Meeting Summary
Hunters Point Naval Shipyard Community Meeting
April 11, 2012

N00217_005266
HUNTERS POINT
SSIC NO. 5090.3.A

MEETING TIME/DATE: Wednesday, April 11, 2012, 6:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m.

MEETING LOCATION:: Southeast Community Facility Commission Building
Alex L. Pitcher, Jr. Community Room
1800 Oakdale Avenue
1601 Lane Street, San Francisco, CA 94124

MEETING TOPIC: Draft Parcel E-2 Record of Decision (ROD)

I. Welcome/Introductions

Matt Robinson/CirclePoint (Community Involvement Manager) introduced himself and welcomed everyone to the Hunters Point Naval Shipyard (HPNS) community meeting. Mr. Robinson introduced Keith Forman/U.S. Department of the Navy (Navy) (Base Realignment and Closure [BRAC] Environmental Coordinator), Melanie Kito/Navy (Lead Remedial Project Manager), and Lara Urizar/Navy (Remedial Project Manager). Mr. Robinson then introduced the regulatory agency team members, including Craig Cooper/U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) (Program Manager), Ryan Miya/California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) (Project Manager), Ross Steenson/San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board (Water Board) (Project Manager) and Tina Low/Water Board (Project Manager).

II. Meeting Format and Ground Rules

Mr. Robinson described the meeting format and ground rules. He stated the general presentation would take about 30 minutes. He asked that the audience hold their questions until the end of the presentation when there would be time for a question and answer session with the Navy and regulators. Mr. Robinson noted the balance of the meeting would be dedicated to answering questions presented by the audience.

Mr. Robinson stated that the purpose of this meeting is to provide a brief background on Parcel E-2, provide an overview of the Navy's selected cleanup action for Parcel E-2, and summarize the Navy's response to community input on the Parcel E-2 Proposed Plan. The Navy will also answer questions on the Parcel E-2 cleanup plan.

III. Overview of Draft Parcel E-2 Record of Decision

Ms. Kito provided an overview on the location and history of Parcel E-2. She noted Parcel E-2 is located in the southwest part of HPNS and includes about 48 acres of shoreline and lowland coastal area. She presented five pictures of Parcel E-2 that showed how the site was gradually filled in since 1946. By 1974, the shape of Parcel E-2 was similar to what currently exists. Ms. Kito explained that the Navy took material from around the area, including crushed bedrock and dredged sediment from the San Francisco Bay (Bay), to fill in Parcel E-2. Parcel E-2 is also the location of the historical landfill that was located on HPNS.

Ms. Kito then presented a slide of the previous investigations from 1998, which included a lot of sampling along the shoreline and covers the entire parcel. Ms. Kito explained that investigations along the landfill have confirmed that the landfill was filled with a variety of shipyard-related wastes. The materials included construction debris (wood, steel, concrete, and soil), municipal trash (paper, plastic, glass, and metal) and industrial waste (sandblast waste, low-level radioactive material, paint sludge, solvents, and waste oils). She then presented a map that showed the locations of cleanup actions that have already been performed on the parcel. These cleanup actions removed contamination near the shoreline and in upland areas.

Mr. Forman explained that the ROD is a document that identifies the final selected cleanup action for Parcel E-2. The ROD includes a Responsiveness Summary, which summarizes all the comments and responses to input received from the public on the Proposed Plan.

Mr. Forman described the key elements of the selected remedy. The remedy would excavate and dispose of remaining soil hot spot areas, install a protective liner and soil cover over the landfill and surrounding areas, and install underground barriers (slurry walls) to limit contaminated groundwater flow to the Bay. In addition, the remedy would remove and treat landfill gas, build a shoreline revetment (rock wall), construct a seasonal wetland (fresh water) and an all-season wetland (salt water) that would connect to the Bay. Finally, the Navy will maintain the remedy and conduct the following monitoring: landfill gas sampling, groundwater sampling, stormwater sampling, soil settlement testing, inspection of the landfill liner and revetment wall, and post-earthquake monitoring. Information collected during the monitoring phase will be posted on the HPNS Website for public review.

Mr. Forman noted the Proposed Plan public comment period was from September 7, 2011, through November 21, 2011. The Navy received 70 comments from a combination of 18 individuals, groups, and agencies. The Navy and regulatory agencies carefully considered all comments. Six important themes arose in the comments. In the draft ROD the Navy included an introduction that summarizes the comments and organizes them by theme.

Mr. Forman noted that there would be a long question and answer session after the presentation for anyone to ask a question if they feel their theme isn't represented or if there are other questions. The following six primary themes were identified in the community comments:

1. Are there sufficient data about the Parcel E-2 Landfill to select the remedy?
2. Why was containment in place selected for the Parcel E-2 landfill instead of complete excavation?
3. How was environmental justice considered in the process of selecting the remedy?
4. How is containment in place consistent with Proposition P?
5. How will the Navy involve the community during the design of the selected remedy?
6. How will the selected remedy protect people and wildlife in the long term?

Mr. Forman addressed the first theme, concerning sufficient data for selection of the remedy. He explained that the Navy (with close regulatory oversight) has been studying the landfill for more than 20 years and has conducted extensive investigations to characterize the extent of contamination on the parcel. He added that collecting more data would not change the selected

remedy. Mr. Forman presented a slide with a picture of the landfill and a figure showing extensive sampling at the site, which has included soil borings, monitoring wells, investigation trenches, landfill gas sampling, air monitoring, and radiological screening and sampling.

Data from these investigations has provided the Navy with a clear picture of what is going on in the landfill, and they believe that the site is well characterized. Observations from various trenches and excavations show that the landfill contains mostly construction debris. The Navy has also learned that groundwater contamination does not pose a major threat to the Bay. Mr. Forman concluded that the landfill gas monitoring has shown that the landfill is generating relatively small amounts of landfill gas and methane.

Ms. Urizar was introduced to discuss the second theme concerning why containment in place was selected as the remedy rather than complete excavation. Ms. Urizar explained that the landfill can be safely contained using proven technology and that no new exposure problems would be created by safely containing it in place. The remedy of closure in place is consistent with the USEPA national policy for large landfills. The Parcel E-2 landfill is similar to hundreds of other landfills across the country that have also been safely closed in place under this same USEPA policy.

Ms. Urizar further explained that the Parcel E-2 landfill meets the USEPA national policy for containment of large landfills for the following reasons: the landfill is greater than 2 acres, landfill contents meet the definition for municipal-type waste, no high-level radioactive waste has been found in the landfill, no high-hazard, military-type wastes were disposed of in the landfill, the site has been adequately characterized, closure in place does not affect future land use (open space), and excavation is not practical and potentially creates new hazards.

Mr. Forman discussed the third theme concerning environmental justice considerations in selection of the remedy. He noted both the Navy and USEPA have been sensitive to the environmental justice issues at HPNS for years and they follow strict government and regulatory guidance concerning environmental justice. The remedy must meet all federal and California environmental justice goals including providing fully protective cleanup actions, fair and equal treatment of all community members, and opportunities for meaningful involvement for community members. Mr. Forman added that the Navy holds more community meetings than are required and is readily available for questions. Furthermore, the Navy takes into account public input regarding its cleanup sites and in the past has modified plans based on community input. Currently, the Navy provides the community with a hotline, Website that houses information, and Community Involvement Manager, Matt Robinson, to help facilitate communication between the public and the Navy.

Mr. Forman then highlighted the goals that the Navy has already successfully achieved. He noted the Navy does not act alone and works with local, regional, state, and federal regulatory agencies to ensure intense regulatory review and oversight of all Navy cleanup activities. The Navy has made a significant financial commitment for cleanup of HPNS, and the USEPA awards Technical Assistance Grants to the community to facilitate reviews of technical documents. Furthermore, meaningful community engagement is outlined in the Community Involvement Plan which the community was invited to comment on, and the Navy requires subcontractors working on HPNS hire locally. In addition, the Navy only selects fully protective cleanup actions at HPNS.

Mr. Forman explained the fourth theme, which dealt with City of San Francisco's Proposition P. He explained that Proposition P calls for cleanup to allow for unrestricted use of the property, and the remedy should not rely on protective barriers unless other solutions are not technically feasible. The Navy and USEPA considered Proposition P and determined that the excavation and offsite disposal of landfill waste presents many complex challenges that border on being technically infeasible and not cost effective. Furthermore, the proposed cover and below-ground barriers will protect people and wildlife from contaminants remaining in the landfill. Mr. Forman added that containment of the landfill is consistent with the City of San Francisco's redevelopment plan.

Ms. Urizar presented a slide on the fifth theme describing how the Navy will involve the community during design of the selected remedy. She explained the Navy will develop the remedial design document with input from federal and state regulatory agencies, representatives from City of San Francisco, and people from the local community. The document will be distributed for public comment and explain all the steps necessary for implementation of the proposed remedy. The remedial design will identify how the Navy will properly construct the selected remedy, including shoreline protection, the landfill gas treatment system, protection from effects of sea level rise and earthquakes/liquefaction at the site, and performance of long-term maintenance and monitoring of the remedy.

Ms. Urizar continued with the sixth theme concerning how the selected remedy will protect people and wildlife in the long term. She explained that the Navy will continue to monitor groundwater and landfill gas on Parcel E-2. Stormwater and erosion controls will be installed, and stormwater discharges will be monitored. The landfill cover will be regularly inspected and maintained, and routine reports will be provided to regulatory agencies. She added that USEPA Superfund laws require a comprehensive review of the selected remedy's effectiveness every 5 years after the remedy is implemented.

Ms. Urizar presented a map that illustrated the selected remedy. She noted construction of the landfill cover and shoreline revetment will require excavating and re-locating some soil mixed with landfill waste located near the shoreline. Ms. Urizar added the excavation (estimated to be about 600 feet long and 15 feet deep) is necessary to build a cover that can withstand earthquakes. She then presented two pictures of the remedy that includes the rock wall area and wetlands. She showed another slide of what the liner and soil cover would look like.

Mr. Forman noted that the Navy is in the middle of the Draft Parcel E-2 ROD comment period, which began on March 15, 2012, and ends April 30, 2012. The Navy will submit the Draft Final ROD in June 2012 and the Final ROD in August 2012. Submission of the Draft Remedial Design is planned for spring 2013. He then showed a site plan of the proposed redevelopment of Parcel E-2.

Mr. Forman then presented a slide which listed the information repositories that contain project-related documents:

San Francisco Main Library
Government Information Center, 5th Floor
100 Larkin Street
San Francisco, CA 94102 (415) 557-4500

Hunters Point Naval Shipyard Office Trailer
690 Hudson Street
San Francisco, CA 94124

Mr. Forman then provided Navy contact information in case the community has further questions or comments.

Keith Forman
Hunters Point Naval Shipyard
BRAC Environmental Coordinator
(415) 308-1458

Melanie Kito
Hunters Point Naval Shipyard
BRAC Lead Remedial Project Manager
(619) 532-0787

Department of the Navy
Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC)
Program Management Office West
1455 Frazee Road, Suite 900
San Diego, CA 92108

Team members from the regulatory agencies then introduced themselves and presented information regarding regulatory requirements. Mr. Cooper introduced himself as the project manager from USEPA. Mr. Miya introduced himself as project manager from DTSC. Ms. Low introduced herself as Project Manager from the Water Board and noted that she has been working on Parcel E-2 since last October. The regulators are committed to protecting human health and the environment and reviewing all of the Navy's documents to ensure they are protective.

Mr. Miya noted that the regulators oversee cleanup activities on Parcel E-2. To meet regulatory approval, the regulatory agencies have required the Navy to collect additional groundwater and soil gas samples, remove additional hot spots, and restore wetlands. The regulatory agencies are imposing strict standards for final soil covers, which will undergo regular inspections. The regulators will help determine the land use controls for the site. The remedy will include ongoing regulatory involvement after implementation.

Mr. Cooper thanked the community for getting involved and providing comments. He stated that the regulatory agencies understand and respect the wide range of opinions in the community. Mr. Cooper added that the selected remedy combines the removal of hot spots and safely containing the large landfill in place; excavation and transporting the landfill materials could create unacceptable risks to the community and the environment. The selected remedy is, overall, the safest remedy for the site.

Ms. Low added that the remedy must be designed and constructed to the high standards of regulatory agencies and that the regulatory agencies for each phase of the project review all reports. She added that within their agencies other people besides themselves are involved in the regulatory review of the documents and that these people are experts in their respective fields.

Ms. Low concluded by presenting a slide showing how to contact the regulatory agencies with comments and questions.

Craig Cooper
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
75 Hawthorne Street, San Francisco, CA 94105
(415) 947-4148
cooper.craig@epa.gov

Ross Steenson and Tina Low
San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control
Board 1515 Clay Street, Suite 1400, Oakland, CA 94612
(510) 622-2445/5682
rsteenson@waterboards.ca.gov
tlow@waterboards.ca.gov

Ryan Miya
California Department of Toxic Substances Control
700 Heinz Avenue, Berkeley, CA 94710
(510) 540-3775
rmiya@dtsc.ca.gov

V. Questions about Parcel E-2 Cleanup, including the Draft ROD

Mr. Robinson facilitated an open forum where meeting participants asked questions of the project team. He asked participants to please raise their hand if they had a question, wait to be recognized before asking their question, and wait to have the microphone before asking the question. He then asked participants to state their name, whether they were associated with a particular interest group, and who the questions were directed to in order to help expedite the process. Finally, he requested that participants be respectful of fellow community members and presenters while they were speaking. The following is a summary of the open forum discussion at the meeting.

- Ms. Marie Harrison: Keith, how well did the first capping work? How many times did you have to redo the capping?

  Mr. Forman: It's true that when the Navy closed the landfill they put 2 to 3 feet of soil of cover over the landfill to cap the site. This was done according to the standards in 1974. On top of that cap, a more permanent cap was installed in 2000. That was the result of a removal action to help extinguish the landfill fire. To meet all the current landfill cap standards, the Navy is installing a specialized cover that meets all regulations.

  Ms. Urizar added that the Navy is keeping the 2000 cap and adding onto it because it is still working well today.

- Ms. Harrison: We took pictures of the cap being replaced because gas was bubbling up under the plastic cover. What's going to happen to the venting holes that were put in to prevent bubbling?

Ms. Urizar: We didn't have bubbling under the cap installed in 2000. We are venting landfill gas at the site, so it doesn't bubble. The landfill gas collection system will continue to work properly and we are proposing to expand the venting system. There will not be holes in the landfill liner and landfill gas will continue to be vented and properly treated.

- Ms. Harrison: How is it possible to stop contaminants from expanding outside the cap, especially into the Bay?

  Ms. Urizar: The revetment will line the edge of the landfill and prevent migration into the Bay.

- Ms. Harrison: Have the current regulators been to the site and watched the testing being done or done the testing themselves? Are you doing more than just reviewing the paper work?

  Mr. Miya: We have programs in place for the agencies to collect independent samples and have them analyzed separately from what the Navy is doing.

- Ms Harrison: I would like to see the results from the regulatory agency testing.

- Mr. Raymond Tompkins: I would like Saul Bloom's opinion about Proposition P to be addressed.

- Mr. Saul Bloom: I have questions and will have an engineer determine if the Navy's objectives are consistent with Proposition P. I have concerns about the community being happy with the remedy and I have technical questions about the remedy as well. I just received funding to hire a landfill engineer to review the Navy's proposed remedy and to see if the selected remedy is in accordance with Proposition P. I request that the comment period be extended an additional two months to allow time for the landfill expert to review the studies.

- Mr. Tompkins: Is the representative from the City of San Francisco Department of Public Health at this meeting?

  Mr. Forman: Thor Kaslofsky does not work for the health department but he does work with the redevelopment agency and is representing the City of San Francisco here tonight.

- Raymond Tompkins: Does the City of San Francisco participate in the regulatory agency meetings and community meetings?

  Mr. Forman: Amy Brownell from the City of San Francisco participates in all the monthly meetings between the regulatory agencies and the Navy. Thor was here tonight because Amy couldn't make it.

- Mr. Tompkins : Can you pull up the slide with the multiple sampling and "previous investigations" that shows two maps? The initial core sampling within the landfill at Parcel E-2 was conducted in 1994. Following the landfill fire in 2000, there have been no more cores or parallel samples within the landfill so that the public and regulators could do a comparative analysis to determine how the fire affected the existing contamination within the landfill. This comparative analysis should be done to assure that there are no new problems that would make the landfill more dangerous to the public. Also, what are the risks to the public for excavating the landfill versus leaving it in place?

Mr. Cooper: Excavation of the landfill presents numerous risks. For example, about half the landfill is below the groundwater table and saturated in water. If the Navy were to excavate this saturated material, it would need to be tented and spread out to dry before it could be put on trucks and removed from the site. The simple activity of excavating and spreading out the saturated parts of the landfill would increase the risk to people in the community. These are some of the technical challenges that the Navy would face if they tried to excavate the landfill, and neither the Navy nor the regulators want to pose risks to the public.

- Mr. Tompkins: You could tent and ventilate the material while it dried out. This seems like a cost issue and not so much a safety decision based on human health risks. How would the community be protected and notified if there is an earthquake and the landfill cap failed?

  Mr. Cooper: The design of the protective cap to withstand earthquakes and sea level rise are two issues that will be worked out in the design process. There are other landfills in earthquake zones and their soil caps are considered protective. Also, there are contingency plans in place for these issues. The Navy and the regulators can work with community to develop a contingency plan about how to notify the community if there is a failure at the landfill.

- Mr. Tompkins: The USEPA talked about risk modeling in the presentation, but there will be new homes built across the street from site, which is a unique situation.

  Mr. Cooper: Even without the Navy involved, the USEPA would have picked this same remedy for the site based on the site risks. The USEPA has overseen landfill sites that are adjacent to community areas before. For example, we capped the Presidio landfill and there are houses on the edge of that landfill. The USEPA also has a new policy to find more beneficial issues after the landfill is capped, including golf courses and baseball fields and not just open space parks.

- Ms. Espanola Jackson: The Navy needs to request $10 billion to cleanup the shipyard. The proposed remedy also needs to meet residential standards to comply with Proposition P. There is no reason fast track the cleanup if you can't use the land other than open space. I have concerns that the right thing isn't being done and that the Navy is not involving the community like what happened at Parcel A. I would like the landfill and contaminated soil removed on barges.

- Ms. Veronica Shepard: I've seen a lot of health disparities that have come from the shipyard. Who is accountable if there are negative health effects? Is there a plan if things go wrong and people get sick because the technicians and engineers are incorrect? Why is it a problem to move the dirt somewhere else if *it's ok to leave it here?*

  Mr. Cooper: There is no cleanup action that has a zero risk solution. Based on the regulators' and Navy's experience and knowledge of these types of landfills, this type of remedy is the most protective short-term and long-term solution for the local community. This is based on our experience with landfills nationwide.

  Mr. Miya: There is also a 5-year review process after the remedy is implemented where the remedy is revisited by the regulators to ensure it is still protective of human health and environment.

- Mr. Robert Woods: How deep will the cap be located? If you put buildings on the land, will the footings need to be specialized to protect the liner so they don't puncture it? Also, what happens to the rain when the water seeps into soil? Does it sit stagnant on top of the liner or will there be drainage.

Ms. Urizar: The redevelopment plans show that the land will be open space, so there is no need to dig into the liner or cap. The depth of the soil cover will be at least 2 feet, and more in many areas. More soil may be added to that 2 feet to allow for planting. Also, the site will be designed so that rain water will drain to the edges and collected. Water will not sit on top of liner.

- Mr. Eric Smith: I work with the San Francisco Bay Railroad. As a former member of the Restoration Advisory Board (RAB), I'd like to see a document outlining the risk for leaving the contaminated soil in place versus removing it. The community hiring commitment is good, and I ask that the Navy continue their commitment to the community to continue employing local workers and trucking agencies.

  Mr. Forman: The Navy will continue to put forth requirements to use local residents and contractors. The Navy tries to maximize the amount of money that stays within the community and will try to find ways to continue to get better at using local assets.

- Mr. John McCarthy: I participated in the RAB when Dr. Tompkins raised questions about the Parcel E-2 landfill. Is anyone aware of ultimate depth of the fill prior to the landfill being built? How much of Parcel E-2 was filled prior to Naval Radiological Defense Laboratory (NRDL) activity?

  Mr. Forman: Your question was documented during the last community meeting and has been responded to previously. Ms. Urizar noted that there has been approximately 34 to 35 feet of fill material added to Parcel E-2.

- Mr. McCarthy: So, there is a difference of 25 feet between the depth of the original fill level and the maximum depth of excavation in the landfill area, which was 10 feet. I have concerns of what is located in the 25 feet that wasn't excavated or studied.

  Mr. Miya: There is a monitoring program to ensure the material below 10 feet is not seeping into the environment and causing a health hazard to the public or environment.

  Mr. Forman: There is a Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ) factsheet about the landfill that answers some of the questions. Copies are available tonight.

- Vatima Patton: I came to the meeting with an open mind. I've seen hazardous material and soil being removed from HPNS with no cover on the trucks. I'm concerned about the diseases that would come from the materials that could have long-term consequences. I'm concerned about the risk to my family by just capping landfill rather than removing it. The Navy needs to ensure the top priority is public safety and not the cost of cleanup. Would any of the them live on HPNS?

  Mr. Cooper: I would live on HPNS, but I've looked at the data and seen the sampling and testing. I've had the opportunity to visit the site and look at data.

- Mr. Sudeep Rao: My concern is that the Navy and regulators are saying that this type of landfill is okay and that the historical practices used to make this landfill were okay. Fundamentally, I'm concerned about historical disposal practices at this site being considered okay. The previous investigation slides show that samples taken within the Parcel E-2 landfill area are restricted in order to not tear the liner, so we don't know what's down there. How can we say it's not harmful? The landfill has not been thoroughly characterized all the way down to 36 feet, so we don't have a good idea of what is down

there. I believe there has been too little sampling to say it's okay to leave that contamination in the landfill. Some technological innovation can be implemented, and the contaminated soil should be excavated.

Ms. Kito: A single sample dot on a slide is not necessarily one sample, it can be many samples collected at different depths. Many samples have been collected throughout Parcel E-2. Typically, if you sample in an area and find no contamination, then there is no need to conduct more step-out sampling in that area. We sampled a lot by the shoreline because that is where we found contamination.

- Mr. Rao: The number of samples per acre seems low in density.

  Ms. Kito: To clarify, every green dot is a radiological screening sample. Some samples we took went all the way down to the bottom of the landfill.

  Mr. Miya: The dots on the left and right are all sampling locations.

  Ms. Kito: Green dots are radiological screening samples that were collected at a depth of about 6 inches to 1 foot.

  Mr. Cooper: Green dots indicate shallow radiological testing. Other colored dots were for chemical testing at multiple depths.

- Ms. Esselene Stencil: I have a concern there will be another fire under the cap. There are many sick individuals in the community so there must be contaminants in that area. I'm concerned about the earthquake risk too. The toxins are too dangerous to only have 3 feet of soil covering them. How will you ensure the wind won't blow the soil off? The Navy promised to cleanup the shipyard and you need to remove the toxic soil to fulfill that promise. Sometimes the water is brown from the faucet, which is also of concern.

- Mr. Neil MacLean: Ms. Urizar, please clarify if all high-level nuclear waste was all accounted for. Wasn't there nuclear waste in the 1940s and 50s?

  Mr. Forman: Records show that when there was high-level radiation it was disposed offsite and not on Parcel E-2. There were no records of the high level of waste disposal at the landfill. Waste in the landfill is construction debris.

- Mr. MacLean: I think there is a conflict of values and a history of mistakes. Do we want to correct the historical mistakes or just cover them up?

  Mr. Cooper: Past dumping should not have happened. We can't undo the past, so we must move forward with making the site safe for the public. The cleanup plans are cleaning it up in a smart way. We are removing truckloads of contaminated soil now. The USEPA is ensuring that the disposal does not contaminate another community. Capping and containing is the best way to manage a landfill at the shipyard.

- Mr. Lee Gray: I work for a trucking company, and I do work for contractors on HPNS. I don't believe that you can't excavate because the landfill is under the water table. We do this all the time on other parcels, so I don't see why you can't do that with Parcel E-2. The liner is not going to work; we need to excavate the landfill.

- Mr. Bloom: We are formally asking for a 2-month extension for the comment period for the draft ROD. I just got an expert hired to review the ROD, contributing documents, and

historical studies for the Parcel E-2 landfill. We need a clean look at the studies to determine if we agree with results of the ROD. We will produce and distribute the results of that review.

The ultimate land use for Parcel E-2 should be driven by the redevelopment plan. In this case, the remedy cap is driving the open space requirement instead. The HPNS landfill is different than the Presidio landfill, which doesn't have the adjacent Yosemite Slough and community environmental justice issues.

Post-meeting Note: The Navy granted a 15 day extension to the original comment period. The comment period for the draft Parcel E-2 ROD ends May 15, 2012. The draft final version will be issued in the June/July timeframe.

- Mr. Jaron Brown: A component of selecting a remedy under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act is community acceptance. The Navy is blatantly disregarding community acceptance on this site. The public comments disapprove of this remedy. The reason for choosing this remedy is that removal is difficult and expensive. Removal is the best long-term solution for a remedy.

- Mr. Francisco De Costa: I worked for the Army and U.S. Park Police. The community is requesting the removal of contaminants. The Navy needs to remediate Parcel E-2 since you created it and you need to respect the wishes of the community.

- Ms. Harrison: I'd like the Water Board to respond to my question. Please email me at Marie@greenaction.org. I have a question about chemicals in the water and toxic materials in the water. Current contaminants in the water are from the ships and Navy actions, and these include [polychlorinated biphenyls] PCBs and mercury. There are other contaminants that came before the liner and fire. How are you addressing that and cleaning the water? How are you cleaning what has already leached off that land? The Navy sued Triple A for contaminating the Bay. The community fishes in the Bay for food. How do you ensure they are safe? How can you remove low amounts of arsenic and other contaminants?

- Mr. Larry Frias: I'm with Waste Solutions. I'm aware of the risk and transporting methods. We removed more than 5 million tons of contaminated soil on the east and west coast and have received no citations.

  Mr. Cooper: We are not concerned about trucking causing the risk to the public, it's the act of digging out the landfill that would cause the greatest risk to the public.

- Mr. Frias: We spread and dry soil already, so why can't we do it for this site?

  Mr. Cooper: We are currently removing strategic hot spot areas and we dry those as necessary, but those are on a limited scale.

  Ms. Urizar: We are trying to not dig into the landfill. The landfill is a physical hazard to workers more than soil removal at hot spots.

- Mr. Lee Gray: At the last meeting at the YMCA you mentioned battery acid that the Navy didn't remove. How are you getting lead out of the soil?

  Ms. Urizar: We are digging for lead along the bay and we are documenting where we have found lead. We will remove it all later pending funding.

- Question from unidentified community member: Craig, you mentioned laying out soil and drying. Can't you use deep water techniques to dewater the site prior to removing the landfill material or is there a hazard with this technique? This technique is used at refineries.

  Mr. Cooper: We are digging up and drying the contaminated soil.

  Ms. Kito: The amount we have removed at other sites is relatively small compared to the landfill. The problem with removing and drying the landfill material becomes a space issue. There is not enough room on HPNS to layout, dry, scan, and load the material for disposal. It has taken 2 years to remove 40 thousand cubic yards of soil at an adjacent site [PCB Hot Spot Area]. By comparison, the landfill is approximately 1 million cubic yards.

- Mr. Tompkins: Looking at the chemical and radiological sampling slide, there is a difference between the anecdotal evidence and empirical evidence. I understand the concern about water seeping into the Bay. There were stories of workers dumping dead radiological animals into a landfill pit that went down 15 feet. Sampling only 2 feet down from the surface isn't enough to ensure that there isn't radioactive impacts to the soil below. Sampling and testing is needed of the two aquifers at the landfill to see if there is water seeping from the landfill and contaminating the groundwater and Bay. Does the Navy still have an active vapor trapping system for gas accumulation?

  Mr. Forman: The Navy does currently maintain a landfill gas extraction system. This system has both active and passive components to it. The landfill gas does pass through multiple filters prior to being released into the atmosphere. Our active system kicks in when methane exceeds 2.5% concentration by volume.

- Mr. Tompkins: The ballistic liner brought to previous meetings only repelled water, but gas could flow through. Is this the same barrier?

  Ms. Kito: Gas doesn't flow though this barrier.

- Mr. Tompkins: What is the life expectancy of the barrier.

  Ms. Kito: The barrier will be built to last over 100 years. The site will also be professionally monitored and maintained.

- Mr. Tompkins: When we sat down with the EPA years ago we couldn't deal with climate change because we were under the Bush administration. In this proposal, are you addressing climate change and what are the remedies if the Bay rises 10 feet or higher? How are you going to protect the public in the event of a 9.0 earthquake.

  Mr. Miya: The design document will take into account both sea level rise and impacts from earthquakes.

- Mr. Tompkins: Will we have an open forum to discuss the design details and have our questions addressed like we did with the RAB? I am questioning methodology and procedure for design since the Navy only did radioactive scanning down to 2 feet. There is anecdotal evidence that the contaminants went down farther. Given the history, you need to scan deeper.

Mr. Cooper: There will be an open forum for the design process and it will be transparent and as open as possible. We could possibly check in with the community at the 30 percent design to communicate what decisions and standards are included in the design elements.

- Mr. Tompkins: I'd like the next meeting to address contaminants below the deepest level scanned.
- Ms. Harrison: Are there still areas in the shipyard that we can't step off a bus at because of contamination? Are those sites still that contaminated?

  Mr. Forman: We have a requirement to wear a vest, steel-toe shoes, hard hat, and goggles while we are on a construction site, which is what HPNS is. It's a safety requirement, and not a contamination level issue.

- Ms. Harrison: This was at the man-made oil wells site. We couldn't go by that area because of the contamination.

  Mr. Forman: All you need is steel-toe shoes for safety issues. You need that required clothing.

- Ms. Harrison: Are you still removing the old infrastructure of sewer lines, and do you have a characterization of where they flowed?

  Mr. Forman: Lines go either way, and we are still investigating sewer and storm line drains on Parcels C and E.

- Mr. Gray: How much of Parcel E-2 will be capped and used for open space?

  Mr. Forman: Roughly 47 acres.

- Mr. Gray: If you can't dig over 6 inches, wouldn't that mean shrubbery can't be planted?

  Ms. Urizar: The city can add more soil to plant shrubbery and trees.

  Mr. Cooper: It's encouraged to plant native plants that have shallow root depths that wouldn't penetrate the cap. The city is working on a revegetation strategy.

- Mr. Browne: Are the dates on the meeting calendar the only ones? The community isn't clear about the process for involvement. What is the process for approving the ROD? Is this the chosen remedy?

  Mr. Forman: We are in the middle of the comment period. The next community meeting is in June. The draft final ROD date in June will probably be pushed out to July if the Navy extends the comment period. It's anticipated the Remedial Design will be submitted in spring 2013.

Ms. Jackson: I'm concerned about the health dangers to the younger generation. The regulators do not know what the community has gone through. I also have concerns about the sewage plant and other hazards, and we don't know what we are inhaling. The Navy and regulators need to be honest about the contaminants in the ground and air. The meeting was adjourned at 9:15 p.m.

- **Action Items**

1. Water Board (Tina Low) to email Marie@greenaction.org a response to her question regarding toxins in the Bay.