

HUNTERS POINT SHIPYARD

RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD MEETING MINUTES

27 April 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, April 27, 2006, in Classroom #313 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 March 23, 2006 RAB Meeting
- (3) Navy Announcements
- (4) Community Co-Chair Report
- (5) Hunters Point Groundwater Monitoring Program 2006 Presentation
- (6) The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Role in the Cleanup Process Presentation
- (7) EPA and the Technical Assistance Grant (TAG) Process
- (8) Subcommittee Reports
- (9) Community Comment Period
- (10) Adjournment

MEETING HANDOUTS:

- Agenda for April 27, 2006, RAB Meeting
- Meeting Minutes from March 23, 2006 RAB Meeting
- Navy Monthly Progress Report, April 27, 2006
- PowerPoint Presentation, Groundwater Update – Treatability Studies and Future Work
- PowerPoint Presentation, EPA Role and Responsibilities in the Cleanup Process under CERCLA
- Membership/Bylaws and Community Outreach (MBCO) Subcommittee Meeting Minutes from April 12, 2006
- Technical Subcommittee Meeting Minutes from March 29, 2006.
- Technical Subcommittee Meeting Minutes from April 26, 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 confirmed that there is a quorum for the meeting.

Approval of Minutes from the March 23, 2006 RAB Meeting

Ms. Pendergrass said that approval of the minutes is needed for the RAB meeting on March 23, 2006. Barbara Bushnell, Community Co-Chair, motioned to vote on approving the minutes. Charles Dacus, RAB member, seconded the motion. Ms. Pendergrass asked the RAB to vote on

1 the March 23, 2006 meeting minutes. The RAB meeting minutes were approved with one
2 abstention, and the minutes were accepted into the record.

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

4 **Carry-over Action Item Number 1:** Keith Forman, HPS Base Realignment and Closure
5 Environmental Coordinator, (BEC) to schedule a field trip in June 2006 to visit the Parcel C
6 Treatability Study Site. This action item will be carried over until May 2006.

7 **Carry-over Action Item Number 2:** Chris Hanif, formerly with Young Community
8 Developers (YCD), to meet with James Morrison, RAB member, and Jesse Mason, RAB
9 member, to debrief on the Economic Subcommittee and schedule the next meeting. This action
10 item will be removed from the table.

11 **Carry-over Action Item Number 3:** Keith Forman, HPS Base Realignment and Closure
12 Environmental Coordinator, (BEC) to provide Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC),
13 San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board (Water Board), U.S. Environmental
14 Protection Agency (EPA), and Mr. Raymond Tompkins, RAB member, with a list of HPS 2006
15 Priority Projects, including projects that overlap into 2007. Mr. Tompkins indicated that his
16 computer has been down so he has not received the list via e-mail, but confirmed he did receive a
17 hardcopy of the list. He asked that Arc Ecology and all the RAB members also get a copy of the
18 list via e-mail. This action item will be carried over until May 2006.

19 **Carry-over Item Number 4:** Keith Forman to provide an Environmental 101 class on a
20 Saturday once at least 3 new community members join the RAB. The RAB is awaiting a third
21 RAB applicant prior to hosting this class. This action item will be carried over until there are at
22 least 3 new RAB members.

23 **Carry-over Action Item Number 5:** James Ponton, Water Board, will provide a presentation
24 on Water Board activities for HPS at the April 27, 2006 RAB meeting. There will then be a
25 regulator presentation at each RAB meeting, with Michael Work, U.S. Environmental Protection
26 Agency (EPA) providing a presentation on EPA activities at the May 25, 2006 RAB Meeting.
27 Michael Works (EPA) indicated that he would be providing the EPA presentation this evening
28 and Mr. Ponton would provide a presentation at the May 25, 2006 RAB Meeting. This action
29 item was completed and will be removed from the table.

30 Navy Announcements

31 Mr. Brooks explained that Mr. Forman will not be here this evening as he is attending a meeting
32 in Washington D.C. for returning Iraqi reservists. He added that the weather finally cleared in
33 April 2006, and now all four removal sites at HPS are back on track.

34 Community Co-Chair Report

35 Ms. Bushnell stated that there is a lot of activity at HPS this year, and she has been getting data
36 on CDs in copious quantities. For anyone who has been out to the shipyard lately, there are
37 dramatic changes at former Parcel A. The RAB, however, needs to remain focused on
38 remediation activities at HPS. The Technical Memorandum in Support of a Record of Decision
39 (ROD) Amendment (TMSRA) for Parcel B is the next document the RAB will be reviewing.
40 The regulatory agencies are also going to provide presentations covering what they do for the
41 shipyard. She indicated that she has attended the BCT meetings and seen how closely the
42 regulators work with the HPS program.

43 Ms. Bushnell explained that the HPS RAB is recruiting new members who will be committed to
44 attending the meetings each month. She added that Mr. Hanif is resigning from the RAB due to

1 changes in his career and residence in Oakland. He extended his appreciation to the community
2 for all their hard work for HPS.

3 **Hunters Point Groundwater Monitoring Program 2006 (Presentation)**

4 Mr. Brooks provided an update of the HPS Groundwater Monitoring Program for 2006. The
5 presentation covered why the Navy conducts treatability studies, progress and recommendations
6 for treatability study areas, impacts due to sewer/storm drain work, and proposed additional
7 monitoring wells.

8 Mr. Brooks explained that there are a number of reasons the Navy conducts treatability studies.
9 First, groundwater cleanup can be complicated with variable geologic conditions and a variety of
10 contaminants. Treatability studies also help evaluate technologies to ensure they will work at
11 each site. If a treatability study is successful, then cleanup can be accelerated and the study will
12 provide a jump start on the cleanup. If not successful, then that technology would not be selected
13 later on in the cleanup process. So far the HPS treatability studies have been successful and have
14 provided a lot of good information. The technologies evaluated in the treatability studies are
15 further evaluated in the feasibility studies. Once the community, regulators, and the Navy have
16 agreed on cleanup methods and a remedy is selected in the ROD, then the final remedy design
17 for a site is finalized.

18 **Remedial Unit (RU)-C1, in-situ bioremediation in a solvent plume:** The work plan for the
19 RU-C1 treatability study was submitted for review on March 26, 2006 with comments due on
20 May 17, 2006. Mr. Brooks stated that fieldwork kickoff is scheduled for mid-June 2006. Pre-
21 mobilization fieldwork has been completed, including a site survey and verification that the
22 storm drains are still blocked off at the treatability study area. These were blocked off several
23 years ago when potassium permanganate, a chemical tested for treating this plume, previously
24 led to a small discharge to the Bay.

25 **RU-C4, zero-valent iron injection for high solvent concentrations in a fractured bedrock**
26 **aquifer:** Mr. Brooks noted that RU-C4 is where the first experiment with zero-valent iron (ZVI)
27 or elemental iron injection took place, and it was successful. In December 2002, 16,000 pounds
28 of iron were injected into fractured bedrock in four locations in the RU-C4 groundwater hot spot
29 near building 272. Injection started at the bottom of the boreholes and worked up to prevent
30 vertical spread of contaminants. Contamination levels dropped substantially after the first
31 injection. Another 73,000 pounds of iron were injected in thirteen locations throughout the hot
32 spot in 2004. The progress of this treatability study is still being tracked and there are still good
33 results.

34 Mr. Brooks explained how the iron corrodes, releasing electrons, which break down chemicals
35 during the ZVI treatment. With trichloroethene (TCE), one of HPS main contaminants,
36 chlorine atoms pick up an electron from the corroding iron and eventually TCE is reduced to
37 harmless byproducts. These electrons also work in treating other contaminants including
38 polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs), carbon tetrachloride, hexavalent chromium, nitrate, and
39 arsenic. The chemical reactions reduce the number of electrons, indicated by measuring what's
40 called the oxidation potential in millivolts. When there is a negative measurement that means
41 there are lots of electrons available to treat contamination. In December 2002, the oxidation
42 potential was -550 millivolts in the hot spot well, which had reduced to -72 millivolts by
43 September 2005 with levels of TCE reduced to drinking water standards. So there are still
44 electrons treating contaminants at RU-C4. There are still contaminants above cleanup levels, so
45 those will continue to be monitored and further treatment will be recommended in the Parcel C
46 Feasibility Study (FS).

1 **RU-C5, in-situ bioremediation for a mixture of contaminants including chlorinated**
2 **solvents:** Mr. Brooks stated that RU-C5 is where an in-situ bio-treatability study is being
3 evaluated. From April to June 2004, food-grade sodium lactate was injected into the treatment
4 area. The lactate served as food for the bacteria, and the bacteria population increases. Then the
5 lactate was cut-off so the bacteria would use the contaminants as food, and start breaking them
6 down. Declines in contaminant levels were noted in all but one well, IR25MW54A, which must
7 have a persistent/continuing source of contamination that still needs to be addressed. Dense non-
8 aqueous phase liquid (DNAPL) was found near IR25MW54A, so there will be some additional
9 source removal near that well recommended in the FS. There are still some contaminants above
10 cleanup levels, so those will continue to be monitored, and further treatment will be
11 recommended in the FS.

12 Mr. Brooks explained that dense non-aqueous phase liquid (DNAPL) is the pure form of the
13 solvent that was used at RU-C5. It is dense so it sinks in water, is non-aqueous meaning it does
14 not mix with water. Since it is a liquid it can migrate. If DNAPL is treated with ZVI, it only
15 treats the surface area of contamination. If ZVI is mixed with oil, however, it then mixes with
16 DNAPL, increasing the surface area that is treated. Since DNAPL sinks in water, excavation
17 would have to be up to 25-feet below ground surface (bgs), but that would be possible by shoring
18 up the building foundation. Emulsifying with treatment fluids is also an option, but that may
19 mobilize contaminants. Six phase electrical heating that vaporizes DNAPL (used successfully at
20 Alameda) is also being considered, but it can be expensive to heat up a large volume of soil.

21 **IR-10, zero-valent iron injection for high solvent concentrations in A-aquifer fill material:**
22 Mr. Brooks explained that IR-10 provided a chance to evaluate ZVI treatment in a different
23 geologic environment. Where RU-C4 had bedrock conditions, IR-10 is sand, gravel and fill
24 material. From September to October 2003, 130,000 pounds of iron were injected at 37 locations
25 within the groundwater plume. Subsequent groundwater monitoring proved the technology was
26 effective. There is now a new hot spot well, IR10MW71A, with TCE reduced from 1,200 µg/L
27 in October 2003 to 59 µg/L in December 2005. The reduction potential was 21 mVolts in
28 December 2005, so there are not a lot of free electrons, but there is still some contaminant
29 destruction taking place. The plumes have remained relatively stable with contaminant
30 concentrations within the plume boundaries declining. There are still some contaminants above
31 cleanup levels, so those will continue to be monitored and additional treatment will be
32 recommended in the Parcel B TMSRA.

33 **Parcel B Remedial Action Monitoring Program (RAMP) Wells:** Mr. Brooks said that once
34 removal of the sewer and storm drain lines gets underway, four of the Parcel B RAMP wells will
35 have to be decommissioned. The plan is to sample the wells directly before decommissioning,
36 and then drill a new well adjacent to the previous location once excavation is completed in each
37 area.

38 **Proposed New Work:** Mr. Brooks explained that replacement of the decommissioned RAMP
39 wells is proposed new work for the HPS groundwater program. An additional well or wells
40 between the current well and the shoreline is proposed for IR-26 to determine if mercury is
41 migrating to the Bay. In the Annual Groundwater Monitoring Report, there are
42 recommendations for 21 new wells in the Parcel C, D and E, and those will be evaluated.

43 Mr. Tompkins asked if HPS groundwater would be cleaned up to a human consumption level
44 when the groundwater program is complete. Mr. Brooks responded that there are different
45 groundwater units at HPS. The top unit, the A-aquifer, is mainly fill material and reclaimed
46 tidelands, so that water is not considered suitable for human consumption. The A-aquifer is
47 evaluated to prevent migration of contaminants to the Bay, which includes ecological criteria that

1 have cleanup levels to protect the Bay; some ecological criteria are lower than drinking water
2 levels. In the A-aquifer, groundwater is only 8 to 10 feet bgs, so VOCs in the groundwater could
3 volatilize into gas and rise into indoor building space. As a result, the calculations for
4 groundwater cleanup levels to address indoor air concentrations are often lower than drinking
5 water levels. A clay layer separates the A- and B- aquifers, with the B-aquifer considered
6 appropriate for human consumption. This water is compared to EPA levels for drinking water.

7 In response to a question from Mr. Tompkins, Mr. Brooks stated that the ZVI injections at Parcel
8 B were in the A-aquifer. Going deeper, there is the B-aquifer, which is separated from the A-
9 aquifer by what geologists call Bay mud. At one time, when the Bay was much bigger, sand and
10 gravel was washed into the Bay by rivers and streams. Later these layers were covered over with
11 the Bay mud. That sand and gravel makes up the B-aquifer, and that is potentially usable for
12 drinking water.

13 Mr. Tompkins asked if there would be land-use restrictions due to contaminants in the A-aquifer.
14 Mr. Brooks replied that in the TMSRA there are land-use restrictions planned. For example,
15 restrictions will include no potable water wells in the A-aquifer, and require that developers
16 properly engineer utility line within a groundwater contaminant plume such that migration is
17 prevented.

18 **The EPA Role and Responsibilities in the Cleanup Process (Presentation)**

19 Mr. Work thanked Mr. Morrison for the idea of the regulators providing presentations on their
20 role in the cleanup process.

21 Mr. Work stated that the best way to explain EPA's role in the Comprehensive Environmental
22 Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) process is to review the history. Back in
23 the 1970s, the American public was becoming more aware of issues with toxic wastes such as
24 Love Canal, where a residential area was built right over a toxic dump. Contaminant levels at
25 Love Canal would horrify a toxicologist today, and people were getting sick. In response to this
26 site and other similar situations congress enacted CERCLA on December 11, 1980 with
27 requirements on how government and industry have to address abandoned toxic waste sites in the
28 United States. Congress provided that EPA could go after certain industries that were
29 responsible for leaving toxic waste behind and EPA has done that. Congress also provided a
30 multi-billion dollar fund, called the Superfund, to go after industries or to cleanup sites where
31 there was not a responsible party.

32 Mr. Work explained that eventually, the states and citizens started commenting that the
33 government, with over 27,000 installations, was also responsible for toxic waste sites. The
34 government has larger and more complex sites than private industry. For example, Edwards Air
35 Force Base is larger than the state of Rhode Island. In response to the Federal Government's
36 toxic waste sites, CERCLA was amended with the Superfund Amendment and Reauthorization
37 Act (SARA) on October 17, 1986 that included a requirement that EPA oversee cleanup at
38 federal agency/government sites. Section 120(a) of CERCLA was amended to require federal
39 facilities to comply with CERCLA to the same extent as private industrial sites. There is also
40 Executive Order 12580 that delegates the president's authority under CERCLA to the
41 Department of Defense (DoD) and more specifically for Hunter's Point the Department of Navy
42 (DON). In fact, the federal government cannot use the Superfund money to cleanup sites where
43 there is a responsible party determined. The Superfund is used to cleanup sites where a
44 responsible party cannot be found. Funding for federal facilities comes from a different
45 mechanism, which also provides funding for EPA oversight under this law.

1 Mr. Work said that when CERCLA was first enacted, EPA's response was to write regulations
2 for implementing the law, including the National Contingency Plan (NCP). NCP outlined
3 specific requirements for conducting cleanups and outlined the use of Operable Units, Feasibility
4 Studies, and Proposed Plans to inform the public. The regulations also provide requirements for
5 the EPA to list sites and prioritize them nationally using the National Priorities List (NPL).
6 There are over 1,200 federal and private facilities on the NPL including HPS.

7 Mr. Work explained that under SARA, federal site cleanups are required to be conducted and
8 overseen under interagency agreements between EPA and other agencies. A Federal Facilities
9 Agreement (FFA) for HPS was finalized in the early 1990s. Mr. Work explained that states are
10 often parties to these agreements, and in California the Navy includes both state agencies in the
11 agreements. It is through agreements like the FFA that EPA legally provides technical advice
12 and assistance and takes enforcement actions when appropriate.

13 Mr. Work outlined EPA's responsibilities including listing sites on the NPL, negotiating
14 interagency agreements, promoting community involvement, selecting or assisting in
15 determination of cleanup remedies, providing technical advice and assistance, and overseeing
16 cleanup activities. EPA's biggest authority under the law and FFA occurs if there is a dispute
17 about the cleanup remedy. If EPA doesn't agree with a remedy, they can elevate it to a formal
18 dispute process that goes up three levels to the EPA Administrator. If a disagreement occurs on
19 a cleanup remedy, EPA decides on the final remedy.

20 In response to a question, Mr. Work reiterated that HPS is a NPL site, which is also referred to as
21 a Superfund site. Ms. Pendergrass asked for clarification that the Navy is not using funding from
22 Superfund to cleanup HPS. Mr. Work explained that the term Superfund is used both to describe
23 funding, and laws and regulations.

24 Robert Van Houten, RAB member, asked if EPA has gone after any companies responsible for
25 toxic waste at HPS. Mr. Work responded that EPA has not pursued action against Triple A
26 Corporation, that used to lease property at HPS, but other regulatory agencies have. EPA sees
27 the cleanup as being a legal obligation for the Navy since Triple A was a tenant at HPS. Ms.
28 Brownell explained that the San Francisco District Attorney did file suit against Triple A for a
29 portion of HPS, but in the end, the Navy is on the hook for cleaning up that contamination. Mr.
30 Van Houten stated that that means his tax money is being spent to cleanup contamination from
31 Triple A activities.

32 Ms. Bushnell stated that when the Navy puts out a proposal for work at HPS, the proposal goes
33 to EPA for review, and there is a deadline to review and comment on the proposal. Mr. Work
34 replied that the FFA lists the type of documents that need to be produced, a schedule for those
35 documents, and timeframes for each party to review those documents. The FFA is roughly
36 modeled on agreements reached with polluters when they are taken to court for cleanup.

37 **EPA and the Technical Assistance Grant (TAG) Process (Presentation)**

38 Jaqueline Ann Lane, EPA, said that she would follow up Mr. Work's presentation by discussing
39 EPA's role in the TAG process and an update on the current TAG for HPS. She explained that
40 the purpose of a TAG is to give a group that represents the local community the opportunity to
41 hire a technical advisor to assist in reviewing documents the Navy prepares for cleanup. This
42 provides the community group with assistance in interpreting technical information to layman's
43 terms, and provides an open door policy on community involvement issues. Only sites on the
44 NPL qualify for TAGs.

1 Ms. Lane explained that a community group will provide EPA with a letter of intent that they are
2 interested in a TAG for a specific site. EPA then advertises for 30 days that the group is
3 interested in applying for the grant. This gives other community groups an opportunity to
4 partner with the advertised group, or submit a separate application for their own group. EPA
5 then evaluates all applications to determine the best applicant for the funding. Once an applicant
6 is selected, the funding cycle begins.

7 Once the TAG is funded, then an EPA project officer is assigned to oversee the grant process to
8 ensure compliance with the work plan agreement. Ms. Lane noted that for HPS she is the officer
9 assigned to oversee the TAG. There is a legally binding document between EPA and the grantee
10 that they are to adhere to the agreement, oversee the TAG, and provide technical assistance to the
11 best of their ability. The agreement includes responsibilities for sending reports to the project
12 officer overseeing the grant. In regards to the HPS TAG with Community First Coalition (CFC),
13 they have decided to terminate their current contractor because of noncompliance with the
14 agreement. CFC is now in the process of hiring a new TAG contractor.

15 Ms. Lane explained that the TAG works on a reimbursement basis. There is still approximately
16 \$36,000 in grant money with the HPS TAG at this time. Grant money will not be released until
17 CFC sends in a reimbursement form to EPA for contractor services once a contractor is selected
18 and begins work on the project.

19 Ms. Pendergrass asked for clarification with the RAB needing technical assistance to understand
20 Navy documents and applying for the TAG. Ms. Lane responded that the application has to be
21 made by a viable non-profit group that is active in the local community, but cannot be the HPS
22 RAB itself. She added that the contractor hired under the TAG will have responsibility to report
23 to the HPS RAB as part of their community involvement obligations to the CFC. Mr. Van
24 Houten asked what the difference is between the HPS RAB and a community non-profit group
25 that is qualified to apply for the TAG. Ms. Lane replied that the RAB is an advisory board, not a
26 separate non-profit community group or organization. The TAG provides a way for the
27 community to have an independent technical advisor.

28 Mr. Morrison stated that there did not seem to be an open door policy between the CFC and
29 other community members when asked for TAG information. Ms. Bushnell added she
30 participated as an applicant for the grant, and the group that applied for the TAG needs to be a
31 part of and involved with the community, including the HPS RAB. She added that over the past
32 two years she knows of no TAG assistant attending the RAB meetings, providing reports to the
33 HPS RAB, or asking what the RAB wants in the way of technical assistance. She asked where
34 the \$14,000 already paid as part of the TAG went. Ms. Lane replied that it was paid to the
35 previous TAG contractor whenever they attended a meeting and CFC submitted a reimbursement
36 form listing exactly how many hours they worked and what activities were performed. She
37 asked that anyone wanting information on payments to the TAG contractor write her a letter and
38 she will be glad to provide that information. She added that she has asked that the CFC, as the
39 TAG grantee, be placed under an advanced monitoring evaluation to determine why the TAG is
40 not working, and develop a corrective action plan.

41 Mr. Tompkins indicated that the previous TAG assistant had attended the Technical
42 Subcommittee meetings, but was dismissed over other issues. He added that none of the
43 members of the CFC received money for administering the TAG and had passed an EPA review
44 on the funds. The money was only paid to the person who was designated to provide technical
45 assistance. Mr. Van Houten asked if there is any way to get reports on what the TAG assistant
46 did on a regular basis.

1 Mr. Tisdell stated that this discussion would be more appropriate at a subcommittee meeting as
2 opposed to the formal RAB meeting. He motioned for any grievances with the TAG to be
3 brought up at the Technical Subcommittee meeting with a report provided to the RAB. Mr.
4 Morrison seconded the motion. Ms. Bushnell added that even though it is part of the bylaws to
5 provide minutes and attendance for meetings, she does not have any minutes, proceedings, or
6 documentation of activities from previous Technical Subcommittee meetings. Melita Rines,
7 RAB member, added that the issue is there was a problem with the TAG and steps are being
8 taken to address the problem. There is a need to start from the beginning and move forward
9 from there. Mr. Tompkins added that the reasons the TAG assistant was dismissed is that
10 reporting was haphazard, was not always sent to him for review, and often did not have the
11 proper stamp from EPA. Ms. Pendergrass asked for a vote on the motion, and the vote was
12 unanimous to have discussion on this issue in the Technical Subcommittee meeting with a full
13 report to the RAB.

14 Ms. Pendergrass indicated that this should be a new action item to have a report from the
15 Technical Subcommittee on the TAG. Ms. Bushnell asked to have until the June 2006 RAB
16 meeting to ensure that every effort is made to take care of this issue.

17 **Subcommittee Reports**

18 **Technical Review Subcommittee**

19 Ms. Bushnell said that the Technical Review Subcommittee has been discussing groundwater
20 reports for the shipyard. For April 2006, the subcommittee reviewed the Parcel B TMSRA,
21 which is 9,068 pages. Anyone interested in reviewing the TMSRA should visit the Bayview
22 Anna Waden Library because there are a lot of fold-out figures and tables in the document. The
23 TMSRA is based on the 5-year review for Parcel B, and this is important because Parcel B is
24 probably the next parcel to be transferred to the City. Remedies have been redefined including
25 use of ZVI, and excavation of contamination is no longer the only option recommended. There
26 are also going to be institutional controls for Parcel B, so most of the property will be paved
27 over. Mr. Brooks stated that Carolyn Hunter, Tetra Tech EMI, can e-mail the TMSRA
28 Executive Summary to HPS RAB members. Tom Lanphar, DTSC, added that comments on the
29 TMSRA are due on June 15, 2006

30 **MBCO Subcommittee**

31 Ms. Bushnell explained that there was one application for RAB membership considered in April
32 2006. The MBCO Subcommittee felt that this person was more concerned with what would
33 happen to the shipyard during redevelopment, so it was recommended that he pursue the
34 Citizen's Advisory Committee instead.

35 **Economic Subcommittee**

36 Mr. Morrison stated that the previous chairs of the Economic Subcommittee did not leave any
37 records to follow. He indicated that he is going to ensure that there are records of the future
38 Economic Subcommittee meetings.

39 Ms. Pendergrass had to adjourn the meeting at 7:52 p.m. due to a heated argument between Mr.
40 Morrison and Mr. Tompkins.

41 **Reminder: The next RAB meeting will be held from 6:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m., Thursday,**
42 **May 25, 2006, at the Southeast Community Commission Facility, Alex Pitcher Jr. Room,**
43 **1800 Oakdale Avenue, San Francisco, California 94124.**

ATTACHMENT A
27 April 2006 - RAB MEETING
LIST OF ATTENDEES

Name	Association
1. Wayne Akiyama	Shaw Environmental
2. Pat Brooks	Navy Lead Remedial Project Manager (RPM)
3. Patricia Brown	RAB Member, Shipyard Artist
4. Amy Brownell	San Francisco Department of Public Health
5. Barbara Bushnell	RAB Co-chair, Resident of the Southeast Sector (ROSES)
6. Charles Dacus	RAB member, ROSES
7. Bill Dougherty	Tetra Tech EC
8. Steve Edde	ITSI
9. Robert Ferry	CE2 Corporation
10. Miguel Garcia	YBE – Yerba-Buena Environmental
11. Steve Hall	Tetra Tech EMI
12. Carolyn Hunter	Tetra Tech EMI
13. Chein Kao	Arc Ecology
14. Ed Kilduff	CE2 Corporation
15. Melanie Kito	Navy RPM
16. Jaqueline Ann Lane	U.S. EPA Region IX
17. Tom Lanphar	California Department of Toxic Substances Control
18. Joel McClure	W. J. Robinson Assoc., Inc.
19. Kevin McCorry	AVHQ
20. James Morrison	RAB member, ROSES
21. Christine M. Niccoli	Niccoli Reporting, court reporter
22. Ralph Pearce	Navy RPM
23. Marsha Pendergrass	Pendergrass & Associates
24. Melita Rines	RAB member, India Basin Neighborhood Association
25. John Singley	Young Community Developers (YCD)
26. Peter Stroganoff	Navy, Resident Officer in Charge of Construction (ROICC) Office
27. Keith Tisdell	RAB member, Resident
28. Raymond Tompkins	RAB member, Bayview-Hunters Point Health and the Environment
29. Robert Van Houten	RAB member, Morgan Heights Resident
30. Julia Vetromile	Tetra Tech EMI
31. Angela Williams	Barajas & Associates
32. Michael Work	U.S. EPA Region IX

ATTACHMENT B
27 APRIL 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 schedule a RAB field trip in June 2006 to visit the Parcel C RU C1 Treatability Study Site.	Keith Forman Navy RAB Co-chair	5/25/06	Mr. Forman	This action item will be revisited at the May 25, 2006 RAB Meeting
2.	The Navy will provide the RAB, U.S. EPA, DTSC, Water Board, the RAB members, and Arc Ecology a list of the HPS Priority Projects in 2006 (including projects that overlap into 2007) via e-mail.	Ray Tompkins RAB member	May 2006	Mr. Forman	This action item was completed on 5/11/06
3.	The Navy will schedule a HPS Environmental 101 class on a Saturday once at least 3 new community members join the RAB.	Mr. Forman	N/A	Mr. Forman	This action item will be tabled until there are at least 3 new RAB members
4.	James Ponton, Water Board, to provide a presentation on Water Board activities for HPS at the April 27, 2006 RAB meeting.	Regulators	5/25/06	Mr. Ponton	This action item will be completed at the May 25, 2006 RAB Meeting.
5.	Barbara Bushnell as chair of the Technical Review Subcommittee to report to the RAB on the Technical Assistance Grant.	Marsha Pendergrass RAB member	6/22/06	Ms. Bushnell	This action item will be completed at the June 22, 2006 RAB Meeting.
6.	Carolyn Hunter to send out the Executive Summary of the Parcel B TMSRA to the RAB.	Pat Brooks Navy Lead RPM	May 2006	Ms. Hunter	This action item was completed on May 16, 2006.

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