Table 5-1: HAZARDOUS SUBSTANCES STORED, RELEASED, OR DISPOSED OF

Notice is hereby given that the information provided below contains a notice of hazardous substances that have been stored, released, or disposed of on the Property and the approximate dates that such storage, release(s), or disposal took place. Title 40 Code of Federal Regulations § 373.3(b) requires that the aforementioned statement be prominently displayed in this notice. The information contained in this notice is required under the authority of regulations promulgated under § 120(h) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act (CERCLA or "Superfund") Title 42 of the United States Code § 9620(h).

Table ID No.	EBS Parcel	Building Number or Location	Substance/ Description of Use	CAS Number	Regulatory Synonym	RCRA Waste Number	Quantity	Storage or Spill Date	Stored (S), Released (R), or Disposed of (D)
		050	0.1	NA-	Unlisted Hazardous	NIA	Assumed		
1	6	353	Ordnance	REACTIVE	Waste - Reactive	NA	100 lbs	Unknown	S
				NA-	Unlisted Hazardous	1	Assumed		
2	6	354	Ordnance	REACTIVE	Waste - Reactive	NA	100 lbs	Unknown	S
3	6	Open Space 6	Inert ordnance reportedly disposed of in landfill.	NA	NA	NA	Unknown	Unknown	D
4	6	442	ordnance and explosives, and PCB-transformer oil	NA	NA	NA	Unknown	Unknown	S
5		West Beach	Ashastas	4000 04 4	A a la a a 4 a a	I lala a suna	30000 to 300000	1958-	5
	6	Landfill	Asbestos	1332-21-4	Asbestos	Unknown	tons	1978	D
6	6	West Beach Landfill	Cleaners	NA	NA	Unknown	30000 to 300000 tons	1958- 1978	R
7		West Beach	Cicariors	107	TV.	Onknown	30000 to 300000	1958-	- K
	6	Landfill	Creosote	8001-58-9	Creosote	U051	tons	1978	D
8		West Beach	Infectious and medical				30000 to 300000	1958-	
	6	Landfill	waste	NA	NA	Unknown	tons	1978	R
	6	West Beach	Mercury	7439-97-6	Mercury	U151	1300 bulbs per week	1958- 1978	D

Table ID No.	EBS Parcel	Building Number or Location	Substance/ Description of Use	CAS Number	Regulatory Synonym	RCRA Waste Number	Quantity	Storage or Spill Date	Stored (S), Released (R), or Disposed of (D)
		Landfill					with 2 to 3		
9							drops of mercury per bulb		
10	6	West Beach Landfill	Paint thinner	NA	NA	Unknown	30000 to 300000 tons	1958- 1978	R
11	6	West Beach Landfill	Various unlisted waste materials: paint, radioactive (low level), acids, and oil wastes. Potential radionuclei of concern: Ra-226, Cs-137, Sr-90, Du, UO ₂ , Th-232, Kr-85, and Co-60	NA- IGNITABL E	Unlisted Hazardous Waste - Ignitable	Unknown	30000 to 300000 tons	1958- 1978	D
		West		_	Aroclors; PCBs;	- Crimanovini	30000 to		
12	6	Beach Landfill	PCBs	1336-36-3	Polychlorinated biphenyls	Unknown	300000 tons	1958- 1978	D
13	6	West Beach Landfill	Pesticides	NA	NA	Unknown	30000 to 300000 tons	1958- 1978	R
14	6	West Beach Landfill	Reagents	NA	NA	Unknown	30000 to 300000 tons	1958- 1978	R
15	6	West Beach Landfill	Sludge	NA	NA	Unknown	30000 to 300000 tons	1958- 1978	R
16	6	Disposal Area	Solvent	NA	NA	Unknown	15000 to 200000 tons	1943- 1956	R
17	6	West Beach Landfill	Solvent	NA	NA	Unknown	30000 to 300000 tons	1958- 1978	R

Table ID No.	EBS Parcel	Building Number or Location	Substance/ Description of Use	CAS Number	Regulatory Synonym	RCRA Waste Number	Quantity	Storage or Spill Date	Stored (S), Released (R), or Disposed of (D)
18	6	West Beach Landfill	Strippers	NA	NA	Unknown	30000 to 300000 tons	1958- 1978	R
19	6	West Beach Landfill	Tear gas agents	NA	NA	Unknown	400 lbs per IAS	1958- 1978	R
20	7	West Beach Landfill	Asbestos	1332-21-4	Asbestos	Unknown	30000 to 300000 tons	1958- 1978	D
21	7	West Beach Landfill	Cleaners	NA	NA	Unknown	30000 to 300000 tons	1958- 1978	R
22	7	West Beach Landfill	Creosote	8001-58-9	Creosote	U051	30000 to 300000 tons	1958- 1978	D
23	7	West Beach Landfill	Infectious and medical waste	NA	NA	Unknown	30000 to 300000 tons	1958- 1978	R
24	7	West Beach Landfill	Mercury	7439-97-6	Mercury	U151	30000 to 300000 tons	1958- 1978	D
25	7	West Beach Landfill	Paint thinner	NA	NA	Unknown	30000 to 300000 tons	1958- 1978	R
26	7	Disposal Area	Various unlisted waste materials: paint, radioactive (low level), acids, and oil wastes	NA- IGNITABL E	Unlisted Hazardous Waste - Ignitable	Unknown	30000 to 300000 tons	1958- 1978	D
27	7	West Beach Landfill	PCBs	1336-36-3	Aroclors; PCBs; Polychlorinated biphenyls	Unknown	30000 to 300000 tons	1958- 1978	D
28	7	West Beach Landfill	Pesticides	NA	NA	Unknown	30000 to 300000 tons	1958- 1978	R

Table ID No.	EBS Parcel	Building Number or Location	Substance/ Description of Use	CAS Number	Regulatory Synonym	RCRA Waste Number	Quantity	Storage or Spill Date	Stored (S), Released (R), or Disposed of (D)
29	7	West Beach Landfill	Reagents	NA	NA	Unknown	30000 to 300000 tons	1958- 1978	R
30	7	West Beach Landfill	Sludge	NA	NA	Unknown	30000 to 300000 tons	1958- 1978	R
31	7	West Beach Landfill	Solvent	NA	NA	Unknown	30000 to 300000 tons	1958- 1978	R
32	7	West Beach Landfill	Strippers	NA	NA	Unknown	30000 to 300000 tons	1958- 1978	R
33	7	West Beach Landfill	Tear gas agents	NA	NA	Unknown	30000 to 300000 tons	1958- 1978	R
34	7	Open Space 7	Inert ordnance reportedly disposed of in landfill.	NA	NA	Unknown	Unknown	1958- 1978	D
35	23	50, 51, 56, 57, and 58	Explosives - High explosive munitions	NA	NA	Unknown	Unknown	6/5/1990	S
36	23	407 Arresting	Liquid Oxygen	NA	NA	NA	6,000 gallon AST	Unknown	S
37	23	gear vault on east side of Runway 13/31	PCB-containing hydraulic fluid	1336-36-3	Aroclors; PCBs; Polychlorinated biphenyls	Unknown	Approx. 40 gal.	8/23/198 3	R
38	23	407	Liquid Nitrogen	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	6,000 gallon AST	Unknown	S
39	23	50	Ordnance/ High Explosives Magazine	NA- REACTIVE	Unlisted Hazardous Waste - Reactive	NA	Assumed 100 lbs	Unknown	S
	23	51	Ordnance/ Small Arms and	NA- REACTIVE	Unlisted Hazardous Waste - Reactive	NA	Assumed 100 lbs	Unknown	S

Table ID No.	EBS Parcel	Building Number or Location	Substance/ Description of Use	CAS Number	Regulatory Synonym	RCRA Waste Number	Quantity	Storage or Spill Date	Stored (S), Released (R), or Disposed of (D)
40			Pyrotechnic Magazine						
40			Ordnance/						
41	23	56	High Explosives Magazine	NA- REACTIVE	Unlisted Hazardous Waste - Reactive	NA	Assumed 100 lbs	Unknown	S
42	23	57	Ordnance/ High Explosives Magazine	NA- REACTIVE	Unlisted Hazardous Waste - Reactive	NA	Assumed 100 lbs	Unknown	Ø
43	23	58	Ordnance/ Missile Magazine	NA- REACTIVE	Unlisted Hazardous Waste - Reactive	NA	Assumed 100 lbs	Unknown	S
44	23	568	Ordnance/ Ready Magazine	NA- REACTIVE	Unlisted Hazardous Waste - Reactive	NA	Assumed 100 lbs	Unknown	S
45	23	569	Ordnance/ Ready Magazine	NA- REACTIVE	Unlisted Hazardous Waste - Reactive	NA	Assumed 100 lbs	Unknown	S
46	23	570	Ordnance/ Ready Magazine	NA- REACTIVE	Unlisted Hazardous Waste - Reactive	NA	Assumed 100 lbs	Unknown	S
47	23	571	Ordnance/ Ready Magazine	NA- REACTIVE	Unlisted Hazardous Waste - Reactive	NA	Assumed 100 lbs	Unknown	S
48	23	572	Ordnance/ Ready Magazine	NA- REACTIVE	Unlisted Hazardous Waste - Reactive	NA	Assumed 100 lbs	Unknown	S
49	23	573	Ordnance/ Ready Magazine	NA- REACTIVE	Unlisted Hazardous Waste - Reactive	NA	Assumed 100 lbs	Unknown	S
50	23	574	Ordnance/ Ready Magazine	NA- REACTIVE	Unlisted Hazardous Waste - Reactive	NA	Assumed 100 lbs	Unknown	S
51	23	575	Ordnance/ Ready Magazine	NA- REACTIVE	Unlisted Hazardous Waste - Reactive	NA	Assumed 100 lbs	Unknown	S
52	23	576	Ordnance/ Ready Magazine	NA- REACTIVE	Unlisted Hazardous Waste - Reactive	NA	Assumed 100 lbs	Unknown	S
53	23	577	Ordnance/ Ready Magazine	NA- REACTIVE	Unlisted Hazardous Waste - Reactive	NA	Assumed 100 lbs	Unknown	S
	23	578	Ordnance/	NA-	Unlisted Hazardous	NA	Assumed	Unknown	S

Table ID No.	EBS Parcel	Building Number or Location	Substance/ Description of Use	CAS Number	Regulatory Synonym	RCRA Waste Number	Quantity	Storage or Spill Date	Stored (S), Released (R), or Disposed of (D)
54			Ready Magazine	REACTIVE	Waste - Reactive		100 lbs		
55	23	579	Ordnance/ Ready Magazine	NA- REACTIVE	Unlisted Hazardous Waste - Reactive	NA	Assumed 100 lbs	Unknown	S
56	23	580	Ordnance/ Ready Magazine	NA- REACTIVE	Unlisted Hazardous Waste - Reactive	NA	Assumed 100 lbs	Unknown	S
57	23	581	Ordnance/ Ready Magazine	NA- REACTIVE	Unlisted Hazardous Waste - Reactive	NA	Assumed 100 lbs	Unknown	S
58	26	NADEP GAP 74 - North end of parcel	1,1,1 TCA	71-55-6	Ethane, 1,1,1- trichloro; 1,1,1- Trichloroethane; Methyl chloroform	U226	330 gal.	5/2/1990	S
59	26	SWMU/GA P 28	Abrasives - Blasting grit (waste)	14808-60-7	Quartz sand	None	Unknown	Unknown	S
60	26	SWMU/GA P 74 -North end of parcel	hydraulic fluid waste	8012-95-1	Mineral oil	None	255 gal.	5/2/1990	S
61	26	NADEP GAP 74 - North end of parcel	Isopropyl alcohol waste	67-63-0	2-Propanol and Rubbing Alcohol	NA	55 gal.	5/2/1990	S
62	26	SWMU/GA P 74 -North end of parcel	JP-5 spent	8008-20-6	Jet propulsion fuel and kerosene	None	55 gal.	5/2/1990	S

Notes:

AST Aboveground Storage Tank
CAS Chemical Abstract Service

Co-60 Cobalt-60 Cs-137 Caesium-137 Du Depleted Uranium

EBS Environmental Baseline Survey

Gal gallon

GAP Generator Accumulation Point

IAS Initial Assessment Study

JP-5 Jet Propellant-5 Kr-85 Krypton-85 NA Not applicable

NADEP Naval Air Depot

Ra-226 Radium-226

RCRA Resource Conservation and Recovery Act

Sr-90 Strontium-90

SWMU Solid Waste Management Unit

Th-232 Thorium-232

PCB polychlorinated biphenyls

UO₂ Uranium Dioxide

Enclosure (3)

References

References

- Battelle and Blasland, Bouck, and Lee, Inc. (BBL). 2006. "Final Remediation Investigation Report IR Site 2, West Beach Landfill and Wetlands, Alameda Point, California." June 23.
- Battelle and BBL. 2008a. "Final Feasibility Study Report, IR Site 2, West Beach Landfill and Wetlands, Alameda Point, California." October 22.
- Battelle and BBL. 2008b. "Draft Proposed Plan for IR Site 2, Former NAS Alameda, Alameda, California." December.
- Bechtel Environmental, Inc. (Bechtel). 2008. "Draft Site Inspection Report, Transfer Parcels FED- 1A, FED-2B, FED-2C, Alameda Point, Alameda, California." May.
- California Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB). 2003. "Closure Letter for Underground Storage Tank 442-1, Corrective Action Area 1, Alameda Point, Alameda, California (RWQCB Case No. 01D9051)." From Curtis T. Scott for Loretta K. Barsamian, Executive Officer, RWQCB to Gregory A. Lorton, Remedial Project Manager, BRAC Operations, SWNAVFACENGCOM. October 9.
- RWQCB. 2007. "No Further Action and Site Summary for the Fuel Line Corrective Action Area A (CAA-A), Alameda Point, Alameda County." From Curtis T. Scott for Bruce H. Wolfe, Executive Officer, RWQCB to Thomas Macchiarella, BRAC Environmental Coordinator, Navy BRAC PMO West. November 28.
- Department of Defense (DOD). 2006. "Base Redevelopment and Realignment Manual." Prepared by the Office of the Deputy Under Secretary of Defense (Installations and Environment). March 1.
- Department of the Navy (DON). 1995. "DON Environmental Policy Memorandum 95-01: Environmental Requirements for Federal Agency-to-Agency Property Transfer at BRAC Installations." May 26.
- DON. 2001. "Federal Facility Agreement Negotiated Between the DON and U.S. EPA." July.
- Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC). 1992. "RCRA Facility Assessment, Naval Air Station, Alameda, West End of Alameda, California." April.
- Foster Wheeler Environmental Corporation (Foster Wheeler). 2002a. "Focused Remedial Investigation Work Plan, Ordnance and Explosives Waste Characterization, Time-Critical Removal Action, and Geotechnical and Seismic Evaluations at IR Site 2, Alameda Point, Alameda, California." February 8.

References

- Foster Wheeler. 2002b. "Final Time-Critical Removal Action Closeout Report, Time-Critical Removal Action at Installation Restoration Site 2, Alameda Point, Alameda, California." November 15.
- International Technology Corporation (IT). 2001. "Final Environmental Baseline Survey, Data Evaluation Summaries Final, Volumes I-XIV, Alameda Point, Alameda, California." June.
- Naval Energy and Environmental Support Activity (NEESA). 1983. "Initial Assessment Study, Naval Air Station, Alameda, California."
- Sullivan Consulting Group and Tetra Tech EM Inc. (SulTech). 2005a. "Solid Waste Management Unit Evaluation Report for Federal Transfer Parcel 1A, Alameda Point, Alameda, California." November 11.
- SulTech. 2006. "Draft Final Petroleum ASTs Evaluation and Closure Request." November.
- Tetra Tech EC Incorporated (TTECI). 2009. "Draft Time-Critical Removal Action Post-Construction Report, IR Sites 1, 2, and 32, Former NAS Alameda, Alameda Point, Alameda, California." April.
- Tetra Tech EM Incorporated (TTEMI). 2001. "Draft Corrective Action Area 1, No Further Action Report, Request for No Further Action, Underground Storage Tank 442-1." December 12.
- TTEMI. 2003a. "Final Supplemental Environmental Baseline Survey, Alameda Point, Alameda, California." March 7.
- TTEMI. 2003b. "Draft Corrective Action Area 12 No Further Action Report and Request for No Further Action, Alameda Point, Alameda, California." July 2.
- TTEMI. 2004. "Draft Fuel Line Corrective Action Area A, No Further Action Report and Request for No Further Action (Draft), Alameda Point, Alameda, California." January 7.
- U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (U.S. EPA). 1999. "Federal Register." Vol. 64, No. 140, 39,878-885. July 22.
- Weston Solutions, Inc. (Weston Solutions). 2007. "Final Historical Radiological Assessment, Volume II, Alameda Naval Air Station, Use of General Radioactive Materials, 1941-2005." June.

Enclosure (4)

Regulatory Comments and Comment Adjudication

Comments from EPA, May 28, 2009

GENERAL COMMENTS

General Comment 1.

The purpose of the Environmental Summary Document is to summarize the environmental conditions on the Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) transfer parcel at Alameda Point. This VA transfer parcel consists of IR Site 2, Transfer Parcels FED-1A, FED-2B, and FED-2C. However, this Draft Environmental Summary Document is very brief and does not include the most recent status of the environmental conditions. In addition, the Draft Site Inspection Report indicates that the Transfer Parcels FED-1A, FED-2B, and FED-2C require further evaluation in some of the areas. This Environmental Summary Document should not be finalized until the Site Inspection Report for Transfer Parcels FED-1A, FED-2B, and FED-2C is complete.

RESPONSE TO GENERAL COMMENTS

Response to General Comment 1.

A 1995 DON memo governs the Navy's preparation of the Environmental Summary Documents. Essentially, the purpose of an ESD is to provide a summary of the current status of the environmental program (a "snapshot" in time). The draft ESD provides all information on the status of the environmental conditions known as of the date of this report. The intended audience of this document is the Navy leadership/authority who will be asked to ultimately approve the property conveyance. This document is not intended to be a final summary on the clean up, but an indication at the time of conveyance of what hazards are known to be present and require investigation or action and to place the necessary restrictions on the property. The environmental work is ongoing and as indicated in the 2008 "Draft Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) Between the DON, BRAC PMO and the Department of Veterans Affairs Regarding the Interagency Transfer of VA Fed Transfer Parcel at the Former NAS Alameda, Alameda, CA," will continue to be the responsibility of the Navy until the regulatory agencies concur that the remedial action is complete. No changes to the document are necessary.

SPECIFIC COMMENTS

RESPONSE TO SPECIFIC COMMENTS

Comments from EPA, May 28, 2009

SPECIFIC COMMENTS	RESPONSE TO SPECIFIC COMMENTS
Specific Comment 1.	Response to Specific Comment 1.
Section 2.0, Property Description, Page 1: The text in the middle of the second paragraph states that "No utilities are located on the Property." However, fuel lines are present on the Property. Please clarify.	The fuel lines present on the Property are addressed in Section 4.3. The purpose of the statement is to give a brief description of the utilities available on the Property that could be used for redevelopment purposes. The sentence will be revised to read: "Utilities located on the Property are not adequate to support future development of the Property."
Specific Comment 2.	Response to Specific Comment 2.
Section 4.1.1, IR Site 2, Page 4: The second to the last sentence in the first incomplete paragraph states that "In August 1999, IR Site 2 was officially added to the U.S. EPA's National Priorities List of Superfund sites." This sentence is confusing. IR Site 2 was part of the Alameda Naval Air Station when the entire base was officially listed in the National Priorities List in July 1999. Please revise.	The sentence will be revised to read: "In July 1999, Alameda Point, including IR Site 2, was officially added to the U.S. EPA's National Priorities List."
Specific Comment 3.	Response to Specific Comment 3.
Section 4.1.1, IR Site 2, Page 4: After the last sentence of the first incomplete paragraph, please add the acreages for the landfill portion and wetland portion. This information will give a better description of IR Site 2 as it mainly consists of landfill and wetland areas.	The following will be added to the end of the paragraph: "IR Site 2 is comprised of the West Beach Landfill, which occupies approximately 77 acres, and the West Beach Wetland, which covers approximately 33 acres."
Specific Comment 4.	Response to Specific Comment 4.
Section 4.1.1, IR Site 2, Page 4: The second complete paragraph describes a time-critical removal action (TCRA) conducted in a possible munitions and explosives of concern	It is not necessary to restate this information in the ESD (and the information discussed in EPA's Specific Comment Nos. 6 and 7) as the locations of the various site activities are documented in

Comments from EPA, May 28, 2009

SPECIFIC COMMENTS	RESPONSE TO SPECIFIC COMMENTS
burial site in 2002. The items recovered during the excavation confirmed that the area was used to bury munitions. However, the excavation only went down to 1 foot, and the text states that "Additional inert munitions may be present below a depth of 1 foot." The Environmental Summary Document should include an additional figure to depict the locations of various site activities including this possible munitions and explosives of concern burial site.	the referenced reports (e.g., the possible MEC burial site is documented in the TCRA), which were reviewed and approved by the regulatory agencies and are available to the VA. No changes to the document are necessary.
Specific Comment 5.	Response to Specific Comment 5.
Section 4.1.1, IR Site 2, Page 4: The first sentence of the last incomplete paragraph states that "A radiological TCRA was conducted in 2006 and 2007 at IR Site 2." The years might be incorrect. A radiological TCRA was conducted in 2007 and 2008 and a Draft Time-Critical Removal Action Post Construction Report for IR Sites 1, 2, and 32 dated April 2009 is currently available for review. Please clarify.	The dates and reference will be updated as requested.
Specific Comment 6.	Response to Specific Comment 6.
Section 4.1.1, IR Site 2, Page 4: The text in the second sentence of the last incomplete paragraph states that "Items and soils contaminated with Ra-226 were identified and removed." Please elaborate further where these removal areas were located and the depths the areas were excavated to and include a figure showing the locations of the removal areas.	Please see response to EPA Specific Comment No. 4 above.
Specific Comment 7.	Response to Specific Comment 7.
Section 4.1.1, IR Site 2, Page 4: The text in the last incomplete	

Comments from EPA, May 28, 2009

SPECIFIC COMMENTS	RESPONSE TO SPECIFIC COMMENTS
paragraph indicates that Ra-226 contamination is still present throughout the IR Site 2. Please clarify the location(s) where the Ra-226 contamination is still present, since some Ra-226 contaminated soil areas have been excavated and removed.	Please see response to EPA Specific Comment No. 4 above.
Specific Comment 8.	Response to Specific Comment 8.
Section 4.1.1, IR Site 2, Page 5: The text in the last paragraph of this section indicates that a Proposed Plan for IR Site 2 will be available for public comments in June 2009 and the Record of Decision is to be finalized by January 2010. Please update the schedules for these two documents.	The date for release of the Proposed Plan for IR Site 2 will be revised to August 2009 and the date of the finalization of the ROD will be revised to May 2010.
Specific Comment 9.	Response to Specific Comment 9.
Section 4.1.2, IR Site 33, Page 5: The text in this section indicates that the boundaries of IR Site 33 will be modified, but no rationale is provided. Please add a justification or a rationale why the boundaries of IR Site 33 are being modified.	It is not necessary to restate this information in the ESD as the rationale for modifying the boundary to exclude Transfer Parcel Fed-2B was documented in the Draft SI Report and will also be included in the Expanded Site Investigation (SI). No changes to the document are necessary.
Specific Comment 10.	Response to Specific Comment 10.
Section 4.1.3, On-Going Investigations, Page 5: The text in this section states that "AOC 2 (between IR Sites 2 and 32)" This description might be confusing for the readers who are not aware of the new boundaries for IR Site 32. Please add text to clarify the reasoning for changing the existing boundaries for IR Site 32. Also, please provide a description of the extent of the new boundaries for IR Site 32.	IR Site 32 is shown on Figure 2 and the figure will be referenced at the end of the sentence. The following sentence will be added to Section 4.1.3: "AOC 2 is not part of IR Site 32." IR Site 32 is discussed in Section 4.10, Adjacent Property. The following will be added to the end of the second sentence in Section 4.10: "The IR Site 32 boundary was changed in 2008 and is shown in Figure 2." IR Site 32 is not the subject of this ESD, so it is not necessary to discuss the rationale for modifying the boundary of

Comments from EPA, May 28, 2009

SPECIFIC COMMENTS	RESPONSE TO SPECIFIC COMMENTS
	IR Site 32 in this ESD.
Specific Comment 11.	Response to Specific Comment 11.
Section 4.1.3, On-Going Investigations, Page 5: This section should include the areas requiring further evaluation in addition to AOC 1, AOC 2, and AOC 3. During the review of the Draft Site Inspection Report for Transfer Parcels FED-1A, FED-2B, and FED-2C, May 2008, additional evaluations were identified as necessary by the regulatory agencies.	Section 4.1.3 will be revised to describe the additional investigations that are planned as part of the Expanded Site Investigation, Petroleum Corrective Action Area – C, and the radiological investigation of areas adjacent to IR Sites 1, 2, and 32.
Specific Comment 12.	Response to Specific Comment 12.
Section 4.1.4, Pesticides, Page 6: The text in this section states that "Registered insecticides, pesticides, herbicides, and rodenticides typically used in construction, management and landscaping have been properly applied at the Property" Please clarify to which part of the Property the above pesticides have been applied and at what part of the Property they have been disposed.	Pesticides were widely applied basewide as part of vegetation management and pest control at NAS Alameda. Documentation on sampling results at IR Site 2 has been made available to the VA. Additional sampling is proposed for pesticides at AOC-1. No changes to the document are necessary.
Specific Comment 13.	Response to Specific Comment 13.
Section 4.3, Presence of Petroleum Products and Derivatives, Page 6: The text in this section does not include the information regarding a fuel tank that leaked and was subsequently removed near the Least Tern sanctuary area. Please include this information in this section.	This fuel tank is discussed in Section 4.4. To avoid confusion, the second sentence in Section 4.4 will be revised to read: "In March 2005, an unnumbered 500-gallon UST was removed in EBS Parcel 24, the least tern nesting area."
Specific Comment 14.	Response to Specific Comment 14.
Section 4.4, Underground Storage Tanks (USTs)/Above Storage	Please see response to EPA Specific Comment 13 above. The

Comments from EPA, May 28, 2009

SPECIFIC COMMENTS	RESPONSE TO SPECIFIC COMMENTS
Tank (ASTs), Page 7: The text in the first paragraph of this section should include the status and the recommendation for the unnumbered UST to give the readers a better description of it.	site is being addressed in the Petroleum Summary Report. A recommendation for the unnumbered tank has not been determined yet, but groundwater monitoring may be needed.
Specific Comment 15. Section 4.4, Underground Storage Tanks (USTs)/Above Storage Tank (ASTs), Page 7: The text in the second paragraph of this section should include the documentation showing the removal of AST 467B on EBS Parcel 5 even though the removal date is unknown. Also, the text in this section should indicate that "Additional soil investigations in the vicinity of the ASTs in Parcel 23 for potential petroleum contamination will be done as part of the planned site investigation work." since sampling has not been done in the vicinity of many of the ASTs located in Parcel 23.	Response to Specific Comment 15. The last sentence of the second paragraph in Section 4.4 will be revised to read: "AST 467B on EBS Parcel 5 was removed; the removal date is unknown (TTEMI 2001). AST 467B will be included in the Petroleum Program Summary Report." The change to the sentence starting "Additional soil investigation in the vicinity of the ASTs in Parcel 23" will be made, as requested. For consistency, a notification that additional investigation for petroleum hydrocarbons in the vicinity of the ASTs will be given in Section 5.1.1. The proposed investigation activities are also summarized in Section 4.1.3.
Specific Comment 16. Section 4.5, Munitions and Explosives of Concern (MEC), Page 7: Please add more text in the first paragraph of this section to reiterate that a CERCLA removal action for inert munitions was only excavated down to the depth of 1 foot and additional or possible inert munitions may be left in place below a depth of 1 foot. This area will be included in the proposed soil cover.	Response to Specific Comment 16. The first sentence will be revised to read: "From February to March 2002, a CERCLA removal action for inert munitions down to a depth of 1 foot was conducted at IR Site 2 as discussed in Section 4.1.1." Notification of possible munitions and explosives of concern is given in Section 5.2.1.
Specific Comment 17.	Response to Specific Comment 17.

Comments from EPA, May 28, 2009

SPECIFIC COMMENTS	RESPONSE TO SPECIFIC COMMENTS
Section 4.7, Lead-Based Paint (LBP), Page 8: Please include some text in this section that it is likely that LBP was used on many of the ASTs. One of the data gaps identified during the review of the Draft Site Inspection Report for Transfer Parcels FED 1-A, FED-2B, and FED-2C, May 2008, was sampling for lead and other paint-related metals in the vicinity of each AST, including areas that would have received runoff.	The following paragraph will be added to Section 4.7: "There were a total of 12 ASTs on Parcel 23 of the Property. These ASTs may have been painted with lead based paint. Therefore, further evaluation of LBP in the vicinity of these ASTs on the Property will be included in the Expanded SI (see Section 4.1.3)." The notification that additional investigation for LBP in the vicinity of the ASTs will be given in Section 5.4.1 with the following: "Additional investigation in the vicinity of each AST for potential LBP contamination will be conducted by the Navy as part of the Expanded Site Investigation."
Specific Comment 18. Section 4.8, Polychlorinated Biphenyls (PCB), Page 8: The text should state that data gaps exist because there is a lack of soil samples analyzed for PCBs in the vicinity of Building 100 (the Transformer Vault) and in the vicinity of each of the arresting gear structures and mechanisms and the associated ASTs, since PCBs were used in hydraulic fluid.	Response to Specific Comment 18. The second sentence in Section 5.5.1 will be revised to read: "Further evaluation will be conducted in the vicinity of Building 100, the Aircraft Arresting Devices, and ASTs for potential PCB contamination as part of the Expanded Site Investigation."
Specific Comment 19. Section 4.8, Polychlorinated Biphenyls (PCB), Page 8: The text in this section should be clarified that detection limits for PCBs exceeded screening criteria (according to the text in the Draft Site Inspection report for Transfer Parcels FED 1-A, FED-2B, and FED-2C, May 2008). If the detection limit is greater than the screening criteria, then the non-detected data could potentially be above the screening levels. Please clarify.	Response to Specific Comment 19. This level of detail is not necessary in the ESD. The Expanded Site Investigation will provide this information. No changes to the document are necessary.

Comments from EPA, May 28, 2009

SPECIFIC COMMENTS	RESPONSE TO SPECIFIC COMMENTS
Specific Comment 20. Section 4.8, Polychlorinated Biphenyls (PCB), Page 8: Please note that Section 4.1.3 of the Draft Environmental Summary Document does not discuss that PCBs were found in AOC 1 specifically as referenced in the last paragraph of this section.	Response to Specific Comment 20. AOC 1 has been added to Section 4.1.3. The text of Section 4.8 will be revised to read "PCBs were found in IR Site 2 as discussed in Section 4.1.1. Further evaluation of PCBs in AOC 1 is discussed in Section 4.1.3."
Specific Comment 21. Section 4.10, Adjacent Property, Page 9: Please change the text in the second paragraph of this section to read "Further investigations of Ra-226 from adjacent IR Site 32 on EBS Parcel 5 and petroleum contamination from CAA-C on EBS Parcel 23E are necessary."	Response to Specific Comment 21. The change will be made to the document as requested. CAA-C will be addressed in Section 4.1.3.
Specific Comment 22. Section 5.1.1, Notifications, Page 10: The last paragraph of this section implies that the transferee will be responsible for all remediation and long term monitoring at this transfer parcel. Please clarify in light of the Navy's obligation under the FFA to conduct all CERCLA response actions.	Response to Specific Comment 22. The 2008 Draft MOU Between the DON and the VA outlines the environmental responsibilities of the Navy and VA. Currently, the draft MOU indicates VA's responsibilities start when the Navy has obtained concurrence from the regulatory agencies that the Navy's remedy is "operating properly and successfully". Per the MOU, VA shall enter into an agreement with USEPA, DTSC and the RWQCB to address and be solely responsible for completion of certain CERCLA response actions after the DON completes its responsibility as outlined in the MOU. Such VA responsibilities include but are not limited to long-term monitoring, long term operations, institutional control reporting and maintenance, engineering control maintenance (e.g., landfill cap/cover monitoring, maintenance and repair),

Comments from EPA, May 28, 2009

SPECIFIC COMMENTS	RESPONSE TO SPECIFIC COMMENTS
	regulatory agreement maintenance, CERCLA five year reviews, and responding to any failures of response actions, all of which may be required in accordance with future DON Decision Documents for the Property. No changes to the document are necessary.
Specific Comment 23.	Response to Specific Comment 23.
Section 5.1.2.2, Specific Land Use Restrictions, Page 10: The text in this section does not mention the restrictions for sensitive habitat. Please elaborate.	Endangered species and sensitive habitat management are addressed in the MOU between the DON, BRAC PMO and the Department of Veterans Affairs (VA). The MOU will require the VA to assume responsibility for the management of federally threatened and endangered species, including the California least tern, and the management of sensitive habitat, including wetlands. No changes to the document are necessary.
Specific Comment 24. Section 5.1.2.2, Specific Land Use Restrictions, Second Bullet, Page 10: The restricted uses include a hospital for humans. However, the planned reuse by the Department of VA is to build medical facilities on the Property. This seems to contradict the restricted uses. Please explain.	Response to Specific Comment 24. Land use restrictions intended for IR Site 2 were mistakenly applied to the entire VA conveyance parcel in the ESD. The proposed environmental restrictions for the VA conveyance parcel have now been revised so that the land use restrictions described in Section 5.1.2.2 will apply only to IR Site 2. The entire parcel will be subject to certain activity restrictions that will prohibit land disturbing activities without prior approval from the FFA signatories. Therefore, the following changes will be made to the ESD:

Comments from EPA, May 28, 2009

SPECIFIC COMMENTS	RESPONSE TO SPECIFIC COMMENTS
	Section 5.1.2.1 "Restrictions On Entire Property" will be deleted in its entirety and replaced with the following:
	 "1. The following restrictions apply to the entire Property, including IR Site 2. The recipient shall be prohibited from conducting any "land disturbing activity," including but not limited to those listed below, unless approval is received from FFA Signatories prior to conducting the activity: Excavation of soil; Construction of roads, utilities, facilities, structures, and appurtenances of any kind; Demolition or removal of "hardscape" (for example, concrete roadways, parking lots, foundations, and sidewalks); Any activity that involves movement of soil to the surface from below the surface of the land; Any other activity that causes or facilitates the movement of known contaminated groundwater; Alteration, disturbance, or removal of any component of a response or cleanup action (including but not limited to pump-and-treat facilities, revetment walls and shoreline protection, and soil cap/containment systems); groundwater extraction, injection, and monitoring wells and associated piping and equipment; or associated utilities;

Comments from EPA, May 28, 2009

SPECIFIC COMMENTS	RESPONSE TO SPECIFIC COMMENTS
	 Extraction of groundwater and installation of new groundwater wells; and Removal of or damage to security features (for example, locks on monitoring wells, survey monuments, fencing, signs, or monitoring equipment and associated pipelines and appurtenances).
	2. Removal of any land disturbing activity restrictions will be based on: results of site investigation, subsequent cleanup considered necessary, or a determination that no-further remedial action is necessary.
	3. Transferee shall not conduct operations or make any alterations that would interfere with, or otherwise restrict, DON operations or environmental cleanup or restoration actions by the DON or FFA signatories or their contractors."
	In Section 5.1.2.2 "Specific Land Use Restriction", the first paragraph will be deleted and replaced with the following:
	"The following land uses are prohibited for property in the IR Site 2 Area. The DON does not anticipate significant changes to the restrictions at IR Site 2; however, minor changes may occur during finalization of the IR Site 2 ROD. Restricted uses include:

Comments from EPA, May 28, 2009

SPECIFIC COMMENTS	RESPONSE TO SPECIFIC COMMENTS
Specific Comment 25. Section 5.4.1, Notifications, Page 12: Please change the text to read "Additional investigation in the vicinity of each AST for potential LBP contamination will be done by the Navy."	 A residence, including any mobile home or factory built housing, constructed or installed for use as residential human habitation; A hospital for humans; A school for persons under 21 years of age; A day care facility for children; and Any permanently occupied human habitation other than those used for commercial or industrial purposes." Response to Specific Comment 25. The following text will be added, "Additional investigation in the vicinity of each AST for potential LBP contamination will be conducted by the Navy as part of the Expanded Site
Specific Comment 26. Section 5.5.1, Notifications, Page 12: Please change the text to read "Further evaluation in the vicinity of Building 100 and the Aircraft Arresting Devices for potential PCB contamination in soil will be done by the Navy."	Investigation." Response to Specific Comment 26. The following text will be added, "Further evaluation will be conducted in the vicinity of Building 100 and the Aircraft Arresting Devices for potential PCB contamination will be conducted by the Navy as part of the Expanded Site Investigation."
Specific Comment 27. Section 7.0, Statement of Finding of Environmental Suitability, Page 14: The proposed uses by the Department of the VA contradict the specified use restrictions. In addition, this Draft	Response to Specific Comment 27. Please see responses to EPA Specific Comment Nos. 1 and 24. Land use restrictions intended for IR Site 2 were mistakenly applied to the entire VA conveyance parcel in the ESD. The

Comments from EPA, May 28, 2009

SPECIFIC COMMENTS	RESPONSE TO SPECIFIC COMMENTS
Environmental Summary Document does not include all environmental conditions since the site inspection for Transfer Parcels FED-1A, FED-2B, and FED-2C has not been completed.	Statement of Finding of Environmental Suitability can be made before the Expanded Site Inspection is completed. No changes to the document are necessary.

MINOR COMMENTS	RESPONSE TO MINOR COMMENTS
Minor Comment 1.	Response to Minor Comment 1.
Section 4.1.2, IR Site 33: There is a typo in this paragraph. It should be "evaluation", not "evalution".	The change will be made as requested.

Comments from CA RWQCB, John West, May 29, 2009

GENERAL COMMENTS	RESPONSE TO GENERAL COMMENTS
General Comment 1.	Response to General Comment 1.
Water Board staff support and concur with EPA's recent comments and also find that the document's Underground Storage Tank (UST)/Aboveground Storage Tank (AGT) summary sections are too brief. These sections should include a more complete description of each fuel tank areas history, evaluation and recommendation.	It is not necessary to restate the information in the ESD from existing documents. References are given in Enclosure (3) of the ESD. Please see response to EPA General Comment No. 1. No changes to the document are necessary.
General Comment 2.	Response to General Comment 2.
In addition, it is my understanding that historical plans have been found and an investigation initiated for the possible presence of two underground fueling bunkers, associated dewatering pipelines and an oil/water separator running along the eastern boundary of VA Transfer Parcel. The possible presence of this these bunkers and fuel waste line is not indicated in the report. According to historical plans, two fueling station subsurface bunkers were located just to the west of CAA-C and a dewatering waste line ran south to just after the Flight Tower and then curved towards Seaplane lagoon.	Historical plans have been found and assessed. An investigation is underway to determine whether or not certain elements (e.g., pipeline and OWS) of the plan are actually inplace. CAA-C is associated with at least 2 fuel pipelines connected to fuel boxes, a potential earthen (e.g., terracotta or vitreous clay) pipeline, and a potential oil-water separator (OWS). As CAA-C is further investigated under the Petroleum Program, the boundary and site features will be further defined. CAA-C is discussed in Section 4.3. A description of the planned future investigations has been included in Section 4.1.3. For consistency, the following will be added to Section 5.1.1: "Additional investigations are described in Sections 4.1.3 and 4.4." to notify the recipient of the possible future investigation.

Comments from DTSC, Dot Lofstrom, June 1, 2009

GENERAL COMMENTS	RESPONSE TO GENERAL COMMENTS
General Comment 1.	Response to General Comment 1.
DTSC recommends that the ESD should not be made final until remedial investigation is complete on the transfer parcels. There are still a number of outstanding questions on parcels FED-1A, FED-2A and FED-2B. A draft Site Inspection Report (SI Report) dated May 30, 2008, was provided to the regulatory agencies for review. DTSC (along with the California Department of Fish and Game and the California Department of Public Health) provided comments on the draft SI report to the Navy on October 7, 2008. The U.S Environmental Protection Agency and the California Regional Water Quality Control Board also provided comments on the draft SI report. The BRAC Cleanup Team (BCT) discussed the regulatory comments and agreed with the Navy's plan to conduct additional investigation in order to complete the SI Report. The additional investigation is planned for summer 2009, and a target date for completion of the SI report is summer 2010. Because there are still uncertainties associated with these transfer parcels, we recommend that the ESD not be finalized until the Navy finalizes the SI and completes any additional remedial investigation that may be warranted.	Please see response to EPA General Comment No. 1.



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY REGION IX

75 Hawthorne Street San Francisco, CA 94105

September 4, 2009

Mr. George Patrick Brooks
Code BPMOW.GPB
Department of the Navy
Base Realignment and Closure
Program Management Office West
1455 Frazee Road, Suite 900
San Diego, CA 92108-4310

Re: Final Environmental Summary Document for the Veterans Affairs Transfer Parcel, Alameda Point, Alameda, California, September 2009

Dear Mr. Brooks:

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Region 9 has received the Final Environmental Summary Document (ESD) for the Veterans Affairs (VA) Transfer Parcel, Alameda Point, Alameda, California, dated September 2009. We have reviewed the aforementioned document and the Navy's responses to EPA's review comments on the draft document. Most of EPA's review comments have been addressed adequately. However, there were several comments that were not fully addressed due, in part, to the purpose of the document. Unlike an EBS/FOST, the ESD serves as the Navy's internal document to provide a summary of the current environmental condition of the transfer parcel prior to the Navy's proposed transfer to another federal agency. There is no established standard for the evaluation of property which is proposed for federal to federal transfer, and we have reviewed the document at the Navy's request. The document summarizes only the currently available information on the transfer parcel and we understand that additional investigations will be conducted in the near future on the transfer parcel. Our remaining concerns are as follows:

- 1. It is EPA's view that the Navy remains as responsible under CERCLA regardless of the language of the proposed Memorandum of Understanding between the Navy and the VA.
- 2. EPA is concerned that the VA lacks adequate resources, technical expertise, and funding needed to assume the Navy's responsibility for the long term environmental responses.
- 3. EPA is also concerned about the VA's ability to assume responsibility for the management of the threatened and endangered species (i.e., the California least tern, etc.) and the sensitive habitat (i.e., wetlands, etc.).

4. EPA believes that Five-Year Reviews should be conducted every five years on an installation-wide-basis. The VA may provide information on the environmental status of the transfer property to the Navy but the Navy should continue to produce and submit the Five-Year Reviews for the entire installation as a whole.

If there are any questions regarding this matter, please feel free to contact me at (415) 972-3002 or Anna-Marie Cook at (415) 972-3029.

THE CONTRACTOR CONTROL OF THE WAR CONTRACTOR CONTRACTOR

nar and de Mille Louis de Mari e i taur la traura de molecula de la cada inceriment de pel cada de como de perfito Se un cod protuitad sedulitor a girar ma em la Anta arres ou ante, a la cumplica VIII deorma de la colectiva d La cada de Marina de Mille de la contrada de Reportado de Mille de Mille de Mille de Contra de Contra de Contra

. No laste anune ALCMAN teobres of their guide as substitute many that was labelled Attental in the sale of sub-

den planet maks, len erfant græste kritt bellegjelst aldjest fild som till krektopiste. Elle til lette til som Refer trennak måleste til ekkil aldje ett matrick som klastik stil attil som ekkilte i britten, ettil ettil so

motivity of the five to provide the control of the

เอริง (ดหวัดเทค) และการใช้เกิดเหมือง และเกิดเกิดเกิดเกิดเมื่อยและ เป็นการและเกิดเมื่อนี้ได้เกิดเหมาะหลายเหมือง

Sincerely,

Xuan-Mai Tran

Remedial Project Manager

างเลือดไป และของ เปลี่ยนหลาย สาร์เปลี่ยนและไม่ได้ได้ และ กาล ของแบบการมา ความสารคนุ้

I for the few will be the first first the second of the

Federal Facilities and Site Cleanup Branch

a juddan ja

Derek Robinson, BRAC NAVFAC SW cc: Wendy Thornton, BRAC PMO, West Patrick McCay, BRAC PMO, West Frances Fadullon, BRAC PMO, West Silvania di Silvania di Santa June Wheaton, BRAC PMO, West Kanagai basi, geratikali atamata bahalaken 1966 Larry Janes, Department of VA Dot Lofstrom, DTSC Sacramento - John West, SFRWQCB Robert Carr, ORC EPA street the section of the contract of the section of the section of the large sections of the section of Karen Vitulano, NEPA EPA The Committee of the Committee of the community of the committee of the co John Chesnutt, EPA Anna-Marie Cook, EPA and order one in the control of the control o

Thornton, Wendy L CIV OASN (IE) BRAC PMO West

From: John West [JWest@waterboards.ca.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, September 08, 2009 12:22 PM

To: Brooks, George Patrick CIV OASN (I&E) BRAC PMO West Cc: Thornton, Wendy L CIV OASN (I&E) BRAC PMO West

Subject: RE: Alameda Final VA ESD

Pat and Wendy,

Water Board staff has received and reviewed the September 2009 Final Environmental Summary Document (ESD) for the Veterans Affairs (VA) Transfer Parcel at Alameda Point.

Based upon available information, we find that the ESD in general adequately summarizes the current environmental conditions and sufficiently documents the proposed property transfer to another Federal agency. However, please note that we concur with the specific comments and concerns raised by EPA Region 9's in their September 4, 2009 memo regarding the Final ESD.

Thanks, John

>>> "Brooks, George Patrick CIV OASN (I&E) BRAC PMO West"

>>> <george.brooks@navy.mil> 9/8/2009 11:52 AM >>>

John, the Navy would appreciate a letter or email from the Water Board similar to the letter we received from EPA (attached). Please note that the property can be transferred to another Federal agency even though there is additional work left to do. The ESD's function is to summarize current environmental conditions and document the proposed transfer to another Federal agency. It's not necessary for all environmental work to be complete.

We understand that there is additional work to do, and appreciate the comments referenced in the EPA letter. We will continue to work with the Water Board and BCT as the additional work is completed.

In summary, we would like a letter or email from the Water Board acknowledging that the ESD summarizes the current environmental conditions and documents the proposed property transfer to another Federal agency.

Thanks, Pat

G. Patrick Brooks, PG BRAC Environmental Coordinator - Alameda Point

BRAC PMO West 1455 Frazee Road, Suite 900 San Diego, CA 92108-4310 619-532-0907 (office) 619-322-1866 (cell) george.brooks@navy.mil

Thornton, Wendy L CIV OASN (IE) BRAC PMO West

From: Dot Lofstrom [DLofstro@dtsc.ca.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, September 01, 2009 3:26 PM

To: Thornton, Wendy L CIV OASN (I&E) BRAC PMO West

Subject: RE: Alameda Final VA ESD

Wendy,

Due to time constraints, DTSC will not be providing further review or comment on the VA ESD.

Dot Lofstrom, P.G.

Senior Engineering Geologist

Geological Services Unit

Brownfields and Environmental Restoration Program Department of Toxic Substances Control 8800 Cal Center Drive Sacramento, CA 95826

(916) 255-6532

cell: (916) 416-4309 fax: (916) 255-3596

>>> "Thornton, Wendy L CIV OASN (I&E) BRAC PMO West"

>>> <wendy.thornton@navy.mil> 9/1/2009 2:38 PM >>>

Just a friendly reminder that we would greatly appreciate your concurrence on the VA ESD by this Friday, 4 September. Thanks!

v/r,

Wendy L. Thornton

Disposal Project Leader

Navy BRAC Program Management Office West

619.532.0937

----Original Message----

From: Thornton, Wendy L CIV OASN (I&E) BRAC PMO West

Sent: Tuesday, August 18, 2009 10:11

To: Cook.Anna-Marie@epamail.epa.gov; Tran.Xuan-Mai@epamail.epa.gov; Dot Lofstrom; 'John

West'

Cc: Brooks, George Patrick CIV OASN (I&E) BRAC PMO West; Lee, Alan K CIV OASN (I&E) BRAC PMO West; Hill, Amy J CIV OASN (I&E), BRAC PMO West; Spinelli, Erica L CIV OASN (I&E),

BRAC PMO West; McCay, Patrick J CIV OASN (I&E) BRAC PMO West; 'Janes, Larry G.'

Subject: Alameda Final VA ESD

Importance: High

All,

Attached is the Final VA ESD and cover letter that will be sent to you via FedEx today. As indicated in the letter, the Navy requests your conditional concurrence on the ESD by 4 September 2009.

Please let me know if you have any questions or problems with the attachments.

v/r,

Wendy L. Thornton Disposal Project Leader

Navy BRAC Program Management Office West

1455 Frazee Road, Suite 900 San Diego, CA 92108-4310

Work Phone: 619.532.0937

Fax: 619.532.0940

wendy.thornton@navy.mil

FOST/FOSL/ESD COORDINATION SHEET

NAVY BRAC PMO INTERNAL TRANSMITTAL/REVIEW ROUTING SLIP

DOCUMENT ATTACHED: Final Environmental Summary Document, Veterans Affairs

Federal Transfer Parcel ACTIVITY: Alameda Point, Alameda, California PROPONENT ENDORSEMENT: The attached Environmental Summary Document has been prepared in accordance with applicable Department of Defense and Department of the Navy policies and guidance. Point of Contact/Title Office/Dept 9/9/09 **PMO WEST** Disposal Project Leader **REVIEWER CERTIFICATION:** The attached document has been reviewed and based upon the information provided; the report is adequate and I provide no further comments. **PMO WEST** The attached document has been reviewed and based upon the information provided, the report is adequate and legally sufficient. I provide no further comments. PMO WEST **ENV Counsel** The attached document has been reviewed and based upon the information provided, the report is adequate and I provide no further comments. PMO WEST Base Closure Mgr RECOMMENDATION: That Director BRAC PMO West sign attached ESD. Claim Duchnik 9/30/09 Approve Director