

HUNTERS POINT SHIPYARD
RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD MEETING MINUTES
22 March 2007

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, March 22, 2007, in the Alex L. Pitcher, Jr. Room at the Southeast Community Facility. A verbatim transcript was also prepared for the meeting and is available in the information repository for Hunters Point Shipyard (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 February 22, 2007 RAB Meeting
- (3) Navy Announcements
- (4) Community Co-Chair Report/Other Announcements
- (5) Overview of the Parcel E-2 Draft Remedial Investigation (RI)/Feasibility Study (FS)
- (6) Technical Assistance Grant (TAG) Update
- (7) Subcommittee Reports
- (8) Community Comment Period
- (9) Adjournment

MEETING HANDOUTS:

- Agenda for March 22, 2007, RAB Meeting
- Meeting Minutes from the February 22, 2007 RAB Meeting
- Navy Monthly Progress Report, March 22, 2007
- PowerPoint Presentation, Parcel E-2 Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study Update
- Membership, Bylaws, and Community Outreach (MBCO) and Technical Review Subcommittee Meeting Minutes from March 8, 2007
- Economic Subcommittee Meeting Minutes from March 16, 2007

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 February 22, 2007 RAB Meeting

Ms. Pendergrass said that approval of the minutes is needed for the RAB meeting on February 22, 2007. The RAB meeting minutes were approved unanimously as written and were accepted into the record.

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

2 **Carry-over Item Number 1:** Keith Forman, HPS Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC)
3 Environmental Coordinator (BEC) to provide an Environmental 101 class on a Saturday once at
4 least 3 new community members join the RAB. This action item will be carried over until April
5 2007.

6 **Carry-over Item Number 2:** Dr. Ray Tompkins, RAB member, to compose a letter from the
7 HPS RAB to the City of San Francisco requesting that Innes Avenue be cleaned regularly to
8 protect residents from dust. The letter will also be provided to Lennar and the HPS RAB. This
9 action item will be carried over until April 2007.

10 **New Action Item Number 1:** Keith Tisdell, Community RAB Co-Chair, to compose a letter
11 from the HPS RAB regarding safety concerns with San Francisco Police Department (SFPD)
12 personnel speeding and running stop signs while on base and on local community streets outside
13 HPS. Mr. Tisdell indicated that he composed a letter to go to Mayor Newsom, San Francisco
14 Police Chief Heather Fong, and Police Commander Daniel McDunna. He summarized the
15 letters' contents for the RAB: "I'm writing on behalf of the HPS RAB as a community co-chair.
16 I am also a Bayview-Hunters Point Shipyard resident and a contract employee on base. It has
17 been brought to my attention by several community members that some of the SFPD officers
18 have been speeding and running stop signs with no flashing lights on base, on Innes Avenue, and
19 in the surrounding neighborhood. This activity is putting officers as well as pedestrians in
20 danger. The roads leading to and from the police laboratory at HPS will become increasingly
21 more crowded in the near future due to an increase in cleanup construction on the base.
22 Additional traffic will include trucks bringing material on and off the base as well as additional
23 Navy and contractor employees. The RAB requests that the SFPD rectify the problem by
24 adhering to the speed limit of 25 miles per hour (mph) on base, 15 mph in work areas, and 35
25 mph on residential streets. Speeding should only be allowed by SFPD personnel in response to
26 an action or should be accompanied by flashing lights. This is our community. We are
27 concerned for the safety of our residents, tenants, and employees on the shipyard, and the
28 community at large. If you have any questions regarding this matter, please contact me at 415-
29 756-4514. The HPS RAB would appreciate a response in writing. Sincerely, Keith Tisdell,
30 Community Co-Chair. Mr. Tisdell passed the letter around to the RAB members for their
31 signature. This action item was completed and will be removed from the table.

32 **New Action Item Number 2:** The Navy will provide the RAB with a Community Notification
33 Plan e-mail with the information resulting from investigation into the detonations near the police
34 laboratory. Ralph Pearce, Navy RPM, explained that there was an investigation and the noise
35 was mischaracterized. There were several loud noises that were characterized as explosions.
36 The Navy investigated those loud noises and a Community Notification e-mail went out with the
37 results of that investigation. The Navy checked with the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency
38 (SFRA), and there were no detonations or unusual explosions during that week when the loud
39 noises were reported. It was surmised that the loud banging noises heard were perhaps the gate
40 of a truck banging down or other related trucking activity. Mr. Tisdell stated that he refutes the
41 response from the SFRA since he is right there by the SFPD laboratory building. This action
42 item was completed and will be removed from the table.

43 Navy Announcements

44 Ms. Kito indicated that Mr. Forman is on reserve duty this week, so she is filling in as the HPS
45 BEC.

1 Ms. Kito explained that there have been a few of changes on the HPS team. The U.S.
2 Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has rotated representatives, so Mark Ripperda is the
3 new EPA representative joining the HPS team. She welcomed him to the team. There have also
4 been some changes for the Navy. Mr. Pearce has been doing a great job as the interim Lead
5 RPM and this is his last week. The Navy is still searching for a permanent lead RPM. Mr.
6 Pearce will be replaced by Mark Walden, Navy RPM, who led the presentation on groundwater
7 at the February 2007 RAB meeting. Lara Urizar, Navy RPM, who works on Parcels B and C
8 will be going on maternity leave and will be replaced by Darren Knight, Navy RPM, who will be
9 taking over for Parcel C.

10 Ms. Kito noted that there have been community concerns about early transfer of HPS property
11 related to a San Francisco Forty-Niners stadium. First, the Navy has not received any official
12 proposal for early transfer from the City of San Francisco (the City) for the Forty-Niners
13 stadium. There have been discussions between the Navy, the City, and the regulators about early
14 transfer, but nothing is official at this point.

15 Ms. Kito explained the basics of the early transfer process and cleanup at HPS. The shipyard is
16 cleaned up under a process called the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and
17 Liability Act (CERCLA). The RAB members are part of that process as volunteers, and the Navy
18 is required to get public input on any cleanup decisions at the shipyard and that is not going to
19 change. In addition, there is a Federal Facilities Agreement (FFA) that is signed by the Navy
20 and EPA that guides the cleanup of HPS . For an early transfer of a section of the base, the Navy
21 would expedite cleanup faster than the current FFA schedule and transfer property before the
22 cleanup is complete. The Navy continues to pay for cleanup after an early transfer, but the new
23 property owner now performs cleanup activities. For an early transfer of part of HPS to be
24 feasible, the Navy would require a larger budget to expedite cleanup or have another party take
25 on the responsibility for cleanup. So without a larger budget, there cannot be any type of early
26 transfer.

27 **Community Co-Chair Report/Other Announcements**

28 Mr. Tisdell announced that he would like to put a motion before the RAB for the April 2007
29 MBCO subcommittee meeting to be held separately from the Technical Review Subcommittee
30 meeting. There are some issues the MBCO Subcommittee needs to address and all RAB
31 members should attend the meeting. Kristine Enea, RAB member, seconded the motion. The
32 motion carried unanimously with no abstentions.

33 James Morrison, RAB member, stated that he has several resolutions that he would like to
34 propose to the RAB. The most important is to take a stand immediately against the City and
35 County of San Francisco that the duly elected members of the HPS RAB are opposed to early
36 transfer. Mr. Morrison stated that he does not believe it is in the best interest of the community
37 to give the cleanup of the Shipyard to Lennar, a limited liability company. He noted that he is
38 shocked that the City would turn supervision of cleanup over to a limited liability company. He
39 passed out a written version of the proposed resolution for RAB review. The document can be
40 used to develop the formal RAB letter to be voted on at the April 26, 2007 RAB meeting, and
41 sent to the City and County of San Francisco. The formal letter would go to the HPS RAB
42 Community Co-Chair for signature and sent out to the RAB distribution list.

43 Mr. Morrison explained that comments/revisions can be forwarded to his attention for
44 incorporation into the resolution. The revised resolution would then be discussed at the MBCO
45 subcommittee meeting, and Mr. Tisdell would bring the final version of the RAB letter

1 developed from the resolution back to the full RAB for a vote. Ms. Pendergrass clarified that an
2 action item is needed for the HPS RAB to provide comments/revisions to Mr. Morrison on the
3 resolution.

4 Tom Lanphar, Department of Toxic Substances Control, said that he would like to ask that the Navy
5 and the City have an agenda item for the next RAB meeting to explain exactly how the early
6 transfer process works and who would be involved with supervision of that process. It is a very
7 complicated process, and a presentation on the early transfer process from the Navy and the City
8 would inform any future RAB discussion on this issue.

9 Ms. Pendergrass stated her understanding is that the RAB is concerned with cleanup of HPS.
10 The RAB ensures that the Navy is doing its job the way it is supposed to, and has an opportunity
11 to review and comment on the cleanup process through various Navy documents like a record of
12 decision (ROD). If there were to be some kind of early transfer, the transfer documents would
13 still have to go through the public review process. In addition, the Navy is not going to renounce
14 their responsibility through the cleanup process. Mr. Lanphar explained that he thinks it is
15 important to clarify any questions about the early transfer process, including regulatory agency
16 involvement, the Navy's responsibility, and what portions of the property would actually be
17 transferred. He proposed having this topic on the agenda for the next RAB meeting.

18 Mike McGowan, RAB member, stated that his understanding is that there has been no formal
19 proposal for an early transfer of HPS property. Consequently, how can the RAB pass a
20 resolution opposing any early transfer of property if there has been no formal proposal for the
21 RAB to review?

22 Ms. Enea explained that she agrees that there are a lot of questions about what an early transfer
23 of HPS property would mean. Mr. Morrison's proposal, however, appears to be symbolic and
24 would be an opportunity for the HPS RAB to express their concerns about early transfer. The
25 point is that the RAB has concerns about any kind of transfer of dirty property and would like to
26 clarify what kind of transfer would be acceptable or unacceptable.

27 Mr. Morrison stated that if the City had any respect for the HPS RAB, they would be present for
28 RAB meetings and have a proposal before the RAB. Mr. Tisdell responded that Amy Brownell
29 works for the San Francisco Department of Public Health and is an important instrument for
30 getting information to the City from the RAB. He encouraged Ms. Brownell to attend the
31 upcoming MBCO meeting on April 12, 2007 to provide the City's perspective on this issue

32 Ms. Kito indicated that she supports a presentation to the RAB on the early transfer process.
33 April 2007 may be premature for that presentation, however, since the Navy has not received a
34 formal proposal for early transfer and thus does not know what would be included in the
35 proposal. Mr. Lanphar explained that the presentation should come from the most appropriate
36 party, and that could be Ms. Brownell in conjunction with the City. This early transfer process
37 has happened at other military bases, and it might be helpful to the RAB to learn how the process
38 works.

39 Ms. Pendergrass clarified that it sounds like there are two sides to this presentation. First, what
40 is an early transfer and what does it mean. Second, what could potentially be in a proposal for
41 early transfer. She asked if the Navy could do some preliminary work on what early transfer
42 would mean in this case, and follow that up if and when there is an actual proposal for early
43 transfer. Ms. Kito responded that any presentation on this issue would have to be coordinated
44 with the City.

1 Ms. Brownell explained that discussion of an early transfer proposal is proceeding and
2 information is being exchanged, but a presentation on the specific proposal would probably not
3 be ready by the April 2007 RAB meeting. She understands the need for a presentation on the
4 early transfer process, but why not wait until the specific proposal for HPS can be discussed.
5 Ms. Pendergrass noted that the HPS RAB would like to be involved in the exchange of
6 information currently taking place, and does not understand how the RAB would be involved in
7 this process. Ms. Brownell suggested that the Navy and City get together to talk about the
8 process and decide if a generic presentation on the concept of early transfer is appropriate and
9 have the regulators provide their input as well. The City does not want to commit to a
10 presentation just yet because there are a lot of parties involved in making the decision for early
11 transfer.

12 Ms. Enea noted that Michael Cohen from the mayor's office and Lennar have made
13 presentations on early transfer at HPS to the Citizen's Advisory Committee (CAC), and the
14 Project Advisory Committee (PAC) and they briefly answered questions. If their presence at a
15 future RAB meeting was only to entertain questions then come back later with answers that
16 would be useful. For example, Ms. Enea asked for clarification at the CAC meeting on what
17 early transfer might mean, and the answer was that it would probably mean that the Navy would
18 not put down a cap before property transfer so that Lennar would not destroy the cleanup action
19 the Navy took in order to begin the redevelopment process. There are a lot of factual questions
20 the RAB has and it would be helpful to have someone from the City and possibly the Navy
21 available to hear those questions even if they are not yet prepared to make a full presentations.

22 Mr. Morrison thanked Ms. Enea for the information. He stated that he thinks it shows the
23 disdain the City and County of San Francisco have for the HPS RAB and the community, since
24 they presented at the CAC and PAC meetings without including the RAB. Those organizations
25 are specifically for redevelopment, and the City and County of San Francisco should have come
26 to the RAB first since they oversee cleanup at HPS. He noted that his motion is to proceed with
27 getting the resolution out as soon as possible. The Navy and the City can decide on when to
28 provide a presentation on early transfer.

29 Robert Van Houten, RAB member, noted that there is not a lot of time for discussion at the main
30 RAB meetings. There are several RAB subcommittee meetings, but the RAB does not get a lot
31 of information back from the subcommittee meetings. He explained that he would prefer to
32 postpone a RAB presentation until there is an official proposal for early transfer. He does,
33 however, support sending a letter to the City that the HPS RAB is not interested in an early
34 transfer of HPS property.

35 **MBCO Subcommittee Report**

36 Mr. Tisdell explained that the MBCO Subcommittee has approved an HPS RAB application
37 from Sudeep Rao, Literacy of Environmental Justice (LEJ). Unfortunately, his RAB application
38 has been misplaced. He asked that Mr. Rao introduce himself and describe his affiliation.

39 Mr. Rao stated that he is a resident of the 94107 zip code, and the Executive Director for LEJ
40 located on Innes Avenue which is very close to the shipyard. LEJ is a youth empowerment and
41 environment health and justice educational organization. LEJ youth, primarily teenagers, are
42 active everywhere, especially in the Hunters Point/Bayview area. The goal for LEJ youth is to
43 engage them in activities that will keep them off the streets and out of trouble. LEJ is primarily
44 interested in restoration of parks and wetlands in Heron's Head Park and Yosemite Slough
45 located just south of the shipyard. LEJ has also been active in getting community feedback on

1 what they would like to have at the shipyard in the future. The RAB may have seen a green
2 booklet that was distributed on the LEJ community vision for the shipyard.

3 Mr. Rao explained that his background is as an environmental engineer, with his masters
4 research on groundwater contamination and remediation strategies for groundwater contaminated
5 with radioactive materials. His doctoral thesis was on acid rain and its affects on leaching rates.
6 He hopes to bring his technical background and community experience to the HPS RAB. Mr.
7 Tisdell made a motion that Mr. Rao be accepted as a RAB member and Patricia Brown, RAB
8 member, seconded the motion.

9 Jesse Mason, RAB member, said that LEJ has been doing a lot of work with youth in the
10 community. Since they are located near the shipyard, they can probably provide information on
11 the uncovered trucks going in and out of the shipyard. Therefore, he is all for having an LEJ
12 representative on the RAB.

13 Mr. Morrison explained that while the RAB is glad to have as many new members as possible,
14 he questions having so many environmental groups that work so closely together on the HPS
15 RAB. The green booklet Mr. Rao mentioned was orchestrated by two or three environmental
16 groups and does not really represent local community sentiment. It is orchestrated literature to
17 produce a certain kind of response. He also talked to Mr. Rabeeb about how LEJ consistently
18 race baits black kids in the community while they do not do the same thing to Indian, Asian, or
19 white kids. The last time LEJ was in the newspaper, and they do appear in the paper often, was
20 November 28, 2006 in the Bay Area and California section. That article illustrates how LEJ race
21 baits black kids to go against black adults in this community.

22 Mr. Van Houten indicated that he is glad to see that the HPS RAB is getting more members. He
23 is also concerned, however, with the breakdown of RAB membership and would like to see
24 something in writing that shows what category a new RAB member would belong to. Barbara
25 Bushnell, RAB member, added that she has concerns that there are too many representatives of
26 groups joining the RAB who don't live in the community. There is still a lot of recruiting to do
27 with RAB membership not yet at top capacity, and it has been a goal to add residents first. Ms.
28 Enea noted that this issue of a percentage breakdown for HPS RAB membership is addressed in
29 the HPS Bylaws. The RAB is currently in compliance with the bylaws, and adding both of
30 today's applicants who represent organizations would still leave the RAB with a majority of
31 members who are residents.

32 Ms. Pendergrass reviewed that there is a motion to accept Mr. Rao as a full HPS RAB member.
33 There has been discussion of ensuring that a majority of RAB members are local residents but
34 there is no prohibition for community organization representatives joining the RAB. Mr. Rao
35 was accepted unanimously as a HPS RAB member with no abstentions and welcomed to the
36 RAB table.

37 Mr. Tisdell explained that the MBCO Subcommittee has approved an HPS RAB application
38 from Leon Muhammad, Muhammad University of Islam. He asked that Mr. Muhammad
39 introduce himself and describe his affiliation.

40 Mr. Muhammad explained that he is the dean of Muhammad University of Islam. He represents
41 the community at HPS, especially the children and parents of the University. He would like to
42 express his concerns by being part of the RAB. He can add diversity to the RAB and be a focal
43 point to communicate issues and concerns to the surrounding community and the local schools.

1 Mr. Tisdell made a motion to accept Mr. Muhammad as an HPS RAB member, and Ms. Enea
2 seconded the motion. Mr. Muhammad was accepted unanimously as a HPS RAB member with
3 no abstentions and was welcomed to the RAB table.

4 Mr. Tisdell announced that the next MBCO subcommittee meeting would be on April 12, 2007
5 at the Anna Waden Library from 6:00 to 8:00 p.m.

6 **Parcel E-2 Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study (RI/FS) Update (Presentation)**

7 Ms. Kito stated that this presentation will provide a preview of the Parcel E-2 RI/FS. The Navy
8 has worked long and hard on this report, which is tentatively scheduled for submittal to the RAB
9 by next week.

10 Ms. Kito reviewed the Parcel E-2 Background. In September 2004 Parcel E was split into two
11 parcels, Parcel E and E-2. This was done to expedite cleanup and closure of the landfill and
12 adjacent areas. Parcel E-2 has four study areas, the Landfill Area, the Panhandle Area, the East
13 Adjacent Area, and the Shoreline Area.

14 Ms. Kito explained that Parcel E-2 was created from the early 1940s to the late 1960s by filling
15 the Bay margin. Fill material was used in the adjacent areas consisting of soil mixed with debris.
16 Debris consisted mostly of wood, metal, and concrete, but there was also industrial wastes
17 including oils and pesticides. The Parcel E-2 landfill was created between 1958 and 1974
18 through placement of a variety of shipyard wastes. The waste included sandblast waste,
19 radioluminescent devices, paint sludge, solvents, and waste oils. Radioluminescent devices
20 include dials used on machinery that have radioactive paint that glows in the dark. The landfill
21 was also a potential disposal area for wastes from decontamination of ships used in atomic
22 testing. When the landfill was closed in 1974, a two-foot thick soil cover was placed over the
23 entire landfill area.

24 Ms. Kito reviewed a series of aerial photographs of Parcel E. The 1946 photograph shows the
25 original 1935 shoreline with just the adjacent areas filled in. In 1955 the area was starting to be
26 filled in with construction debris. The landfill started officially being developed and filled in
27 1958 and by 1965 the panhandle area was being filled with soil. In 1969 the landfill looks to be
28 almost completely filled with the exception of a channel through the middle. The landfill was
29 completed in 1974, and the 1974 photograph shows the two-foot soil cap that was constructed
30 over the landfill with the present boundary for Parcel E-2. The 1986 photograph shows some of
31 the activities taking place at Parcel E.

32 Ms. Kito reviewed CERCLA, which is the environmental process that the Navy is required to
33 follow to achieve final cleanup at a site. The great thing about CERCLA is that the community
34 is involved in any cleanup at HPS, which is why there are RAB meetings. The CERCLA
35 process starts with a preliminary assessment and site inspection to determine if there is a problem
36 with contamination at a site. That is followed by a Remedial Investigation (RI) that gathers all
37 the data for a site into one document and again determines if there is a problem. Then the
38 Feasibility Study (FS) is prepared, and that document evaluates risk and looks at all the data
39 gathered for a site to determine a range of possible cleanup remedies. This process is open for
40 public review and public comments are encouraged. There will be a presentation on the Parcel
41 E-2 RI/FS at the Anna Waden library.

42 Ms. Kito explained that the Proposed Plan is where the public officially gets involved in the
43 cleanup process. The public provides comments on the Proposed Plan to let the Navy know if
44 the public agrees or disagrees with a remedy the Navy proposes for a site. That is followed by

1 the Record of Decision (ROD), which is an important document because it is the decision point
2 for a site. Then there is the remedial design where decisions are made on designing the best way
3 to cleanup a site. Once the design is finalized, the Navy performs the activities to cleanup a site,
4 and that is called the remedial action. From that point cleanup at the site may be complete or
5 long-term monitoring starts. Landfill sites usually require long-term monitoring.

6 Ms. Kito reviewed the goals of the Parcel E-2 RI. The RI presents and evaluates previous
7 investigation data for a site. Soil, soil gas, and groundwater data was gathered from Parcel E-2
8 from 1988 to 2005. The RI includes aerial photographs, geologic cross sections, and
9 groundwater level maps that are used to evaluate groundwater flow directions. The geological
10 cross sections show where there is clay or sand to help determine if and how contamination is
11 migrating. The main goal for the RI is to evaluate risk to human health and the environment.
12 The Parcel E-2 RI evaluated risk to human receptors for future recreational users and site
13 workers. The RI also evaluated risk to ecological receptors such as birds and mammals on shore,
14 and aquatic life along the shoreline and in the Bay.

15 Ms. Kito summarized previous investigations for Parcel E-2 and how the decision is made that
16 there is enough data collected for a site. Samples were collected at Parcel E-2 for soil gas,
17 ambient air, groundwater, soil, and shoreline sediment. There is also a meteorological tower that
18 collected data on precipitation, wind, and temperature. From 1988 to 2005 the Navy completed
19 124 soil borings and 40 test pits at Parcel E-2. A soil boring is where a cylindrical tube is pushed
20 into the ground and a sleeve is pulled out of the tube with a sample of soil to see where different
21 soil types, such as clay or sand, are present. Samples are also collected from that soil to test for
22 contamination like metals or chemicals. Test pits are large holes dug to look at larger areas than
23 soil borings, to see how the soil is stratified and collect samples to test for contamination. There
24 are also 40 groundwater-monitoring wells and 32 gas monitoring probes (including probes along
25 Crisp Avenue) that gather data at Parcel E-2. Those investigation points provided data from 821
26 soil samples and 416 groundwater samples to produce the Parcel E-2 RI report.

27 Ms. Kito reviewed previous removal actions conducted at Parcel E-2. A removal action is
28 similar to a remedial action but can be performed before a site gets to the ROD stage. There was
29 a fire at the landfill in 2000. After putting out the fire, an interim landfill cap was installed to
30 ensure the fire did not start again. The cap consists of two feet of soil, followed by a high-
31 density polyethylene (plastic) cap, with more soil on top of the cap. The cap keeps oxygen out of
32 the landfill, effectively preventing any more fires. The landfill also has a sheet pile wall, which
33 is a long deep wall near the southern edge of the landfill that prevents contaminants like
34 polychlorinated biphenyls (PCB) from flowing into the Bay. The sheet pile wall leaves
35 groundwater with nowhere to go so a groundwater extraction trench was built to keep water from
36 mounding behind the wall. To prevent migration of methane gas to the University of California
37 San Francisco (UCSF) property, the landfill has an interim landfill gas control system. That
38 system includes extraction wells, passive vents, the interim landfill cap, and a grouted section.

39 Ms. Kito indicated that in 2006 the Navy conducted some time critical removal actions (TCRAs)
40 at Parcel E-2. A TCRA was performed at the PCB Hot Spot to remove the source area for PCB
41 contamination in the soil. The groundwater extraction trench was removed during that action but
42 the sheet pile wall is still in place. A TCRA was also performed at the Metal Slag Area.

43 Ms. Kito reviewed the ongoing activities for Parcel E-2. The groundwater monitoring program,
44 landfill gas monitoring and control, and storm water discharge management are ongoing at
45 Parcel E-2. Reports for the PCB Hot Spot and Metal Slag Area TCRAs were still being prepared

1 when draft RI preparation started, so the draft RI does not cover all the information from the
2 TCRA reports. Information from the final TCRA reports will be updated in the draft final RI.

3 Ms. Kito reviewed the nature and extent evaluation for the RI. The Navy's evaluation criteria
4 are based on soil and groundwater criteria from EPA and DTSC guidance. The evaluation also
5 looked at all the maps and data for Parcel E-2 to see if a chemical has been adequately delineated
6 to support the risk assessments or if a data gap exists.

7 Ms. Kito stated that based on the CERCLA process, the RI concluded that Parcel E-2 does
8 require additional remedial action to ensure it is safe for reuse as open space. The FS will
9 identify and evaluate alternatives for Parcel E-2 using the best remedial technologies available.
10 The RI also concluded that there are data gaps for groundwater, so more data is needed to
11 identify areas where active remediation may be necessary. The highest groundwater
12 concentrations are found in the PCB Hot Spot. The good news is that most of the contaminated
13 soil was excavated in that area, so the source area may have been removed and that should
14 gradually reduce groundwater concentrations. The monitoring wells in the PCB Hot Spot were
15 removed during the TCRA, however, so those wells will be reinstalled to start collecting data for
16 the groundwater monitoring program again. That new groundwater data will help address the
17 groundwater data gaps.

18 Ms. Kito reviewed the key elements of the Parcel E-2 FS. The Remedial Action Objectives were
19 developed to address human and ecological exposure to the affected media, like soil and
20 groundwater. The radiological constituents, however, will be a deferred to a separate
21 radiological addendum, which will be the case in preparing the FS for all remaining HPS parcels.
22 Another key element of the FS is development of remedial alternatives that will be applied to the
23 entire parcel.

24 Ms. Kito explained that remedial technologies are screened to develop alternatives for the FS,
25 with all possible technologies that might work considered. The technology screening for Parcel
26 E-2 focused on containment options like capping that are consistent with EPA guidance, and
27 removal options like excavation and disposal. Three remedial alternatives were developed
28 including the no action alternative that is used for comparison purposes. Alternative 2 is
29 excavation and disposal of solid waste, soil, and sediment, and would be applied to the entire
30 parcel, not just the landfill. Alternative 3 is containment of solid waste, soil, and sediment,
31 which means capping the entire parcel.

32 Ms. Kito summarized details for each of the remedial alternatives. Excavation for Alternative 2
33 would involve an estimated 1,008,250 cubic yards (cy) for the Landfill Area, 98,658 cy for the
34 Panhandle Area, 38,453 cy for the East Adjacent Area, and 16,639 cy for the Shoreline Area for
35 a total of 1,162,000 cy of soil, sediment and solid waste. Alternative 3, the containment option,
36 would extend a multi-layer cap over the Landfill Area consistent with the interim cap that has
37 been working well. The adjacent areas would be graded to facilitate wetlands restoration in the
38 Panhandle Area. The wetlands were destroyed during the TCRAs, so new wetlands have to be
39 constructed. A rock revetment wall would be installed along the shoreline to prevent erosion.

40 Ms. Kito explained that NCP stands for the National Contingency Plan, and NCP criteria are
41 national guidelines to follow for alternatives to be protective. If a technology fails any of the
42 NCP criteria, then that technology is rejected. Alternatives 2 and 3 both meet the threshold
43 criteria for protection of human health and the environment and compliance with Applicable or
44 Relevant and Appropriate Requirements (ARARs). Both alternatives also evaluated high for
45 long-term effectiveness and permanence.

1 Ms. Kito indicated that the alternatives differed for short-term effectiveness, implementability,
2 and cost. For short-term effectiveness, if it takes two years to construct and implement a
3 remedy, this criteria considers what the effects are going to be during those two years.
4 Alternative 2 was evaluated as low for short term effectiveness. To excavate the entire landfill
5 means exposure to solid waste, and produces more dust, noise, and construction traffic. There
6 are over one million cubic yards of material to be removed for Alternative 2, so there would be a
7 lot of truck traffic. It would also take twice as long to implement Alternative 2 than to cap the
8 entire parcel. There is also the issue that any soil removed would have to be screened for
9 radiological contamination, so land would be needed for screening yards.

10 Implementability means how easy is it to construct the remedies. Alternative 2 presents
11 numerous technical concerns because there is a large area to excavate. Nearly a mile of sheetpile
12 wall would have to be installed around the landfill so the excavation would not collapse. In
13 addition, the excavation would have to be deep to remove all the debris, so there would be
14 groundwater in the excavation that would have to be extracted and treated, requiring an on-site
15 treatment plant. There would also have to be a large area of land set aside to store any excavated
16 material for waste characterization, segregation, transportation, and disposal. Alternative 3,
17 however, involves capping which is widely used for landfills and is based on EPA guidance for
18 CERCLA sites. Implementability for Alternative 3 therefore exceeds that for Alternative 2. For
19 cost, Alternative 1 costs nothing since nothing is done. The cost for Alternative 2 is hefty at
20 \$330 million, with most of the cost involved in transportation and disposal of the material and
21 screening for radiological contamination. Alternative 3 has two options, 3A that includes gas
22 treatment by enclosed flare at \$73 million, and 3B that includes gas treatment by granular
23 activated carbon (GAC) and potassium permanganate at \$74 million, which is how gas is
24 currently being treated.

25 Ms. Kito reviewed the comparative evaluation for the Parcel E-2 alternatives in the FS. First, the
26 alternatives are evaluated to ensure that everything is protective overall. Alternative 1 is not
27 protective, but Alternatives 2 and 3 are. Next compliance with ARARs is evaluated and
28 Alternative 1 is not compliant while Alternatives 2 and 3 are compliant. ARARs are the legal
29 requirements that have to be followed for a remedy to be protective. Long-term effectiveness
30 and permanence evaluate if the alternatives will be effective for a long time once the remedy is
31 constructed, and both Alternatives 2 and 3 were evaluated as high for this criteria. Alternatives 2
32 and 3 are tied for reduction of toxicity, mobility, or volume via treatment. Short-term
33 effectiveness evaluates the risk while implementing the remedy, and Alternative 1 ranks high,
34 Alternative 2 ranks low, and Alternative 3 ranks in the mid-range for this criteria. For
35 implementability, Alternative 1 ranks high, while Alternative 2 ranks low and Alternative 3
36 ranks in the mid-range. For cost, Alternative 2 has a much higher cost than either of the options
37 for Alternative 3.

38 Ms. Kito explained that the alternatives also have to get acceptance from the regulatory agencies
39 and the community. The Navy will know if the regulators accept the remedies once comments
40 are received on the draft RI/FS that is scheduled to go out next week. Community acceptance
41 will be evaluated after the public comment period during the Proposed Plan phase.

42 Ms. Enea asked if the cost calculations for Alternative 2 mean transporting soil off-site by truck
43 or by barge. Ms. Kito replied that the cost for Alternative 2 is based on several transportation
44 methods, including trucking and rail but does not include barges. Transportation, however, was
45 not the biggest cost factor for that option.

1 Mr. Rao asked how the Navy determines that the existing landfill cap is working well and what
2 kind of monitoring is being performed. Ms. Kito explained that the interim landfill cap was a
3 result of the 2000 landfill fire and is working well since there have not been any subsequent fires.
4 There is an ongoing landfill gas-monitoring program that evaluates the methane being created
5 and prevents migration of landfill gas to the UCSF property.

6 Mr. McGowan stated that the main tradeoff seems to be between cost and effectiveness and
7 permanence, with it costing four to five times as much to excavate the material, but then it's
8 gone forever. He asked how the ranking for effectiveness and permanence for containment can
9 be calculated at three-quarters of the ranking for excavation. The containment remedy is only
10 going to be effective for 10 to 15 years, so that's not really permanent. Ms. Kito responded that
11 the main driver for evaluating the remedies is long-term risk, so when exposure is cut-off risk is
12 eliminated. Mr. McGowan asked how risks like earthquakes or sea level rise are calculated into
13 the risk. Doug Bielskis, ERRG, replied that the engineering involved at this conceptual stage
14 provided a landfill cap design for a 30-year plus lifetime. There were a number of engineering
15 analyses performed for each alternative, and the containment option included an analysis of
16 different capping alternatives to limit groundwater infiltration. Slope stability was also analyzed
17 in detail as recommended by a 2002 study of the landfill's liquefaction potential.

18 TAG Update

19 Dr. Peter Palmer explained that he is the technical advisor with the Community First Coalition.
20 He has been a professor of analytical chemistry at San Francisco State University for about 15
21 years. He is working on the TAG with a colleague, Greg Grist, who has a master degree in
22 environmental engineering. He urged the RAB members to bring them any questions or
23 concerns the TAG can address.

24 Dr. Palmer provided a comments and updates on TAG activities. As Mr. Grist mentioned at the
25 last RAB meeting, they are getting up to speed on HPS activities. He came on board in
26 November 2006 and Mr. Grist came on board in December 2006. He thanked Mr. Forman and
27 Mr. Pearce for hosting a tour for them of HPS.

28 Dr. Palmer noted that it has been a quiet time at HPS so far this year. He found out at the Base
29 Realignment and Closure (BRAC) Cleanup Team (BCT) meeting earlier this week that there are
30 a lot of activities coming up in the near future. He and Mr. Grist are looking forward to getting
31 into the details of the documents associated with Parcel E-2. He reminded the RAB that the
32 Parcel E-2 RI/FS would not include information on radiological components. That information
33 will be provided in an addendum scheduled for submittal in about a month and a half. He
34 thanked Ms. Kito for expediting delivery of documents for their review.

35 Subcommittee Reports

36 **Economic Subcommittee**

37 Mr. Mason explained that the Economic Subcommittee meeting took place on March 15, 2007
38 with about thirty-two people in attendance. His full report is available tonight on the information
39 table. It looks like very positive things are happening for the community because community
40 contractors will be doing quite a bit of the work for Parcel B. There is a community contractor in
41 place to do the brokering for HPS. Miguel Galarza, Yerba Buena Engineering and Construction,
42 has a couple of proposals that have community contractors involved. Another community
43 contractor received an invitation to send information to Tetra Tech and will be taking that out to
44 their offices tomorrow morning.

1 Mr. Mason stated that if anyone here tonight knows of a community contractor who would like
2 to be involved in the work at HPS, be it trucking, construction, or other services, the
3 subcommittee will work just as hard for them as it has for the truckers.

4 Mr. Morrison said that he would like to know if there were any proposals, bids, or contracts
5 passed out at the subcommittee meeting. He had previously asked for a copy of a contract to
6 pass out at the RAB meeting but that was never provided. Mr. Mason replied that copies of
7 contracts are for the contractors not the community members. Ms. Pendergrass asked if there is
8 any kind of contracting information that could be provided to the RAB, and if that information
9 has been distributed in the past. Mr. Mason replied that he passed out documents on
10 opportunities to remove soil at HPS to the truckers who attended the February 15, 2007
11 Economic Subcommittee meeting. He indicated that he could provide contracting information to
12 Carolyn Hunter, Tetra Tech EM Inc., for distribution to anyone who is interested and people can
13 contact him about opportunities for work at HPS. Mr. Morrison stated that he would like to have
14 all contracting opportunities available to the community on a consistent basis and copies
15 provided to the RAB. Mr. Mason noted that there is an application process for contractors to
16 work with the Navy or Tetra Tech.

17 Mr. Van Houten explained that he attended the Economic Subcommittee meeting and was
18 surprised at the format. He expected the meeting would be more about the economics of cleanup
19 at HPS. It was basically a job fair for contractors and subcontractors. He was told that the
20 Economic Subcommittee really has nothing to do with the RAB and that was a surprise. He
21 would like to see an Economic Subcommittee that provides information on how much is being
22 spent at HPS, where it is being spent, and what is being done to keep funding in the community.
23 That way the RAB can provide oversight that is currently missing. Mr. Tisdell explained that the
24 Navy contractors have to provide information on the money being spent and not all contractors
25 provide that information. Some contractors will provide information on how many community
26 members are working for the company, but their financial records may not be available to the
27 public. Mr. Morrison explained that before Pat Brooks, former Navy RPM, left the HPS team, a
28 program was started to document and organize all of the Navy expenditures with a breakdown by
29 contractor for distribution to the community. That program, however, has been dropped.

30 Mr. Mason stated that these are private contractors so they are not going to provide information
31 on how they are spending their money. The whole point is to make the community a part of the
32 process. If you are not part of the community, or don't have a business in the community, you
33 have no business at the Economic Subcommittee meetings. People may be living, working, and
34 making money in the community, but they are not spending that money in the community.

35 Mr. Morrison asked if Mr. Mason knows of any other job opportunities that will be open to the
36 community. Mr. Mason replied that currently there are not a lot of openings for the community,
37 but Tetra Tech is hiring staff from Young Community Developers. Mr. Tisdell recommended
38 that this discussion be continued at the MBCO Subcommittee meeting on April 12, 2007.

39 Mr. Van Houten clarified that he is looking for financial information from the Navy on how they
40 are spending money, and who they are spending it with in the Bayview/Hunters Point
41 community for the RAB to understand the economic aspects of the HPS program. That can be a
42 report to the Economic Subcommittee on a monthly or quarterly basis that is then reported to the
43 RAB. Ms. Pendergrass suggested that Mr. Van Houten meet with Mr. Mason on how that
44 information can be provided and then have a motion or action item for the RAB

1 Mr. Mason stated that the Navy did provide expenditures for the 94124, 94134, and 94107 zip
2 codes at a previous RAB meeting. They provided cost information on what they are spending
3 with contractors and on services in the Bayview/Hunters Point community.

4 Mr. Mason indicated that the next Economic Subcommittee meeting is on April 19, 2007 at 6:00
5 p.m. at the Anna Waden Library. Ms. Bushnell reminded Mr. Mason that his minutes should
6 include attendance lists. Ms. Pendergrass added that the way to discuss community needs is to
7 go to these subcommittee meetings and report back to the full RAB on those meetings.

8 **Technical Review Subcommittee**

9 Ms. Bushnell noted that the meeting was brief and she was not in attendance. The Navy
10 provided a presentation on the Parcel B Technical Memorandum in Support of a ROD
11 Amendment (TMSRA). Due to the radiological work at Parcel B it will most likely be a while
12 before the RAB receives the TMSRA to review.

13 Ms. Bushnell stated that the next Technical Review Subcommittee meeting is on Tuesday, April
14 10, 2007 at the Anna Waden Library.

15 **Community Comment Period**

16 Dr. Ahimsa Sumchai, former RAB member, stated that she would like to revisit some of the
17 issues regarding the proposed dirty transfer. In her opinion the HPS RAB should view it from
18 the standpoint of the consequences of a transfer from federal government ownership to the City
19 and County of San Francisco and to a private developer. The RAB is an organization established
20 under federal law and RAB members should presume that the RAB would be phased out of
21 existence if the property is transferred to a private entity.

22 Dr. Sumchai explained that her biggest concern is the public participation process and regulatory
23 oversight required under CERCLA. Clearly there is a situation at Parcel A with toxic dust
24 exposure that Lennar is responsible for and that does not speak well for transferring the entire
25 base to them. Consequently, the RAB needs to think carefully about any transfer of this property
26 out of federal government control.

27 Dr. Sumchai noted that the other reality for the RAB members to think about is the impact RAB
28 decision-making has on the ROD for Parcel E. Lennar Corporation is a residential builder and
29 transfer of property to Lennar means the prospect of residential building on these toxic parcels
30 even if there is a stadium proposed. Under rezoning for the Bayview and Eastern Neighborhood
31 plan, industrial properties can be rezoned for mixed-use development and there is some mixed-
32 use development for Parcel E in the current redevelopment plan. If the community wants
33 property cleaned up to residential standards that means the landfill cannot be capped, which
34 impacts the ROD.

35 Dana Dillworth stated that she is a resident of Brisbane, Director of the Citizens League for
36 Environmental Action, and Chairperson for the Baylands Community Advisory Group. She said
37 that she sees a systemic problem from tonight's presentation and from similar meetings
38 regarding development in very toxic areas. When she hears that material could be construction
39 debris but that's not completely clear, and that soil is stockpiled while being tested, it appears
40 that there is a system that is not looking at impacts to the health of the community. She noted
41 that she concurs with the gentleman from Arc Ecology asking how can leaving debris in place be
42 considered three-quarters equal to a total removal. These are situations the community has to
43 deal with.

1 Ms. Dillworth said that she does not think the RAB is looking at the synergistic affect of
2 chemicals that would intermix. Nor is the RAB looking forward enough at global warming and
3 the water inundation with these toxins having a chance to migrate into the Bay. She doesn't
4 think long-term health costs and the loss of land value are figured into the costs for Parcel E-2.
5 She would like to propose rather than focusing on building first then clean up later, do clean up
6 first and then build. It is not in the public's interest to piece meal HPS cleanup and leave the
7 dirtiest parcel to be dealt with last.

8 Willie Ratcliff explained that he publishes the San Francisco Bayview Newspaper. He also
9 worked at the shipyard in 1951, but did not really know what was going on at the time. This
10 information on Parcel E should have been out before cleanup at the shipyard even started. Even
11 the EPA recommended that the Navy evaluate the worst part of the shipyard first. The Navy
12 claims to have already spent \$500 million at HPS and the community is just now getting an
13 evaluation report for Parcel E which is the worst parcel at HPS. HPS is a Superfund site, and the
14 Navy says this parcel cannot be cleaned up for residential use. So now there is talk of
15 containment and putting a stadium on the property. The Navy is talking about leaving the
16 landfill there, knowing what can happen with liquefaction and fracturing. The best thing for the
17 community, both money and health wise, would be to clean up the property first then build.

18 Espanola Jackson, Bayview/Hunters Point resident, noted that she is responsible for the RAB
19 being established in 1991. The RAB's number one responsibility is to see that the base is clean
20 and not portioned off in pieces. The RAB really needs to contact the representatives in
21 Washington D.C. If the government can spend \$5 billion a month overseas, then why not ask for
22 \$5 billion one time to cleanup the shipyard. The base is filled with toxins and the Navy wants to
23 cap the landfill, but don't do that.

24 Ms. Jackson stated that last year she lived on Ingalls at Jamestown and could look out her
25 window to the shipyard. They are still landfilling at HPS at nighttime so there is work going on
26 there without the community knowing it is going on. The RAB's concern is to get the shipyard
27 cleaned up, not about who is working out there. No one should be working there in the first
28 place because it's a toxic dump. It's a Superfund site, which means it the worst of the worst.
29 She said that she is tired of coming and hearing about jobs. The people working out there will
30 probably be dead in ten years, inhaling all of the toxins and the radiation you cannot see. She
31 wants the regulators and the residents of this community to do their job and make sure the job at
32 the shipyard is done properly.

33 Ms. Pendergrass explained that the meeting would need to break to give the court reporter a
34 break, or it can be adjourned at this time. She noted that Francisco Da Costa, Environmental
35 Justice Advocacy, would not get on record tonight.

36 Ms. Pendergrass adjourned the meeting at 8:07 p.m.

37 **Reminder: The next RAB meeting will be held from 6:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m., Thursday,**
38 **April 26, 2007, at the Earl P. Mills Auditorium, 100 Whitney Young Circle, San Francisco,**
39 **California 94124.**

ATTACHMENT A
22 March 2007- RAB MEETING
LIST OF ATTENDEES

Name	Association
1. Brian Baltimore	Tetra Tech EMI
2. Terrence Baxter	Health & Environmental Resources Center
3. Doug Bielskis	Engineering Remediation Resources Group (ERRG)
4. Lee Boreen	Tetra Tech ECI
5. Jeff Bray	Tetra Tech ECI
6. Patricia Brown	RAB member, Shipyard Artist
7. Amy Brownell	San Francisco Department of Public Health
8. Barbara Bushnell	RAB member, Resident of the Southeast Sector (ROSES)
9. Reverend Carroll	Saint Paul Tabernacle Baptist Church
10. Charles Dacus	RAB member, Bayview/Hunters Point Resident
11. Tommie Jean Damrel	Tetra Tech EMI
12. Francisco Da Costa	Environmental Justice Advocacy
13. Thomas Dias	Environmental Management Services, Inc.
14. Dana Dillworth	Brisbane Baylands Community Advisory Group and Citizens League for Environmental Action
15. Eileen Downey	Resident
16. Stan Drury	Channel 4
17. Robert Dunkley	RCD Tire Service
18. Minerva Dunn	Community Activist
19. Kristine Enea	RAB member, ROSES
20. Larry Frias	RAB member, Waste Solutions Group
21. Shane Gilman	San Francisco Bay Guardian
22. Jose Gonzalvez	Resident
23. Gregory Grist	Tech Physics - TAG
24. Steve Hall	Tetra Tech EMI
25. Earl Hampton	Resident
26. Carolyn Hunter	Tetra Tech EMI
27. Espanola Jackson	Resident
28. Shameka Johnson	Literacy for Environmental Justice (LEJ)
29. Melanie Kito	Interim Navy RAB Co-Chair
30. Tom Lanphar	Department of Toxic Substances Control
31. Mishwa Lee	Resident
32. Andrew Mark	Resident
33. Steve Martini	18 Trucking
34. Jesse Mason	RAB member, resident
35. Mike McGowen	RAB member, Arc Ecology
36. Dan Misunas	Presentation Services Audio Visual
37. James Morrison	RAB member, ROSES
38. Leon Muhammad	University of Islam, Center for Self Improvement
39. Christine M. Niccoli	Niccoli Reporting, court reporter
40. Pete Palmer	San Francisco State University - TAG
41. Ralph Pearce	Navy RPM
42. Marsha Pendergrass	Pendergrass & Associates
43. Sarah Phelan	San Francisco Bay Guardian
44. Jim Ponton	San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board
45. Jaime Poole	All Islanders Gathering as One
46. Harrell Powell	Resident

Name	Association
47. Willie Ratcliff	San Francisco Bay View
48. Sudeep Rao	LEJ
49. Mark Ripperda	U.S. EPA Region IX
50. Gaynorann Siataga	All Islanders Gathering as One
51. John Sourial	ERRG
52. Peter Stroganoff	Navy, Resident Officer in Charge of Construction (ROICC) Office
53. Lee Sullivan	LEJ
54. Ahimsa Porter Sumchai	Former RAB member
55. Keith Tisdell	RAB member, Resident
56. Robert Van Houten	RAB member, Morgan Heights Resident
57. Eli Vedagiri	Barajas & Associates
58. Angela Williams	Barajas & Associates
59. Wade Woods	Post News Group

**ATTACHMENT B
22 MARCH 2007 – 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 HPS Environmental 101 class on a Saturday once at least 3 new community members join the RAB.	Keith Forman Navy RAB Co-Chair	N/A	Mr. Forman	This action item will be carried over to April 2007.
2.	Dr. Ray Tompkins, RAB Member, to compose a letter from the HPS RAB to the City of San Francisco requesting that Innes Avenue be cleaned regularly to protect residents from dust. The letter will also be provided to Lennar and the HPS RAB.	Dr. Ray Tompkins RAB Member	November 2006	Dr. Tompkins/ Mr. Tisdell	This action item will be carried over to April 2007.
New Action Items					
1.	The HPS RAB will provide comments/ revisions on a resolution to send a letter to the City and County of San Francisco that the RAB is opposed to early transfer of property at the Shipyard. The letter will be discussed and finalized at the April 12, 2007 MBCO subcommittee meeting and voted on at the April 26, 2007 RAB meeting.	James Morrison RAB Member	April 2007	Keith Tisdell	This action item will be completed during April 2007.
2.	Provide a presentation on the basics of the early transfer process, and the property at HPS that would be part of an early transfer.	Tom Lanphar Department of Toxic Substances Control	May 2007	Mr. Forman	This action item to be completed at the May 2007 RAB meeting.

August 15, 2007

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 March 22, 2007 Restoration Advisory Board Meeting Minutes
- Final March 22, 2007 Restoration Advisory Board Meeting Transcript
- Final April 26, 2007 Restoration Advisory Board Meeting Minutes
- Final April 26, 2007 Restoration Advisory Board Meeting Transcript
- Final May 24, 2007 Restoration Advisory Board Meeting Minutes
- Final May 24, 2007 Restoration Advisory Board Meeting Transcript
- Final June 28, 2007 Restoration Advisory Board Meeting Minutes
- Final June 28, 2007 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,

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

cc : Keith Forman, BEC
Cynthia Mafara, Contract Specialist