

HUNTERS POINT SHIPYARD

RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD MEETING MINUTES

26 January 2006

These minutes summarize the discussions and presentations from the Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) meeting held from 6:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m. Thursday, January 26, 2006, in the Alex L. Pitcher, Jr. Room at the Southeast Community Facility at Hunters Point Shipyard (HPS). A verbatim transcript was also prepared for the meeting and is available in the information repository for HPS and on the Internet at <http://www.navybracpmo.org/bracbases/california/hps/default.aspx>. The list of agenda topics is provided below. Attachment A provides a list of attendees. Attachment B includes action items that were requested or committed to by RAB members during the meeting.

AGENDA TOPICS:

- (1) Welcome/Introductions/Agenda Review
- (2) Approval of Meeting Minutes from the December 8, 2005, RAB Meeting
- (3) Navy Announcements
- (4) Community Co-Chair Report
- (5) Navy's Latest Treatability Study – Contaminants in Groundwater at Parcel C
- (6) Subcommittee Reports
- (7) Parcel E-2 Landfill Gas Update
- (8) Community Comment Period
- (9) Adjournment

MEETING HANDOUTS:

- Agenda for January 26, 2006, RAB Meeting
- Meeting Minutes from December 8, 2005, RAB Meeting
- Navy Monthly Progress Report, January 26, 2006
- PowerPoint Presentation, The Latest Treatability Study at Parcel C
- PowerPoint Presentation, Parcel E-2 Landfill Gas Update
- Final Revised and Adopted RAB Bylaws, October 27, 2005
- Membership Bylaws Community Outreach (MBCO) Subcommittee Meeting Minutes from January 11, 2006

Welcome/Introductions/Agenda Review

Marsha Pendergrass, facilitator, called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. Ms. Pendergrass welcomed everyone to the meeting. All attendees introduced themselves and the organization they represent.

Ms. Pendergrass asked Keith Tisdell, RAB member, if a quorum was present for the meeting. Mr. Tisdell replied a quorum was present, because six out of 10 RAB members are in attendance, which is more than one-third of the board.

1 **Approval of Minutes from the December 8, 2005 RAB Meeting**

2 Ms. Pendergrass said that approval of the meeting minutes is needed for the RAB meeting on
3 December 8, 2005. Mr. Tisdell motioned to vote on approving the minutes. Melita Rines, RAB
4 member, seconded the motion. Four members were in favor of approving the RAB meeting
5 minutes, with two abstentions, and the minutes were accepted into the record.

6 Ms. Pendergrass addressed the status of the action items:

7 **Carry-over Action Item Number 1:** Chris Hanif, Young Community Developers (YCD), is to
8 contact Charles DePew, Navy contracting officer, to schedule to next Economic Subcommittee
9 meeting. This action item was completed and will be removed from the table.

10 **Carry-over Action Item Number 2:** U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (U.S. EPA) to
11 provide a Technical Assistance Grant (TAG) update. Dr. Raymond Tompkins, RAB member,
12 said that the criteria for evaluating applications for the TAG have been submitted for U.S. EPA
13 review. He added that he needs to submit a copy of the TAG ad to Ms. Jackie Lane, U.S. EPA,
14 for approval. Once approved, the ad will be run in the Bayview newspaper, and there will be an
15 announcement on a KPOO, 89.5 FM radio program. The plan is to review candidates in
16 February 2006 and have a candidate on board in March 2006. This action item was completed
17 and will be removed from the table.

18 **New Action Item Number 1:** Pat Brooks, Navy Lead Remedial Project Manager (RPM), to
19 provide a list of all businesses in the Bayview Community that have been retained by the Navy
20 contractors. This action item will be carried over until March 2006.

21 **New Action Item Number 2:** Keith Forman, HPS Base Realignment and Closure
22 Environmental Coordinator, (BEC) to provide Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC),
23 San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board (Water Board), EPA and Dr. Tomkins
24 with a list of HPS 2006 Priority Projects, including projects that overlap into 2007. Dr.
25 Tompkins indicated that he would use the list to interview TAG candidates. This action item
26 will be carried over.

27 **Navy Announcements**

28 Mr. Forman stated that Barbara Bushnell, RAB Co-Chair, is unable to attend tonight's meeting.
29 Ms. Pendergrass added that James Morrison, RAB member, will be speaking on Ms. Bushnell's
30 behalf this evening.

31 Mr. Forman requested the RAB members approve an additional presentation on Parcel E-2
32 landfill gas monitoring. Monitoring is performed on a monthly basis and the presentation will
33 provide the latest results. The RAB approved the additional presentation on the January 2006
34 agenda.

35 Mr. Forman reviewed dates for upcoming meetings:

- 36 • MBCO Subcommittee Meeting – February 8, 2006, 6:00 p.m. at the Anna Waden Library.
37 He stated that RAB membership has declined over time and asked for help from the RAB in
38 ways to get new members and increase attendance at the RAB meetings.
- 39 • Technical Subcommittee Meeting – February 9, 2006, 6:00 p.m. at the Anna Waden Library.
40 He explained that the meeting will be a forum for a groundwater 101 presentation.
- 41 • Citizen's Advisory Committee (CAC) Meeting – February 13, 2006, 6:00 p.m. at the Alex L.
42 Pitcher, Jr. Room. He stated that he and Ms. Bushnell will be attending to recruit new RAB
43 members and provide them information on the HPS program.

1 Ms. Pendergrass asked Ms. Hunter to ensure that all the meeting announcements are duly
2 circulated to everyone. Ms. Hunter agreed to provide the RAB the upcoming meeting
3 information.

4 Dr. Tompkins requested to have some time on the January 2006 RAB agenda. Ms. Pendergrass
5 agreed that he can be added to the January 2006 RAB agenda after the community comment
6 period

7 **Community Co-Chair Report**

8 Mr. Morrison did not provide a community co-chair report.

9 **The Latest Treatability Study at Parcel C (Presentation)**

10 Mr. Forman provided an overview of the Treatability Study at Parcel C including background
11 information, the contaminants to be addressed, the strategy, and the schedule.

12
13 Mr. Forman explained that a treatability study is an experiment conducted on a small scale to
14 determine if a technology will work for a site. The Parcel C study is being conducted to gather
15 data to determine the effectiveness of an in-situ or “in the ground” technology. Sometimes a
16 technology is a good fit for a site, and it is proposed for use on a larger scale; sometimes it is not
17 a good fit and the technology is not considered for further use.

18
19 Mr. Forman showed the location of Remedial Unit C1 (RU-C1) at Parcel C and the location of
20 the study that will be conducted around Buildings 211, 231, and 253. A remedial unit is an
21 organized area where there are contaminants in groundwater than can be measured as a unit of
22 contamination. HPS was a shipyard where heavy equipment was built, cleaned, and repaired,
23 and it specialized in manufacturing any part a Navy ship required. Mr. Forman explained that
24 Building 211 was used for degreasing and parts washing. Building 231 had sumps and
25 associated trenches and piping where metallic parts were chemically stripped. Building 253 had
26 solvent tanks, paint booths and dip tanks. There were also several underground storage tanks
27 (USTs) used in and around the buildings for oil, fuel and solvent storage. Contaminants leaked
28 from the sumps, tanks, and associated piping resulting in releases over a significant period of
29 time.

30
31 The primary chemicals of concern (COCs) in groundwater at RU-C1 are solvents including
32 tetrachloroethene (PCE), trichloroethene (TCE), dichloroethene (DCE), and vinyl chloride (VC).
33 Mr. Forman stated that many of these chemicals are still in use today. For example, PCE is a
34 chemical used in dry cleaning clothes. Other chemicals present at RU-C1 are dichloroethane
35 (DCA), benzene, dichlorobenzene (DCB), and petroleum products. He provided a figure
36 showing the contaminant plume contours and pointed out that the plumes overlap. One of the
37 Navy’s concerns is to clean up these groundwater contaminants before they reach San Francisco
38 Bay.

39
40 Mr. Forman stated that the technology being tested in the RU-C1 treatability study was already
41 used successfully at RU-C5. The lessons learned from RU-C5 are being used to adjust elements
42 of the RU-C1 study to be more effective.

43
44 The RU-C1 Treatability Study will be conducted in three stages. Stage 1 will enhance the non-
45 oxygen or anerobic environment in the groundwater. Stage 2 will enhance the oxygenated or
46 aerobic environment. Stage 3, if needed, will add oxygen to the groundwater. Data will be
47 collected at each stage to determine if the treatment is effective in reducing contaminant

1 concentrations. The study is also designed to minimize impacts to deeper groundwater and
2 minimize any movement of contamination into a wider area.

3
4 Mr. Forman explained that there are microbes (bacteria) that are naturally occurring in the soil
5 and groundwater at RU-C1. The RU-C1 treatability study is designed to enhance the
6 environment for these microbes to get them to breakdown contamination more effectively. The
7 first stage enhances the environment for a family of microbes that do not need oxygen called
8 anerobic microbes. He stated that for 15 days sodium lactate, which is found in many consumer
9 products, will be added to feed the anerobic microbes. These microbes thrive with this nutrient
10 and will multiply as they eat the sodium lactate. The process, called recirculation, will extract
11 groundwater, add sodium lactate, and return the groundwater to the subsurface through injection
12 wells. Sodium lactate will be added for 15 days, followed by a 60 day observation period when
13 the increased microbe population will start feeding on (breaking down) the groundwater
14 contaminants. The 15 day feeding/60 day observation cycle will be conducted twice for each
15 stage of the study. For Stage 2, sodium nitrate will be added to enhance the environment for
16 microbes that need oxygen called aerobic microbes. Stage 3 is an optional stage where oxygen
17 will be added if Stage 2 results indicate there is a need to further degrade contaminants. At RU-
18 C5, there were some issues with getting oxygen to distribute uniformly and reach all the areas
19 where there were contaminants.

20
21 Mr. Forman provided a slide showing the reactions during chemical breakdown of
22 contamination. He explained that the contaminants are chlorinated compounds with molecules
23 that have carbon and chlorine. The breakdown process occurs as chlorine molecules are taken
24 away. Groundwater sampling results will provide the levels and ratios of contaminants in the
25 groundwater to determine how effectively breakdown is occurring. At the end of the breakdown
26 process there should be only harmless byproducts, like water.

27
28 Mr. Forman provided a diagram of the injection system. Groundwater is extracted and sent to a
29 mix tank where nutrients or oxygen are added. The groundwater is then recirculated back to the
30 subsurface through an injection well. These types of systems have been used many times
31 throughout the county, but each site has different hydrogeology. A treatability study provides
32 data to determine if a technology will be effective over a larger area that affects the entire
33 contaminant plumes.

34
35 Mr. Forman explained that during the study data will be collected on the amount of dissolved
36 oxygen in the groundwater, the levels of sodium lactate or sodium nitrate used, and on the
37 microbe population. All of the data is used to determine how much the groundwater
38 contaminants are being reduced during treatment. He added that RU-C1 has one of the highest
39 concentrations of chemicals at HPS, so it is one of the more challenging sites. The treatability
40 study will provide considerable data to use in proposing a technology to remediate the
41 groundwater contaminant plumes at the site.

42
43 Mr. Forman presented the schedule for completing the Treatability Study Work Plan with field
44 work beginning in late April 2006. He added that the RU-C1 treatability study should take about
45 nine or ten months to complete.

46
47 Mr. Forman stated that he would like the RAB to consider a field trip in May 2006 to visit RU-
48 C1 once all the equipment is in place. Seven RAB members indicated interest in a field trip.

1 Dr. Tompkins asked if Parcel C is composed of fill material similar to Parcel B. Mr. Forman
2 replied that Parcel C does contain fill material and parts of the parcel have bedrock close to the
3 surface.

4
5 Dr. Tompkins asked if solid baseline data is being collected before the study. Mr. Brooks
6 indicated that the work plan includes a baseline analysis before any treatment.

7
8 Mr. Tisdell asked if microbes eat VC. Mr. Forman replied that there are microbes that eat VC,
9 which is just part of the chemical chain during contaminant breakdown. He added that at the end
10 of the chemical breakdown process, there is a lot of methane and harmless byproducts that are
11 waste from the microbes. Mr. Tisdell asked if microbes dying re-contaminated the groundwater.
12 Mr. Forman replied that microbes dying did not do anything to re-contaminate the groundwater.
13 Chemical breakdown of the contaminants is actually a waste product of the living microbes.

14
15 Dr. Tompkins asked if there are other technologies being considered for RU-C1. Mr. Forman
16 replied that if the treatability study technology does not work, then other technologies would be
17 considered. The Parcel C FS would need to incorporate a number of solutions and the Navy is
18 anticipating that this in-situ or "in the ground" technology could be one of the solutions.

19 **Subcommittee Reports**

20 **Economic Subcommittee**

21 Mr. Hanif said that he is stepping down as Economic Subcommittee chair due to his workload,
22 but will continue to provide support. Mr. Hanif stated that Mr. Morrison has volunteered to take
23 over as chair of the Economic Subcommittee. He added that if the Anna Waden library
24 community room is not available for Economic Subcommittee meetings, they can be held at the
25 YCD office. Jesse Mason, RAB member expressed his interest in assisting Mr. Morrison
26 coordinate the Economic Subcommittee meetings and agendas. Ms. Pendergrass summarized
27 that Mr. Hanif would meet with Mr. Morrison and Mr. Mason to debrief with them on the
28 Economic Subcommittee. Mr. Morrison will then provide Ms. Hunter with a date and place for
29 the next meeting.

30 31 **Technical Review Subcommittee**

32 Mr. Morrison indicated that due to Ms. Bushnell's absence, the Technical Subcommittee update
33 will be provided at a later date. Mr. Tisdell said that Dr. Tompkins had requested that he resume
34 his position as the Technical Subcommittee chair. Ms. Pendergrass confirmed that Dr. Tompkins
35 will touch base with Ms. Bushnell to discuss resuming the Technical Subcommittee chair.

36
37 Mr. Morrison stated that if Dr. Tompkins resumes as the Technical Subcommittee chair, that he
38 provide the RAB minutes summarizing the discussions of the Technical Subcommittee meetings.

39 40 **MBCO Subcommittee**

41 Mr. Tisdell stated that the MBCO Subcommittee met on January 11, 2006 and he has copies of
42 the minutes for that meeting. Topics discussed included recruiting new RAB members, Mr.
43 Forman providing an Environmental 101 class, and update of the Community Notification Plan.
44 The next meeting is scheduled for 6:00 p.m. on February 8, 2006 at the Anna Waden Bayview
45 Library. He stated that he would like to request that more HPS RAB members attend the
46 meeting to provide direction for the RAB recruitment process. Mr. Forman stated that he would
47 commit to a Saturday to review HPS Environmental 101 once there are at least 3 new RAB
48 members. Mr. Forman stated that current RAB members interested in attending HPS

1 Environmental 101 are welcome to attend. Ms. Pendergrass added that one of the best ways to
2 get new RAB members is through referral from existing RAB members, and asked if each RAB
3 member would take several copies of the RAB member application to pass out in your
4 neighborhood.

5 **Parcel E-2 Landfill Gas Update (Presentation)**

6 Mr. Brooks provided an update of the landfill gas monitoring results at Parcel E-2. Landfill gas
7 monitoring at Parcel E-2 has been conducted monthly for about 3 years. He said that he would
8 provide a review of the results through December 2005, and inform the RAB of some different
9 results from recent monitoring.

10
11 Mr. Brooks provided a list of the monitoring locations at Parcel E-2 and explained that gas
12 monitoring probes (GMPs) are used to measure methane gas from the landfill. On the north side
13 of the landfill there is a wall that captures methane gas, and the University of California San
14 Francisco (UCSF) research facility is on the other side of that wall. There are GMPs both on the
15 landfill side of the wall and on the University of California San Francisco side of the wall.
16 Anytime landfill gas levels at the UCSF GMPs rise above trigger levels, there are two units on
17 site that begin extracting methane gas.

18
19 Mr. Brooks explained that there are now only two groundwater extraction well vaults on site,
20 with most of the vaults removed during excavation for the polychlorinated biphenyl (PCB) hot-spot
21 removal action. That removal action is taking place on the south side of the landfill with
22 excavation running from 2 to 10 feet deep. There was a lot of rain in December 2005, so there is
23 now a large pond in that area.

24
25 Mr. Brooks said that there is a trigger level of 2.5 percent methane for the landfill, and if any
26 GMP measurement is above that level, landfill gas extraction is performed. In December 2005
27 nothing exceeded action levels so there was no need for extraction. He explained that GMP 24
28 was just under the trigger level in November 2005, so it was measured a second time and
29 methane was detected at 2.3 percent. He explained that if a measurement is above the trigger
30 level, a second measurement is taken about a week later and if levels are still above the trigger
31 level, extraction is performed. It usually takes a day or two of extraction to get the landfill gas
32 levels back down below the trigger level. This monitoring and extraction program will continue
33 until a final remedy for the landfill is in place.

34
35 Landfill gas monitoring was performed in January 2006 and methane was detected at GMP 1 at
36 3.3 percent and at GMP 7 at 7.2 percent as of 10:00 a.m. By 2:30 p.m. that same day, GMP 1
37 was up to 25 percent and GMP 7 was up to 32 percent methane. The meter was recalibrated, and
38 a new meter was brought in and the high levels were confirmed. As of January 26, 2006, GMP
39 1 was at 0.4 percent and GMP 7 was at 6.8 percent, so extraction is continuing at GMP 7.

40
41 Mr. Brooks stated that he has a theory to explain the higher methane levels. The landfill has an
42 impermeable cap, so any methane from the landfill rises up, hits that cap, and spreads out
43 looking for the edge of the cap. Recently, due to the water that has collected in the PCB hot-spot
44 excavation, the methane venting has been pushed further out resulting in the higher methane
45 levels in these two GMPs.

46
47 Mr. Brooks explained that there are a couple of steps being taken to address the methane gas
48 issue. First, monitoring frequency is going to be increased and landfill gas extraction will be

1 performed when necessary to keep conditions safe. In addition, a discharge permit has been
2 submitted to remove the water that has collected in the excavation and that extraction will
3 probably start in a day or two.
4

5 In response to a question, Mr. Brooks explained that there is a lower and an upper explosive limit
6 for methane. The lower limit is anything below 2.5 percent, and the upper limit is anything
7 above 15 percent. Anything below the lower limit or above the upper limit is either too lean or
8 too rich to explode.
9

10 Ms. Rines asked if landfill cap venting has been considered to address the higher methane gas
11 levels. Mr. Brooks responded that venting has been considered, but the methane will most likely
12 vent naturally once the pond in the excavation is drained. Mr. Brooks added that there are
13 groundwater monitoring wells in the landfill that could also be used as vents for methane.
14

15 Mr. Hanif asked why the methane gas levels fluctuated so much over such a short period of time.
16 Mr. Forman responded that the Navy is working with landfill experts on this issue and will have
17 an update at the February 2006 RAB meeting.
18

19 Charles Dacus, RAB member, asked if there is a regular monitoring schedule for the landfill.
20 Mr. Brooks replied that there is a schedule for monitoring the landfill. About a week before the
21 RAB meeting, extraction blowers are hooked up to a gas collection trench that runs along one
22 side of the landfill and the methane gas is extracted. Everything is left alone over the weekend,
23 and landfill gas monitoring is performed the following Monday. For any measurements that are
24 close to the trigger level, monitoring is performed a week later at those locations.
25

26 Mr. Tisdell asked if the Navy has had any more problems with the Gundwall® at the landfill.
27 Mr. Forman replied that the Navy is still working out some Gundwall® issues. The Navy will
28 provide the RAB an update at the February 2006 RAB meeting.

29 **Goals of HPS RAB Members**

30 Ms. Pendergrass asked each RAB member to reflect on 2005, their goal for 2006, and state what
31 their interest is for being involved in the RAB. The RAB members took turns sharing their goals
32 for 2006 and their interest in being on the RAB.

- 33 • Amy Brownell, San Francisco Department of Public Health - Provide information from the
34 Health Department, City Redevelopment Agency, and developer perspective to the RAB and
35 also take information back. .
- 36 • Patricia Brown, Shipyard Artist – Take information back to the artists at HPS about the
37 environmental cleanup program.
- 38 • Mr. Dacus – Take information back to his neighborhood as well as organizations he is
39 involved in.
- 40 • Mr. Brooks – Cleanup HPS in the best way possible. Mr. Brooks was trained in
41 environmental cleanup procedures which is the favorite part of his job.
- 42 • Mr. Forman – Mr. Forman wants to provide the community the ability to become informed
43 about the cleanup process. Even if the Navy cleans up the base and does an outstanding job,
44 it is not good enough if the community doesn't know what is going on. Mr. Forman stressed
45 the importance of having the cleanup of HPS as a transparent process
- 46 • Mr. Morrison – To provide equal opportunity for participation in jobs and other
47 opportunities, and to relay the ideas, perception and values of his friends and neighbors to the
48 RAB. Mr. Morrison expressed his interest in cleanup technology.

- 1 • Michael Work, U.S. EPA – It is part of U.S. EPA’s mission to involve the community in the
2 decision-making process through the selection of a remedy for site cleanup, and reuse of the
3 property.
- 4 • Mr. Hanif – Gain awareness in order to impart information to the community, and also
5 ensure that the community members that are working on various sections of the HPS cleanup
6 program are trained appropriately. .
- 7 • Tom Lanphar, California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) – One of the
8 missions of DTSC is to ensure the public is involved and informed in the decision-making
9 process for cleanup of HPS. One of the roles of a California regulator is to represent the
10 views, laws, and regulations of the State of California. Mr. Lanphar interprets how and what
11 is done to accomplish the cleanup of HPS . Mr. Lanphar assists the community in translating
12 technical information into easy to understand language.
- 13 • Dr. Tompkins – Representative of the Bayview-Hunter’s Point Coalition. The mission of the
14 Bayview-Hunters Point Coalition is to protect the community that is at greatest risk.
- 15 • Mr. Tisdell – Stay informed and keep an eye on the process to ensure that nothing is
16 overlooked.

17
18 Ms. Pendergrass thanked the RAB members for sharing their thoughts. She stated that there is a
19 lot of commonality in the statements made by the RAB, and reminded them that everyone is
20 striving for the same goals even when there are disagreements. She asked the RAB to consider
21 for next month’s RAB meeting suggestions on how to make the HPS RAB meetings more
22 relevant to the community interests. Ms. Pendergrass would like to make each RAB meeting a
23 more meaningful 2-hour experience for everyone each month.

24 **RAB Comment Period**

25 Ms. Pendergrass asked the audience if there were any community members who would like to
26 make a comment. There were no comments received from the meeting attendees in the
27 audience.

28 Ms. Pendergrass adjourned the meeting at 7:49 p.m.

29 **Reminder: The next RAB meeting will be held from 6:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m., Thursday,**
30 **February 23, 2006, at the Southeast Community Commission Facility, Alex Pitcher Jr.**
31 **Room, 1800 Oakdale Avenue, San Francisco, California 94124.**

ATTACHMENT A
26 January 2006 - RAB MEETING
LIST OF ATTENDEES

Name	Association
1. Wayne Akyama	Shaw Environmental
2. James Ansbro	Bayview Resident
3. Brian Baltimore	Young Community Developers (YCD)
4. Patrick Brooks	Navy Lead Remedial Project Manager (RPM)
5. Patricia Brown	Shipyard Artist
6. Amy Brownell	San Francisco Department of Public Health
7. Charles Dacus	RAB member, ROSES
8. Keith Forman	Navy RAB Co-chair
9. Chris Hanif	RAB member, Young Community Developers
10. Carolyn Hunter	Tetra Tech EMI
11. Jaqueline Ann Lane	U.S. EPA Region IX
12. Tom Lanphar	California Department of Toxic Substances Control
13. Jesse Mason	RAB member, Community Windows on the Shipyard
14. Joel McClure	Bayview Resident
15. Mary McClure	Bayview Resident
16. Darlene McCray	CDM Federal
17. Verla Morris	Bayview Resident
18. James Morrison	RAB member, ROSES
19. Christine M. Niccoli	Niccoli Reporting, court reporter
20. Ralph Pearce	Navy RPM
21. Marsha Pendergrass	Pendergrass & Associates
22. Melita Rines	RAB member, India Basin Neighborhood Association
23. Matthew Shaps	Paul Hastings LLP for Lennar
24. Gerard Slattery	Tetra Tech EC
25. Keith Tisdell	RAB member, resident
26. Raymond Tompkins	RAB member, Bayview-Hunters Point Health and the Environment
27. Eli Vedagiri	Barajas & Associates
28. Julia Vetromile	Tetra Tech EMI
29. Angela Williams	Barajas & Associates
30. Michael Work	U.S. EPA Region IX

ATTACHMENT B
26 JANUARY 2006 – RAB MEETING
ACTION ITEMS

Item No.	Action Item	Person Authoring the Action Item	Due Date	Person/Agency Committing to Action Item	Resolution Status
Carry-Over Items					
1.	The Navy will provide a list of all businesses in the Bayview Community that have been retained by the Navy Contractors	James Morrison RAB member	1/26/06	Pat Brooks Navy Lead Remedial Project Manager	An extension was requested at the 1/26/06 RAB meeting. The new deadline is 2/23/06.
New Items					
1.	The Navy will schedule a RAB field trip in May 2006 to visit the Parcel C Treatability Study Site.	Keith Forman Navy RAB Co-chair	2/23/06	Mr. Forman	
2.	Chris Hanif, Young Community Developers, to meet with James Morrison (RAB Member), and Jesse Mason (RAB Member) to debrief on the Economic Subcommittee and schedule the next meeting.	Mr. Hanif	2/23/06	Mr. Hanif	The next Economic Subcommittee meeting is to be determined.
3.	The Navy will provide the RAB, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Department of Toxic Substances Control, and San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board a list of the HPS Priority Projects in 2006 (including projects that overlap into 2007).	Ray Tompkins RAB Member	2/3/06	Mr. Forman	For use in interviewing TAG candidates
4.	The Navy will schedule a HPS Environmental 101 class on a Saturday in April 2006 once at least 3 new community members join the RAB.	Mr. Forman	2/23/06	Mr. Forman	
5.	Carolyn Hunter, SulTech, to circulate announcements for the upcoming Membership Bylaws and Community Outreach Subcommittee, Technical Subcommittee, and Citizen's Advisory Committee Meetings.	Ms. Pendergrass	ASAP	Ms. Hunter	This action item was completed on 2/1/06

June 5, 2006

Diane Silva
SWDIV Records Manager
Facilities Engineering Command
1220 Pacific Highway
San Diego, CA 92132

Subject: Hunters Point Shipyard Information Repository/Administrative Record Submittals

Dear Ms. Silva,

Enclosed are three copies of the following documents for submittal to the Hunters Point Shipyard Information Repository/Administrative Record:

- Final January 26, 2006 Restoration Advisory Board Meeting Minutes
- Final February 23, 2006 Restoration Advisory Board Meeting Minutes
- Final February 23, 2006 Restoration Advisory Board Meeting Transcript
- Final March 23, 2006 Restoration Advisory Board Meeting Minutes
- Final March 23, 2006 Restoration Advisory Board Meeting Transcript
- Final April 27, 2006 Restoration Advisory Board Meeting Minutes
- Final April 27, 2006 Restoration Advisory Board Meeting Transcript

Please feel free to contact me or Angela Williams (Community Relations Specialist [619-338-0798, ext. 12]) if you have any questions.

Thank you,



Saravanan (Eli) Vedagiri, P.E.
Program Manager
Barajas and Associates, Inc.
Phone: (619) 338-0798, ext. 11
Fax: (619) 338-0617
E-mail: eliv@barajas.cc