the Navy’s community involvement program for Alameda Point include:”

Response: The Navy would like to indicate that many of the components of the community involvement program are a direct result of information received during the interviews, so the sentence was not changed.

Comment 7: **Page 1-1; Introduction; second paragraph** – Please re-write and split the second sentence into two sentences so that it reads, “Alameda Point occupies about 2,700 acres, of which 1,100 are offshore. It is about one mile long and one mile wide.”

Response: The text “it is about one mile long and one mile wide” was removed to address another comment, and therefore shortening this sentence as well.

Comment 8: **Page 1-1; Section 1.1; third bullet point** – Please re-write to read as follows, “...(Water Board) acts as a support agency to DTSC, and is responsible for overseeing.. .”

Response: The text was revised as suggested, with the exception that the agency is referred to as the Water Board.

Comment 9: **Page 1-2; Section 1.3** – I suggest changing the title of this section to “Organization of the Community Involvement Plan”.

Response: The section header was revised as suggested.

Comment 10: **Page 1-3; Section 1.4** – Please group all of Mr. Cooper’s contact information together. Currently, his name, title, and agency are separated from the rest of his contact information.

Response: The formatting was corrected. A global check of all formatting will be conducted again before final publication as items move with further changes.

Comment 11: **Page 2-2; Goal No. 1, last bullet point** – Please refer to the main library by its full title (assuming it is the Alameda Free Library) as opposed to simply ‘main library’ for clarity.

Response: The text was revised as suggested.

Comment 12: **Page 2-2; Goal No. 2, last bullet point** – It is mentioned here that comments that have been expressed by the public and Regulatory agencies at RAB meetings will continue to be addressed. Furthermore, the previous bullet point mentions that public comments will be accepted at appropriate milestones. However, neither bullet (nor does the Goal No. 2 section in general) mention that public comments taken at public meetings, or submitted during a public comment period will be responded to. Please indicate (In This Section; It will not hurt to have it here and in Section 2.4.13) that public comments submitted during public comment periods will be responded to.

Response: The text was revised as follows: “Continue to hold public meetings to explain technical issues and accept public comments at appropriate milestones during the remedial action planning process, and respond to all written comments received.”

Continue to address comments and concerns expressed by the public and regulatory agencies at RAB meetings, either through the formal comment process, by addressing comments received on feedback forms, or by tracking action items for the Navy to respond to in the meeting minutes.

Comment 13: **Page E-1: Key Contacts** – Please remove the (510) 540-381 9 phone number as it is not my number. You can replace it with the DTSC Toll Free Public Participation number, which is 1- 866-495-5651. In addition, the fax number listed for Dot Lofstrom is not the correct number. Please update accordingly.

Response: The phone and fax numbers have been corrected.

Comment 14: **Page 2-5; First Paragraph; third sentence** – Please re-write to read, “The Navy co-chair is:”

Response: We have added the contact information for the Community co-chair, with permission, so it now reads “The RAB co-chairs are...”

Comment 15: **Page 2-5: RAB Meetings; first paragraph, first sentence** – Please include the word ‘public’ in this sentence so that the sentence reads, “The Navy will continue to sponsor monthly RAB meetings; open to the public from...”

Response: The text was revised as suggested.

Comment 16: **Page E-1; Key Contacts** – Please include individual’s cellular phone numbers in this section, or replace the existing fax numbers with the cellular phone numbers. While fax numbers are good to have in the event that hard-copy information needs to be shared/transmitted, it seems more in line with current informational needs to have team member’s cellular phone contact numbers in this section.

Response: Many team members do not have a cellular phone that is specific to work, and therefore should not be published for the public. We will keep the fax numbers there for reference, just in case they are needed.

Comment 17: **Page 2-5; RAB Meetings; last sentence** – Please consider re-writing sentence to read as follows: “Based on feedback from community interviews with RAB members, the Navy will work with a professional meeting facilitator to facilitate RAB meetings to keep discussions focused on agenda topic, and keep the meetings on schedule.”

Response: This sentence has been omitted since the long-term use of the facilitator may not be necessary.

Comment 18: **Page 2-5; RAB Meeting Agenda; last sentence** – Please consider re-writing to read as follows “The Navy, RAB members, and regulatory agencies will work cooperatively to finalize the agenda, which will be distributed at least seven days prior to the meeting.”

Response: Based on other comments received, the text was revised as follows: “The Navy and community co-chairs will work together to finalize the agenda and the Navy will continue to distribute it at least seven days prior to the meeting via mail and the community email distribution list.”

Comment 19: **Page 2-5; RAB Meeting Attendance; last sentence** – In general, I would not recommend leaving this sentence in the Updated CIP. However, if the Navy ultimately decides to keep the sentence, please consider the following issues:

This sentence states that RAB members who miss four or more meetings may be removed from the RAB. However, there is no reference given insofar as meetings missed over what period of time. Please clarify whether the message here is that RAB members who miss four or more meetings during their overall tenure may be removed, or if the message is four or more consecutive meetings missed may result in removal from the RAB.

In addition the RAB Rules (Appendix J) reference is not specific enough. Please include the official document title (Alameda Point Restoration Advisory Board Rules of operation), as well as which section this particular rule can be found in within the document.

Response: The statement about attendance was left in, but clarified as follows: “As stated in the Alameda Point RAB Rules of Operation ([Appendix J](#)), in Section D, page 4, RAB community members who miss four or more meetings in a calendar year may be removed from the RAB.”

- Comment 20:** **Page 3-1; Community Interviews** – Please inform readers in this section that the regulatory agencies were also involved in the community interview preparation and interview process.
- Response:** The text has been revised to reflect that the regulatory agencies gave input on the questions, interviewee list, and participated in the interviews.
- Comment 21:** **Page 3-3; Involvement; first sentence** – Please replace the word ‘thirteen’, with the number ‘13’ in the first sentence. Please do the same for the first sentence in the third paragraph. In addition, this sentence is slightly confusing. Please clarify that 13 interviewees knowledge of the Navy’s community involvement program is limited to their awareness of the RAB.
- Response:** Because it is the first word of the sentence, the number is spelled out. It has been revised as follows to clarify awareness of the RAB: “Thirteen of 22 interviewees stated they are aware of the Navy’s community involvement program, primarily because of the RAB.”
- Comment 22:** **Page 4-1; Current Site Description and Contaminants of Concern; second sentence** – The phrase, “...or sediment from Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) substances.” is slightly confusing, as many leaders will not know what a CERCLA substance is. Please re-write to clarify how CERCLA factors in to the contaminant history at the base as opposed to simply terming the contaminants as “CERCLA substances”. In addition, the following paragraph goes on to list numerous contaminants. As a matter of readability, is it possible to simply list them in bullet form?
- Response:** Based on other comments, the term has been revised to “CERCLA hazardous substances”. A link to the EPA definition has also been included. The contaminants have been put in a bulleted list, as requested.
- Comment 23:** **Page 4-2; Land Reuse and Transfer; first sentence** – Please consider adding to this first sentence the fact that NAS Alameda was closed as an active military installation as part of the Base Realignment and Closure Act.
- Response:** The text was revised as requested.
- Comment 24:** **Page 5-2; Remedial Action Process** – Please consider adding a bullet point paragraph that follows ‘PP’ titled, ‘Public Comment Period’ that informs readers of the public comment period and public meeting portion of the Remedial Action Process, and what their purposes are.

Response: The purpose of the public comment period has been added into the text of the PP bullet. That item has been revised as follows: “Proposed Plan (PP) – The PP is a fact sheet that is developed for the public in order to describe cleanup alternatives and cleanup goals, and explain why the preferred remedy was identified. This is a key milestone for members of the public to provide written and oral comments (on record at a public meeting) on the PP. The Navy considers all comments received on the PP before a final decision is made. Responses to all comments are in the responsiveness summary, which is included as an appendix to the ROD.”

Comment 25: **Page 5-2; Remedial Action Process** – Please consider adding the full words prior to the acronyms of the bullet points. For example, instead of using the acronym PP alone, please consider writing as such ‘Proposed Plan (PP)’ to help readers cut down on needing to reference the acronym list whenever possible.

Response: The full words have been added before each acronym in the bulleted list.