

HUNTERS POINT SHIPYARD
RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD MEETING MINUTES
24 May 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, May 24, 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 April 26, 2007 RAB Meeting
- (3) Navy Announcements
- (4) Community Co-Chair Report/Other Announcements
- (5) Conceptual Framework for Candlestick Point and Hunters Point Shipyard
- (6) Wetlands Restoration at Yosemite Slough Update
- (7) Technical Assistance Grant (TAG) Update
- (8) RAB Community Co-Chair Nominations
- (9) Subcommittee Reports
- (10) Community Comment Period
- (11) Adjournment

MEETING HANDOUTS:

- Agenda for May 24, 2007, RAB Meeting
- Meeting Minutes from the April 26, 2007 RAB Meeting
- Navy Monthly Progress Report, May 24, 2007
- Power Point Presentation, Combined Plan, Candlestick Point and Hunters Point Shipyard
- Power Point Presentation, The Restoration Project, Candlestick Point State Recreation Area, Yosemite Slough Wetlands Restoration
- Exhibit D, Preliminary Hazardous Materials Remediation Plan
- Truckers' Certification, Transport and Disposal of Contaminated Soils, Hunters Point Shipyard, San Francisco, CA
- Membership, Bylaws, and Community Outreach (MBCO) Subcommittee Meeting Minutes from May 10, 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.

1 **Approval of Minutes from the April 26, 2007 RAB Meeting**

2 Ms. Pendergrass said that approval of the minutes is needed for the RAB meeting on April 26,
3 2007. Barbara Bushnell, RAB member, said that she had a correction to the minutes. Page 4,
4 lines 17 through 23, where it is implied that she and Mr. Morrison represented the HPS RAB at a
5 meeting with Michael Cohen, San Francisco Redevelopment Agency (SFRA), which is not
6 accurate. Ms. Bushnell noted that she and Mr. Morrison did not represent the RAB at that
7 meeting and she would like the minutes to reflect that change. Mr. Morrison and Ms. Bushnell
8 representing the RAB at a meeting with Mr. Cohen was implied to them by Raymond Tompkins,
9 RAB member, and Ahimsa Sumchai, former RAB member, who were not at the meeting.
10 Carolyn Hunter, Tetra Tech EMI, explained that she has already double checked that section of
11 the transcript and the minutes accurately reflect the statement made by Mr. Morrison. She
12 offered to review that section of the transcript with Ms. Bushnell. Ms. Bushnell stated that she
13 wants it clear that she and Mr. Morrison were not representing the RAB, and Mr. Cohen is here
14 tonight and can verify that.

15 Ms. Pendergrass noted that the minutes reflect what actually took place at the RAB meeting.
16 Consequently, if the minutes have exactly what was said and it was misrepresented, then the
17 correct statement can be reflected in tonight's minutes. The RAB meeting minutes were
18 approved unanimously as written with no abstentions and were accepted into the record.

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

20 **Carry-over Item Number 1:** Keith Forman, HPS Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC)
21 Environmental Coordinator (BEC) to provide an Environmental 101 class on a Saturday once at
22 least 3 new community members join the RAB. Mr. Forman indicated that the class has been
23 scheduled for Saturday, June 30, 2007 and will run from 9:00 a.m. until 3:00 or 4:00 p.m. The
24 class will be held at the Tetra Tech ECI Compound at HPS. The class is limited to RAB
25 members, but not just new RAB members. Those who have been part of the RAB for many
26 years are also welcome. A flyer will be sent to all HPS RAB members to ensure everyone is
27 informed on the class. Please contact Mr. Forman or Ms. Hunter to RSVP for the class so there
28 is an accurate head count. There will be a lunch break for the class, but lunch will not be
29 provided. This action item was completed and will be removed from the table.

30 **Carry-over Item Number 2:** The HPS RAB will provide comments/revisions on a resolution to
31 send a letter to the City and County of San Francisco stating the RAB is opposed to early transfer
32 of property at the Shipyard. The letter will be discussed and finalized at the April 12, 2007
33 MBCO subcommittee meeting and voted on at the April 26, 2007 RAB meeting.

34 Mr. Forman explained that at the letter was not discussed at the MBCO Subcommittee but was
35 addressed during the April 2007 Technical Review Subcommittee meeting. It was recommended
36 that the RAB members listen to the City's presentation first to get all the facts before moving
37 forward with the resolution. Ms. Bushnell added that at the April 2007 RAB meeting she put a
38 motion before the RAB to wait on the resolution until after Mr. Cohen's presentation. Drafting
39 the letter as an action item will be carried over until June 2007.

40 **New Action Item Number 2:** U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) to request a 30-day
41 extension to the public comment period for the draft Parcel E-2 Remedial
42 Investigation/Feasibility Study (RI/FS). Mr. Forman indicated that there were four different
43 requests for an extension to the public comment period, and the Navy granted a 45-day
44 extension. Comments to the Parcel E-2 RI/FS are now due on July 5, 2007. This action item
45 was completed and will be removed from the table.

1 **Navy Announcements**

2 Mr. Forman stated that he and Melanie Kito, Navy Remedial Project Manager (RPM), wanted to
3 thank the HPS RAB for the opportunity to speak at the Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC)
4 Environmental Subcommittee and RAB Technical Subcommittee meeting on May 22, 2006.
5 There were five RAB members that attended the presentation at Windows on the Shipyard office
6 on Third Street. The Navy provided the CAC and Technical Subcommittee a presentation on the
7 Parcel E-2 RI/FS and had a good dialogue with the community. The Parcel E-2 RI/FS is the
8 document that had the public comment period extended to July 5, 2007. Mr. Forman noted that
9 RAB and community members can call him anytime during the public comment period with any
10 questions. The Navy can address questions and comments on the phone and questions do not
11 always have to be provided in writing.

12 Mr. Forman reiterated that RAB members who have signed up to attend the Environmental 101
13 class on June 30, 2007 should be on the lookout for a flyer that will be distributed in the next two
14 weeks.

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

16 Keith Tisdell, Community RAB Co-Chair, stated that he did not have a Community Co-chair
17 report this evening.

18 **Combined Plan, Candle Stick Point and Hunters Point Shipyard (Presentation)**

19 Mr. Cohen introduced himself and said that he is from the San Francisco Mayor's office. He
20 explained that he will first provide information about the combined plan for Candlestick Point
21 and HPS. Then Mira Waldman from Lennar will review elements of the plan, followed by
22 questions from the audience.

23 Mr. Cohen noted that the HPS RAB is familiar with the City of San Francisco involvement in
24 redevelopment plans for HPS and Candlestick Point for more than a decade. Candlestick Point
25 redevelopment planning goes back to a 1997 voter measure, which called for a stadium and a 1.6
26 million square-foot mall. HPS redevelopment planning goes back even further. The
27 redevelopment plan for HPS was adopted in 1997 and that called for a range of uses, including
28 residential, light industrial, research and development, job generating, and parks and open space.

29 Mr. Cohen explained that over the last ten years, these two projects have generally been moving
30 forward on separate but parallel paths. That began to change in 2005 when the San Francisco
31 Forty-Niners came to the City and indicated that the stadium/mall concept was no longer
32 practical or financially feasible. The appetite for public financing for professional sports
33 stadiums had waned since the 1997 bond measure. Consequently, the Forty-Niners and the City
34 began to look at a plan for denser urban use at Candle Stick Point, which is a recent trend seen
35 around the country where surrounding development helps pay for stadium infrastructure. In
36 many respects, the thinking was that this stadium would be to football what PacBell Park was to
37 baseball, with a more urban and forward-looking approach.

38 Mr. Cohen stated that in November 2006, after about a year and a half of work with the Forty-
39 Niners, they came to the City and said that they were not sure the denser urban use would work
40 at the site. They indicated that they were going to look at Santa Clara for a new stadium. In
41 December 2006, the City began to look at Candle Stick Point and HPS sites combined as one
42 project to see if it could meet two objectives. First, if it could alleviate the Forty-Niners
43 concerns with too much density of development in one location. Second, would the project keep

1 the decades-long promises to the City and the Bayview community for revitalization of these two
2 incredible largely dormant water front sites for parks, affordable housing, jobs, and economic
3 development.

4 Mr. Cohen noted that part of the genesis for considering a combined project was a potential
5 Olympic bid. In addition, from a planning, infrastructure, transportation, and parks and open
6 space perspective, a combined project made sense. Consequently, in December 2006 and
7 January 2007 the question of combining these two properties to meet the City's dual objectives
8 was seriously evaluated. Since that time, the City and County of San Francisco, who do not
9 always agree on issues, have been remarkably clear in policy guidance. The guidance was for
10 the SFRA to work hard to come up with a solution that provides a compelling way to keep the
11 Forty-Niners in San Francisco. That solution would have to work without mortgaging the City's
12 financial future or delaying the redevelopment of these sites further. The City would not just sit
13 back and see what would happen with Santa Clara. The County Board of Supervisor's passed a
14 resolution in February 2007 for the SFRA to move forward with all due speed to come up with a
15 plan that would realize all the benefits around parks, affordable housing, jobs, and economic
16 development that would work with or without the Forty-Niners. In fact, there is an unwavering
17 commitment to move forward with or without the Forty-Niners.

18 Mr. Cohen also reviewed the process behind the combined plan for Candlestick Point and HPS.
19 The SFRA has been very busy over the last four to five months in a sprint to the starting line.
20 There have been meetings with a number of community groups, with a plan to start a two-year
21 community-based development process and Environmental Impact Report (EIR) process in June
22 2007 similar to the process for Treasure Island, Mission Bay, and Phase I of HPS. There will be
23 a very transparent public process for all elements of the project, including infrastructure,
24 affordable housing, and financing.

25 Mr. Cohen explained that to get this two-year process started on a good footing and with clear
26 policy guidance, a document has been prepared called the Conceptual Framework. There are
27 three elements to the Conceptual Framework. The first element puts the City's policy goals and
28 objectives for the project in writing for the community and city at large to use to ensure those
29 goals and objectives are being achieved. The main goals and objectives include a significant
30 increase in public open space and recreational areas, in affordable housing, and in jobs. There
31 will be a unique opportunity to rebuild the Alice Griffith Housing Project without displacement,
32 on a one-for-one-basis at current low-income housing levels. The City also recognizes a need for
33 jobs to create economic development opportunities that are particularly directed to Bayview
34 residents. The Conceptual Framework describes goals for achieving the highest levels of good
35 urban design and environmental sustainability. There is also a commitment to preserve the artist
36 community at HPS on a permanent basis. Finally, there is a process for developing and
37 implementing transportation solutions that will improve the transit picture in the area.

38 Mr. Cohen noted that the second element of the Conceptual Framework is a discussion of the
39 means to achieve policy goals and objectives. This is an issue that City's across California have
40 been facing for some time, since Proposition 13 was passed and as less money is provided by the
41 federal and state governments. It has become difficult to pay for parks, open space, and
42 affordable housing, and there is a financial strain to provide basic services like police, public
43 health, and road resurfacing. As a result, this project provides opportunities to leverage
44 development to provide public benefits. San Francisco is blessed with a demand for land, so the
45 City's entitlement power can be used along with tax-exempt financing tools and significant
46 investments from private capital to create public benefits. An example is Treasure Island, where
47 the City is looking at building a 300-acre park that would be one the biggest park improvement

1 projects in the City's history. That project would include about \$400 million in below-market
2 affordable housing without spending a penny of general fund money. The Candlestick Point
3 HPS combined project would use the same financing tools, entitlement power, hundreds of
4 millions of dollars of private capital investment in the Bayview community, and tax-exempt
5 financing tools like tax-increment financing similar to the Mello-Roos bonds.

6 Mr. Cohen reviewed the third element of the Conceptual Framework, a preliminary land plan and
7 preliminary transportation plan. This is important because it provides a development plan for
8 starting the EIR process soon.

9 Mr. Cohen noted that there is one word of caution about this combined plan for Candlestick
10 Point and HPS. There is one thing he can guarantee over the next few years, that the land plan
11 for this project will change. As the process moves forward and there are more and more
12 community meetings, there will be park advocates, affordable housing advocates, Alice Griffith
13 Park residents, and others that all have issues to be factored into the plan. The land plan that Ms.
14 Waldman from Lennar is about to present, however, is a good demonstration of what
15 development elements can be put where. It also answers the question from the City and County:
16 can these projects be combined in a way that addresses the Forty-Niners concerns and delivers
17 on the promises to the Bayview community that have been out there a long time. The SFRA
18 believes the answer is yes.

19 Ms. Waldman provided a layout of the combined site for Candlestick Point and HPS.
20 Combining these two sites into one project has provided an opportunity for Lennar to envision
21 this as one specific plan. In the process of developing that plan, the land surrounding these sites
22 is a factor, including Double Rock and the Alice Griffith Housing project that the City is
23 considering including in this project. If housing project residents do not agree that this is the
24 way to proceed, however, then that would not be included in the project. At this time, the
25 combined project involves about 771 acres of land.

26 Ms. Waldman reviewed the process for developing a combined land plan. One of the main
27 elements of the process is looking at opportunities and constraints. The designers specifically
28 considered sustainability principles in the design for the entire site. One of the first
29 considerations for sustainability is that HPS is a Brownfields site, which means a significant
30 amount of healing needs to take place before development. The designers also looked at ways to
31 integrate public transit into land use. The idea is to make this a walk-able community where
32 people would want to live. Different types of energy sources have been explored that can be
33 used to maintain this area as a sustainable community. With 771 acres of land, there is a lot of
34 opportunity for open space. That is one of the great amenities that redevelopment of HPS can
35 provide. The designers spent time figuring out where jobs should be placed and how to create an
36 optimal network of infrastructure, building and open space for distinct but linked communities.
37 Since there are no areas of existing housing within these two sites, there is a great opportunity to
38 create a vibrant neighborhood in Southeast San Francisco without displacement.

39 Ms. Waldman reviewed the land use plan for HPS. At Parcel B, there will be a significant
40 section of housing with 2,000 and 2,500 homes. At Parcel C, the design involves about 2 million
41 square feet of industrial/commercial uses that would produce jobs. There are a variety of
42 biotech, industrial, and research and development firms that are potentially interested in HPS.
43 Then there are plans for a 69,000 seat stadium. Moving the stadium from Candlestick Point to
44 HPS provides for a huge green open space network around the stadium. When creating a
45 stadium, a sea of parking is often also created, which is a scenario the designers want to avoid.
46 As a result, the plan looks at creating parking as an amenity with dual uses. During the football

1 season, there would be parking for the stadium. The rest of the year, the parking area would be
2 used as soccer fields, ball courts, or other active amenities for all of Southeast San Francisco and
3 for the new communities that would be created here.

4 Ms. Waldman reviewed the plans for Candlestick Point. There is housing planned for the
5 northeast area of the site, with lower-scale housing planned for the southwest. The middle of the
6 site will be mixed use with 500,000 to 600,000 square (sq.) foot retail center and 700,000 sq. feet
7 of office space. Surrounding the entire Candlestick Point site is about 350 acres of parks and
8 open space. In terms of sustainability principles, there are a number of white dots around the site
9 that represent bus and rapid transit stations. Those are strategically placed so that each home is
10 within a five-minute walk to public transportation. Ms. Waldman provided a figure showing
11 what the combined site would look like when completed and a figure of the goal for walk-able,
12 livable streets in a vibrant community.

13 Ms. Waldman reviewed the open space plan for the combined sites that will be designed for a
14 variety of active and passive uses. The State of California is the owner of the land around
15 Candlestick Point and they prefer passive recreational uses for that land. That provides an
16 opportunity for the parking and areas around HPS to be used for a variety of more active
17 amenities that the community and neighborhoods could use. Ms. Waldman provided figures
18 showing what passive sites might look like and some of the existing uses around Candlestick
19 Point. There is a windsurfing area that would certainly remain. There would be trails, seating
20 areas, and big open fields for passive recreation which as kite flying. Parts of the open space
21 area would be also be used for storm water or bioretention ponds. Figures were provided
22 showing more active recreation at HPS areas. There is an opportunity for an area to celebrate the
23 legacy of HPS, an area near Drydock 4 that would be a heritage park.

24 Ms. Waldman explained that when looking at building homes, there is a need for transportation
25 to get people in and out of the community. There will be a need for a variety of road
26 improvements, including improvements to the streets Evans, and Cesar Chavez at HPS. There
27 are also design ideas for widening the Illinois Street Bridge and improvements to Cargo Way to
28 create additional vehicular capacity. Around Candlestick Point, the design ideas include
29 improvements to Harney Way and the U.S. 101 interchange. Consequently, there is a large
30 traffic team exploring the best way for cars and people to get in and out of these areas. There are
31 also a number of other transportation improvements being considered for a bus and rapid transit
32 system to service these new communities as they develop. The system would link into the
33 Geneva Avenue extension of CalTrain and take a route through Candlestick Point and HPS,
34 linking the two sites to the surrounding areas.

35 Dr. Tompkins noted that Mr. Cohen referred to a Conceptual Framework. Can that be provided
36 to the RAB members for review? Mr. Cohen replied that it was his understanding that the
37 Conceptual Framework had been distributed to the RAB. If it hasn't been distributed, he will
38 make sure that is taken care of. Ms. Pendergrass confirmed that this would be an action item for
39 the meeting and Ms. Hunter would be the contact for distributing the document.

40 Dr. Tompkins asked with the concept that has been presented, is that proposed for early transfer
41 at HPS. If so, how would the City go about that early transfer? Dr. Tompkins explained that he
42 has read a lot in the newspaper about early transfer of HPS property and there are concerns in the
43 community and that the RAB has voiced their concerns on the topic. Early transfer was not
44 really addressed in this presentation. Mr. Cohen responded that the one direction the City has
45 been considering for HPS is pursuing a series of phased early transfers that is being referred to as
46 "Early Transfer Lite." The typical early transfer happens when there is still a lot of cleanup to be

1 done and the Navy, Army, or Air Force provides the money for the City or a developer to
2 complete that cleanup. What the City is considering, and this idea actually came from EPA, is to
3 have the Navy complete all the radiological work and hot spot removal at HPS. After that, the
4 remedy involves a cover over nearly all the HPS site since it is a Brownfields site. The question
5 then becomes who is responsible for enforcing that cover remedy if development activities come
6 in and affect that remedy. Consequently, the general idea is two fold. There would be a series of
7 phased early transfers of large areas of land as it becomes available and it works for the
8 redevelopment plans. That transfer happens once the Navy has completed all removal actions,
9 but the City will install the cover remedy during development activities. The City would then be
10 responsible for long-term monitoring of the cover remedy among other things.

11 Ms. Bushnell asked how the EIR process will be implemented, how will it be announced to the
12 public, and if is there a mailing list HPS RAB members can be placed on. Mr. Cohen responded
13 that for those familiar with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), there is a very
14 public process for reviewing the scope of a project. For Candlestick Point and HPS, the City is
15 looking at using the EIR process to actually help mold the project. There will be transportation
16 studies, wind studies, natural resource studies, basically all the elements that have to be worked
17 through for the project. That is why the only thing for certain is that this project will change over
18 time. The SFRA will be the lead agency for this combined project. A contractor, EIP Associates
19 who has done a number of major EIRs in San Francisco, has been selected for the EIR process.
20 Mr. Cohen noted he would make sure the HPS RAB is included for receipt of all of the notices
21 for the CEQA and EIR process.

22 Ms. Bushnell explained that with the former Parcel A, the RAB has experienced that Lennar has
23 not provided proper dust control during construction. It now appears that Lennar is taking care
24 of dust control, but that has still left the community with the impression that Lennar cannot be
25 trusted. Mr. Cohen responded that the SFRA is aware of the dust-control issue on the former
26 Parcel A and he has two things to say to address that. First, there are going to be a lot of public
27 meetings during summer 2007 to discuss dust-control, because clearly there were things that
28 were done wrong and some of those things have been fixed. The biggest frustration is that there
29 is a lot of misinformation out there on the nature of exposure from dust. It is important that as a
30 city and community, that information be used as a tool so the dust control issue will be discussed
31 extensively. Second, when talking about early transfer, is the notion that Lennar would be doing
32 cleanup at HPS. That was actually reported in the newspaper. Lennar is a development firm not
33 a remediation firm. Under the type of early transfer planned for HPS, the Navy will conduct the
34 cleanup with their remediation contractors. Any cleanup left after the Navy is done will be
35 performed by qualified remediation firms hired by the City, with State and Federal regulatory
36 oversight.

37 Mr. Tisdell asked what is meant by lower scale housing, and will the stadium at Candlestick
38 Point be torn down. Mr. Cohen responded that the stadium at Candlestick Point will definitely
39 be torn down. He said that he wants to strongly point out that one of the benefits the City hopes
40 to create with this project is open space. Once the project is complete, there will be more park
41 land and it will be vastly improved. Most of the Candlestick state recreation area is underutilized
42 and is actually just dirt. Candlestick Point has 77 acres of recreation and park land that consists
43 of an asphalt parking lot and a decrepit stadium. The parking lot and stadium will be demolished
44 and the area will be integrated into the larger project. The term that Ms. Waldman used was
45 actually lower-density housing. That refers to the majority of housing on both sites being in the
46 2 to 4 story range. The rebuild of the Alice Griffith site and development of Parcel B will also
47 provide housing mostly in the 2 to 4 story range. There will be some higher density housing, but

1 to make this a sustainable community residential density has to be concentrated around public
2 transit stops.

3 Jesse Mason, RAB member, said that his one big concern is the job situation for the community.
4 As the Economic Subcommittee chair for the RAB, he would like to know if there is going to be
5 any technical help for community contractors and businesses to get work on this project. For the
6 community to continue and for this project to be sustainable, community members have to
7 continue working. Community businesses also want to be in that industrial area. Will those
8 elements be part of the City's implementation plan for this project? Mr. Cohen replied that for
9 those RAB members who are familiar with the development agreements for Phase I at HPS, a lot
10 of time was spent on determining job programs and economic development opportunities for
11 Bayview businesses. This is not well known since home building has not yet started, but forty-
12 two percent of all the vertical development for Phase I homes has to go to local community
13 builders, either independently or in joint ventures with Lennar. There are also programs that
14 require buying goods and services on Third Street rather than at large corporations such as Home
15 Depot. There will be many more jobs here, particularly permanent jobs, in the future. The City
16 recognizes that Phase I is an opportunity to work out the kinks and do better in the future.

17 Mr. Cohen noted that he was talking to Dr. Veronica Hunnicutt from City College. The City
18 Build Program has really taken off, and that is an important vehicle for the construction trades.
19 There is also a new program through Dr. Hunnicutt and City College for Bayview youth to get
20 training for bio-tech jobs. People often think of bio-tech careers as requiring PhDs. The reality
21 is that for every PhD position, there are ten to fifteen positions working under them in the
22 laboratories. Those are career jobs that often require only a two-year Associates Degree.
23 Accordingly, the City is anticipating other types of jobs that are going to come for construction
24 and on a permanent basis. Then the Workforce Development Program is used to train people for
25 the right jobs.

26 Patricia Brown, RAB member, asked where the artist community will be in this plan. Mr. Cohen
27 indicated that there was a terrific meeting with shipyard artists two weeks ago and about a
28 hundred artists attended. Like a lot of people with an interest in HPS, the first reaction when
29 things start moving forward is utter panic. In the conceptual framework document, there is
30 specific language that the shipyard artists will be kept as a permanent part of HPS at affordable
31 rates. Thanks to Congresswomen Pelosi the SFRA has a planning grant to help determine where
32 the permanent artist community should be located in the shipyard. That's going to be a
33 fascinating discussion because some artists want to be off on their own and some like the idea of
34 a retail area that would be like an Open Studio all year. The commitment, however, is
35 unequivocal that the artists are part of the project.

36 Sudeep Rao, RAB member, said he has a question about the transition for the transfer of HPS
37 property. For example, if the Navy is not putting a cap on the property, how do the regulatory
38 agencies certify that there is no public health hazard so redevelopment can continue? Second, in
39 terms of liability under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and
40 Liability Act (CERCLA), is there continuing liability for the Navy or does liability fall to Lennar
41 or the City? Mr. Cohen responded that he mentioned earlier that the regulators were encouraging
42 the City to take action on early transfer. That was because they were not sure how they were
43 going to certify that the property was suitable for transfer if the cap was going to be
44 compromised during development activities. The bottom line is that there is a conveyance
45 agreement that was negotiated with the Navy in 2004 that requires concurrence from EPA and
46 the State that the property transferred is safe for its intended use, whether that is a residential,
47 industrial, recreational, or open space use. As for liability, Congress thought out this issue long

1 ago in the context of base closure. There are two Federal laws, CERCLA 120(h), and Section
2 330 indemnity that mean legal liability comes back to the Navy if anything is discovered after
3 property is transferred.

4 Mr. Forman explained that there will be a Finding of Suitability to Transfer (FOST) for HPS
5 property. There are several different types of early transfer and the type depends on how far the
6 Navy has completed cleanup. Ideally, property would be transferred when no further action is
7 required and would be done in concert with redevelopment. The Navy will have to examine the
8 situation in detail when the time for property transfer arrives to put all of the pieces together. At
9 this time, it would be hard to predict when exactly transfer time would come. The Navy has
10 every intention of retaining cleanup for the radiological program. In addition, as funding become
11 available, work will move forward to remediate groundwater plumes among other activities.
12 There is a series of documents required under CERCLA followed by the FOST. The public will
13 have a chance to provide comments on those documents and there will be future RAB meeting
14 presentations to cover every step of the process. What "Early Transfer Lite," refers to is that the
15 final piece of the remedy, the cover (the stadium, housing, etc. are considered a cover), would
16 become the responsibility of the new landowners. The regulators would then provide oversight
17 and work with whoever built the structures to authorize that everything is complete at some point
18 in the future.

19 **The Restoration Project, Candlestick Point State Recreation Area, Yosemite Slough**
20 **Wetlands Restoration (Presentation)**

21 Barbara Hill, California State Parks Foundation, stated that this presentation is an update for a
22 project on a site adjacent to HPS. The California State Parks Foundation is not a State agency,
23 but is a primary independent nonprofit partner for the State park system. The foundation has
24 been shepherding the process forward to restore the Yosemite Slough located adjacent to the
25 South Basin and extending inland. The foundation got involved with the Yosemite Slough some
26 time ago, primarily to raise funds to do a feasibility study to help move this potential restoration
27 project through to completion. There is no question that this project could not have been done
28 without help from many different agencies, community groups, and nonprofit organizations, so
29 the foundation is grateful for that help.

30 Ms. Hill explained that Candlestick Point Recreational Area is a State park, and like many State
31 parks in California has been facing funding challenges. There are 278 State parks in California
32 that are facing close to a \$1 billion backlog for maintenance. Consequently, dollars are precious,
33 and the constituency for each park is out there advocating for work on their park. Candlestick
34 Point Recreational Area is an important because it was the first urban State park in the system,
35 which means it was created to serve a non-traditional park user population.

36 Ms. Hill stated that in 1987 a general plan was developed calling for restoration of Yosemite
37 Slough and plans for Candlestick Point Recreation Area. That general plan goes through a
38 public process to define what kind of uses will take place at the park. There were a lot of grand
39 ideas for enhancing the park, most of which haven't happened due to a lack of funding. In 1999,
40 California State Parks came to the foundation to see if there was interest in working together on
41 restoring Yosemite Slough. The foundation began the process by conducting a feasibility study
42 to try to identify some of the challenges. Ultimately it was decided that restoration would
43 ultimately reach the foundations strategic goals as well as the State Parks goals.

44 Ms. Hill explained that the foundation is a membership organization that has 85,000 members
45 statewide. Outreach to diverse California populations has been identified as a strategic goal for

1 the foundation in order to have everyone in California passionate about protecting their State
2 parks. The only way that happens is if people have that park experience, which is where the
3 foundation comes in.

4 Ms. Hill said that the Yosemite Slough restoration project will open up 34 acres of new park land
5 that is not currently accessible. It will also mitigate chemical impacts, expand current wetlands
6 and restore uplands, connect the Bay Trail, and provide greater park access and increased open
7 space. There will also be an opportunity for an interpretive or environmental education center.

8 Ms. Hill noted that Yosemite Slough is located adjacent to the South Basin near Parcel E. The
9 existing slough is essentially being choked off with non-native grasses and sediment, along with
10 about 10 feet of various material and rubble. The restoration project will create three new little
11 bays and provide significant improvement in the habitat by removing the rubble that has
12 historically been dumped there. The tidal wetlands will be expanded by adding 12 acres to make
13 it 21 acres. Nesting islands are part of the project to protect birds from feral species like cats.
14 There will be an extension of the Bay Trail on both sides to connect the trail. There has been a
15 great deal of interest in San Francisco to have that Bay Trail connection. A recreational or
16 natural area is included and that will be a large grassy area. A portion of the soils being removed
17 will be placed in that area to create a hill that will be a great place for picnics and kite flying –
18 also vista viewing points to look into the Slough area. There will also be vista viewing areas
19 where people can walk right up near the edge and look into the slough area.

20 Ms. Hill reviewed the community benefits for the Yosemite Slough restoration. Restoration
21 would cleanup trash and debris as well as chemically-impacted soils to protect people and
22 wildlife from exposure. There will be increased economic activity in the community during
23 construction and beyond. The foundation learned early on that economic benefit, especially jobs,
24 is very important in this community. Consequently, in the process to date, the foundation has
25 worked to hire local contractors and involve the community. Studies from other state parks in
26 California actually prove parks can be an economic driver for the community. Park visitors
27 spend money in the community and statewide have generated a lot of revenue. There will be
28 increased visibility for the neighborhood, educational opportunities, and the project will open up
29 34 acres of new park land. Access and security for the Bay Trail will be improved and the park
30 will be walking distance from the Third Street Rail.

31 Ms. Hill reviewed the environmental benefits for restoration. The project definitely has
32 economic benefits in terms of cleanup of contaminated soil for a healthier San Francisco
33 ecosystem, greatly enhanced habitat for wildlife and to support endangered species, an enhanced
34 recreational area with extended public access to the Candlestick Point Recreational Area, and a
35 clear benefit to the neighborhood.

36 Ms. Hill reviewed the restoration process for Yosemite Slough. The foundation completed the
37 feasibility study in 2002. In 2003 and 2004 there was a lot of community outreach and public
38 meetings were held. Various design opportunities were discussed with the community based on
39 what existed at the slough. A lot of studies were conducted including wave-action analysis, and
40 a lot of borings to study soil contamination. The foundation came up with a preferred
41 alternative, and State Parks filed a CEQA mitigated negative declaration. The 100 percent
42 drawing will be completed in June 2007. The foundation anticipates getting full permits in July
43 2007 from the San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board (Water Board), the Bay
44 Conservation and Development Commission, the Army Corps of Engineers, and the City of San
45 Francisco after much work.

1 Ms. Hill reviewed the CEQA permitting process. The first step is the initial study and that is
2 complete. That is followed by the mitigated negative declaration that is also complete. The
3 biggest step is getting the 401 permit from the Water Board, which is scheduled for completion
4 in July 2007.

5 Ms. Hill explained that the northern section of the slough has been divided into three areas,
6 North Area A to the east, North Area B adjacent, and a west corner. Then there is the South
7 Area.

8 Ms. Hill reviewed the results of the soil and groundwater investigations for Yosemite Slough.
9 Chemicals were found that are typical of fill material in the San Francisco Bay area, primarily
10 metals (arsenic, chromium, lead, and nickel), petroleum hydrocarbons, and polyaromatic
11 hydrocarbons. The good news is that chemicals are not migrating to groundwater.
12 Consequently, soil handling will be a major part of this restoration project. State parks will be
13 doing bioremediation of petroleum hydrocarbon impacted soils on site. An estimated 110,000
14 cubic yards of estimated will be excavated and taken off site. Some of that soil will be returned,
15 but it has to be cleaned to the level of residential use. An estimated 33,000 cubic yards of clean
16 soil will be imported for the public use areas. The Water Board has been very involved in this
17 process and will be monitoring activities during the actual restoration.

18 Ms. Hill reviewed the community outreach the foundation has done for the Yosemite Slough
19 restoration. The foundation has partnered with the Literacy for Environmental Justice on a
20 program to hire youth interns to build a native plant nursery at Candlestick Point. The youth
21 interns have also conducted community outreach and the foundation has taken them to
22 Sacramento to meet with lawmakers. That is just one example of creative collaboration the
23 foundation is looking to form with the community. The foundation has also hosted many public
24 workdays for the restoration project, and the interns have done a terrific job with that.

25 Ms. Hill stated that the first phase of the Yosemite Slough restoration will cost about \$12 million
26 with the overall cost about \$19 to 20 million. The foundation's job is to get that funding together
27 and funding comes from all kinds of sources. There is \$7.5 million committed right now for
28 construction to start, with bioremediation scheduled to start in January 2008. At that point most
29 of the funding for the first phase will be in place with the remaining funding scheduled to be in
30 place by July 2008.

31 Dr. Tompkins stated that in previous meetings with the Navy a few years back, there was
32 dichloro-diphenyl-trichloroethane DDT as a contaminant in that area. DDT has a correlation
33 with breast cancer when inhaled by women, and the African-American women in the Bayview-
34 Hunters Point community have the highest incidence of breast cancer in the world. What level
35 of cleanup is being proposed for DDT? Ms. Hill replied that cleanup levels would be high and
36 have to meet the Water Board's standards as well as requirements from the other regulatory
37 agencies. The foundation invested about 1.5 million dollars just on the design and permitting for
38 the project. Dr. Tompkins asked, as an action item for this meeting, if Ms. Hill could forward
39 him the tables and levels for cleanup of Yosemite Slough. Ms. Pendergrass asked that Ms. Hill
40 please coordinate that action item with Ms. Hunter for distribution to the entire RAB.

41 Jim Ponton, Water Board, explained that the Water Board's tentative order for the Yosemite
42 Slough restoration project, which has the cleanup levels and cleanup strategy, was mailed out to
43 Keith Forman and others on the RAB. It is available on the Water Board website at
44 www.waterboards.ca.gov. Click on Region 2 and the order is listed for review under "Available
45 Documents." Many of the cleanup levels are modeled after wetlands restoration at the Hamilton
46 Air Force Base in Novato, California. Mr. Ponton added that the Water Board is excited about

1 this project because the bio-landscaping and layout for the bird islands is attractive and may be a
2 good template to apply to HPS parcels.

3 **TAG Update**

4 Dr. Tompkins explained that he is the administrator for the TAG, so he is responsible for hours
5 and has to signoff on the contract. If RAB members have materials for the TAG team to review,
6 e-mail those to his attention so that Dr. Tompkins can see if the materials merit TAG review.
7 The TAG contractors have limited funding and a specific contract with the Community First
8 Coalition.

9 Greg Grist, TAG technical advisor, indicated that he and Dr. Peter Palmer have been in the
10 process of reviewing the Parcel E-2 documents and are glad to have an extension.

11 Mr. Grist noted that there are two other issues that are of concern. The first is the Technical
12 Review Subcommittee meeting that was posted for May 3, 2007 at the April 2007 meeting.
13 When he and Dr. Palmer received a breakdown of the upcoming HPS RAB meetings it was no
14 longer listed. It was discovered that the meeting was combined with the MBCO meeting after a
15 request had been made to keep those meetings separate. One of the main purposes of the TAG
16 contract is to review technical documents, and when the meetings are combined there is often
17 only 20 minutes left for technical issues. Then it was heard through the grapevine that the
18 combined meeting had been cancelled and the Technical Review Subcommittee meeting would
19 be folded into the CAC meeting where Mr. Forman was giving a presentation. The concern is
20 that an announcement of a meeting date is made at a public meeting like this RAB meeting, and
21 then the meeting is cancelled and there is no way to let the public know. In addition, there was
22 no Technical Review Subcommittee meeting in May 2007, so there is concern with reviewing
23 documents on one of the most polluted areas of HPS.

24 Mr. Grist explained that the second concern relates to meeting with the Navy RPM for Parcel E-
25 2 to review the finer points of the RI/FS as recommended by Mr. Forman. He and Dr. Palmer
26 have twice made appointments with the RPM with those meetings cancelled at the last minute.
27 He is going to talk to the Navy this evening to set another meeting date with the RPM. These
28 issues do not instill a lot of confidence for the TAG advisors to have a good relationship with the
29 Navy and community.

30 **Subcommittee Reports**

31 **Technical Review Subcommittee**

32 Ms. Bushnell noted that the Technical Review Subcommittee met with the CAC for Mr. Forman
33 and Ms. Kito to provide a presentation on the Parcel E-2 RI/FS. Mr. Forman has already
34 provided a synopsis of that meeting. She was unable to attend due to a conflict with a
35 homeowners meeting. There are no meeting minutes for that meeting.

36 Ms. Bushnell explained that there were some problems getting a place and scheduling the
37 subcommittee meeting, so that is why it was combined with the CAC meeting. Ms. Pendergrass
38 added that these are public meetings and meeting times are announced at the RAB meetings, so
39 there is some concern when meeting times change. She asked Mr. Tisdell, as Community Co-
40 Chair, what the mechanism is for communicating a meeting cancellation or change to the public.
41 Mr. Tisdell replied that the information is directed to Ms. Hunter who notifies people of a
42 meeting change by e-mail or phone. Mr. Forman added that a notification is usually distributed

1 the same day a meeting date is cancelled or changed. Ms. Pendergrass noted that to get timely
2 information people need to be on the distribution list with at least a phone number.

3 **Economic Subcommittee**

4 Mr. Mason noted that there was a good economic subcommittee meeting in May 2007. He has
5 been swamped with work, however, and has not gotten out his report. He will get that out to Ms.
6 Hunter soon.

7 **MBCO Subcommittee**

8 Mr. Tisdell explained that there were a number of community members at the May 2007 MBCO
9 meeting that voiced concerns on dust control at the former Parcel A that could not really be
10 addressed by the RAB. That took up a good deal of the meeting, but business was conducted as
11 usual.

12 **Community Comment Period**

13 Dr. Tompkins stated that he would like to clarify a point about meeting schedules. For setting up
14 special meetings, there should be 24 hours notice prior to the meeting date, and 15 days notice
15 for special meetings. That is listed in Section 3 on Page 1 of the RAB bylaws. A copy of that
16 section is available on the information table this evening. Ms. Pendergrass clarified that RAB
17 subcommittee meetings are not considered special meetings.

18 Mr. Mason stated that someone on the RAB has written something about him that was
19 distributed via e-mail. He noted that he is bringing this up because he thought it was overbearing
20 for someone to distribute an e-mail that's libelous and slanderous. He discussed this with his
21 lawyer today who told him to ask to have his name removed by Monday from any e-mails that
22 are slanderous. He passed around a document to the RAB related to this issue.

23 **RAB Community Co-Chair Nominations**

24 Ms. Pendergrass explained that the RAB Community Co-Chair responsibilities are listed on Page
25 4, Items 14 and 15 of the RAB bylaws as follows: "The Navy and the Community Co-chairs
26 shall preside over all meetings of the RAB. When either co-chair is absent, their alternate –
27 alternates designated by the respective co-chair may lead the RAB meeting. The co-chairs may
28 be or may authorize RAB representatives to attend meetings and hearings for the purpose of
29 representing the RAB. The co-chairs are responsible for preparing and soliciting input for the
30 agenda as well as assuring that the concerns of the community are heard and recorded and that
31 the RAB's comments and/or recommendations are forwarded to the BRAC Cleanup Team and
32 Navy for incorporation within the decision-making process at Hunters Point Shipyard. RAB
33 members who would like to have a topic placed on the upcoming agenda may contact the
34 community co-chair."

35 Ms. Pendergrass stated that it is time for nominations. The process is that a person can self-
36 nominate or nominate someone else. Ms. Hunter will write down the names, and that will create
37 a slate of nominees. Those individuals, if they are present tonight, will then be asked if they
38 accept the nomination. The nominees then have a full month to lobby and then a vote will be
39 held at the June 28, 2007 RAB meeting.

40 Ms. Brown and Gaynorann Siataga, RAB member, nominated Mr. Tisdell. Dr. Tompkins
41 nominated Leon Mohammed, RAB member. Mr. Rao nominated Robert Van Houten, RAB
42 member. All nominees accepted the nomination.

1 Ms. Pendergrass adjourned the meeting at 7:46 p.m.

2 **Reminder: The next RAB meeting will be held from 6:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m., Thursday,**
3 **June 28, 2007, at the Earl P. Mills Auditorium, 100 Whitney Young Circle, San Francisco,**
4 **California 94124.**

5 **PLEASE NOTE THAT THIS IS A CHANGE IN MEETING LOCATION**

ATTACHMENT A
24 May 2007- RAB MEETING
LIST OF ATTENDEES

Name	Association
1. Salem Attiga	Environmental Management Services, Inc.
2. Jeff Austin	Lennar
3. Brian Baltimore	Tetra Tech EMI
4. Doug Bielskis	ERRG
5. Patricia Brown	RAB member, Shipyard Artist
6. Amy Brownell	San Francisco Department of Public Health
7. Aleta Bryant	CAMKAL
8. Barbara Bushnell	RAB member, Resident of the Southeast Sector (ROSES)
9. Cecille Caterson	California State Parks Foundation (CSPF)
10. Michael Cohen	San Francisco Redevelopment Agency
11. Charles Dacus	RAB member, Bayview/Hunters Point Resident
12. Michael Dennis	Resident, MCD Trucking
13. Thomas Dias	Environmental Management Services, Inc.
14. Bill Dougherty	Tetra Tech ECI
15. Larry Frias	RAB member, Waste Solutions Group
16. Doug Gilkey	Navy
17. Gregory Grist	Tech Physics – TAG
18. Steve Hall	Tetra Tech EMI
19. Barbara Hill	California State Parks Foundation
20. Carolyn Hunter	Tetra Tech EMI
21. Melanie Kito	Interim Navy RAB Co-Chair
22. Darren Knight	Navy Remedial Project Manager (RPM)
23. Jackie Ann Lane	U.S. EPA Region IX
24. Tom Lanphar	Department of Toxic Substances Control
25. Laurie Lowman	Navy RASO
26. Steve Martini	18 Trucking
27. Jesse Mason	RAB member, resident
28. Lonnie Mason	First Generation
29. Leon Muhammad	University of Islam, Center for Self Improvement
30. Christine M. Niccoli	Niccoli Reporting, court reporter
31. Marsha Pendergrass	Pendergrass & Associates
32. Jim Ponton	San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board
33. Sudeep Rao	RAB member, Literacy for Environmental Justice
34. Gaynorann Siataga	All Islanders Gathering as One
35. Matthew Slack	Navy RASO
36. Peter Stroganoff	Navy, Resident Officer in Charge of Construction (ROICC) Office
37. Keith Tisdell	RAB member, Resident
38. Raymond Tompkins	RAB member, Community First Coalition
39. Robert Van Houten	RAB member, Morgan Heights Resident
40. Mark Walden	Navy Interim Lead RPM
41. Mira J. Waldman	Lennar
42. Diane Westley-Smith	BVHP Realtors
43. Angela Williams	Barajas & Associates
44. James Williams	Community First Coalition

**ATTACHMENT B
24 May 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 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 June 2007.
New Action Items					
1.	Michael Cohen, San Francisco Redevelopment Agency (SFRA), to provide the RAB with the Conceptual Framework document for the combined project for Candlestick Point and HPS.	Dr. Ray Tompkins RAB Member	June 2007	Mr. Cohen SFRA	This action item was completed.
2.	Barbara Hill, California State Parks Foundation (CSPF), to provide the RAB with information on the chemical cleanup levels set for the Yosemite Slough restoration project.	Dr. Tompkins	June 2007	Ms. Hill CSPF	This action item to be completed during June 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