

HUNTERS POINT SHIPYARD

RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD MEETING MINUTES

26 April 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, April 26, 2007, in the Earl P. Mills Auditorium. 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 March 22, 2007 RAB Meeting
- (3) Navy Announcements
- (4) Community Co-Chair Report/Other Announcements
- (5) Role of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) in Early Transfers
- (6) Further Discussion on the Parcel E-2 Draft Remedial Investigation (RI)/Feasibility Study (FS)
- (7) Technical Assistance Grant (TAG) Update
- (8) Subcommittee Reports
- (9) Community Comment Period
- (10) Adjournment

MEETING HANDOUTS:

- Agenda for April 26, 2007, RAB Meeting
- Meeting Minutes from the March 22, 2007 RAB Meeting
- Navy Monthly Progress Report, April 26, 2007
- Power Point Presentation, Parcel E-2 Landfill Summary
- Application of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) Municipal Landfill Presumptive Remedy to Military Landfills
- Conceptual Framework for Development, Mixed-Use Revitalization Project for Candlestick Point and Parcels A-3 and B-E of HPS
- Technical Review Subcommittee Meeting Minutes from April 10, 2007
- Membership, Bylaws, and Community Outreach (MBCO) Subcommittee Meeting Minutes from April 12, 2007
- San Francisco City and County Department of Public Health letter in response to January 9, 2007 HPS RAB letter regarding dust control issues at Parcel A
- Draft RAB Resolution Opposing Early Transfer at HPS, April 2007

Welcome/Introductions/Agenda Review

Marsha Pendergrass, facilitator, called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. She explained that there were some technical difficulties with the audio-visual equipment. The decision was made to proceed with the RAB meeting despite the difficulties.

1 Ms. Pendergrass welcomed everyone to the meeting. All attendees introduced themselves and
2 the organization they represent. She confirmed that there was a quorum of community RAB
3 members present to conduct business at the meeting.

4 **Approval of Minutes from the March 22, 2007 RAB Meetings**

5 Ms. Pendergrass said that approval of the minutes is needed for the RAB meeting on March 22,
6 2007. The RAB meeting minutes were approved as written with two abstentions and were
7 accepted into the record.

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

9 **Carry-over Item Number 1:** Keith Forman, HPS Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC)
10 Environmental Coordinator (BEC) to provide an Environmental 101 class on a Saturday once at
11 least 3 new community members join the RAB. Mr. Forman stated that the class is for HPS
12 RAB members only and has been scheduled for Saturday, June 30, 2007. Carolyn Hunter, Tetra
13 Tech EM Inc., is working on a location. Most of the supplies for the class will be provided for
14 the RAB members. The class will go for 50 minutes every hour with ten minute breaks along
15 with an hour for lunch. The Environmental 101 class will take approximately 4 hours on
16 Saturday, June 30, 2007.

17 Ms. Hunter explained that she will pass around a sign-in sheet to get an idea if this date works
18 for the majority of RAB members and to get an accurate count for class attendance. She
19 indicated that she has looked into space at the Anna Waden Library Community Room, the
20 Bayview Police Station Community Room, and the Southeast Community Facility. The time for
21 the class will most likely be starting at 9:00 or 10:00 a.m. and ending at 3:00 or 4:00 p.m. This
22 action item will be carried over until May 2007 to get an accurate count for attendance and the
23 location for the class.

24 Dr. Ray Tompkins, RAB member, said that he is a faculty member at City College and would
25 speak with the Dean about space there. Ms. Pendergrass added that there is a place on Third
26 Street near Jamestown at the Coleman Medical Center that has a conference room that would
27 probably accommodate this class.

28 In response to a question from Charles Dacus, RAB member, Mr. Forman explained that the
29 Environmental 101 Class was requested by the RAB members. It is a class that will focus on
30 two things: 1) to provide a basic understanding of environmental cleanup and making cleanup
31 decisions, and 2) applying this understanding to where the Navy is for each of the HPS parcels.
32 This will be for standing RAB members who want to learn more about the HPS program, and
33 new RAB members who came on board recently and do not really know what the Navy has been
34 doing at HPS since the RAB started in 1993.

35 **Carry-over Item Number 2:** Dr. Tompkins to compose a letter from the HPS RAB to the City
36 of San Francisco requesting that Innes Avenue be cleaned regularly to protect residents from
37 dust. The letter will also be provided to Lennar and the HPS RAB. Keith Tisdell, Community
38 RAB Co-chair, indicated that he has a copy of the letter dated April 24, 2007 and signed by the
39 RAB. On behalf of the RAB, he is requesting that the City of San Francisco provide frequent
40 street-cleaning on Innes Avenue. He handed the letter to Amy Brownell, San Francisco
41 Department of Public Health. Ms. Brownell said that she would be happy to take the letter and
42 pass it on to the appropriate authorities. This action item was completed and will be removed
43 from the table.

1 **New Action Item Number 1:** The HPS RAB will provide comments/revisions on a resolution
2 to send a letter to the City and County of San Francisco that the RAB is opposed to early transfer
3 of property at the Shipyard. The letter will be discussed and finalized at the April 12, 2007
4 MBCO subcommittee meeting and voted on at the April 26, 2007 RAB meeting. Dr. Tompkins
5 indicated that this item was discussed at the Technical Review subcommittee meeting.

6 Mr. Forman explained that there are a couple of issues with the resolution. First, Kristine Enea,
7 RAB member, brought it to his attention that RAB members had not unanimously endorsed all
8 the phrasing in the resolution. The second point is that on May 24, 2007, Michael Cohen with the
9 City of San Francisco will provide a presentation to the HPS RAB. Rather than pass a resolution
10 before hearing from the City, Mr. Forman suggested the RAB listen to the City's official
11 presentation first, then go forward with the resolution with more knowledge about the City's
12 plans.

13 James Morrison, RAB member, explained that RAB members met with Mr. Cohen yesterday. It
14 was an extensive, interesting meeting with Mr. Cohen on behalf of the HPS RAB. A few packets
15 of information were picked up and are available for the RAB members. Mr. Morrison made a
16 formal invitation to Mr. Cohen to attend the next RAB meeting on May 24, 2007.

17 Mr. Tisdell explained that the HPS early transfer will be voted on by the County Board of
18 Supervisors before Mr. Cohen provides the presentation at the May 24, 2007 RAB meeting. The
19 original plan was for him to come before the MBCO Subcommittee for a question and answer
20 session before the Board of Supervisors voted on early transfer. Mr. Tisdell stated that the RAB
21 members who took it upon themselves to meet with Mr. Cohen and speak on behalf of the RAB
22 were not supported by the rest of the board.

23 Barbara Bushnell, RAB member, stated that the Technical Review Subcommittee took over on
24 the resolution because it is a technical issue. At the subcommittee meeting, the RAB members
25 talked around the issues for the resolution rather than discussing the resolution's contents. She
26 sent a copy of the resolution to Ms. Enea, and she was going to edit it based on what she did or
27 did not like. Ms. Bushnell noted that at the end of the subcommittee meeting she indicated that
28 the resolution would go to Ms. Hunter to send out to the full RAB for review of the language. At
29 this point it is a draft resolution and it is important that the RAB take a stand on this early
30 transfer issue.

31 Ms. Pendergrass asked if anyone has a motion for a RAB vote. Ms. Bushnell made a motion for
32 the RAB to wait to hear from Mr. Cohen on City plans for HPS. In the meantime, RAB
33 members can consider the resolution and provide any edits or changes to her or Mr. Morrison.
34 Mike McGowan, RAB member, seconded the motion.

35 Robert Van Houten, RAB member, stated that he wants clarification on timing. If the RAB
36 wants a resolution to be expressed in decision-making on early transfer, then Mr. Cohen's
37 presentation needs to happen prior to the May 24, 2007 RAB meeting. Ms. Enea explained that
38 the original intention was to have Mr. Cohen come to the May 10, 2007 MBCO subcommittee
39 meeting because that would happen before the Board of Supervisors vote. Due to the sideline
40 meeting a few RAB members had with Mr. Cohen, the presentation to the MBCO subcommittee
41 is not going to occur. If the resolution is deferred until after the May 24, 2007 presentation, it
42 will be irrelevant.

43 Mr. Forman clarified that it was originally planned for Mr. Cohen to appear at both the May 10,
44 2007 MBCO subcommittee meeting and the May 24, 2007 RAB meetings. He cannot make the
45 May 10, 2007 MBCO meeting, however, because his schedule is full with other appearances.

1 The RAB could ask him to reschedule an appearance at another RAB subcommittee meeting for
2 early May 2007. Ms. Bushnell clarified that no one with the HPS RAB cancelled his appearance
3 at the May 10, 2007 meeting. Ms. Brownell added that she checked with the Mayor's office and
4 confirmed that Mr. Cohen is not available on May 10, 2007 due to a schedule conflict.

5 Ms. Brownell explained that the Board of Supervisors will be voting on a conceptual plan or
6 broad framework for HPS. There is a handout available this evening on that conceptual plan.
7 The specific resolution the RAB is preparing is on early transfer. While early transfer is
8 discussed in that conceptual plan, the Board of Supervisors approval of the plan does not mean
9 early transfer would happen. It is going to take years of discussion before early transfer can
10 possibly happen, so there is plenty of time for the RAB to get information on the City's plans
11 and provide an opinion through the resolution.

12 Ms. Pendergrass called the vote on the motion to have Mr. Cohen provide a presentation at the
13 May 24, 2007 RAB meeting and provide comments and revisions to the resolution. The motion
14 passed unanimously with no abstentions. Comments and revisions to the resolution should go to
15 Mr. Morrison or Ms. Bushnell.

16 Dr. Tompkins stated that he would like to put before the RAB a procedural item. There was
17 debate on the resolution and Dr. Ahimsa Sumchai, former RAB member, had asked for censure
18 regarding RAB members going to the City and representing the RAB without the entire RAB
19 present. Mr. Morrison and Ms. Bushnell took it upon themselves to meet with Mr. Cohen and
20 there appears to be a different perspective on this issue than what his understanding was from the
21 subcommittee meeting. He would like the MBCO subcommittee to discuss this resolution issue
22 and how the meeting with Mr. Cohen was handled.

23 Dr. Tompkins made a motion for RAB members designated by the HPS RAB as representing the
24 RAB to attend the Board of Supervisor's meeting to let them know the RAB concerns regarding
25 early transfer. Mr. Morrison seconded the motion. Ms. Bushnell noted that the Board of
26 Supervisors meetings are televised. Ms. Enea asked if the motion could be amended to have
27 RAB representatives attend the Board of Supervisor's Land Use subcommittee meeting on May
28 7, 2007. Mr. Tisdell seconded the amended motion.

29 Mr. Van Houten stated that he thinks it's premature to go to the Board of Supervisors meeting.
30 Having RAB members represent the HPS RAB on a resolution that has not been voted on to
31 determine the full RAB position is inappropriate.

32 Ms. Enea stated that she would like to amend the motion to have RAB members attend the Land
33 Use subcommittee meeting to gather information on the conceptual framework from the Board
34 of Supervisors and report that back to the RAB. Ms. Pendergrass explained that the RAB needs
35 to vote on the original motion to send representatives to the Board of Supervisor's Land Use
36 subcommittee meeting to represent the RAB view on early transfer. Based on Robert's Rules of
37 Order, the motion cannot be withdrawn after it has been seconded. The RAB voted in opposition
38 to the motion.

39 Ms. Enea made a motion to have RAB members attend the Board of Supervisor's Land Use
40 subcommittee meeting on May 7, 2007 and report back to the full RAB on that meeting. Mr.
41 Tisdell seconded the motion. Ms. Pendergrass noted that a motion is not needed for RAB
42 members to attend a meeting for information. A motion is needed only if RAB members are
43 going to represent the HPS RAB. Mr. McGowan amended the motion to have RAB members
44 attend the Board of Supervisor's Land Use subcommittee meeting representing the RAB. The
45 board members who attend the Land Use subcommittee will request that the HPS RAB wants to

1 be considered in discussions and informed on decisions for early transfer as the process moves
2 forward. Dr. Tompkins seconded the amended motion. The motion was approved with eight in
3 favor, one opposing, and two abstentions. Ms. Pendergrass noted that the RAB would work out
4 who would be attending the meeting.

5 **New Action Item Number 2:** Provide a presentation on the basics of the early transfer process,
6 and the property at HPS that would be part of an early transfer. Mr. Forman noted that Tom
7 Lanphar, Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC), is not here tonight. This action item
8 will be carried over until May 2007.

9 **Navy Announcements**

10 Mr. Forman stated that on May 22, 2007, he and Melanie Kito, Navy Remedial Project Manager
11 (RPM), will provide a presentation and be available for questions on Parcel E-2 at the San
12 Francisco Redevelopment Agency Citizens' Advisory Committee (CAC) from 5:30 to 8:00 p.m
13 in the Alex Pitcher Jr. room at 1800 Oakdale Avenue. He invited RAB members to attend that
14 meeting for a different perspective on Parcel E-2. Saul Bloom of Arc Ecology will also provide
15 a presentation on redevelopment at the CAC meeting. Ms. Brownell noted that it is a special
16 CAC meeting devoted to HPS issues and is sponsored by the Environment and Reuse
17 Subcommittee.

18 Mr. Forman indicated that there was a suggestion to look into having the HPS RAB meetings
19 broadcast live on KPOO radio like the Project Advisory Committee (PAC) and CAC meetings.
20 The Navy is currently looking into what it would take to make that happen. Mr. Van Houten
21 made a motion to vote on the RAB meetings going live on KPOO. Ms. Pendergrass noted that
22 the vote on this issue would need to happen after the subcommittee reports.

23 **Role of EPA in Early Transfers**

24 Mark Ripperda, EPA, explained that whether early transfer happens or not at HPS, the base is
25 still a Superfund Site. That means that under the law all actions have to be approved by the San
26 Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board (Water Board), DTSC, and EPA. The
27 City of San Francisco would become the responsible party the regulators would oversee.
28 Regardless of an early transfer, the cleanup of HPS would not lose regulator oversight.

29 The RAB only oversees cleanup work done on parcels of land that belong to the Navy.
30 Consequently, the RAB would not be overseeing work on transferred parcels. The RAB would
31 still exist, however, as long as the Navy is working on some part of HPS. There are other
32 avenues for public involvement, and community members who have been involved with the HPS
33 RAB for some time have a better understanding of how those other organizations operate.

34 **Further Discussion on the Parcel E-2 Draft Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study** 35 **(RI/FS) (Presentation)**

36 Mr. Forman explained that this presentation is part 2 of the presentation from the March 2007
37 RAB meeting. Another presentation on the Parcel E-2 RI/FS will follow at the May 2007 RAB
38 meeting.

39 Ms. Kito explained that the presentation covers the closure process for landfill sites, the Parcel
40 E-2 RI/FS Summary, remedies at other Bay Area landfills, and the use of the Presumptive
41 Remedy for military landfills.

1 Ms. Kito provided a basic landfill schematic and reviewed exposure routes, including ingestion
2 or eating, inhalation or breathing, and dermal contact, which is direct contact with the skin.
3 There are three ways contamination can be released from a landfill. First is through landfill gas,
4 and if landfill gas migrates to a building it can be inhaled in an indoor atmosphere. Second is
5 leachate, which is any liquid coming out of a landfill, and that can contaminate groundwater.
6 Third is surface runoff, which is any type of runoff usually from rain or precipitation. When rain
7 hits the landfill it runs off the cover and can get into the Bay or wetlands.

8 Ms. Kito reviewed remediation technologies used in landfill closure. For landfill waste and soil
9 as the contaminated media, the remediation technologies that are normally used are excavation
10 and disposal, capping or containment, and all components have monitoring and maintenance to
11 ensure the technologies are working. For landfill gas, the remediation technology normally used
12 is collection and treatment with monitoring and maintenance. For leachate, the remedial
13 technologies normally used are hydraulic containment that keeps a water plume from migrating
14 from the site, which for HPS means keeping it from migrating to the Bay. A physical barrier
15 such as a wall can also be installed to prevent migration. Storm water runoff remediation simply
16 uses monitoring and maintenance.

17 Ms. Kito summarized the Parcel E-2 RI/FS. There are three alternatives for remediation of solid
18 waste, soil, and sediment. Alternative 1 is no action which is used for comparison as the worst
19 case scenario of doing nothing. Alternative 2 is to excavate and dispose of solid waste, soil, and
20 sediment. Alternative 3 is containment of solid waste, soil, and sediment, which means capping
21 the landfill.

22 Ms. Kito explained that the EPA developed guidance used to evaluate remedies for sites such as
23 military landfills; this guidance identifies a Presumptive Remedy of containment. Throughout
24 the years there were historical patterns of remedy selections based on the type of waste and size
25 of a landfill. The Presumptive Remedy, therefore, has criteria to determine if containment can be
26 used or not and was established to reduce cost and time with landfill sites.

27 Ms. Kito reviewed the components of the Presumptive Remedy for landfill sites. The first
28 component is a landfill cap, which is a cover that goes on top of the landfill. Another component
29 is source area groundwater control to contain a groundwater plume and prevent migration. The
30 remedy also can include collection and treatment of leachate, which is any type of liquid coming
31 out of the landfill. Additionally, landfill gas would also be collected and treated. At HPS, the
32 landfill already has landfill gas controls in the northern part of the site. Institutional controls
33 (ICs) are another component added to supplement engineering controls. ICs are legal
34 mechanisms such as a deed restriction that prohibits building houses, or developing a well and
35 pumping groundwater. Engineering controls are any type of physical barrier such as a fence with
36 a no trespassing sign to prevent exposure from the landfill.

37 Ms. Kito summarized the evaluation criteria from EPA guidance to see if Parcel E-2 is eligible
38 for the Presumptive Remedy. Is there enough information; yes, several previous investigations
39 have been completed at Parcel E-2 and there is enough information. Does land reuse affect
40 remedy selection; yes, the majority of the landfill site is slated for reuse as open space. Do the
41 landfill contents meet municipal landfill type waste definition; yes, Parcel E-2 landfill contents
42 are mostly household/commercial waste and construction debris. To be able to use the
43 Presumptive Remedy, the majority of landfill wastes have to be household/commercial waste
44 and construction debris. Household/commercial waste is household and business garbage and
45 that eventually goes into a landfill. Construction debris is material like concrete and rebar from
46 buildings. The majority of the wastes also have to be nonhazardous versus hazardous wastes,

1 and the Parcel E-2 landfill has mostly nonhazardous waste. Are military-specific wastes present?
2 There are two kinds of military-specific waste, low hazard and high hazard. The Parcel E-2
3 landfill does have low hazard military waste in the form of low-level radioactive waste. That
4 could be material like sand blast grit, and radium deck markers and gauges with glow-in-the-dark
5 dials. The EPA guidance states that low hazard military wastes are generally no more hazardous
6 than some wastes found in municipal landfills. No high-hazard military waste has been found at
7 the Parcel E-2 landfill. High hazard military waste would be material like bombs and artillery,
8 explosives, or dangerous chemicals. HPS was never a weapons station that had any type of high-
9 hazard military waste.

10 Ms. Kito described the last evaluation criteria, is excavation of contents practical? This considers
11 two parameters, volume of waste and size of the landfill. Landfills with more than 100,000
12 cubic yards (cy) of wastes, or larger than 2 acres and 30 feet deep, would normally not be
13 considered for excavation. The Parcel E-2 landfill contains an estimated 473,000 cy of waste, is
14 approximately 22 acres, and is about 25 to 30 feet deep at its maximum depth.

15 Ms. Kito explained that overall the evaluation in Section 8 of the draft Parcel E-2 RI/FS shows
16 that the landfill meets the Presumptive Remedy criteria for containment. The EPA guidance for
17 the Presumptive Remedy does not actually require a lot of detailed evaluations or risk
18 assessments for landfill sites. The Navy, however, did want to complete the RI/FS and Proposed
19 Plan process showing that every reasonable step was taken and all details considered for Parcel
20 E-2 since there have been some community concerns. The draft RI/FS includes added
21 evaluations with a detailed nature and extent evaluation, risk assessments, and evaluation of the
22 excavation alternative.

23 Ms. Kito noted that EPA guidance on, "Application of CERCLA Municipal Landfill
24 Presumptive Remedy to Military Landfills," can be reviewed at
25 www.epa.gov/fedfac/documents/1296mem.htm. Mr. Forman added that a copy of EPA's
26 Presumptive Remedy guidance is also available as a handout tonight. It's 14 pages and contains
27 valuable information on EPA experience with Records of Decision (RODs) for landfills across
28 the nation.

29 Mr. Forman explained that it is important to give the RAB a larger perspective on where the HPS
30 landfill fits into the larger picture for landfills in the Bay area. There are 24 municipal landfills
31 on the Bay fringe evenly spread among Alameda, San Mateo, and Santa Clara counties. There
32 are no municipal landfills along the Bay shore in San Francisco County. Of the 24 landfills, 5
33 are active, and one of those five has been partially closed. All 24 of the municipal landfills have
34 been or eventually will be closed in place.

35 Mr. Forman noted that typically for landfills across the country, a soil cap is used when closing
36 the landfill. The key to how a landfill is closed is the volume of waste, the surface area size or
37 acreage of the landfill, the future potential reuse of the property, and if there any special
38 circumstances for the landfill wastes. Most landfill sites have an existing or proposed end use as
39 open space for passive recreation, recreational use like a golf course or soccer field, or
40 commercial use. Reuse for commercial purposes is found in areas of California where open
41 space is not affordable and land is at a premium. Decisions are then made on how to properly
42 engineer commercial buildings to be constructed on top of or in close proximity to a landfill.

43 Mr. Forman reviewed the military landfill closure examples in the San Francisco Bay area that
44 most closely fit the HPS landfill profile for comparison. These bases all have a couple of
45 characteristics in common. First, all the bases are part of the BRAC program. Second, like HPS,
46 all these bases are in different phases of closure followed by conveyance to local authorities,

1 usually city governments. Mare Island Naval Shipyard has a landfill that most closely fits the
2 profile for the HPS landfill, and not coincidentally is also a naval shipyard.

3 Mr. Forman reviewed the Bay Area landfills as follows:

4 Mare Island Navy Shipyard Area H1 Landfill: The landfill contains 428,000 cy of waste and is
5 30 acres in size. That is close to the 470,000 cy of waste and 22 acre size for the Parcel E-2
6 landfill. The H1 landfill contains municipal and industrial wastes and construction debris with
7 the potential presence of low level radioactive debris and munitions. It was operated from 1942
8 to 1989. Capping was selected as the remedy for soil and solid waste at the H1 landfill using the
9 Presumptive Remedy guidance, and the ROD was signed in 2006. The containment remedy will
10 also be applied to adjacent areas (approximately 72 acres) with waste. Parcel E-2 also has
11 adjacent areas where waste has been found, so this is an example where the containment remedy
12 was extended to those nearby areas. The future use for the H1 landfill is open space similar to
13 the Parcel E-2 landfill.

14 Naval Weapons Station Concord Site 1 Landfill: Concord is located on Suisun Bay and the
15 landfill contains 135,000 cy of waste/soil and is 13 acres in size. It contains municipal and
16 industrial wastes and construction debris. Munitions are also present in the landfill, which is not
17 surprising since it was a weapons station. The landfill operated from 1944 to 1979. Capping
18 was selected as the remedy for soil and solid waste using the Presumptive Remedy guidance and
19 the ROD was signed in 2004. Capping was initiated in 2006 and the cap is going to be integrated
20 with the surrounding wetland areas with reuse as open space. That is similar to the Parcel E-2
21 landfill where the Navy is proposing to upgrade the ecosystem in the panhandle area with
22 healthy wetlands. These healthy wetlands will replace parts of a barely sustainable wetlands area
23 that were removed during the time-critical removal actions at Parcel E-2.

24 Naval Air Station Moffett Field Site 22 Landfill: Moffett Field is located in the southern portion
25 of the Bay and the landfill contains 92,000 cy of waste and is 9 acres in size. It primarily
26 contains municipal wastes and was operated between 1950 and 1967. Even though it is a smaller
27 landfill, capping was selected as the remedy using the Presumptive Remedy guidance. The ROD
28 was signed in 2002 and the cap was integrated with an existing golf course. A golf course is one
29 form of recreational use that lends itself to wide-open spaces suitable for landfill sites.

30 Naval Air Station Moffett Field Site 1 Runway Landfill: The landfill contains 423,000 cy of
31 waste and is 12 acres in size, so it is smaller than the Parcel E-2 landfill. It contains primarily
32 municipal wastes and construction debris with reported disposal of industrial wastes. The
33 landfill was operated from 1965 to the late 1970s. Capping was selected as the remedy for soil
34 and solid waste using the Presumptive Remedy guidance and the ROD was signed in 1997.
35 Waste from the smaller Site 2 landfill was consolidated into the Site 1 landfill prior to capping in
36 1998. That is a common practice to reduce the footprint for landfills and to have monitoring and
37 maintenance for only one cap. The future reuse is open space similar to HPS.

38 Naval Fuel Depot Point Molate Site 1 Landfill: Point Molate is near Oakland, and the landfill
39 contains 20,000 cy of waste and soil and is about 1 acre in size. Another common denominator
40 for military bases is that about half the time, Site 1 is going to be a landfill site. The Point
41 Molate landfill contains construction debris and some petroleum wastes and was operated from
42 1953 to 1979. Capping was performed under a removal action from 2001 to 2002 with capping
43 also selected as the final remedy. The ROD was signed in 2005 and the site is slated for future
44 use as open space. This is similar to the Parcel E-2 landfill where a partial cap was installed
45 under a removal action in response to a landfill fire in August 2000. The Navy proposal is to

1 extend that cap and make it the final remedy for Parcel E-2 and that is clearly the leading
2 alternative in the FS.

3 Naval Security Group Activity Skaggs Island Site 2 Landfill: Skaggs Island is located in a
4 wetland area near San Pablo Bay. The landfill is located within a wetland area and is habitat for
5 two endangered species, the Clapper Rail and the Salt Marsh Harvest Mouse. It contains 8,900
6 cy of waste and soil and is 1 acre in size. The landfill contains construction debris and landscape
7 waste and was operated between the early 1940s and late 1970s. Excavation was performed
8 under a removal action in 2001 and 2005, which can be done for a small landfill like this. This
9 remediation is part of a larger CalTrans wetland mitigation effort required for the East Span of
10 the Bay Bridge. The area is planned as part of the San Pablo Bay National Wildlife Refuge.

11 Hamilton Army Airfield Site 26 Landfill: The landfill contains 294,000 cy of waste/soil and is
12 28 acres in size. It contains municipal and industrial wastes and construction debris and was
13 operated between the early 1940s and 1974. Capping was selected as the final remedy for soil
14 and solid waste and the ROD was signed in 1989. The cap was constructed in 1994 to 1995 and
15 the site is being reused as open space with adjacent residential housing outside of a 150 to 200-
16 foot buffer zone. Part of the remedy included a landfill gas control system similar to Parcel E-2.
17 A previous RAB presentation showed how the Navy created a new preferential pathway for
18 landfill gas at the Parcel E-2 landfill. A passive venting system was installed by creating a
19 trench along the perimeter and putting in piping to passively vent landfill gas through filters. At
20 Hamilton they took a similar path. They consulted with HPS and used the HPS designs for the
21 Hamilton Site 26 landfill.

22 Presidio of San Francisco, 15 Small Landfills: Presidio is a beautiful small former army base
23 that has a few characteristics in common with HPS. There are 15 small landfills 1 to 5 acres in
24 size. Most are located in sensitive environments like Tennessee Hollow and Crissy Fields. The
25 landfills did not contain diverse waste streams; for example, one landfill contained mostly
26 incineration ash. The landfills contain primarily construction debris and soil fill. Excavation
27 was performed at several of these small landfills to facilitate ecological restoration efforts at
28 Tennessee Hollow, Rob Hill Campground, and Baker Beach coastal bluffs, which was the best
29 fit for the end goal of creating a wildlife refuge or nature preserve. Volumes in these excavated
30 landfills ranged from 1,000 cy to greater than 40,000 cy. The two largest Presidio landfills,
31 Landfill E (200,000 cy) and Landfill 10 (185,000 cy) are recommended for capping. These
32 landfills are smaller than the HPS landfill, but much larger than the landfills recommended for
33 excavation. The Landfill E site is slated for recreational use. The remedy has not yet been
34 approved for either of these larger landfills. The bottom line is that at Presidio, excavation was
35 performed for the mini landfills that had one or two distinct types of waste and were located in
36 sensitive environments. The two largest landfills are recommended for containment with a soil
37 cap.

38 Mr. Forman reviewed conclusions for the military landfill closures in the San Francisco Bay
39 area. Many of the sites are located close to or adjacent to the Bay and wetland areas because
40 historically the Bay Fringe was not regarded as desirable property like it is now. Typically the
41 landfills contain construction debris and soil fill. The Parcel E-2 landfill contains predominantly
42 inert construction debris (giant concrete slabs and rebar, concrete dust, and soil waste) based on
43 what was seen in a cross section exposed when the landfill gas venting system was put in. Some
44 of the other military landfill sites also contain municipal and industrial wastes and may contain
45 low-level radioactive debris and munitions. HPS is no exception and has devices with glow-in-
46 the-dark paint that came off ships and those devices were disposed of in the landfill. Capping
47 was selected as the final remedy at most of the landfill sites consistent with EPA's Presumptive

1 Remedy guidance based on the footprint or size of the site, the waste volume, the depth of the
2 landfill, and future reuse for the site.

3 Mr. Forman provided a table with a comparison of the Parcel E-2 landfill and four of the landfills
4 in the Bay Area that had the most in common with HPS, the Mare Island Landfill, Moffett Field
5 Site 1 Landfill, Hamilton Site 26 Landfill, and Concord Site 1 Landfill. These landfills generally
6 contain municipal waste (office and residential waste), industrial waste (concrete and rebar), and
7 construction debris. Interestingly enough all these landfills are located close to wetlands and
8 near the Bay and have planned reuse as open space, similar to HPS.

9 Mr. Tisdell asked what is considered high hazard waste. He also asked if oily substances,
10 polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs), or volatile organic compounds (VOCs) have been found in
11 the Parcel E-2 landfill. Ms. Kito responded that high hazard wastes are defined in the EPA
12 Presumptive Remedy guidance as material like bombs, munitions, and chemicals, and there is no
13 knowledge of any type of high hazard waste in the Parcel E-2 landfill. There are oily wastes,
14 PCBs, and VOCs in the landfill, but that is considered industrial waste not high hazard waste.
15 One requirement for the Presumptive Remedy is for hot spots to be removed before the landfill is
16 capped. Time-critical removal actions have already taken place at the PCB Hot Spot and Metal
17 Slag Area to remove hot spots.

18 Leon Muhammad, RAB member, asked what low-hazard military wastes are present in the HPS
19 landfill. Ms. Kito replied that the Navy knows there are radiological wastes in the landfill, but
20 those are considered low hazard. There is a list of the wastes in the landfill in the Parcel E-2
21 RI/FS, but radiological waste will be listed in a separate FS Radiological Addendum that will be
22 submitted in about two months. Mr. Muhammad asked if the RI/FS would also list any
23 environmental hazards from contamination for those in the community. Ms. Kito responded that
24 the FS and the FS Radiological Addendum would include all that information.

25 Harrell Powell, resident, asked why some of the HPS industrial waste can't be relocated to the
26 Richmond Sea Cliff area where they need soil to keep the area from sinking. Mr. Forman
27 responded that the Navy cannot remove waste from a landfill area and move it to another area
28 where there is not a landfill. If a landfill meets the Presumptive Remedy criteria, the prevailing
29 philosophy is to cap and contain the landfill, and monitor and maintain the cap to be protective of
30 human health and the environment. Moving that waste through communities to another place is
31 considered not the most prudent action.

32 TAG Update

33 Dr. Tompkins stated that he was asked by the Technical Review subcommittee to provide a
34 synopsis of the TAG. The TAG is a grant from the EPA that is put out for bid to community
35 organizations who are interested in receiving technical assistance interpreting documents. EPA
36 then evaluates proposals and makes a decision on who should get the grant. The Community
37 First Coalition (CFC) was setup and organized as a result of the passage of Proposition P.
38 During the elections, the City of San Francisco voted by 86.5 percent to remove the HPS landfill
39 from Parcel E.

40 Dr. Tompkins explained that the CFC initially hired a couple of technical assistants but was
41 dissatisfied with their work. The HPS RAB concurred with that dissatisfaction so the assistants
42 were removed with a letter of dismissal. New technical assistance was then sought, and the CFC
43 made sure potential grantees did not have any financial relationships with the Navy or Navy
44 contractors. The TAG assistant function is to provide the RAB with a neutral, unbiased opinion,
45 and review and advise on the Navy's technical work so the RAB can make intelligent decisions.

1 The TAG assistant cannot go out and do their own research and experiments. As an
2 organization, the CFC tries to work with other scientific community based organizations like Arc
3 Ecology.

4 Dr. Pete Palmer, TAG assistant, explained that he put together this presentation for the RAB on
5 short notice and can provide the handout by e-mail to the RAB members. He can be reached at
6 palmer@sfsu.edu.

7 Dr. Palmer explained that the Navy has the floor for most of the RAB meetings and thus the
8 opportunity to present Navy views. He indicated that he has nowhere near the knowledge that
9 some people have who have spent years overseeing the HPS program. He does subscribe to the
10 principles of scientific objectivity and will do his best to provide that in his evaluation of data for
11 HPS.

12 Dr. Palmer stated that there are over 11,000 pages of text, figures, and tables in the draft Parcel
13 E-2 RI/FS, and admitted he had not read all of the report. His understanding is that once the
14 Radiological (RAD) Addendum is provided to go with the RI/FS, there is an opportunity to
15 provide comments for the permanent record.

16 Dr. Palmer said that the bottom line is that Parcel E-2 is the most contaminated parcel at HPS so
17 the RAB needs to take its time to review the RI/FS. He and his colleague, Gregg Grist, TAG
18 assistant, are reviewing the RI/FS and are going to focus on evaluating solid-waste chemicals in
19 soil, chemicals in groundwater, soil gas, and the alternatives recommended in the FS. Sampling
20 will be closely scrutinized and can be biased based on where and how sampling is conducted.
21 He said he would not debate on the appropriate regulations and limits on emissions, but can say
22 that the regulators are upholding the current regulations. He will question if the proposed limits
23 for Parcel E-2 are adequately protective of residents, birds, aquatic organisms and the Bay. He
24 can also question if the assumptions drawn in the Navy's recommendations for remedial
25 alternatives are appropriate and if the costs represent a valid comparison. For example, consider
26 global warming. If in 200 years water levels rise and this whole site is under water, what does
27 that imply? Are geotextile barriers resistant to earthquakes? Could chlorine gas be released
28 from cylinders that might be stored in the landfill? These are some of the issues he is uncertain
29 about and the RAB should be too.

30 Dr. Palmer stated that there are a couple of quick points to make about concentrations of toxic
31 organic compounds. First, one part per million (1 ppm) means one part in a million parts.
32 Benzene, for example, is a particularly noxious VOC that has a number of different sources. It is
33 found at 2 parts per trillion (ppt) in the relatively clean stratosphere, but remember that CFCs are
34 up there causing ozone hole degradation. Ambient levels for benzene are about 200 ppt. An
35 EPA Air Toxic Assessment study found higher concentrations around 1 part per billion (ppb)
36 near highways and there are even higher concentrations close to a gas pump. The bottom line is
37 that concentrations of a toxic VOC or any VOC are highly variable and concentrations can even
38 depend on meteorological conditions.

39 Dr. Palmer explained that exposure limits differ widely for different agencies. For example, The
40 National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH) limit for benzene is 10 ppm and
41 anything higher requires a respirator. The Occupational Safety and Health Administration
42 (OSHA) limit is 5 ppm over any 15-minute time period. As the exposure time goes up, the limit
43 must go down and 1 ppm is the permissible exposure limit over an 8 hour time weighted average.
44 EPA does not set exposure limits for benzene, but regulates primary air pollutants like ozone,
45 NO_x, and particulates. But EPA's Integrated Risk Information system (IRIS) database provides
46 some equivalent concentrations with corresponding cancer risk that has been estimated.

1 Dr. Palmer explained that going through some HPS documents, he noticed that soil gas
2 monitoring does not require monitoring of benzene in the air. There is some stipulation on
3 nonmethane organic compounds (NMOCs). NMOCs cover thousands of compounds with
4 widely different toxicities. There is no speciation of NMOCs for Parcel E-2, so that may be
5 cause for concern.

6 Dr. Palmer reviewed some EPA studies to put risks into perspective. In a 1999 study, benzene at
7 15 ppb corresponds to a 1 in 18,000 cancer risk, and that is average across the nation. To put
8 that in perspective, radon gas is a naturally occurring radioactive species that emanates through
9 rocks, and it has a much higher cancer risk at 1 in 500. Now human beings take on all sorts of
10 risks voluntarily, like smoking and speeding, and that's acceptable. Risk though, is a very
11 contentious subject here at HPS. He asked the RAB members and community if they would feel
12 better if the contamination at Parcel E-2 has been removed and the site cleaned, or if it's
13 contained, monitored, and controlled, knowing that there are no guarantees that the cap, barriers,
14 walls, and monitoring/treatment will be 100 percent effective.

15 Dr. Palmer stated that comments on the draft Parcel E-2 RI/FS are due on May 22, 2007, and the
16 draft RAD Addendum will be out for review soon. There is one point to make regarding radium-
17 226. It has a significant half life of 1,600 years. In the RI/FS, the Navy's own data indicates that
18 more than 1 percent of the soil removed from the Metal Slag Area and the PCB Hot Spot was
19 radiologically impacted and had to be disposed of. That is a concern because HPS was a
20 radioactive testing center where radioactive sources were put into the Bay and testing was done
21 on animals. No one really knows where this contamination is and these unknowns could
22 possibly hurt the community.

23 Dr. Palmer asked if doctor's would diagnose a condition without having all the data. That is
24 where he is right now, and he will not draw any conclusions about the alternatives here until he
25 has seen the RAD Addendum.

26 Dr. Palmer said that it is an unattainable goal to remove all uncertainty. If he has left the RAB
27 more confused, that's good because science is not black and white. The point is to ask if there is
28 sufficient information to evaluate risk and make appropriate recommendations.

29 Dr. Tompkins noted that in the administration of the TAG, CFC and members of CFC do not
30 receive any financial compensation from the EPA funds provided for the TAG grant. All the
31 money goes to the technical assistants for the grant.

32 **Subcommittee Reports**

33 **MBCO Subcommittee**

34 Mr. Tisdell noted that he would like to say something to the RAB members, especially the new
35 RAB members. The HPS RAB voted that no individuals would go to outside organizations
36 representing opinions of the RAB.

37 Mr. Tisdell explained that the MBCO Subcommittee has approved an HPS RAB application
38 from Gaynorann Siataga, Hunters Point/Bayview Resident. He made a motion to accept Ms.
39 Siataga as a RAB member and Mr. Dacus seconded the motion. In respect for time, the RAB
40 will not be hearing from the applicants tonight. Ms. Siataga was accepted as a RAB member
41 with one abstention and welcomed to the RAB table.

42 Mr. Tisdell explained that the MBCO Subcommittee has approved a RAB application from Aleta
43 Bryant, CamKal Trucking. He made a motion to accept Ms. Bryant as a RAB member and Mr.

1 Van Houten seconded the motion. Ms. Bryant was accepted as a RAB member with one
2 abstention and welcomed to the RAB table.

3 Mr Tisdell explained that the MBCO Subcommittee has approved a RAB application from a
4 former RAB member, Sam Ripley. He made a motion to accept Mr. Ripley as a RAB member
5 and Mr. Dacus seconded the motion. Mr. Ripley was accepted as a RAB member with one
6 abstention.

7 Mr. Tisdell asked that Ms. Brownell attend the next MBCO subcommittee meeting on May 10,
8 2007 because there are attendees who have questions on the SFPH Department letter that
9 responded to RAB concerns that went out regarding the dust control issues.

10 Mr. Tisdell said that attendance at the MBCO Subcommittee is appreciated and asked that people
11 continue to come to the meetings. Ms. Bushnell asked that Mr. Tisdell provide Ms. Hunter with
12 the RAB applications approved by the MBCO subcommittee so they can be distributed with the
13 RAB meeting minutes and agendas.

14 **Economic Subcommittee**

15 Jesse Mason, RAB member, said that a statement was made at the last RAB meeting that there is
16 no information available on how the Navy is spending money in the community. The Navy did
17 provide a presentation on that topic and he asked if that information would be provided to the
18 RAB members who were not in attendance for that presentation.

19 Mr. Mason said that the Economic subcommittee meetings are going well. There was a 20 to 30
20 minute meeting on April 19, 2007 and attendees expressed concerns about community
21 participation. If RAB attendees know anyone or any company that is interested in participating
22 in Navy contract's please have them contact Mr. Mason.

23 Tom Dias is a contractor for radiological removal at HPS and he provided some information that
24 is available to RAB members. Mr. Morrison asked that Mr. Mason leave information on the
25 sign-in table so RAB members do not have to seek him out to get those documents. Ms.
26 Pendergrass explained that the format is for information to go to Ms. Hunter who can make it
27 available to the RAB.

28 Mr. Forman noted that ITSI has been awarded a large contract for soil removal and disposal.
29 They will be holding a seminar for trucking firms on Thursday, May 10, 2007 10:00 a.m. to
30 12:00 p.m. to provide information about the contract and how to bid on it. Then there will be a
31 Small Business Outreach meeting at the EP Mills facility on Wednesday, May 23, 2007 from
32 5:00 to 7:00 p.m. That meeting will provide information on how community contractors can
33 participate in Navy contracts. Ms. Pendergrass asked that the information on the upcoming
34 economic meetings be included in the list of RAB meetings that will occur during the month Ms.
35 Hunter sends out.

36 **Technical Review Subcommittee**

37 Ms. Bushnell said that the minutes from the April Technical Review subcommittee meeting are
38 available on the table. She noted that the subcommittee is requesting an extension for public
39 comments on the draft Parcel E-2 RI/FS since the RAD Addendum and groundwater sections are
40 not complete. Mr. Forman explained that according to the Federal Facilities Agreement for HPS,
41 any agency can make a request to the Navy for an extension. Mr. Ripperda offered to make that
42 request on behalf of the RAB. Ms. Bushnell clarified that the RAB would like an additional 30
43 days for public comments. Ms. Pendergrass noted that this would be an action item.

1 Ms. Bushnell indicated that there is an additional request for the EPA, DTSC, and the Water
2 Board. The Technical Review subcommittee would like to ask the regulators to prepare a
3 comment document for the RAB when documents like the Parcel E-2 RI/FS are reviewed. Mr.
4 Ripperda asked if the subcommittee wants a presentation or just written comments. Ms.
5 Bushnell replied that the subcommittee would like a presentation.

6 Ms. Bushnell noted that the web address Mr. Forman provided in his earlier presentation has a
7 lot of great information. The entire www.epa.gov website has a lot of valuable information.

8 Dr. Tompkins asked if the RAB is reviewing various parts of the Parcel E-2 RI/FS is there
9 another period for public comments. Mr. Forman explained that there are different components
10 to the RI/FS and each has its own public comment period. Dr. Tompkins noted that he wants to
11 look at all the components together as a whole because radiological and groundwater issues may
12 impact chemical issues. Mr. Forman noted that not all the components came together at the same
13 time. The RAB, however, will get three interactions of all the documents and will have plenty of
14 time to comment before the RI/FS goes final. Mr. Ripperda added that EPA would be making
15 final decisions on the overall risk assessments once they have looked at all the components of the
16 RI/FS.

17 Community Comment Period

18 Ms. Pendergrass indicated that it is time to vote on having the HPS RAB meeting live on KPOO.
19 Mr. Tisdell made a motion to go live on KPOO when the RAB meeting is at the Southeast
20 Community College Facility and it was seconded by Mr. Van Houten. Mr. Tisdell clarified that
21 the Alex Pitcher Jr. room has the setup for broadcasting on KPOO. The motion passed with one
22 abstention.

23 Mr. Tisdell noted that he was at the People's Earth Day this weekend passing out RAB
24 applications. There were five people who accepted applications and said they were interested in
25 joining the RAB.

26 Ms. Pendergrass reviewed the dates of the upcoming meetings. The next Technical Review
27 Subcommittee meeting is scheduled for May 3, 2007. The trucking seminar is scheduled from
28 May 10, 2007 from 10:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m. The next MBCO Subcommittee meeting is also
29 scheduled for May 10, 2007. The next Economic Subcommittee meeting is scheduled for May
30 17, 2007 from 6:00 to 8:00 p.m. The CFC Environmental subcommittee meeting is scheduled
31 for May 22, 2007 from 5:30 to 8:30 p.m. The Small Business Outreach meeting is scheduled for
32 May 23, 2007 from 5:00 to 7:00 p.m. at the EP Mills facility. Finally, the Environmental 101
33 class is scheduled for June 30, 2007.

34 Mr. Dacus asked how many members are now on the RAB. Mr. Tisdell indicated that he would
35 report on the number of members including the categories for the members at the next RAB
36 meeting. He added that June 2007 is coming up soon, so it's time to think about nominations for
37 Community Co-chair. The Community Co-chair nominations will take place at the May 24,
38 2007 RAB meeting.

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

40 **Reminder: The next RAB meeting will be held from 6:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m., Thursday,**
41 **May 24, 2007, at the Alex Pitcher Jr. Room, 1800 Oakdale Avenue, San Francisco,**
42 **California 94124.**

ATTACHMENT A
26 April 2007- RAB MEETING
LIST OF ATTENDEES

Name	Association
1. Bianca	Unknown
2. Brian Baltimore	Tetra Tech EMI
3. Kaitlan Blackford	San Francisco Resident
4. Patricia Brown	RAB member, Shipyard Artist
5. Amy Brownell	San Francisco Department of Public Health
6. Barbara Bushnell	RAB member, Resident of the Southeast Sector (ROSES)
7. Aleta Bryant	CAMKAL
8. Charles Dacus	RAB member, Bayview/Hunters Point Resident
9. Francisco Da Costa	Environmental Justice Advocacy
10. Thomas Dias	Environmental Management Services, Inc.
11. Darin Donnell	FMC Corporation
12. Bill Dougherty	Tetra Tech ECI
13. Eileen Downey	Shipyard Artist
14. Kristine Enea	RAB member, ROSES
15. Robert Fields	Resident
16. Larry Frias	RAB member, Waste Solutions Group
17. Miguel Galarza	YBE
18. Gregory Grist	Tech Physics - TAG
19. Steve Hall	Tetra Tech EMI
20. Sam Hoffman	City of School Management
21. Carolyn Hunter	Tetra Tech EMI
22. Espanola Jackson	Resident
23. Melanie Kito	Interim Navy RAB Co-Chair
24. Jackie Ann Lane	U.S. EPA Region IX
25. Jesse Mason	RAB member, resident
26. Lonnie Mason	First Generation
27. Mike McGowan	RAB member, Arc Ecology
28. James Morrison	RAB member, ROSES
29. Leon Muhammad	University of Islam, Center for Self Improvement
30. Christine M. Niccoli	Niccoli Reporting, court reporter
31. Peter Palmer	San Francisco State University - TAG
32. Ralph Pearce	Navy RPM
33. Marsha Pendergrass	Pendergrass & Associates
34. Jim Ponton	San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board
35. Jaime Poole	All Islanders Gathering as One
36. Harrell Powell	Resident
37. Pat Randell	Vironex
38. Sam Ripley	Resident
39. Mark Ripperda	U.S. EPA Region IX
40. Gaynorann Siataga	All Islanders Gathering as One
41. Jennifer Siataga	All Islanders Gathering as One
42. Leann Speta	San Francisco Resident
43. Peter Stroganoff	Navy, Resident Officer in Charge of Construction (ROICC) Office
44. Keith Tisdell	RAB member, Resident
45. Raymond Tompkins	RAB member, BVHP Coalition on the Environment
46. Robert Van Houten	RAB member, Morgan Heights Resident
47. Mark Walden	Navy Interim Lead RPM
48. Angela Williams	Barajas & Associates

**ATTACHMENT B
26 APRIL 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	The class is scheduled for June 30, 2007. This action item will be carried over to May 2007 to get feedback from RAB members.
2.	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 Community RAB Co-Chair	This action item will be carried over until May 2007.
New Action Items					
1.	EPA to request a 30-day extension to the public comment period for the draft Parcel E-2 RI/FS	Barbara Bushnell RAB Member	April 2007	Mark Ripperda EPA	This action item to be completed during May 2007.

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