

1 **HUNTERS POINT SHIPYARD**  
2 **RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD MEETING MINUTES**  
3 **25 JANUARY 2007**

4 These minutes summarize the discussions and presentations from the Restoration Advisory  
5 Board (RAB) meeting held from 6:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m. Thursday, January 25, 2007, in the Earl  
6 P. Mills Auditorium. A verbatim transcript was also prepared for the meeting and is available in  
7 the information repository for Hunters Point Shipyard (HPS) and on the Internet at  
8 <http://www.navybracpmo.org/bracbases/california/hps/default.aspx>. The list of agenda topics is  
9 provided below. Attachment A provides a list of attendees. Attachment B includes action items  
10 that were requested or committed to by RAB members during the meeting.

11 **AGENDA TOPICS:**

- 12 (1) Welcome/Introductions/Agenda Review  
13 (2) Approval of Meeting Minutes from the December 7, 2006 RAB Meetings  
14 (3) Navy Announcements  
15 (4) Community Co-Chair Report/Other Announcements  
16 (5) 2007 HPS Radiological Program Update  
17 (6) HPS Stormwater Management Program  
18 (7) Technical Assistance Grant (TAG) Update  
19 (8) Subcommittee Reports  
20 (9) Community Comment Period  
21 (10) Adjournment

22 **MEETING HANDOUTS:**

- 23 • Agenda for January 25, 2007, RAB Meeting  
24 • Meeting Minutes from the December 7, 2006 RAB Meeting  
25 • Navy Monthly Progress Report, January 25, 2007  
26 • PowerPoint Presentation, 2007 HPS Radiological Program Update  
27 • PowerPoint Presentation, HPS Stormwater Management Program  
28 • Economic Subcommittee Meeting Minutes from December 6, 2006

29 **Welcome/Introductions/Agenda Review**

30 Marsha Pendergrass, facilitator, called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. Ms. Pendergrass  
31 welcomed everyone to the meeting. All attendees introduced themselves and the organization  
32 they represent. She confirmed that there was a quorum of community RAB members present to  
33 conduct business at the meeting.

34 **Approval of Minutes from the December 7, 2006 RAB Meetings**

35 Ms. Pendergrass said that approval of the minutes is needed for the RAB meeting on December  
36 7, 2006. Barbara Bushnell, RAB member, provided a revision to page 3, line 24. The sentence  
37 should read, "As a result, arsenic would not be a concern related to clotting disorders, but  
38 problems with asbestos would be associated with breathing problems." The RAB meeting  
39 minutes were approved with the revision with one abstention, and were accepted into the record.

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

2 **Carry-over Item Number 1:** Keith Forman, HPS Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC)  
3 Environmental Coordinator (BEC) to provide an Environmental 101 class on a Saturday once at  
4 least 3 new community members join the RAB. Mr. Forman noted that he and Keith Tisdell,  
5 Community RAB Co-chair, have been discussing this class and are working on an acceptable  
6 date for the class. This action item will be carried over until February 2007.

7 **Carry-over Item Number 2:** Robert Van Houten, RAB Member, to compose a letter from the  
8 HPS RAB requesting strict compliance for dust control at the former Parcel A area. Mr. Tisdell  
9 will sign the letter and forward it to the San Francisco Department of Public Health. Mr. Tisdell  
10 indicated that he has sent the letter to Amy Brownell, San Francisco Department of Public  
11 Health, who is preparing a response. Mr. Forman indicated that the letter would be distributed to  
12 the HPS RAB as well. In response to a question from Mr. Van Houten, Ms. Pendergrass  
13 explained that a letter that has already been approved by a RAB motion does not need to go  
14 through RAB approval again. This action item was completed and will be removed from the  
15 table.

16 **Carry-over Item Number 3:** Dr. Ray Tompkins, RAB Member, to compose a letter from the  
17 HPS RAB to the City of San Francisco requesting that Innes Avenue be cleaned regularly to  
18 protect residents from dust. The letter will also be provided to Lennar and the HPS RAB. Dr.  
19 Tompkins indicated that his computer has been out for repair so he was unable to complete this  
20 action item. This action item will be carried over until February 2007.

21 **New Action Item Number 1:** The Navy will provide Dr. Tompkins with information on the  
22 area of land on Parcel B that one million gallons of water covered for dust control for  
23 comparison with the volume of water Lennar is using for dust control. Mr. Forman stated that  
24 Tetra Tech ECI has three 2,000-gallon water trucks on site for dust control. During construction  
25 or other activities that might create dust, each truck refills once per hour. The typical working  
26 day for HPS contractors is 10 hours, and the approximate water usage is 48,000 gallons a day.  
27 For a six day work week 288,000 gallons of water are used, and that covers approximately 217  
28 acres at the maximum.

29 Dr. Tompkins stated that he has additional issues to be addressed within this action item, so he  
30 would like it to be carried over. Mr. Forman responded that the information provided completes  
31 this action item. Dr. Tompkins can review the information and request a new action item if he  
32 would like the Navy to provide additional information. This action item was completed and will  
33 be removed from the table.

34 **New Action Item Number 2:** Ms. Brownell to provide Dr. Tompkins with the Site Evaluation  
35 Report for the Parcel A transfer that was prepared by Lennar. Ms. Brownell responded that she  
36 recalls sending the report several weeks ago, but she will verify that the report was sent and  
37 resend it if necessary. Dr. Tompkins asked that the report also be forwarded to Dr. Peter Palmer  
38 the new TAG advisor. This action item was completed and will be removed from the table.

39 **New Action Item Number 3:** Michael Work, Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), to  
40 provide Dr. Tompkins with the EPA guidance on recommended risk assessment formulas for  
41 Parcel A. Mr. Forman noted that Mr. Work is not at the RAB meeting this evening, but he did  
42 send out a widely distributed e-mail with this information. Dr. Tompkins indicated that his  
43 computer has been down and asked that the e-mail be resent as he did not receive it. He asked  
44 that the information also be forwarded to Dr. Palmer and that his e-mail address be added to the  
45 HPS RAB distribution list. This action item was completed and will be removed from the table.

1 Mr. Forman stated that Melanie Kito, Navy Remedial Project Manager (RPM), has Dr. Palmer's  
2 card with his e-mail address. Ms. Bushnell asked that as chair of the Technical Review  
3 Subcommittee, she be copied on all these reports and information sent to Dr. Palmer. Ms.  
4 Pendergrass added that all documents and information should be provided to the entire HPS  
5 RAB, and RAB members can delete anything that they are not interested in. The RAB members  
6 agreed that they would prefer to receive all correspondence via e-mail.

### 7 **Navy Announcements**

8 Mr. Forman stated that the RAB is being held here in the Earl P. Mills Auditorium this evening,  
9 and will also be held here on February 22, and April 26, 2007. The March 22, 2007 RAB  
10 meeting will be in the Alex L. Pitcher, Jr. Room at the Southeast Community Facility. He asked  
11 the RAB to provide input if anyone can recommend a better place to hold the RAB meetings.

12 Mr. Forman said that he hopes RAB members read the HPS Navy Monthly Progress Report that  
13 provides the status of various projects at the shipyard.

14 Mr. Forman noted that a thank you is in order for Ms. Kito who has been the Interim Lead RPM  
15 for HPS since December 11, 2006. She has done a great job during her tenure. Ralph Pearce,  
16 Navy RPM, will be taking over as the Interim Lead RPM for six weeks starting close of business  
17 tomorrow, January 26, 2007. The Lead RPM position for HPS will continue to rotate between  
18 the RPMs every six weeks until the Navy fills the position permanently.

19 Mr. Forman explained that the Navy is requesting that RAB members expand the exposure and  
20 awareness of the HPS program to other parts of the community, particularly the Asian-American  
21 community. The HPS RAB can help the Navy reach other areas of the community and increase  
22 the diversity represented on the RAB. In February 2007, he and Carolyn Hunter, Tetra Tech  
23 EMI, will be investigating new opportunities for HPS community outreach and the Navy is open  
24 to all suggestions.

### 25 **Community Co-Chair Report/Other Announcements**

26 Mr. Tisdell indicated that there are some community concerns that he will review during the  
27 Membership Bylaws and Community Outreach (MBCO) subcommittee report later this evening.

### 28 **2007 HPS Radiological Program Update (Presentation)**

29 Laurie Lowman, Navy Radiological Affairs Support Office (RASO), stated that this presentation  
30 will review the current work status to complete the Parcel E Time Critical Removal Actions  
31 (TCRAs), the Parcel B sewer removal project, and the radiological surveys. The presentation  
32 will also review the work planned through fiscal year (FY) 2007 for Parcel E TCRA projects  
33 reports, the sewer removal project, and radiological surveys.

34 Ms. Lowman explained that the Navy is finishing removal activities at the Parcel E TCRA sites.  
35 Debris removal and radiological scanning was conducted at the sites, but deeper removal work  
36 was not conducted so the sites are not ready for radiological release.

37 Ms. Lowman stated that at the Metal Debris Reef (MDR) and Metal Slag Area (MSA), located  
38 on the south end of Parcel E, all work was completed in November/December 2006. The draft  
39 construction report is scheduled for submittal in March 2007 and will cover the activities  
40 completed and the material found at the two sites. The MDR and MSA had previously been burn  
41 areas with large quantities of molten metal slag and miscellaneous junk. Mr. Forman noted that  
42 the MDR and MSA are success stories for the Navy. When someone asks what has been done at

1 HPS the community can be told about the work completed at these two sites. Now that removal  
2 work is complete, a lot of wildlife has returned to the MDR and MSA. The sites are not only  
3 beautiful now, but there also appears to be a healthy ecosystem.

4 Ms. Lowman stated that work at IR-02 is ongoing and backfill activities are expected to be  
5 complete in approximately two weeks. Material was removed down to 15 feet below ground  
6 surface (bgs), and large quantities of contaminated soil and thousands of radiological devices  
7 have been shipped off-site for disposal. Site restoration work (grading and hydroseeding) will  
8 follow, and the draft construction report is scheduled for submittal in June 2007. There are still  
9 some contamination hot spots at IR-02 to be addressed in the future.

10 Ms. Lowman indicated that work at the PCB Hot Spot was completed in November/December  
11 2006. The draft construction report is currently being reviewed by Matt Slack, RASO, and is  
12 scheduled for submittal to the agencies in March 2007. This site is also a success story for the  
13 Navy, and is now beautiful and inhabited by geese.

14 Ms. Lowman explained that current radiological work at Parcel B includes surveys of keel  
15 blocks, and Buildings 142 and 157. A total of 986 keel block surveys have been completed.  
16 Keel block surveys have been suspended, however, until spring 2007 because inclement weather  
17 was expected in January but has not materialized. There are about 2,200 more keel blocks to be  
18 surveyed.

19 Ms. Lowman stated that Building 142 was a former bomb shelter where samples from Operation  
20 Crossroads were stored. A second concrete pad was discovered underneath the top foundation.  
21 That pad will be removed and additional radiological surveys conducted to ensure all  
22 contamination has been addressed.

23 Ms. Lowman said that Building 157 was a former non-destructive testing facility that used  
24 radioactive material. The building was a metal shell, and the building and concrete pad have  
25 been surveyed and removed. Low levels of cesium contamination were found where the  
26 concrete pad was removed. The site is being remediated and step-out surveys will be conducted  
27 from the former concrete pad location to ensure all contamination is addressed.

28 Ms. Lowman reviewed pending radiological surveys at Parcel B. Buildings 146, 113, 113A,  
29 130, 142, and the discharge tunnel have pending radiological surveys. Building 142 is a pump  
30 building that was used to empty the dry docks, and inside the building the tile work is  
31 remarkable. A survey is also pending for Building 133 that is an artists building. That survey  
32 will take place once a suitable building for the artists to move to is found. Drydocks 5, 6, and 7  
33 with discharge piping are also scheduled for radiological surveys in FY 2007 if there is extra  
34 time at the end of the year.

35 Ms. Lowman explained that 70 percent of the Parcel B storm drain and sanitary sewer removal  
36 work has been completed to date. A total of 13,772 linear feet (lf) of piping (approx. 2.6 miles)  
37 has been removed and 12,213 lf of storm/sanitary sewer trench has been excavated. That is  
38 approximately 51 percent of the total 24,000 lf of trenches to be excavated in the previously  
39 identified area. That doesn't match the 70 percent completed for Parcel B, but current removal  
40 action is for deeper lines that take more effort to remove than the shallow lines. A total of 1,559  
41 lf of piping has been excavated that was not identified on any of the maps. During excavation,  
42 the trench is opened and piping is sometimes found that was not anticipated. To date, 35,180  
43 cubic yards (cy) (2,500 truck loads) of soil have been removed. A total of 6,938 lf (approx. 1.3  
44 miles) of trenches have been backfilled after excavation. Building 144 was removed to facilitate  
45 the removal action because the sanitary sewer lines run directly under that building.

1 Ms. Lowman reviewed the radiological waste identified during the removal action. The  
2 radiological program started with Parcel B because it has the least potential for radiological  
3 contamination of the remaining HPS parcels. A total of 726 cy of soil from Parcel B has been  
4 identified as radiologically contaminated. It was projected that 5 percent of the Parcel B  
5 excavated soil would have radiological contamination, but so far only 2.1 percent of the soil has  
6 been identified as contaminated. A total of 94 lf of pipe and system components and 9 manholes  
7 have been identified as contaminated. There have also been 39 lf of extraneous piping (non-  
8 storm/non-sanitary sewer) identified as contaminated.

9 Ms. Lowman explained that the release limit for Radium-226 is 1.485 picocuries per gram  
10 (pCi/g). The highest Radium-226 level found in soil is 3.026 pCi/g and in pipe sediment is 4.220  
11 pCi/g, so there have not been any high levels. Cesium-137 contamination has only been found in  
12 pipe sediment with the highest level at 1.393 pCi/g; the release limit for Cesium-137 is 0.113  
13 pCi/g. To date no Strontium-90 contamination has been found.

14 Ms. Lowman indicated that the Navy will continue to excavate the remaining soils and piping in  
15 Parcel B, and continue radiological screening of soils, piping, and debris. The excavated  
16 trenches will continue to be backfilled once the California Department of Health Services (DHS)  
17 has confirmed that all potential contamination has been removed. Soil that has been  
18 radiologically cleared will continue to be sampled and analyzed for Installation Restoration (IR)  
19 site chemicals of concern. The Navy is also building swales at Parcel B to take care of  
20 stormwater runoff.

21 Ms. Lowman summarized additional sewer/storm drain activities. At Bldg. 813 piping needed to  
22 be excavated due to work Lennar was performing on the hillside behind the building. That work  
23 is nearly complete and the trenches will be backfilled once DHS has approved the radiological  
24 results. Also in FY 2007, piping will be removed from the deep line locations along Lockwood  
25 Street and Outfall 1 in Parcel B. That work will start in the summer of 2007 during dry weather.  
26 The work at Building 813 and on the deep lines is scheduled for completion by late summer  
27 2007.

28 Ms. Lowman stated that new sewer/storm drain projects are scheduled for Parcel D and the main  
29 HPS access roads. A second radiological screening yard (RSY) will be built to handle the larger  
30 volume anticipated from removals in Parcels D, E, and E-2. There is already an RSY at IR 7 and  
31 18, but that yard does not have the capacity for completing the work at Parcel B and the access  
32 roads, and will be needed for the work at Parcel D. The new RSY will be located over the  
33 helicopter pad located behind the police laboratory building (Building 606). Construction on the  
34 RSY will start in late winter/early spring 2007.

35 Ms. Lowman explained that excavations will take place in FY 2007 along the main HPS access  
36 roads (Robinson, Fischer, and Spear). That work will start when dry weather is anticipated in  
37 spring 2007. There will be routing to ensure the necessary access to the shipyard, but there will  
38 be some interruption as this is a large construction project. Excavation of the lines along Crisp  
39 Avenue is scheduled for summer 2008.

40 Ms. Lowman provided pictures showing radiological sampling from the bottom and sidewall of a  
41 trench. Man lifts or remote equipment are used for work in the trenches so no one actually goes  
42 into the trench.

43 Ms. Pendergrass asked how far the Navy went into the Bay at the MDR to ensure all metal debris  
44 underneath the water was removed. Mr. Pearce responded that a magnetometer survey was  
45 conducted and the work plan was designed to remove all the metal identified during that survey.

1 The survey went into the water just past the low tide mark, which is approximately 100 to 200  
2 feet from the shoreline. Based on that survey, metal debris was only found a short distance from  
3 the shoreline and it was all removed. Ms. Lowman added that material excavated from the water  
4 was placed on a pad to dry before being scanned for radiological contamination. Ms.  
5 Pendergrass noted that there has been discussion at the HPS RAB of how much debris is  
6 underneath the water surrounding HPS. Ms. Lowman explained that the Bay has been  
7 designated as Parcel F and the Navy will be investigating that parcel in the future.

8 Dr. Tompkins said that in previous discussions, Chein Kao, former RAB member, had argued  
9 that areas where radium dials were found probably had chemical contamination as well. As part  
10 of the sewer/storm drain removal is material being scanned for chemical contamination and is  
11 that being removed simultaneously with any radiological contamination. Ms. Lowman explained  
12 that radium dials were found at IR-02, and the investigation at that site was not for free release.  
13 The goal was to remove radioactive material from the soil because of the high concentrations at  
14 IR-02. The sewer/storm drain removal at Parcel B is different because free-release is the goal for  
15 those areas. For the Parcel B removal action, soil is sampled for chemical contamination and is  
16 not put back in the trenches if contamination is present above residential release levels.

17 Harrell Powell, Bayview-Hunters Point resident, asked where the excavated soil goes. Ms.  
18 Lowman responded that soil with radiological contamination has to be shipped out of California,  
19 so it goes to the U.S. Ecology disposal facility in Idaho. Bill Dougherty, Tetra Tech ECI,  
20 confirmed that disposal of soil with chemical contamination is being handled by TPA-CKY, and  
21 that soil is going to the Kettleman Hills disposal facility in central California. If the soil is clean  
22 radiologically and chemically it goes back into the same trench where it was removed. If the soil  
23 from a trench is not clean, then that trench is backfilled with clean soil from another site. The  
24 clean soil brought in is sampled before being used as backfill.

25 Gina Love, Bayview-Hunters Point resident, asked how long that soil is guaranteed to stay clean.  
26 Ms. Lowman replied that as long as there are no activities involving contaminants, then the soil  
27 should remain clean. Ms. Love asked when houses are eventually built at HPS and people move  
28 into those houses, will there be any guarantees if residents start getting ill. She added that she  
29 had an aunt who lived in Mariners Village and worked at the shipyard, and she died from breast  
30 cancer. Mr. Forman responded that whether a remedy is excavation of material or other method  
31 there is a process for proving the remedy's effectiveness. In the Finding of Suitability to  
32 Transfer (FOST) the Navy has to show that all necessary action has been taken at a site to  
33 transfer the land prior to any development.

34 Ms. Love asked why so many people in the community have asthma and if it is safe to live in the  
35 HPS community. Mr. Forman replied that there is no housing at the shipyard and there have not  
36 been any shipyard activities for decades. Ms. Love noted that Mariners Village was once part of  
37 HPS. Ms. Lowman explained that HPS closed in 1974 and there was already housing in the  
38 Mariners Village area at that time. The Navy reviewed literally thousands of documents as part  
39 of a study of the radiological history at HPS. In the 1940s and 1950s there were some HPS  
40 administrative buildings in the Mariners Village area but there was no evidence of any industrial  
41 operations there.

42 Ms. Pendergrass noted that there are new people in the audience tonight that have good questions  
43 about the HPS program. A lot of that information, however, has been covered in previous RAB  
44 meetings. Many years of the HPS RAB Meeting Minutes are available on the Navy's website.  
45 All of the meetings also have a verbatim transcript which can also be found on the website.  
46 There are also many reports on the radiological program including discussion with the

1 community on how to clean up that contamination and to what level so people will be safe. She  
2 said that Ms. Love has valid questions that need to be answered and asked that a HPS RAB  
3 member talk with her to provide background information on HPS.

4 Mr. Powell asked why radiological material is not being shipped out of HPS by rail car. Ms.  
5 Lowman responded that it is not cost-effective to ship material by rail car since there is no active  
6 rail head into HPS. There was a proposal to ship material out to Oakland on barges then from  
7 Oakland by rail, but that was much more expensive than the current shipping method. The  
8 research to date also indicates that the rail line would not be able to handle the volume of  
9 material being shipped out of HPS.

10 Francisco Da Costa, Environmental Justice Advocacy, stated that when someone from the  
11 community has a question it is not pertinent to have a HPS RAB member answer the question.  
12 There should be someone from the San Francisco Health Department, the Department of Toxic  
13 Substances Control (DTSC), or another qualified expert to answer the question. What Ms. Love  
14 was saying is that as work has been done at HPS, the community needs to be cognizant of the  
15 fact of cumulative pollution as nothing takes place in a vacuum. He added that he would clarify  
16 Ms. Love's questions on his website so that information would be available to everyone. Ms.  
17 Lowman explained that the Navy does continual air sampling in all work areas and all workers  
18 wear devices to measure any radiation dosage during radiological removal activities. There have  
19 been no issues identified by air sampling and none of the workers have had any radiation dose  
20 from the work being performed. Mr. Tisdell noted that the HPS RAB needs these people to  
21 come to the Technical Review Subcommittee meetings where questions can be answered in  
22 depth.

23 Mike McGowen, Arc Ecology, asked when scanning the sewer and storm drain areas for radium,  
24 cesium, and strontium, is there a check for other isotopes. Ms. Lowman replied that in the  
25 laboratory, samples are tested for a complete library of isotopes that includes about sixteen  
26 radionuclides of concern for the site. In addition, strontium-90 analysis and alpha spectroscopy  
27 is performed at the site. Overall, testing covers about 20 to 22 radionuclides, and uranium is one  
28 of the radionuclides covered.

29 Mr. Van Houten asked how much the old RSY will be used since there is going to be a new  
30 larger RSY. Ms. Lowman responded that the RSY in Parcel B will continue to be used in 2007  
31 because there is so much soil to be processed that both screening yards are necessary. The old  
32 screening yard will still be used six days a week. Mr. Forman added that the Navy is working to  
33 complete the removal action as fast as possible, and acknowledges that it's difficult to be patient  
34 with the noise generated by these activities. Ms. Lowman noted that the RSY at Parcel B would  
35 eventually need to be removed for IR-7 and IR-18 to be radiologically cleared on the surface.  
36 That will not happen before October 2007.

37 Mr. Van Houten stated in response to Ms. Love's concerns, he lives in Morgan Heights located  
38 right at the gate of HPS. He would like to let the community know that he is there keeping an  
39 eye on everything. If there was anything that he found really concerning, he would be on the  
40 Navy's back about it. He's been attending HPS RAB meetings for about a year and a half, and  
41 so far he has seen nothing of concern for the public, his livelihood, or living in the community.  
42 There are also others on the HPS RAB who live in the community and are examining the Navy's  
43 activities.

44 Ms. Love explained that dirt is blown up by activities at HPS and that dirt is affecting the  
45 community. Mr. Van Houten responded that the dirt is from Lennar's activities on former Parcel  
46 A. The HPS RAB is concerned about that and has been working with Lennar on solutions.

1 Kristine Enea, RAB member, noted that that former Parcel A property does not belong to the  
2 Navy. There is a Citizen's Advisory Committee (CAC) that is the place to get information on  
3 Lennar's activities. Mr. Tisdell added that Ms. Brownell is an HPS RAB member and can  
4 answer questions about activities on former Parcel A.

5 **2007 HPS Stormwater Management Program (Presentation)**

6 Ms. Kito explained that this presentation will provide the HPS RAB with information on  
7 stormwater management at HPS. At this time of year stormwater is usually active with a lot of  
8 rain, but it's been a dry winter so far.

9 Ms. Kito explained that a basic definition of stormwater is that it comes from storms as rain.  
10 When it rains on a parking lot, for example, the water is not absorbed into the parking lot, so it  
11 runs off and goes to a channel, storm drain, or to bare ground wherever it can be absorbed. As a  
12 result, stormwater runoff is an issue at HPS. There is also non-stormwater that does not come  
13 from rain. That water can be from fire hydrant flushing, landscape watering, and condensation.  
14 Non-stormwater also can be from one of the issues discussed this evening, the water used for  
15 dust control.

16 Ms. Kito said that the basic reason the Navy manages stormwater is that storm drains channel  
17 stormwater to the Bay. As a result, anything that goes into the storm drains goes directly to the  
18 Bay and the Bay has to be protected. Stormwater management at HPS looks for industrial  
19 pollutants from industrial sites at the shipyard. Pollutants can include solvents, grease and oils,  
20 sediment, and metals. The Navy manages stormwater to meet legal requirements in the Clean  
21 Water Act and the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System permitting programs. The  
22 Navy also works with Jim Ponton to meet San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control  
23 Board (Water Board) standards.

24 Ms. Kito explained that HPS has a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) that  
25 documents what can be done to prevent pollutants from going into the storm drains. The Navy  
26 first evaluates possible sources of pollutants from industrial activities. For example, the artist  
27 tenants at HPS use paints and metals for their designs. Those are possible pollutants if they get  
28 into a storm drain. The Navy also has a monitoring plan that looks at certain outfalls and areas  
29 with industrial activity to determine where to monitor stormwater and non-stormwater. An  
30 outfall is a manhole with the bottom like an inverted T. The storm drain is at the bottom of the  
31 manhole and there can be a flow of water through that tube. Since HPS stormwater management  
32 is protecting the Bay, the outfalls are all close to the shoreline.

33 Ms. Kito stated that Navy personnel visually observe authorized non-stormwater discharge  
34 sources like the tidal influx. As the tide comes in from the Bay there is water flow through the  
35 outfalls. The Navy also prevents unauthorized non-stormwater discharge sources, such as  
36 someone washing a vehicle at HPS with that water going into the storm drain. Stormwater is  
37 also managed by evaluating and maintaining Best Management Practices. The final way  
38 stormwater is managed at HPS is by maintaining records.

39 Ms. Kito stated that BMPs are activities that prevent pollutants that may have collected in storm  
40 drains from being flushed into the Bay. There are two kinds of BMPs, procedural and structural.  
41 Procedural BMPs are similar to those used at homes, avoid hosing down sites, perform regular  
42 pavement sweeping instead of washing things down the storm drains, and clean up a spill rather  
43 than having it washed down the drains. In catch basins, vegetation and other material  
44 accumulate and that is cleaned out so the stormwater can run through. The stormwater  
45 conveyance system is also regularly inspected and maintained.

1 Ms. Kito noted that BMPs can also be structural or physical controls. For example, if a handful  
2 of dirt is added to a jarful of water and that jar is shaken. Shaking the jar adds velocity and the  
3 result is cloudy water. That is similar to sediment that can be carried into the Bay. Water from a  
4 storm collects on the ground and gathers silt and sediment that eventually settles to the bottom.  
5 Structural BMPs reduce stormwater velocity so sediment does not go into the storm drains.  
6 Examples of structural BMPs are hay bales around storm drains, and erosion and sediment  
7 controls such as fiber rolls placed on hillsides. These BMPs reduce velocity, which allows  
8 sediment to settle out of the stormwater. Filter screens on storm drains, silt fences, sand bags,  
9 fiber rolls, and sediment traps are all structural or physical controls used to manage stormwater.

10 Ms. Kito explained that the Navy samples six outfalls at HPS. There are two contractors that  
11 work on stormwater management, one for basewide management and one that manages the  
12 landfill area. Pictures were provided of various structural BMPs. Sandbags can be placed  
13 around an outfall to slowdown the stormwater velocity so sediment does not get in. There are  
14 also felt filters that let water through but stop sediment. Erosion controls include fiber rolls and  
15 hydroseeding for grass to grow, which reduces sediment in runoff.

16 Ms. Kito explained that swales are gravel channels that route water to the appropriate storm  
17 drain. The gravel reduces the water velocity so that sediment settles and does not get into the  
18 Bay. Gravel berms are also used to prevent sediment from reaching the Bay.

19 Dr. Tompkins said that BMPs that reduce the sediment going to the Bay leave sediment that  
20 turns to dust on dry days. He suggested developing a remedy that would reduce the sediment on  
21 the road to reduce dust on dry days and mud on rainy days. Ms. Kito replied that street sweepers  
22 are used in most of the HPS areas to minimize the dust.

23 Mr. Powell stated that with the gravel berm near the Bay, what stops the sediment from trickling  
24 down into the soil and then trickling underneath the berm into the Bay. Ms. Kito explained that  
25 as stormwater travels to the Bay it is filtered through soil particles anyway. For example, when  
26 water comes out of a mountain it is usually clear because it has already been filtered through  
27 rock and soil. Therefore, sediment will most likely be seen in runoff if it goes over the berm and  
28 picks up the loose dirt there. Mr. Powell noted that the sediment still trickles into the soil and  
29 those particles get into the Bay. Ms. Kito responded that there is always natural groundwater  
30 present at HPS, regardless of whether it is wet or dry on the surface. In addition, these areas are  
31 near the shoreline, so there is a tidal influence that flows out to the Bay at low tide. The issue of  
32 water percolating into the ground, therefore, is not really a concern.

33 Mr. Powell clarified that a higher than normal high tide would potentially push water over the  
34 rim of the berm so sediment would still get into the Bay. Ms. Kito explained that high tide never  
35 goes over the berm because it is at a higher elevation than the tide. Mr. Ponton indicated that he  
36 is with the Water Board (a division of Cal EPA), and one of the board's responsibilities is to  
37 monitor stormwater controls. The main goal of stormwater controls is to slow down water as it  
38 runs over the land so it does not dig gullies and wash mud into the Bay or storm lines. As a  
39 result, the Water Board likes controls that contain the water. Sometimes areas are used to retain  
40 water, letting it settle and filter into the soil because soil is a great natural filter. That water  
41 filters down into the water table to groundwater and that is what the Water Board aims for. On  
42 sloping topography such as a hillside, fiber rolls, gravel berms, plastic covering, and  
43 hydroseeding are used so that there is no erosion or movement of soil down the slope. Mr.  
44 Ponton stated that he has personally walked the shoreline at HPS looking at gravel berms, plastic  
45 covering, and hay bales, and there are a lot of redundant protections in place.

1 Mr. Ponton said that he is not aware of anyplace where the tide overtops a berm, eroding the dirt  
2 behind the berm and carrying that out to the Bay. Mr. Powell explained that he has lived in the  
3 HPS community all his life and has seen tides that overtop the berms and carry sediment to the  
4 Bay. Mr. Ponton noted that the tides have a predictable range and he has not seen an occurrence  
5 of a tide overtopping a berm in the last few years at HPS. In addition, there are redundant  
6 stormwater controls that are effective at protecting the Bay. With BMPs, however, there are  
7 instances where they don't work and have to be augmented. The stormwater management  
8 program is designed to learn from experience and anticipate problems. The program relies  
9 primarily on good housekeeping practices that keep material away from the storm drains and  
10 areas covered during rainy season. In addition, the Navy reports annually to the Water Board on  
11 the effectiveness of those controls.

12 Mr. Powell explained that his concern is that rainfall is going into the ground at Parcel E where  
13 there is a landfill. Ms. Kito responded that the landfill at Parcel E is capped, so rain will not  
14 percolate into the ground. The rain runs off the cap and into two gravel swales that keep the  
15 water from getting into the landfill. Mr. Ponton added that there are groundwater monitoring  
16 wells at the landfill site that monitor groundwater before it reaches the Bay. The groundwater  
17 standards set for HPS apply surface water standards to groundwater to be protective of fish and  
18 the Bay. The groundwater at the landfill is monitored for metals, polychlorinated biphenyls,  
19 volatile organic compounds, and hydrocarbons. Any elevated contaminant levels trigger the  
20 Navy to take action to address that contamination.

21 Ms. Enea asked if Mr. Powell's question is about high tide coming over the berm and washing  
22 contaminated soil directly into the Bay. Ms. Kito responded that the stormwater controls at HPS  
23 are designed for a 25-year storm, and there are going to be storms that are more intense than  
24 normal. There has not been an instance in recent years, however, where high tide has gone over  
25 the berm.

26 Lee Gray, former Triple A employee, stated that ships were sand blasted and bilges were  
27 dumped directly into the Bay during the 1970s when there were no EPA regulations. He asked if  
28 there will be dredging or other action on the shoreline to address that group of contaminants.  
29 Ms. Kito responded that the area in question is Parcel F, which covers the Bay. The Navy is  
30 currently dealing with contaminants and activities on Parcel B, where Drydocks 5, 6, and 7 are  
31 located.

## 32 **TAG Update**

33 Dr. Tompkins introduced Greg Grist, another member of the TAG team, a physicist who is  
34 working with Dr. Palmer on his analysis. There are a lot of concerns about contaminants in the  
35 air getting into the community. The TAG team is looking for documentation from the Navy and  
36 the Department of Health with actual air-monitoring numbers. That data will be reviewed so Dr.  
37 Palmer can act as liaison to explain what is happening at HPS and answer RAB questions. Mr.  
38 Forman responded that the best work for the TAG grantee is to review a document then report  
39 back to the HPS RAB with an independent review of that document. The Navy will add the  
40 TAG grantee information to the RAB distribution list to receive documents that are distributed to  
41 the regulators and the RAB. The RAB needs to let Navy know what documents the TAG grantee  
42 will be reviewing.

1 Dr. Tompkins indicated that the documents on the updated document review list from March  
2 2006 will be reviewed by the TAG grantee. He noted that Dr. Palmer has been trying to reach  
3 the Navy to request those documents on CD. Mr. Forman stated that no one from the Navy has  
4 received any e-mails from Dr. Palmer to date.

## 5 **Subcommittee Reports**

### 6 **Economic Subcommittee**

7 Jesse Mason, RAB member, explained that November and December 2006 were bad months for  
8 him and his wife passed away on December 9, 2006. As a result, he was unable to make it to the  
9 December 2006 RAB meeting. There was an Economic Subcommittee meeting, however, on  
10 December 6, 2006 and his report on that meeting is available this evening. Mr. Forman and  
11 Charlie Depew, the Navy's contracting representative, were invited to the meeting and there  
12 were many truckers also at the meeting. That meeting was initiated through a conversation with  
13 Mr. Dougherty with Tetra Tech ECI for discussion of the bidding process. It was a positive  
14 meeting for both the information provided and the truckers concerns that were addressed. Tetra  
15 Tech ECI is willing to work with the community on radiological program hauling. Mr. Mason  
16 said that he expects local contractors to be included on any Navy requests for proposal coming  
17 out in the future.

18 Mr. Mason said he would set up a date for the next Economic Subcommittee meeting and  
19 provide Ms. Hunter with that date for distribution to the HPS RAB. Ms. Pendergrass noted that a  
20 date for the next Economic Subcommittee meeting needs to be provided at the RAB meetings so  
21 that any attendees not on the RAB distribution list can attend. Mr. Mason replied that the  
22 meeting would be held on February 15, 2007 at 6:00 p.m. at the Anna Waden library and he will  
23 check to make sure the library is available on that date.

24 Mr. Mason noted that there are many truckers attending the HPS RAB meeting tonight that are  
25 concerned about economic issues and community participation for the work at HPS. Community  
26 participation is also a concern for other local contractors like Robert's RCD Tire Service, and  
27 Guillory's Cement Construction. Ms. Pendergrass asked as part of being the Economic  
28 Subcommittee Chair, if Mr. Mason would prepare a strategy or motion for the RAB for what he  
29 would like to happen based on the Economic Subcommittee meetings.

### 30 **Technical Review Subcommittee**

31 Ms. Bushnell apologized for the lack of meeting minutes from the January 9, 2007 Technical  
32 Review Subcommittee, but they were delayed. It was a good meeting with a presentation on the  
33 wetlands proposal and an update on activities at Parcel B. Those presentations will be outlined  
34 in the meeting minutes once those are ready. The next Technical Review Subcommittee meeting  
35 will be on February 8, 2007 at 6:00 p.m. at the Anna Waden library.

36 Dr. Tompkins explained that he brought up issues on dust control and the children examined by  
37 Dr. Mahmoud that would need to be part of the subcommittee meeting minutes. Nine out of ten  
38 faculty and children examined had health issues related to arsenic in the brain and he has a chart  
39 from the doctor on the results of those examinations. He was asked not to provide the letter that  
40 was given to the school because of confidentially issues. Ms. Bushnell indicated that she would  
41 include what Dr. Tompkins provided at the meeting with the meeting minutes.

1 **MBCO Subcommittee**

2 Mr. Tisdell mentioned that the meeting minutes from the MBCO Subcommittee meeting were  
3 also delayed. It was a good, knowledgeable meeting. The next meeting will be combined with  
4 the Technical Review Subcommittee meeting on February 8, 2007 from 6:00 to 8:00 p.m. at the  
5 Anna Waden library.

6 **Community Comment Period**

7 Dr. Tompkins stated that he has a motion for the RAB to have the Technical Review  
8 Subcommittee go back to a two-hour agenda that is not combined with the MBCO meeting.  
9 There are several documents coming up for review and there are concerns from the community  
10 that deal with former Parcel A and land transfer issues. Time is needed to look closely at the  
11 problems to prevent them in the future. Mr. Tisdell seconded the motion. Ms. Bushnell noted  
12 that for the combined meetings, 1 hour and 45 minutes is spent on the Technical Review  
13 Subcommittee and 15 minutes on the MBCO subcommittee. She and Mr. Tisdell wanted to  
14 make it convenient for RAB members to attend one meeting rather than two. When appropriate,  
15 the Technical Review Subcommittee meeting can be held separately. James Morrison, RAB  
16 member, said that he doesn't think it is necessary to split the meetings. When it becomes  
17 necessary, the meeting can be extended. Mr. Van Houten added that for him it has been  
18 convenient to have the meetings on the same night, but he understands that there are documents  
19 coming up for review so he's on the fence on this issue.

20 Dr. Tompkins explained that at the last Technical Review Subcommittee meeting he brought up  
21 the issue of contamination and the children at the school and his discussion was cut short for the  
22 Navy's presentation. Ample time was not given to his concern so it was not addressed. Mr.  
23 Morrison stated that the information Dr. Tompkins brought to the meeting was a single sheet of  
24 paper that the subcommittee was not able to understand so there was nothing to discuss. He  
25 explained that he usually relies on Mr. Da Costa for information because he is usually more  
26 informative and concise on these issues. When more information is not available there cannot be  
27 a discussion. Ms. Bushnell added that there must also be sufficient copies of documents brought  
28 to the meeting.

29 Ms. Pendergrass asked if there is a process to put items on the subcommittee meeting agenda  
30 with the amount of time needed for that item. Ms. Bushnell replied that she is accessible by  
31 phone and e-mail if there is a topic for the Technical Review Subcommittee agenda.

32 Ms. Pendergrass recapped the motion to hold a separate Technical Review Subcommittee  
33 meeting and called for a vote. There were three votes in favor and five votes opposed to the  
34 motion. At this time, then, the subcommittee meetings will continue to be held on the same night  
35 and will use the process outlined for topics to be included on the meeting agenda.

36 Dr. Tompkins said that when the TAG grantee is attending subcommittee meetings they are paid  
37 \$75 an hour, so that is another reason to have the meetings held separately. Ms. Pendergrass  
38 suggested taking this issue up with the subcommittee chairs for resolution. Mr. Van Houten  
39 noted that as long as the agenda sticks to the times allotted to each topic, the TAG grantee only  
40 has to show up for the appropriate topics. Mr. Tisdell added that lately there have not been many  
41 issues for the MBCO Subcommittee meeting, so the meeting can be conceded to the Technical  
42 Review Subcommittee when necessary.

43 Ms. Pendergrass noted that all the subcommittee chairs and the RAB members serve on a  
44 voluntary basis in addition to their regular lives. They are really putting in a lot of effort for the

1 community. A great deal is expected of them for attending meetings and getting information out  
2 on behalf of the public.

3 Mr. Gray stated that there is a rail spur in the HPS community within two miles of the shipyard  
4 that goes out of state to Utah and beyond. He added that as a local trucker he has not been able  
5 to use his trucking ability at HPS because the Navy uses brokers who insist on using truckers  
6 outside the community. This is an opportunity within the community and he does not understand  
7 why the Navy would not accept local truckers that live within two miles of the shipyard for the  
8 work at HPS. Ms. Lowman explained that several RAB attendees spoke to her during the break.  
9 She will be investigating the rail spur at HPS and looking at other shipping alternatives as well.  
10 Until that investigation is complete, however, she cannot comment on any of these issues.

11 Mr. Forman explained that the Port of Oakland handles any shipping for the radiological  
12 program. For all other shipping, a cost analysis is performed based on where material has to go  
13 for disposal and the Navy is required to use the most cost effective approach. In the past, the rail  
14 head has been used for transport, but that depends on a number of factors that can be discussed at  
15 the Economic Subcommittee meeting. Mr. Morrison noted that there is a basic problem that  
16 there have not been meeting agendas, sign-in sheets, or meeting minutes provided for the  
17 Economic Subcommittee meeting. As a result, people at the RAB meetings are not able to get  
18 feed back out to the community.

19 Mr. Da Costa stated that there are some very serious issues with former Parcel A. A lot of  
20 debate has taken place with the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency and the CAC and there  
21 have been no truthful statements from many of the people sitting at this table for the HPS RAB.  
22 As the director of an Environmental Justice Advocacy, he will not tolerate adverse health affects  
23 for the community's children. Even the Navy has issued notices of violation for former Parcel  
24 A, so why is there debate among city agencies who think they can play around with notices of  
25 violation. They are not going to play around with the community. At one of the RAB meetings,  
26 the Nation of Islam will be here, so he would like to have a special RAB agenda to address this  
27 issue for former Parcel A. He noted that he came to the RAB meetings for a long time, but the  
28 RAB did not address the real issues so today the rubber meets the road.

29 Ms. Pendergrass explained that anyone who would like to add an item to the RAB agenda needs  
30 to work with the Community Co-Chair and the Navy Co-Chair who develop the agenda. Mr.  
31 Tisdell provided his phone number (415-756-4514), and as Community Co-Chair he can be  
32 reached 24 hours a day.

33 Dr. Tompkins said that Mr. Brooks was going to deal with trucks coming onto and leaving HPS  
34 that are not clean. On Tuesday he was at HPS, and the roads were coated in dirt and mud that  
35 covered his car. He asked two months ago that the HPS roads be cleaned and that is not  
36 happening if his car is covered in mud. That dirt also has an impact on health for the  
37 community. The Navy needs to take an aggressive approach to dealing with this dirt and not just  
38 wash it down the streets.

39 Ms. Enea explained that it's important to be on record for the benefit of the community that the  
40 area that used to be Parcel A no longer belongs to the Navy. It now belongs to Lennar and the  
41 City of San Francisco. The San Francisco Redevelopment Agency has jurisdiction and control  
42 over that parcel. Any complaints about activities on that parcel need to go before the CAC, not  
43 the HPS RAB.

44 Ms. Pendergrass adjourned the meeting at 8:16 p.m.

1 **Reminder: The next RAB meeting will be held from 6:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m., Thursday,**  
2 **February 22, 2007, at the Earl P. Mills Auditorium, 100 Whitney Young Circle, San**  
3 **Francisco, California 94124.**

**ATTACHMENT A**  
**25 January 2007- RAB MEETING**  
**LIST OF ATTENDEES**

Name	Association
1. LaRonda Anders	Young Community Developers (YCD)
2. Annette Barber	YCD
3. Ronald Batiste	Eagle Environmental Construction
4. Larry Blankenship	J. Higgins Trucking
5. Steve Bradley	Tetra Tech EM Inc.
6. John Brandt	MACTEC
7. Geary Brown	Brown & Sons Trucking
8. Patricia Brown	RAB member, Shipyard Artist
9. Amy Brownell	San Francisco Department of Public Health
10. Aleta Bryant	Cam Kal Ind. Transport LLD
11. Barbara Bushnell	RAB member, Resident of the Southeast Sector (ROSES)
12. Ronald Camese	Camese Transportation
13. Francisco Da Costa	Environmental Justice Advocacy
14. Charles Dacus	RAB member, Bayview/Hunters Point Resident
15. Michael Dennis	MCD Trucking
16. Bill Dougherty	Tetra Tech ECI
17. George Drake	D & W Transport
18. Kristine Enea	RAB member, ROSES
19. James Fields	San Francisco Redevelopment Agency
20. Keith Forman	Navy RAB Co-chair
21. Larry Frias	Waste Solutions Group
22. Miguel Galarza	Yerba Buena Engineering & Construction
23. David Gavrich	Waste Solution Group
24. Lee Gray	Former Triple A employee
25. Gregory Grist	Tech Physics
26. Steve Hall	Tetra Tech EMI
27. Earl Hampton	Resident
28. Niam Harrison	Resident
29. Jerry Higgins	J. Higgins Trucks
30. Carolyn Hunter	Tetra Tech EMI
31. Melanie Kito	Navy RPM
32. Jaqueline Ann Lane	U.S. EPA Region IX
33. Gina Love	Resident
34. Laurie Lowman	Navy RASO
35. James Martin	Business Development, Inc.
36. Jesse Mason	RAB member, resident
37. Mike McGowen	Arc Ecology
38. James Morrison	RAB member, ROSES
39. Christine M. Niccoli	Niccoli Reporting, court reporter
40. Pat Owens	Navy RASO
41. Ralph Pearce	Navy RPM
42. Marsha Pendergrass	Pendergrass & Associates
43. Jim Ponton	San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board
44. Harrell Powell	Resident
45. Sudeep Rao	Literacy for Environmental Justice (LEJ)
46. Dale Roberson	Resident

<b>Name</b>	<b>Association</b>
47. Matt Slack	Navy RASO
48. Keith Tisdell	RAB member, Resident
49. Raymond Tompkins	RAB member, Bayview-Hunters Point Health and the Environment
50. Frances Travis	Resident
51. Robert Van Houten	RAB member, Morgan Heights Resident
52. Angela Williams	Barajas & Associates

**ATTACHMENT B  
25 JANUARY 2007 – RAB MEETING  
ACTION ITEMS**

<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Action Item</b>	<b>Person Authoring the Action Item</b>	<b>Due Date</b>	<b>Person/Agency Committing to Action Item</b>	<b>Resolution Status</b>
<b>Carry-Over Items</b>					
1.	The Navy will schedule a HPS Environmental 101 class on a Saturday once at least 3 new community members join the RAB.	Keith Forman Navy RAB Co-Chair	N/A	Mr. Forman	This action item will be carried over to March 2007.
2.	Dr. Ray Tompkins, RAB Member, to compose a letter from the HPS RAB to the City of San Francisco requesting that Innes Avenue be cleaned regularly to protect residents from dust. The letter will also be provided to Lennar and the HPS RAB.	Dr. Tompkins	November 2006	Dr. Tompkins/ Mr. Tisdell	This action item will be carried over to February 2007.

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](mailto: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](mailto:eliv@bai.cc)

cc : Keith Forman, BEC  
Cynthia Mafara, Contract Specialist