

HUNTERS POINT SHIPYARD
RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD MEETING MINUTES
28 September 2006

These minutes summarize the discussions and presentations from the Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) meeting held from 6:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m. Thursday, September 28, 2006, 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 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 July 27, 2006 and August 24, 2006 RAB Meetings
- (3) Navy Announcements
- (4) Community Co-Chair Report/Other Announcements
- (5) HPS Radiological Program Update
- (6) The Navy's Latest Treatability Study at Remedial Unit (RU) C-1
- (7) Approval of the Revised RAB Bylaws
- (8) Subcommittee Reports
- (9) Technical Assistance Grant (TAG) Update
- (10) Community Comment Period
- (11) Adjournment

MEETING HANDOUTS:

- Agenda for September 28, 2006, RAB Meeting
- Meeting Minutes from July 27, 2006 and August 24, 2006 RAB Meetings
- Navy Monthly Progress Report, September 28, 2006
- PowerPoint Presentation, Parcel B Radiological Update
- PowerPoint Presentation, Remedial Unit (RU) C1 Treatability Study Update
- Revised and Adopted Bylaws, Hunters Point Shipyard RAB, August 9, 2006
- Community First Coalition (CFC) Technical Assistance Grant (TAG) Work Plan
- Community Notice – Special Community Meeting for the Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC)
- Federal Register, 32 CFR Part 202 – Department of Defense Restoration Advisory Boards
- Excerpt from the Installation Restoration (IR)-02 Work Plan that provides the step-out sampling process

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 July 27, 2006 and August 24, 2006 RAB Meetings**

2 Ms. Pendergrass said that approval of the minutes is needed for the RAB meetings on July 27,
3 2006 and August 24, 2006. The RAB meeting minutes were approved as written with two
4 abstentions, and were accepted into the record.

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

6 **Carry-over Item Number 1:** Keith Forman, HPS Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC)
7 Environmental Coordinator (BEC) to provide an Environmental 101 class on a Saturday once at
8 least 3 new community members join the RAB. The RAB is awaiting a third RAB applicant
9 prior to hosting this class. This action item will be carried over until there are at least 3 new
10 RAB members who need the class.

11 **Carry-over Action Item Number 2:** Navy will provide a presentation on Human Health Risk
12 from Groundwater at HPS for the October 2006 Technical Review Subcommittee Meeting. This
13 action item will be carried over until October 2006.

14 **Carry-over Item Number 3:** Navy will provide Chein Kao, RAB member, and the RAB with
15 the standard protocol for the step-out process for the Parcel B Storm Drain and Sanitary Sewer
16 Removal Action. Mr. Forman indicated that there is a handout available tonight, an excerpt from
17 the IR-02 Work Plan that provides this step-out process. This document will also be e-mailed to
18 all HPS RAB members tomorrow. If there are any questions on this document, please feel free
19 to contact Mr. Forman, Pat Brooks, Navy Lead Remedial Project Manager (RPM), or Laurie
20 Lowman, Radiological Affairs Support Office [RASO]. This action item was completed and
21 will be removed from the table.

22 Mr. Forman reviewed the acronyms from the IR-02 Work Plan handout:

23 TtFW = Tetra Tech/Foster Wheeler
24 RSO = Radiation Safety Officer
25 NWT = New World Technologies
26 RTM = Radiation Technical Manager
27 RCT = Radiation Control Technician

28 Mr. Forman explained that the RCT is the worker out in the field using instruments for the
29 survey during excavation and investigation. New World Technologies is a subcontractor to Tetra
30 Tech Foster Wheeler for this project.

31 **Navy Announcements**

32 Mr. Forman stated that the August 26, 2006 HPS tour was successful with fifty-five attendees,
33 well above what was originally expected. The attendees did not leave the bus, but it did stop at
34 intervals to view sites. The attendees provided a lot of positive feedback after the tour and
35 indicated that they learned a lot about HPS. At some point in 2007, there will be another site
36 tour and that will hopefully provide an opportunity to leave the bus, but the Navy will have to
37 figure out those logistics.

38 Mr. Forman indicated that Keith Tisdell, Community RAB Co-chair, is hard at work at HPS and
39 will not be getting off work until 7:00 p.m. tonight. He will come directly to the RAB Meeting
40 after he gets off work.

41 **Community Comment Period**

42 Robert Van Houten, RAB member, stated that he wanted to thank Mr. Forman and Carolyn
43 Hunter, Tetra Tech EMI, for all their time and effort coordinating the HPS site tour. It was really

1 appreciated by the Morgan Heights Home Owners Association and the surrounding
2 neighborhood. The Navy provided a lot of information and took care of the rumors about HPS
3 during the tour.

4 Jesse Mason, RAB member, said that he wanted to thank New World Technologies for hiring
5 people from the Bayview/Hunters Point community.

6 Patricia Brown, RAB member, announced that Georgia Oliva, a former HPS RAB member
7 passed away from lung cancer the first part of September 2006. Dr. Raymond Tompkins, RAB
8 member, said that the HPS RAB should think positively about people's participation and
9 unfortunately the RAB has lost a member who participated and cared about this community.

10 Amy Brownell, San Francisco Department of Public Health, explained that there is a flyer
11 regarding a CAC meeting as a handout tonight. The meeting is this Saturday, September 30,
12 2006 from 10:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. The first session of the CAC meeting will cover Lennar
13 Corporation and redevelopment. The second session will cover the dust and asbestos control
14 programs on Parcel A. Ms. Brownell indicated that she would be attending the meeting.
15 Attendees will need to be at the meeting by noon for the lunch. She added that Lennar has had
16 difficulties with their asbestos air-monitoring data. As part of the investigation into that issue
17 another irregularity with their dust control program was discovered. As a result, another
18 amendment to the previous Notices of Violation was issued. There have been two Notices of
19 Violation, one from an inspection on July 7, 2006 and one from an inspection on August 9, 2006.
20 The amendment documents that Lennar failed to do something that was required as part of the
21 dust control program.

22 Dr. Tompkins asked that the Economic Subcommittee Report be moved up on the agenda since
23 Mr. Mason is not feeling well and may not be at the meeting later. The Economic Subcommittee
24 Report is listed later in the meeting minutes with the other subcommittee reports.

25 **Community Co-Chair Report**

26 A Community Co-Chair Report was not provided.

27 **HPS Radiological Program Update (Presentation)**

28 Ralph Pearce, Navy RPM, stated that the primary focus for the radiological program is currently
29 Parcel B. The project work scope includes removing impacted sanitary and storm water piping
30 and associated soils from Parcel B, a small portion of Parcel C, and outside Building 813 at
31 Parcel D that was formerly part of Parcel A. The work scope also includes radiological surveys
32 of impacted buildings and areas in Parcel B listed in the 2004 Historical Radiological
33 Assessment (HRA).

34 Mr. Pearce explained that the Navy is working to finish all the Parcel B radiological work as one
35 group. The goal is to get free release for unrestricted reuse from California Department of
36 Health Services (DHS). DHS is the California regulatory agency for radiological issues that
37 reviews the final status surveys for the sewer and storm drain lines and buildings. DHS
38 determines if the standards have been met for the sites to be cleared for unrestricted reuse. There
39 are also ongoing surveys of the keel blocks that are located throughout HPS. The keel blocks are
40 the large blocks that can weigh tons that were used in the dry docks to stabilize the ships. Since
41 they were used in the drydocks, where OPERATION CROSSROADS ships may have been
42 decontaminated, the keel blocks are being surveyed to ensure they are clear of radiological
43 contamination.

1 Mr. Pearce reviewed the radiological work completed as of September 22, 2006. A total of
2 7,215 linear feet (approx. 1.4 miles) of storm and sanitary sewer pipe, and 680 linear feet of
3 undocumented pipe have been excavated. There is approximately five miles of pipe at Parcel B.
4 A total of 10,849 cubic yards of overburden soil and 12,052 cubic yards of peripheral material
5 have been excavated. The overburden soil is the soil that has to be removed to get down to the
6 pipes. The peripheral material is the soil that is within one foot of the pipes.

7 Mr. Pearce provided a summary of the contaminated materials found to date. A total of 553
8 cubic yards of overburden and peripheral soil has been identified as contaminated and that
9 material is immediately loaded into radiological waste disposal bins for disposal out of state.
10 Thirty-seven linear feet of pipe and two catch basins have also been identified as contaminated.
11 The catch basins are like large manways that are used to walk down into a sewer, and include a
12 manhole and all the associated concrete and brick. There is also 39 linear feet of undocumented
13 pipe identified as contaminated. Once the trenches have been surveyed and cleared, they can be
14 backfilled. Backfill has already started in Survey Unit 1 at the far end of Parcel B.

15 Mr. Pearce stated that the Navy met with the artists that are tenants on Parcel B on Wednesday
16 afternoon (September 27, 2006). The artists' Open Studios occurs the last weekend in October
17 2006. The Navy is working six days a week and has committed to having the trenches backfilled
18 in the artist area by October 13, 2006 so there is full access to prepare for the Open Studios
19 event.

20 Mr. Pearce reviewed the radioactive materials identified to date. There are three isotopes,
21 Radium-226, Cesium-137, and Strontium-90 that were identified as isotopes of concern for the
22 sewer removal project and in the HRA. For Radium-226 the highest level in soil or pipe
23 sediment has been 4.220 picocuries per gram (pCi/g) and the release limit for Radium-226 is
24 1.485 pCi/g. While some contamination has been identified, it is not much above the release
25 limit. The highest level of Cesium-137 was found in pipe sediment at 1.393 pCi/g, and the
26 release limit is 0.113 pCi/g. No Strontium-90 has been detected over the release limit of 0.331
27 pCi/g.

28 Mr. Pearce reviewed ongoing Parcel B radiological site work. Work Plans are in preparation for
29 the radiological survey of Dry Docks 5, 6, and 7, berths, the shoreline, and Building 142. The
30 dry docks are the smaller ones at the base used for submarines and ships. The berths are located
31 along the water and are the areas where ships could pull up adjacent to the shore. The surveys
32 are ongoing at Buildings 146 and 157. The survey of Building 813 in Parcel D is complete. The
33 internal draft Survey Reports for Buildings 114, 813, and 819 are complete. Building 819 is the
34 sewer pump station in Parcel D. The keel block surveys are ongoing and there are about 2,000 of
35 the keel blocks located around HPS.

36 Mr. Pearce provided photos of the excavation work for Parcel B. He also provided a photo
37 showing hot tapping of an undocumented pipe. When an undocumented pipe is found, hot
38 tapping or drilling into the pipe is performed to safely access the inside of the pipe to determine
39 if anything is in there. The pipes are usually empty but they can contain fuel oil or some other
40 material. He explained that some of the pipes break as the peripheral soil is excavated, and then
41 the pipe is removed and scanned with the peripheral soil. In cases where pipes are intact,
42 sediment inside the pipe is removed and swipe samples are collected to look for contamination.

43 Mr. Pearce explained that soil is taken to the radiological screening area that is located in IR-07
44 and IR-18. It is a large area where soil is spread out to a 6-inch depth for radiological surveys.
45 Soil samples are also collected for radiological screening. Once the soil is cleared radiologically,
46 it is moved off the screening area to the soil stockpile area. Soil from an IR site is moved to a

1 stockpile area where it is sampled for chemical analysis, and it takes about two weeks to get the
2 samples results back.

3 Mr. Pearce said that when any radiologically-contaminated soil is found it is put into a 14-cubic-
4 yard waste bin. The waste bins have sealed metal lids on top for transportation out of state for
5 disposal of radiological materials. When a truck is loaded with soil and leaves the excavation
6 area to be transported to the screening area, the truck is scanned to ensure that no radiological
7 contamination is tracked or spread from that site. Trucks with a green square on the front
8 bumper are carrying overburden soil and trucks with red squares are carrying peripheral material.
9 Over one million gallons of water are used a month for dust control efforts at Parcel B.

10 Mr. Pearce showed a photo of the first backfilled trench at Survey Unit 1. Once the surveys are
11 complete in the trench and there is approval from RASO for the radiological clearance, then the
12 trench can be backfilled. Once backfilling is completed in certain areas, swales will be built so
13 that stormwater will drain to the Bay.

14 Dr. Tompkins asked what the radiologically-contaminated products were originally associated
15 with or used for and what would be the health risk factors to the population. Mr. Pearce
16 responded that radium was typically used in glow in the dark paint for dials and instruments on
17 ships so they could be seen if power went out. Cesium and strontium were associated with
18 atomic weapons testing. Dr. Tompkins asked if the cesium and strontium were byproducts of
19 decontaminating the ships. Ms. Lowman replied that the product in the storm drains and sewers
20 was from decontamination of ships returning from OPERATION CROSSROADS. There was
21 Radium in the device storage and turn-in buildings. Those devices were often washed off and
22 Radium could get into the pipes. The risk levels associated with these contaminant levels is in
23 the 10^{-5} to 10^{-6} range, which is a 1 in 1 million cancer risk and that is very low.

24 Dr. Tompkins stated that he was out at Dago Mary's and saw trucks going off the shipyard that
25 had the hazardous materials plaques. The trucks were carrying dirt and were covered, but the
26 trucks were dirty and there was dust on the street as the trucks were going by. The upper half of
27 the hazardous materials plaque was striped red and the bottom half was white. Mr. Brooks
28 responded that if it was a truck carrying soil excavated by the Navy it was brushed down before
29 it left the Navy areas. The wheels and horizontal surfaces and anywhere dirt would spill while it
30 was being loaded are brushed with a broom or stiff brush, not washed with liquid.

31 Ms. Brownell indicated that the only comment she has on the Lennar activities is that Lennar has
32 mentioned previously that there should not be any trucks leaving HPS from Parcel A. Lennar is
33 only moving material from hillside to hillside around Parcel A at the moment. If there was a
34 truck full of dirt there is no reason for it to be coming from Parcel A. Dr. Tompkins responded
35 that the trucks need to be cleaned better, whether it is a Navy or Lennar truck. The trucks could
36 be inspected to address the dust issue for public safety. Mr. Brooks agreed to provide the RAB a
37 presentation on the Navy's method of cleaning the trucks before they leave HPS.

38 Approval of the Revised RAB Bylaws

39 Ms. Pendergrass suggested that the RAB move on to approval of the Revised RAB Bylaws. Mr.
40 Forman responded that Mr. Tisdell wanted to be at the meeting for this item since he is one of
41 the leaders on revising the RAB Bylaws.

42 Ms. Pendergrass asked if the RAB members have had a chance to review the Revised RAB
43 Bylaws. Dr. Tompkins stated that he wants to discuss with the general RAB where there was a
44 tie vote on a revision to the RAB Bylaws and voice his opinion before the vote. Ms. Pendergrass
45 replied that any discussion of revision would need to be discussed at the Membership, Bylaws,

1 and Community Outreach (MBCO) subcommittee meeting. Dr. Tompkins said that there was a
2 tie vote and there was an impression that the revision would be discussed before the general
3 RAB before a vote. In addition, the MBCO did not meet in September 2006.

4 Ms. Pendergrass stated that this issue is keeping the Revised RAB Bylaws from moving forward,
5 Dr. Tompkins suggested deferring the vote on the Bylaws until the October 2006 RAB meeting.
6 Mr. Forman noted that there is only one change being considered tonight, a change in Section 8
7 regarding RAB members designating an alternate to attend in his or her place. That change came
8 from the subcommittee and there was a tie vote. Ms. Pendergrass stated that there would then
9 need to be group discussion on the intent of having this revision to the RAB Bylaws.

10 Mr. Van Houten stated that he believes there were some RAB members who felt that an alternate
11 was not necessary because RAB members should be attending the meetings. In addition, he said
12 that he has a problem with an alternate having full voting ability. Ms. Pendergrass said that if
13 she was a member of ROSES and was briefing people on the HPS RAB, then why not have
14 someone representing that group present for an important vote. Mr. Forman added that Mr.
15 Tisdell authored this change is not here at the moment. Ms. Pendergrass stated that if this text
16 was deleted, there would be no distinction between excused and unexcused RAB absences. Mr.
17 Forman recommended that the RAB vote on this change to the RAB Bylaws this evening.

18 Ms. Pendergrass noted that looking at Number 5 in Section 8, it still has text regarding an
19 alternate. Dr. Tompkins pointed out that the text marked for deletion in the second paragraph of
20 Section 8 is in contradiction to the text in Number 5. He motioned to vote on the RAB Bylaws
21 as they stand now. Mr. Van Houten seconded the motion. The RAB Bylaws were accepted as
22 revised (with the recommended deletion of text from Section 8) with one abstention.

23 **RU C1 Treatability Study Update (Presentation)**

24 Mr. Brooks explained that this presentation is an update on the Treatability Study the Navy plans
25 to perform at RU-C1. This would be the sixth in the series of groundwater treatability studies at
26 HPS. There are other treatability studies for soil and soil vapor extraction that are being
27 conducted by the Navy. Stanford University is conducting a sediment study in the South Basin.
28 The presentation will review the background, description of the technology, the objectives, and
29 the approach that will be used for the treatability study at RU-C1.

30 Mr. Brooks stated that the remedial investigation identified contamination in both the soil and
31 groundwater at RU-C1. The contamination extends under Buildings 253, 211, and 231. The
32 contaminants are mostly volatile organic compounds (VOCs), used as solvents, and petroleum
33 products. Solvents were used by the Navy to clean parts. When the parts were cleaned of oil and
34 grease with the solvents, these products were sometimes released as contamination. The sources
35 of the contamination include the sumps where a floor was washed down into the sump. There
36 were also degreasing pits and dip tanks where parts were dipped to remove grease. Solvent tanks
37 and piping were also sources of contamination.

38 Mr. Brooks indicated that the treatability study area is in the corner of Building 253. The
39 groundwater moves from higher groundwater elevation to lower elevations, which is usually
40 towards the Bay. In this area there is a gentle groundwater gradient.

41 Mr. Brooks explained that the treatability study treatment process destroys contamination using
42 native microorganisms. There is already bioremediation occurring slowly because groundwater
43 samples show breakdown of products (ethene, ethane, and vinyl chloride) at low levels. This
44 process will be enhanced by feeding the microorganisms with nutrients that help build up the
45 population. The nutrients are then cut off and the microorganisms have to start feeding on the

1 contamination and break it down. Bioremediation is a widely used and effective cleanup
2 technology. It has already been successfully tested at RU-C5, but is greatly dependent on site
3 conditions, both the contaminant characteristics and the site geology.

4 Mr. Brooks said that the treatability study would begin with a sodium lactate injection to increase
5 the microorganism population. The injection should speed up the destruction of the
6 contamination. The objectives of the study include testing how effective the nutrient injection is
7 in reducing contamination levels. Objectives also include minimizing the spread of
8 contamination due to the injection process. The cost, effectiveness and implementability of the
9 injection process will then be evaluated to help select future groundwater remedies.

10 Mr. Brooks reviewed the treatability study approach. The approach includes establishing
11 circulation using three injection wells and one extraction well. The extraction well brings
12 groundwater out of the ground where it is mixed with sodium lactate. The groundwater is then
13 injected back to the ground in three injection wells that surround the extraction well. This
14 process continues until the nutrients are evenly distributed throughout the treatment area. The
15 groundwater is then extensively monitored to make sure the nutrients are evenly distributed, that
16 contamination is not spreading, and to monitor the decrease in the contaminants in the
17 groundwater. There are four existing groundwater monitoring wells to monitor the treatment
18 area and there will be four new wells installed. A sodium bromide tracer will be injected with
19 the lactate to help monitor where the nutrients are and ensure that contamination is not spread
20 outside the treatment area.

21 Mr. Brooks indicated that the Navy planned for a flow of three gallons a minute from the
22 extraction well. After the nutrients are added, the groundwater would be divided equally so that
23 one gallon a minute would be injected in the three injection wells. This process will continue for
24 two weeks, which is how long it should take to get an even distribution of nutrients in the
25 treatment area. The process would then be turned off to allow the nutrients dissipate the
26 microorganisms start breaking down the contamination.

27 Mr. Brooks explained that the treatability study would use a phased implementation. Phase 1
28 will be the sodium lactate injection. At RU-C5 this was the only phase necessary to address
29 contamination. If this is not all that is needed at RU-C1, then Phase 2 will be nitrate injection.
30 Nitrate functions similar to oxygen and is easier to distribute to the subsurface than oxygen. If
31 needed, Phase 3 will be oxygen injection, which would continue for 30 days. The oxygen would
32 work to breakdown fuel products and one of the last breakdown products, vinyl chloride.

33 Mr. Brooks indicated that the Work Plan for the Treatability Study Approach is scheduled to be
34 issued on October 8, 2006. The new monitoring wells are scheduled for installation in mid
35 October, 2006. After the new wells are installed the system will be setup with testing of the
36 injection apparatus and mixing tanks. The Phase 1 lactate injection will then start and continue
37 for about 180 days until about April 2007. There will be two weeks of injection followed by two
38 months with no injection. Then there will be two more weeks of injection followed by three
39 months where the microorganisms will break down the contamination. If necessary the Phase 2
40 nitrate injection will follow with two weeks of injection followed by a two-month resting period,
41 and two more weeks of injection followed by two weeks where the microorganism break down
42 the contamination. Then the Phase 3 oxygen injection will take place if necessary with 30 days
43 of extracting groundwater, adding oxygen, and injecting the groundwater back into the ground.

44 Mr. Brooks stated that after Phase 3 is complete, there would be a large amount of data collected.
45 That data will be evaluated and put in a report that summarizes the studies findings, conclusions,
46 and recommendations

1 Mr. Tisdell asked if during circulation all three of the injection wells would be used at the same
2 time. Mr. Brooks replied that the three injection wells would be used at the same time. The
3 system is designed so that the central extraction well can capture all the water from the injection
4 wells.

5 Dr. Tompkins asked how many gallons of groundwater would be treated in this RU-C1
6 treatability study. Mr. Brooks responded that there is a total of four weeks of extraction so 28
7 days times 1,440 minutes per day at 3 gallons a minute would give an approximate total
8 (calculated later – 110, 960 gallons).

9 Dr. Tompkins noted that there was a problem with the treatability study at Parcel B due to the
10 landfill and asked what is the difference at RU-C1 in terms of site characterization. Mr. Brooks
11 replied that there is some fill material at RU-C1, but there are already breakdown products in the
12 groundwater, which indicates bioremediation is occurring. As a result, there should not be the
13 same issues with delayed treatment as with the zero-valent iron injection at Parcel B. Even
14 though the treatment was delayed at Parcel B, it was still much faster than with pump and treat
15 technology.

16 Dr. Tompkins asked if there are any projections of how much vinyl chloride would be present
17 during treatment and what would be acceptable residual levels. Mr. Brooks replied that the
18 acceptable residual levels for vinyl chloride are very low in the single digit parts per billion
19 (ppb). There will be a gradual breakdown to vinyl chloride and then to ethane and ethane, which
20 are harmless. The data will have to be examined to see how fast the contaminants are going to
21 break down. Vinyl chloride is a major concern and it sometimes needs additional treatment with
22 nitrate or oxygen to break down. Dr. Tompkins asked how many pounds of vinyl chloride would
23 be in the groundwater. Mr. Brooks responded that the greatest fraction of contamination is
24 usually in the soil, but when talking about 500 parts per billion of contamination in water, if
25 there are a billion pounds of water there are 500 pounds of contaminants. Across all of RU-C1,
26 there would probably be less than two to three pounds of contaminant, but that estimate should
27 be checked.

28 Charles Dacus, RAB member, asked if there are already groundwater monitoring wells at RU-
29 C1. Mr. Brooks said that the area is a known source of contamination and groundwater is
30 monitored quarterly. There are already monitoring wells in this area. Additional monitoring
31 wells will be added to be sure contamination is not spreading and to track the reduction of
32 contaminants.

33 **Subcommittee Reports**

34 **Economic Subcommittee**

35 Mr. Mason stated that the Economic Subcommittee Meeting started with a review of the
36 Conveyance Agreement the City and community has with the Navy and Lennar. Preference for
37 local community contractors was discussed, because the community is clearly not involved with
38 any of the work at HPS. Out-of-town contractors are bidding on work and eliminating the
39 community's participation. He said that he wrote a portion of the Conveyance Agreement into
40 his Economic Subcommittee report that covers local community business preference as first
41 choice for work at HPS. The section discusses a 25 percent referendum on bidding and the small
42 business community contractors need that percentage.

43 Mr. Mason reviewed a situation a couple of years ago where two contractor bid on a project with
44 TPCKY. The contractor that won the contract had the same score as a local community
45 contractor Jimmie Potts. Based on the Conveyance Agreement and community preference, Mr.

1 Potts should have gotten that contract. He added that his Economic Subcommittee Report speaks
2 for itself.

3 **MBCO Subcommittee**

4 Mr. Tisdell indicated that there was not an MBCO meeting in September 2006 because there
5 were no issues for the subcommittee to address. The next meeting is scheduled for October 19,
6 2006 in conjunction with the Technical Review Subcommittee meeting. There is a new RAB
7 Member application to be reviewed. He encouraged RAB members to join him at the meeting.

8 Ms. Pendergrass asked how the farmers' market community outreach booth worked out. Mr.
9 Forman replied that it was an interesting experience, but did not have the level of foot traffic as
10 hoped. The Navy spoke to about five people during the four hours spent at the market. He
11 thanked Jim Ponton, San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board, for attending the
12 farmers market. It was nice to have a regulator present with the Navy. He also thanked Mr.
13 Tisdell and Jackie Lane, Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), for being there. He thanked
14 Ms. Hunter for doing much of the legwork for this event. Mr. Forman explained that RAB
15 applications were passed out and the farmers' market was a good experience. The Navy will be
16 looking for a better location with more foot traffic for a similar event in 2007. Ms. Hunter is
17 working on that.

18 **Technical Review Subcommittee**

19 Dr. Tompkins stated that he has to make the regrettable announcement that Mr. Kao is stepping
20 down from the HPS RAB because his wife has cancer. They will be going to Dallas, Texas for
21 treatment, and that is where her family is. His heart will still be with the HPS RAB.

22 Dr. Tompkins noted that the subcommittee chair was not at the meeting. The meeting intent was
23 to get other opinions on the Navy's Parcel B Technical Memorandum in Support of a Record of
24 Decision (ROD) Amendment (TMSRA). It was a very constructive exchange of ideas and the
25 Navy took notes. Tom Lanphar, Department of Toxic Substances Control, was at the meeting
26 and he shared his opinions.

27 Mr. Brooks added that it was a good meeting with Mr. Kao and Dr. Tompkins. Mr. Kao's
28 comments were reviewed including the need for clarification on why the ROD Amendment is
29 necessary. The Navy agreed to add a subsection covering the Navy's position on why the Parcel
30 B ROD needs to be amended.

31 Mr. Brooks stated that specifics of the risk assessment were also reviewed and it was pointed out
32 that the major risk driver at Parcel B is arsenic that comes from the serpetinite rock. That does
33 not discount the fact that the Navy did have spills and releases at Parcel B from Navy activities.
34 Contaminants from spills and releases include chlorinated solvents, petroleum products,
35 pesticides, and polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs). The risk from spills and releases is dwarfed
36 by about 100 times by the arsenic at the site. The Navy will excavate to remove contaminants
37 from spills and releases to the best extent possible. The Navy is proposing to block the exposure
38 pathway to the soil. This would effectively address the arsenic present in soil. The remedy that
39 is presented in the draft TMSRA is to turn over the property to the City with complete coverage
40 of the property and that would generally be an asphalt cover. As redevelopment takes place, the
41 developer would be responsible to install a cover that meets the same engineering guidelines.
42 There would be deed restrictions that would require that the cover be replaced after any
43 excavation. There would be notification of this restriction.

44 Mr. Brooks noted that in the past he has discussed a study that looked at metals in soil samples
45 collected from three areas in San Francisco to put in perspective the contamination being dealt

1 with at HPS. Samples were taken at Innes Avenue, Twin Peaks, and O-Shaughnessy, and there
2 were the same metals present in those samples as exist at HPS because the serpentine rock exists
3 all over the City.

4 Dr. Tompkins said that he hoped to contact Mr. Lanphar to have him voice his concerns on the
5 Parcel B TMSRA. Ms. Pendergrass clarified that issues are discussed in detail at the Technical
6 Subcommittee meeting. Highlights of what is discussed are provided at the RAB meeting, and
7 recommendations of further discussion or a presentation to the full RAB can be evaluated.

8 **TAG Update**

9 Dr. Tompkins stated that there is a handout tonight called the CFC Work Plan that outlines the
10 criteria for the TAG recipient to follow. There is also an advertisement in the Bayview
11 newspaper for the TAG. On the back page of the handout there is a list of criteria with a
12 weighted rate scale for evaluating proposals for the grant. If RAB members know anyone who
13 would qualify for the TAG, the CFC would be happy to entertain their proposal. The CFC
14 deadline to receive proposals is October 20, 2006 at 5:00 p.m.

15 Ms. Pendergrass asked about the CFC's outreach strategy to the community for soliciting
16 proposals. Dr. Tompkins replied that there is an advertisement in the Bayview newspaper, there
17 will be an announcement on KPOO radio, and RAB members can notify prospective applicants
18 by word-of-mouth. He added that he is paying for the advertisements out of his pocket. In
19 response to a question from Ms. Pendergrass he indicated that he has also contacted the local
20 colleges including San Francisco State University to inform them of the grant.

21 Dr. Tompkins stated that he would like to make a motion to provide an update on the TAG grant
22 as part of the agenda for each HPS RAB meeting. Then, once someone is employed under the
23 grant, the monthly update will be from them as part of their TAG requirements. Ms.
24 Pendergrass asked if that update should be part of the Technical Subcommittee Report. Dr.
25 Tompkins responded that the TAG update should be separate since it will be part of the TAG
26 contract. The TAG person will also provide presentations on technical reports in layman's terms
27 for the RAB. Ms. Lane indicated that she would like the TAG updates to be separate because
28 community outreach is part of the TAG contractors responsibility under their contract. The TAG
29 contractor is required to let the RAB members know exactly what they are doing with the grant.
30 Mr. Van Houten stated that he would like to see the TAG update as a separate item on the agenda
31 and seconded the motion. Mr. Forman indicated that the Navy is agreeable to allotting five
32 minutes on the HPS RAB agenda for this update. The vote was unanimous to accept the new
33 agenda item, and it will be added to the October 2006 RAB agenda.

34 Ms. Pendergrass asked that the HPS RAB take a moment to honor and remember Georgia Olivia
35 this evening.

36 Ms. Pendergrass adjourned the meeting at 8:04 p.m.

37 **Reminder: The next RAB meeting will be held from 6:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m., Thursday,**
38 **October 26, 2006, at the Southeast Community Commission Facility, Alex Pitcher Jr.**
39 **Room, 1800 Oakdale Avenue, San Francisco, California 94124.**

**ATTACHMENT A
28 SEPTEMBER 2006 - RAB MEETING
LIST OF ATTENDEES**

Name	Association
1. Pat Brooks	Navy Lead Remedial Project Manager (RPM)
2. Patricia Brown	RAB member, Shipyard Artist
3. Amy Brownell	San Francisco Department of Public Health
4. Charles Dacus	RAB member
5. Thomas Dias	EMS
6. Bill Dougherty	Tetra Tech EC
7. Keith Forman	Navy RAB Co-chair
8. Steve Hall	Tetra Tech EMI
9. Earl Hampton	Interested Party
10. Fatima Holmes	Young Community Developers (YCD)
11. Carolyn Hunter	Tetra Tech EMI
12. Jaqueline Ann Lane	U.S. EPA Region IX
13. Laurie Lowman	Navy RASO
14. Jesse Mason	RAB member, Resident
15. Christine M. Niccoli	Niccoli Reporting, court reporter
16. Ralph Pearce	Navy RPM
17. Marsha Pendergrass	Pendergrass & Associates
18. Jim Ponton	San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board
19. Harrell Powell	Community Resident
20. Matt Slack	Navy RASO
21. Peter Stroganoff	Navy, Resident Officer in Charge of Construction (ROICC) Office
22. Keith Tisdell	RAB member, Resident
23. Raymond Tompkins	RAB member, Bayview-Hunters Point Health and the Environment
24. Robert Van Houten	RAB member, Morgan Heights Resident
25. Angela Williams	Barajas & Associates
26. Michael Work	U.S. EPA Region IX

**ATTACHMENT B
28 SEPTEMBER 2006 – RAB MEETING
ACTION ITEMS**

Item No.	Action Item	Person Authoring the Action Item	Due Date	Person/Agency Committing to Action Item	Resolution Status
Carry-Over Items					
1.	The Navy will schedule a HPS Environmental 101 class on a Saturday once at least 3 new community members join the RAB.	Keith Forman Navy RAB Co-Chair	N/A	Mr. Forman	This action item will be tabled until there are at least 3 new RAB members who need the class.
2.	The Navy will provide a presentation on Human Health Risk from Groundwater at HPS for the October 2006 Technical Review Subcommittee Meeting.	Dr. Ray Tompkins RAB Member	October 2006	Pat Brooks Navy Lead RPM	This action item will be completed at the October 2006 Technical Review Subcommittee Meeting.
New Action Items					
1.	The Navy will provide information on the Navy's method for cleaning trucks before they leave the shipyard.	Mr. Brooks	October 2006	Mr. Brooks	This action item will be completed at the October 2006 RAB Meeting.

April 11, 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 September 28, 2006 Restoration Advisory Board Meeting Minutes
- Final September 28, 2006 Restoration Advisory Board Meeting Transcript
- Final October 26, 2006 Restoration Advisory Board Meeting Minutes
- Final October 26, 2006 Restoration Advisory Board Meeting Transcript
- Final December 7, 2006 Restoration Advisory Board Meeting Minutes
- Final December 7, 2006 Restoration Advisory Board Meeting Transcript
- Final January 25, 2007 Restoration Advisory Board Meeting Minutes
- Final January 25, 2007 Restoration Advisory Board Meeting Transcript
- Final February 22, 2007 Restoration Advisory Board Meeting Minutes
- Final February 22, 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,



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