

HUNTERS POINT SHIPYARD
RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD MEETING MINUTES
22 June 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, June 22, 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 May 25, 2006 RAB Meeting
- (3) Navy Announcements
- (4) Community Co-Chair Report/Other Announcements
- (5) Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) Role in the Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) Cleanup Team
- (6) Protecting San Francisco Bay from Groundwater Contamination – Parcel D Groundwater Modeling.
- (7) RAB Co-Chair Elections
- (8) Subcommittee Reports
- (9) Community Comment Period
- (10) Adjournment

MEETING HANDOUTS:

- Agenda for June 22, 2006, RAB Meeting
- Meeting Minutes from May 25, 2006 RAB Meeting
- Navy Monthly Progress Report, June 22, 2006
- PowerPoint Presentation, DTSC Role in the Hunters Point BRAC Cleanup Team
- PowerPoint Presentation, Protecting San Francisco Bay from Groundwater Contamination
- Revised and Adopted Bylaws, Hunters Point Shipyard RAB
- Membership Bylaws Community Outreach (MBCO) and Technical Review Subcommittee Meeting Minutes from May 17, 2006 and June 15, 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. She confirmed that there was a quorum of community RAB members present to conduct business at the meeting.

Approval of Minutes from the May 25, 2006 RAB Meeting

Ms. Pendergrass said that approval of the minutes is needed for the RAB meeting on May 25, 2006. Raymond Tompkins, RAB member, indicated that he would like future minutes to refer to him as Dr. Tompkins not Mr. Tompkins. Patricia Brown, RAB member, asked that the word Jr.

1 be added to the Martin Luther King Middle School reference on Page 3. Chein Kao, RAB
2 member, noted that the RAB minutes need to be revised to show that he retired from DTSC in
3 July 2005. The RAB meeting minutes with revisions were approved with one abstention, and
4 were accepted into the record.

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

6 **Carry-over Action Item Number 1:** Keith Forman, HPS Base Realignment and Closure
7 Environmental Coordinator, (BEC) to schedule a field trip in June 2006 to visit the Parcel C
8 Treatability Study Site. Mr. Forman stated that he would like to move the field trip to Saturday,
9 August 26, 2006. He noted that the Navy would have a booth at the Farmer's Market from 9:30
10 a.m. to 1:30 p.m. that same day with the field trip scheduled at 2:00 p.m. This action item was
11 completed and will be removed from the table.

12 Melita Rines, RAB member, asked if there are a maximum number of people who can attend the
13 site visit. Mr. Forman replied that there has never been an issue with having too many people on
14 a site visit, so there should not be a problem. Ms. Brown asked if the tour will only cover Parcel
15 C. Mr. Forman responded that the tour will focus on Parcel C. The Morgan Height's Home
16 Owners Association asked for a highlight tour of the rest of the shipyard which will occur after
17 visiting Parcel C. There will most likely be a caravan of vehicles used for the site visit on
18 August 26, 2006.

19 **Carry-over Item Number 2:** Mr. Forman to provide an Environmental 101 class on a Saturday
20 once at least 3 new community members join the RAB. The RAB is awaiting a third RAB
21 applicant prior to hosting this class. This action item will be carried over until there are at least 3
22 new RAB members who need the class.

23 **Carry-over Action Item Number 3:** Barbara Bushnell, Chair of the Technical Review
24 Subcommittee, to report to the HPS RAB on the Technical Assistance Grant (TAG). This action
25 item will be carried over until July 2006 to allow the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
26 (EPA) to address Ms. Bushnell's concerns.

27 **Community Co-Chair Report**

28 Ms. Bushnell, Community Co-Chair, said that the combined MBCO and Technical Review
29 Subcommittee Meetings appear to be working well for everyone. She encouraged all HPS RAB
30 members to attend the Farmers' Market event on August 26, 2006 to participate in community
31 outreach and recruitment efforts.

32 Ms. Bushnell stated that there are many things going on at HPS this summer. The RAB is
33 reviewing the Parcel B Technical Memorandum in Support of a Record of Decision (ROD)
34 Amendment (TMSRA). The Navy has also been reviewing this document and she suggested that
35 the RAB get a chance to review the Navy's comments on the TMSRA.

36 Ms. Bushnell noted that EPA is awaiting Community First Coalition (CFC) compliance with the
37 TAG criteria prior to a decision on reissuing or rescinding the grant. She also indicated that she
38 has e-mailed some of her concerns to Jaqueline Lane, EPA, including 8 out of 10 missing
39 documents that should be added to the records before a July 4, 2006 deadline. She added that
40 unless there is clear compliance by CFC on the TAG by July 4, 2006, she feels strongly that the
41 grant should be renegotiated.

42 Ms. Brown explained that she would like to add an action item for the RAB to discuss dust
43 control issues at HPS. Ms. Pendergrass noted that the dust control issues would be discussed at
44 the end of the RAB meeting once all of the agenda items are complete.

1 **DTSC Role on the Hunters Point BRAC Cleanup Team (BCT) (Presentation)**

2 Tom Lanphar, DTSC, stated that he is a Senior Hazardous Substances Scientist with DTSC. He
3 indicated that he has worked in pollution prevention and in hazardous waste management and is
4 now working in hazardous waste cleanup at HPS. This presentation will cover what DTSC does,
5 how it's organized, the governing laws DTSC operates under, and the federal/state partnership
6 called the BCT.

7 Mr. Lanphar explained that DTSC's mission is to restore, protect, and enhance the environment;
8 to ensure public health, environmental quality, and economic vitality by regulating hazardous
9 waste, conducting and overseeing cleanups, and developing and promoting pollution prevention.
10 One of DTSC's main concerns is the health affects of hazardous materials and hazardous waste.
11 DTSC is also concerned about how the environment affects the animals that live at HPS.
12 Economic vitality involves helping restore HPS so that it can be reused to the economic benefit
13 of the community. DTSC is conducting and overseeing cleanup at HPS, which is similar to
14 cleanup for Brownfields sites that DTSC oversees. Brownfields sites, for example the Mission
15 Bay Development in San Francisco, are properties within urban areas that have been
16 contaminated and require cleanup for reuse. DTSC is also involved in developing and promoting
17 pollution prevention, as there are ways to prevent production of hazardous waste at the onset.

18 Mr. Lanphar noted that DTSC is part of California/EPA (Cal/EPA), and Cal/EPA has a new
19 secretary, Linda Adams and new director Maureen Gorsen. DTSC is a department that is within
20 the hierarchy of Cal/EPA, unlike the water board whose members are appointed by and report to
21 the Governor of California. He explained that he works within the site mitigation and
22 Brownfields Reuse program and Deputy Director Dorothy Rice is in charge of that department.
23 There is also an Office of Military Facilities (OMF) that has a Northern and Southern California
24 Group, and that office is located at Berkeley, which is where Mr. Lanphar works. The OMF is
25 run by Rick Moss, Division Chief, Tony Landis, Supervision Engineer II, and Daniel Murphy,
26 Supervision Engineer I.

27 Mr. Lanphar explained that the OMF is responsible for investigation, technical assistance, and
28 oversight of cleanup operations at contaminated California properties currently or previously
29 operated by the Department of Defense (DoD). California has one-third of all the closing bases
30 in the country and over 1,000 formerly used defense sites (FUDs) that were closed previous to
31 BRAC law. He noted that Building 815 in the Bayview/HPS community was a FUD site that
32 was transferred prior to BRAC law. OMF has about 66 personnel that are currently engaged in
33 the cleanup of more than 160 current or former military installations nationwide.

34 Mr. Lanphar reviewed the federal law that applies to DTSC. CERCLA (also referred to as
35 Superfund) Section 120A requires that federal facilities comply with CERCLA. The Superfund
36 Amendments and Reauthorization Act (SARA) was later passed to provide a missing piece in the
37 requirement that federal facilities comply with CERCLA. Executive Order 12580 delegates the
38 President's authority under CERCLA to federal departments and agencies. It also holds the Navy
39 responsible for funding and implementing cleanup at their own facilities.

40 Mr. Lanphar reviewed the California law that applies to DTSC. The California Hazardous
41 Substances Account Act is the umbrella law for California Superfund, and Health and Safety
42 Code, Division 20, Chapter 6.8, Section 25300. The California Hazardous Waste Control Law
43 covers the Health and Safety Code, Division 20, Chapter 6.5, Section 25100. It also covers
44 regulation of hazardous waste through California's Resource Conservation and Recovery Act
45 (RCRA). California is authorized to implement the RCRA federal law. The Health and Safety
46 Code Division 20, Chapter 6.5, Section 25100 acts as California's RCRA law.

1 Mr. Lanphar indicated that the State of California's role at HPS is to ensure that all hazardous
2 substance releases have been adequately cleaned up. The State also ensures that the Navy
3 substantially complies with state laws and regulations, that public health and the environment are
4 protected, and that the public is involved in cleanup activities at military facilities.

5 Mr. Lanphar explained that DTSC has a Federal/State partnership, the DoD and State of
6 California Memorandum of Agreement (DSMOA), that was created in the 1980s to provide the
7 state with funding for oversight of bases. Also, HPS has a Federal Facilities Agreement (FFA)
8 that establishes a procedural framework and schedule for developing, implementing, and
9 monitoring actions at the shipyard in accordance to law, regulation, and guidance. The FFA is
10 specific to HPS and covers many aspects of the work at the shipyard. The FFA also provides for
11 state involvement in the initiation, development, selection, and enforcement of remedial actions.
12 The FFA establishes a process for dispute resolution as well.

13 Mr. Lanphar said that there is the BCT that is comprised primarily of DTSC, the Water Board,
14 EPA, and the Navy. As a member of the BCT, DTSC performs a range of activities. DTSC
15 reviews Navy documents, negotiates policy direction within the BCT, involves DTSC specialists,
16 and informs and involves DTSC management on HPS activities. DTSC coordinates with other
17 state agencies on HPS, including the Water Board, Department of Health Services, Department
18 of Fish and Game, and the Bay Conservation and Development Commission. DTSC also
19 coordinates with EPA, and the City and County of San Francisco. DTSC partners with the Navy
20 on HPS and participates on the RAB.

21 Mr. Lanphar provided the following as his contact information:

22 Tom Lanphar
23 510-540-3776
24 tlanphar@dtsc.ca.gov

25 Ms. Rines asked how DTSC ensures the public is involved at HPS. Mr. Lanphar replied that
26 EPA has taken the lead for public involvement for HPS, so DTSC does not have a public
27 participation specialist assigned to HPS. DTSC does, however, monitor public participation to
28 ensure that meetings are held and processes are followed.

29 Dr. Tompkins asked how conflict between the BCT members is resolved. Mr. Lanphar
30 responded that DTSC has a dispute resolution process and the FFA identifies that the draft final
31 stage for primary documents is the point in time to address a formal dispute. Anytime before the
32 draft final stage an informal dispute can be raised to work out a resolution. He added that if there
33 is a formal dispute, which has not happened at HPS in the recent past, the dispute is discussed
34 with management to see if it can be dealt with at management level or needs to be elevated to a
35 higher level for resolution. Mr. Kao clarified that if there are different state and federal
36 standards, then the most stringent standard is followed. Mr. Lanphar added that there are even
37 times when there is a dispute over what is actually an Applicable Relevant and Appropriate
38 Requirement (ARAR), and again, the most stringent standard is applied.

39 Dr. Tompkins asked in regards to manganese at Parcel B, if a state ARAR was more stringent
40 than a federal ARAR, would the state ARAR supersede the federal and become the standard.
41 Mr. Lanphar responded that manganese at Parcel B has been partially addressed in the TMSRA.
42 In addition, DTSC is looking for a Parcel B remedy that addresses total risk, which would
43 address manganese.

1 **Protecting San Francisco Bay from Groundwater Contamination (Presentation)**

2 Mr. Forman stated that the HPS RAB will be getting the Revised Draft Final Parcel D Feasibility
3 Study for review in July 2006. This presentation covers Parcel D groundwater modeling, which
4 will also be applicable at other shipyard parcels. The presentation covers the purpose of the
5 modeling, groundwater basics, using computer modeling, developing protective standards, and
6 conclusions from the modeling.

7 Mark Walden, Navy RPM, said that as part of the Parcel D Feasibility Study there is a
8 requirement to protect the Bay from potential discharges of groundwater containing
9 contaminants. He explained that as rain falls it infiltrates through the soil and collects
10 underground in aquifers. That groundwater eventually discharges to the surface, which for HPS
11 is the San Francisco Bay. HPS has a shallow or A aquifer that has an average depth to the water
12 table of 8 feet. Beneath the A aquifer is a layer called bay mud, a confining layer that is not as
13 permeable as the aquifer layers. The bay mud separates the A aquifer from the B aquifer with a
14 bedrock water bearing zone below the B aquifer. The B aquifer can reach down to 135 feet
15 below ground surface (bgs). Groundwater flows slowly downhill towards the Bay,
16 approximately 10 to 100 feet per year. The difference between the highest and lowest point of
17 the aquifer controls the flow.

18 Mr. Walden explained that contamination in groundwater can occur when chemicals spill from
19 the surface, from an underground storage tank, or from a sewage line. As contamination
20 dissolves into groundwater it forms a contaminant plume that moves with groundwater in the
21 general direction of the groundwater flow. The chemical concentrations decrease as the plume
22 moves away from the source area. The groundwater moves faster where there are larger voids
23 between soil particles, and does not move in a straight line. It follows the path of least resistance
24 winding around soil particles and fanning out.

25 Mr. Walden explained that the question for the modeling is as chemical concentrations move
26 with the groundwater, how to predict the concentrations that reach the Bay and if there will be an
27 impact to the Bay. The Navy team developed a computer program to evaluate how contaminants
28 move with groundwater and how contamination in groundwater changes as it moves away from
29 the source area. This process is intended to provide a water quality goal to protect the Bay from
30 any groundwater discharges. The model is conservative to ensure protection of the Bay,
31 meaning that although there are many different parameters that affect how the plumes behave as
32 groundwater moves, the model uses only one parameter, dispersion, to determine concentrations
33 at the Bay.

34 Mr. Walden stated that the purpose of the modeling is to help determine an attenuation factor
35 that shows how much the contamination concentrations have changed as plumes move with
36 groundwater towards the Bay. The attenuation factor is the difference or ratio between the initial
37 concentration at the source area and the concentration that reaches the Bay. For example the
38 difference between 500 parts per billion (ppb) and 50 ppb is a factor of 10, so the attenuation
39 factor is 10; or between 500 ppb and 5 ppb there is an attenuation factor of 100.

40 Mr. Walden provided a graph that shows the relationship between the attenuation factor and the
41 distance the contaminant has traveled from the source. The curves show that as contaminants
42 move away from the source area, the attenuation factor increases and the contaminant
43 concentration decreases. Mr. Brooks added that the graph can be used for all the HPS parcels.

44 Mr. Walden said that the Navy has developed trigger levels that are screening concentrations to
45 determine if further action is necessary. If a trigger level is exceeded, that would mean taking a
46 closer look at why contaminant concentrations are higher than expected. The trigger level is

1 equal to the surface water quality goal times the appropriate attenuation factor. Closer to the Bay
2 the attenuation factor would be one (about 50 to 150 feet from the shoreline) so that would mean
3 directly applying surface water criteria. The trigger levels have been established as a screening
4 tool to protect surface water from groundwater discharges.

5 Mr. Walden reviewed the conclusions from the Parcel D Groundwater Modeling. The Navy
6 team developed groundwater screening criteria that ensures protection of the Bay. Trigger levels
7 provide a conservative approach for developing criteria, and are easily applied to other plumes.
8 Trigger levels also can be used to help develop a groundwater monitoring plan to track if
9 contaminant concentrations are changing.

10 Mr. Tisdell asked if there is a large source area of contamination flowing in the groundwater
11 toward the Bay, what would make the concentration less as it moves toward the Bay. Mr.
12 Brooks replied that the computer model shows how chemical concentrations decrease as the
13 contaminant fans out. Some of the contaminant takes a short path, moving faster, and some a
14 longer path, which dilutes the contaminant as it moves toward the Bay.

15 Dr. Tompkins asked regarding Parcel B, is the model applicable to a landfill site or would there
16 need to be a wall implemented to protect the Bay. He further asked how the model would
17 incorporate the differences that we saw in the zero-valence iron test, where it worked slowly in
18 fill at Parcel B, but worked well in solid ground at Parcel C. Mr. Brooks responded that in
19 developing the model, different input parameters were evaluated using a sensitivity analysis.
20 The input parameters were varied, including the differences observed during the zero-valent iron
21 (ZVI) studies at Parcels B and C. These include variations in hydraulic conductivity and
22 groundwater gradients. These factors affect the time the chemical reaches the Bay (i.e., rate of
23 movement), rather than predicting the concentration reaching the Bay. Conservative values were
24 used in the model for the factors that affect concentration.

25 For the Parcel B debris fill area, there were a few exceedances of groundwater quality criteria,
26 but not many. There are issues with IR-26 (mercury) and at IR-10 (Building 123) where the ZVI
27 treatability study took place, and those are historically the problem areas in Parcel B. However,
28 there is nothing at the debris fill site that exceeds the goals in the Parcel B ROD.

29 Dr. Tompkins asked what time span is represented in the graph. Mr. Brooks replied that each of
30 the lines represents a time span of years, when the plume has dispersed and reached its maximum
31 concentration at the shoreline. He added that the shipyard is old and many of the releases
32 happened back in the 1950s and 1960s.

33 Ms. Bushnell asked if there are 10 tubs of a contaminant as a source, and the contaminant moves
34 out and is diluted, then there are still 10 tubs of the contaminant across the site that may enter the
35 Bay, unless you remove them. Mr. Brooks replied that starting with the day the 10 tubs are
36 dumped, contamination gets into the groundwater and starts to move. The contamination
37 diffuses (i.e., fans out) into the groundwater and eventually the concentration spreads out
38 sufficiently to go away.

39 Mr. Kao asked if the model applies to vertical movement of contamination. Mr. Brooks replied
40 no, vertical movement is not included. The Navy team wanted the most conservative model to
41 estimate the maximum concentration that would reach the Bay. Therefore, parameters like
42 vertical movement, volatilization, biodegradation, and others that would reduce the concentration
43 at the Bay were not included. He explained that this presentation covers protection of the Bay,
44 which means the living organisms in the Bay. Mr. Kao is talking about vertical movement, and
45 if there is vertical movement down into the B aquifer, then drinking water standards would
46 apply. Ms. Pendergrass asked if contaminant concentrations have gone lower into the B aquifer,

1 would it travel faster down toward the Bay, and how does the model compensate for that. Mr.
2 Brooks responded that time is not a constant in the model; the maximum concentration as it
3 reaches the Bay is the constant.

4 Mr. Kao asked if the model has been calibrated with field data. Mr. Brooks replied that the
5 model could never be calibrated with field data because it is far more conservative than any
6 actual processes at the shipyard. If realistic inputs had been used in the model, then attenuation
7 factors at the shoreline would far exceed one, so the model would support that there is no need to
8 apply surface water criteria at the shoreline. If effects such as pH, absorption, chelation, or
9 others had been included in the model, it would have shown that surface water criteria could be
10 elevated near the shoreline. Those parameters were intentionally left out so the model would be
11 conservative and an acceptable model to use across the whole shipyard. Mr. Kao stated that the
12 model could still be run with field data to show that it is more conservative; that field data
13 concentrations are lower than concentrations predicted by the model. Mr. Brooks replied that the
14 Parcel D FS shows the metal plumes have remained near the source areas.

15 Dr. Tompkins stated that he would suggest another presentation that reviews the human health
16 risk factors from groundwater. He added that he has some concerns regarding cleanup levels for
17 groundwater at HPS. Mr. Forman noted that kind of presentation would be better handled in the
18 Technical Review Subcommittee. Mr. Brooks agreed that this would be a topic for the August
19 2006 Technical Review Subcommittee.

20 **RAB Community Co-Chair Elections**

21 Ms. Pendergrass indicated that 9 HPS RAB members that are in good standing with their
22 attendance records were issued a community co-chair election ballot. There is a slate of two
23 candidates for this position which include Ms. Bushnell and Mr. Tisdell. She gave each
24 candidate two minutes to discuss what they propose for the upcoming year.

25 Ms. Bushnell stated that it has been an interesting and invigorating year getting involved in the
26 many activities associated with the HPS RAB and with the Navy having a lot of activities at the
27 shipyard. Recruiting has also been challenging since the RAB lost some members. There have
28 also been new regulators joining the RAB so the dynamics have changed a great deal. She said
29 that she has appreciated being the RAB co-chair and would like to do it for another year.

30 Mr. Tisdell said that he is interested in becoming the Community Co-chair because he can see
31 where he can be a benefit to the RAB since he works at Tetra Tech EC and sees a lot of what is
32 going on at the shipyard. There are also community concerns with activities at Parcel A. He
33 stated that if he becomes the Community Co-chair, he can be more involved in putting pressure
34 on the appropriate agencies to get work done correctly at the shipyard.

35 Ms. Pendergrass noted that there are eleven HPS RAB members on the roster, ten members are
36 in good standing, and nine members are present tonight. She asked the nine RAB members
37 present take a moment to mark their ballots and then pass them to her for collection.

38 **Subcommittee Reports**

39 **MBCO Subcommittee**

40 Mr. Tisdell said that there was a combined meeting with the Technical Review Subcommittee
41 due to conflicts at the library. The next meeting will also be a combined meeting to be held on
42 July 13, 2006 from 6:00 to 8:00 p.m. at the Anna Waden Library.

1 Mr. Tisdell stated that Carolyn Hunter, Tetra Tech, has been actively pursuing the Third Street
2 Fair as a place to have a Navy booth for community outreach. To date, however, there has been
3 no response on participation in that fair. The Navy has scheduled a date, Saturday, August 26,
4 2006, for hosting a community outreach booth at the Bayview Farmers Market.

5 Mr. Tisdell indicated that the Bylaws for the HPS RAB are up for revision in July 2006. Anyone
6 with concerns or who would like to see something new in the Bylaws is encouraged to attend the
7 July 2006 MBCO Subcommittee Meeting. A vote on the Bylaws will take place in August 2006
8 and the revised Bylaws will go into affect in September 2006.

9 Mr. Tisdell noted that Jesse Mason, RAB member, does have a residence in the
10 Bayview/Hunters Point Community.

11 **Technical Review Subcommittee**

12 Ms. Bushnell stated that the meeting minutes from the May and June 2006 combined MBCO and
13 Technical Review Subcommittee meetings are available tonight. At the May 2006 meeting,
14 there was an update on the TAG, and a presentation on the Parcel B storm drain and sanitary
15 sewer removal. At the June 2006 meeting, there was a further update on the TAG, and Mr.
16 Forman provided an update on the FFA for HPS. Ralph Pearce, Navy RPM, also provided an
17 update on the Radiological Program at HPS.

18 Dr. Tompkins asked if Ms. Bushnell indicated earlier in the RAB meeting that she had sent a
19 letter to the EPA with some concerns regarding the TAG. Ms. Bushnell replied that she sent Ms.
20 Lane an e-mail. Dr. Tompkins stated that at the subcommittee meeting he asked if there were
21 any questions or concerns and there weren't any at the conclusion of the meeting. Therefore, he
22 is dismayed that an e-mail stating TAG concerns was sent to EPA. Ms. Bushnell noted that other
23 concerns had come up within the last few days and Ms. Lane had advised her to send any
24 concerns to her attention. She indicated that she had copied Dr. Tompkins on the e-mail. Dr.
25 Tompkins indicated that he had not received that e-mail. He explained that according to the last
26 letter he received from Ms. Lane, the target date for having all TAG issues addressed is July 31,
27 2006, and he is striving to meet that date and to meet EPA's requirements. Ms. Pendergrass
28 suggested that Ms. Bushnell and Dr. Tompkins work out TAG issues together and then report
29 back to the RAB on their recommendations. Mr. Forman added that Ms. Lane was not present at
30 the last Technical Review Subcommittee Meeting, and that is most likely why there was not
31 further resolution on the TAG.

32 **Economic Subcommittee**

33 Mr. Morrison stated that he was scheduled to discuss some major issues with the truckers. He
34 did get to discuss issues with a few individual truckers, but that information was not passed
35 along to other truckers, so he did not get enough feedback to hold a meeting. He indicated that
36 he would be meeting with Mr. Mason next week to resubmit the RAB concerns with the trucking
37 situation.

38 Mr. Morrison said that the Economic Subcommittee looked at employment and job opportunities
39 at HPS. He explained that Mr. Brooks has suggested including a flyer in the HPS Navy Monthly
40 Progress Report that would list jobs that are available at the shipyard. That way the community
41 is notified and can prepare applications for employment. He indicated that he would also like to
42 feature people who are currently working at HPS so they can serve as role models for the
43 community and visibly show that hiring is being done from the community. He noted that job
44 listings in writing would eliminate the problems with heresy about what groups are getting the
45 jobs.

1 Mr. Morrison said that the next Economic Subcommittee Meeting is scheduled for July 26, 2006
2 at 5:00 p.m. at the Bayview Police Station.

3 **RAB Comment Period**

4 Ms. Pendergrass reminded that RAB that a Parcel C site tour is scheduled for Saturday, August
5 26, 2006 at 2:00 p.m.

6 Ms. Brown said that she has some concerns about what the community needs to do when there
7 are issues with dust from HPS. Mr. Forman explained that Ms. Brown is referring to trucks that
8 are leaving HPS from the former Parcel A (Lennar Parcel). Amy Brownell, San Francisco
9 Department of Public Health, noted that she is aware of dust controls issues with Parcel A. She
10 explained that she wears the Department of Public Health (DPH) Article 31 hat. What that
11 means is before Lennar could get permits from the San Francisco Building Department, she
12 reviewed and approved plans submitted by Lennar, one of those being a dust control plan.
13 Lennar has been doing a lot of work moving massive quantities of dirt around, and there really is
14 not much dust. However, there are intermittent issues with the community on dust control.

15 Ms. Brownell reminded the RAB that the best number to call to report issues is 866-5Lennar.
16 Always call that number even if another number is also called, because the calls are logged by
17 Lennar. She indicated that she called to check the line, and a live person did answer at 6:50 p.m.
18 at night. The second person to call with Lennar Parcel issues is the project manager, Gary
19 McIntyre at 415-995-4814, his office number. She can also provide his cell number to anyone
20 who specifically contacts her for that number. The Bay Area Air Quality Management District
21 (BAAQMD) also has a complaint line at 800-334-6367. The last number to call with issues is
22 the Department of Building Inspection with the City of San Francisco at 415-558-6096, and tell
23 them there is a complaint about dust control as part of a grading permit for the Lennar Parcel.
24 RAB members can also call Ms. Brownell directly at 415-252-3967.

25 Ms. Brownell said that she was out at the shipyard on June 14, 2006 at 10:00 a.m. and did see
26 dust. She then proceeded to drive around to observe the activities. There is an issue with the
27 steep haul road behind Building 813 where trucks are having difficulty controlling dust. In
28 response she indicated that she talked to Mr. McIntyre and wrote an e-mail that if she was out at
29 the shipyard again and there is dust, she will issue a notice of violation. Lennar is currently
30 putting more water on the soil and monitoring closely for dust. Ms. Brownell stated that Ms.
31 Brown called her yesterday at 3:00 p.m. and said that there was dust at that time. Ms. Brownell
32 called Mr. McIntyre and the situation was immediately corrected. She added that if dust control
33 continues to be an issue, then she can use enforcement measures including a cease-and-desist
34 work order if additional steps to enforce dust control are not instituted by Lennar. She added that
35 she visited the shipyard before coming to the RAB meeting this evening and even with the high
36 wind did not see any dust, so at least for today they are doing a good job.

37 Ms. Pendergrass stated that it would make more sense to have just one number for everyone to
38 call so all complaints are cumulatively logged instead of having people calling all these different
39 numbers. It may not be an intermittent problem if more than one person is calling in and each
40 person is calling a different number.

41 Mr. Tisdell noted that a lot of the dust is blowing on the shipyard when he leaves between 4:40
42 and 4:50 p.m. each day. Yesterday there was a street sweeper that was sweeping without an
43 ounce of water. In addition, when Ms. Brownell mentioned calling the BAAQMD, it takes three
44 to five complaints before they get involved with dust control issues.

45 Mr. Morrison asked how many more chances Lennar will get based on these complaints that
46 have been ongoing for weeks. Ms. Brownell replied that she has given them their first warning

1 and the next time they will get a notice of violation, which is a major issue for Lennar. She
2 emphasized that the 866-5Lennar number is the first number to call to properly log complaints
3 before following up with calls to any of the other numbers or to call her directly.

4 Dr. Tompkins stated that he has not seen any air monitoring stations around the Lennar Parcel
5 and asked if there are any air monitoring records available. He indicated that he has seen the
6 dust in the neighborhood and it is all over his car. He added that the Navy has done a better job
7 at dust control than Lennar. Ms. Brownell responded that she can bring a map showing the
8 location of the air monitoring stations. The air monitoring equipment is mainly checking for
9 asbestos and there have not been any asbestos hits.

10 Mr. Mason stated that he has some concerns about getting work at HPS for truckers from the
11 community. Mr. Tisdell indicated that he had called Ms. Bushnell to contact Mr. Morrison when
12 Charles Depew, Navy Contracting Officer, was at the shipyard. Dr. Tompkins said that YCD
13 has been getting jobs at HPS for young people at the lower end of the pay scale. He stated that
14 he would like to see the Navy contractors employ more environmental consultants from the
15 Bayview community at HPS who are women and people of color. Ms. Pendergrass noted that
16 these topics would need to be discussed in the Economic Subcommittee meeting with reports to
17 the full RAB.

18 **RAB Community Co-Chair Results**

19 Ms. Pendergrass notified the RAB that the majority of votes went to Mr. Tisdell who is the new
20 HPS RAB Community Co-Chair. Ms. Bushnell congratulated her opponent.

21 Ms. Pendergrass adjourned the meeting at 8:10 p.m.

22 **Reminder: The next RAB meeting will be held from 6:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m., Thursday,**
23 **July 27, 2006, at the Southeast Community Commission Facility, Alex Pitcher Jr. Room,**
24 **1800 Oakdale Avenue, San Francisco, California 94124.**

**ATTACHMENT A
22 JUNE 2006 - RAB MEETING
LIST OF ATTENDEES**

Name	Association
1. Ryan Blitstein	San Francisco Weekly Newspaper
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. Thomas Dias	EMS
7. Bill Dougherty	Tetra Tech EC
8. Keith Forman	Navy RAB Co-chair
9. Steve Hall	Tetra Tech EMI
10. Fatima Holmes	Young Community Developers (YCD)
11. Carolyn Hunter	Tetra Tech EMI
12. Chein Kao	RAB member, Arc Ecology
13. Ed Kilduff	CE2 Corporation
14. Tom Lanphar	California Department of Toxic Substances Control
15. Jesse Mason	RAB member, Resident
16. Kevin McCorry	AVHQ
17. James Morrison	RAB member, ROSES
18. Christine M. Niccoli	Niccoli Reporting, court reporter
19. Marsha Pendergrass	Pendergrass & Associates
20. Jim Ponton	San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board
21. Melita Rines	RAB member, India Basin Neighborhood Association
22. Maurice Robinson	YCD
23. Ehmed Sheikh	Interested Party
24. Quincy Smith	YCD
25. Peter Stroganoff	Navy, Resident Officer in Charge of Construction (ROICC) Office
26. Keith Tisdell	RAB member, Resident
27. Raymond Tompkins	RAB member, Bayview-Hunters Point Health and the Environment
28. Robert Van Houten	RAB member, Morgan Heights Resident
29. Shanya Watkins	YCD
30. Angela Williams	Barajas & Associates
31. Mark Walden	Navy RPM
32. Olin Webb	RSI
33. Michael Work	U.S. EPA Region IX

**ATTACHMENT B
22 JUNE 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 scheduled a RAB site visit for August 26, 2006 to visit the Parcel C (RU-C1) Treatability Study Site, with a highlight tour of the shipyard for the Morgan Heights Homeowners Association.	Keith Forman Navy RAB Co-chair	8/26/06	Mr. Forman	This RAB field trip is scheduled for Saturday, August 26, 2006 at 2:00 p.m..
2.	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 who need the class.
3.	Follow up on financial accounting for the TAG and provide a report to the RAB at the July 27, 2006 RAB meeting.	Barbara Bushnell Community Co-Chair	July 2006	Ms. Bushnell/Dr. Tompkins	This action item will be completed at the July 27, 2006 RAB Meeting.
New Action Items					
1.	Navy will provide a presentation on Human Health Risk from Groundwater at HPS for the August 2006 Technical Review Subcommittee Meeting.	Dr. Tompkins RAB Member	August 2006	Mr. Brooks Navy Lead RPM	This action item will be completed at the August 2006 Technical Review Subcommittee Mtg.

October 31, 2006

Diane Silva
SWDIV Records Manager
Administrative Record (Code EVR)
NAVFACENGCOM Southwest
1220 Pacific Highway
San Diego, CA 92132

Subject: Hunters Point Shipyard Information Repository/Administrative Record
Submittals – Contract No. N68711-03-D-5106, CTO-016

Dear Ms. Silva,

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

- Final May 25, 2006 Restoration Advisory Board Meeting Minutes
- Final May 25, 2006 Restoration Advisory Board Meeting Transcript
- Final June 22, 2006 Restoration Advisory Board Meeting Minutes
- Final June 22, 2006 Restoration Advisory Board Meeting Transcript
- Final July 27, 2006 Restoration Advisory Board Meeting Minutes
- Final July 27, 2006 Restoration Advisory Board Meeting Transcript
- Final August 24, 2006 Restoration Advisory Board Meeting Minutes
- Final August 24, 2006 Restoration Advisory Board Meeting Transcript

Please feel free to contact me or Angela Williams (Community Relations Specialist – angelawilliams@bai.cc) 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