

**REVISED FINAL**  
**NAVAL FUEL DEPOT, POINT MOLATE**  
**RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD (RAB) MEETING**  
**4 June 2008**

**Richmond City Library, Madeline F. Whittlesey Community Room**  
**325 Civic Center Plaza, Richmond, California**

**Purpose:** 1) finalize minutes from the previous RAB meeting; 2) present information on the Finding of Suitability for Early Transfer (FOSET); 3) present the proposed environmental remediation approach for Point Molate and the proposed redevelopment; 4) provide an update on recent Regional Water Quality Control Board (Water Board) activities; 5) provide an update on recent city of Richmond (City) activities; and 6) solicit community questions and topics for the next meeting.

These meeting minutes summarize the items discussed during the RAB meeting. This is not a verbatim transcript. Attachment A provides the attendance list.

**Meeting Attendees:**

**RAB Community Members:** Shirley Butt; Henry Clark; Don Delcollo; Gaye Eisenlord; Sharon Fuller; Don Gosney; Jeff Inglis; Arnie Kasendorf; Rao Kaza; Jil Kiernan; Kent Kitchingman; Stephen Linsley; Sharon Maves; Tony Mendicino; Margaret Morkowski; Nagaraja Rao; Eileen Whitty; and Bruce Beyaert (RAB Alternate)

**Government Agencies/Regulators:** Michael Bloom, Navy RAB Co-Chair/Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) Environmental Coordinator (BEC); Derek Robinson, Navy Remedial Project Manager (RPM); David Clark, Navy Lead RPM; George Leyva, Water Board; John Kaiser, Water Board; and Alvaro Da Silva, City of Richmond

**I. Welcome and Meeting Minutes Approval**

Mr. Gosney called the meeting to order at 7:07 p.m. He announced that the RAB has held just about 100 meetings since August 1996, and that tonight's meeting should be one of the most important. He asked for corrections to the draft March 2008 RAB meeting minutes. There were none, and the minutes were unanimously approved as written.

**II. Finding of Suitability for Early Transfer**

Mr. Gosney introduced Mr. Bloom to present the Finding of Suitability for Early Transfer (FOSET) for Point Molate. Overheads and handouts accompanied the presentation.

Mr. Bloom announced that the draft FOSET will be out for public review on June 11<sup>th</sup>. The presentation will explain "Early Transfer" and what the process entails, the areas of the former base addressed in the FOSET, what a FOSET document contains, the Covenant Deferral Request package submitted to the governor, and the schedule.

The base is divided into thirteen transfer or "disposal" areas. Much of the base was transferred to the City of Richmond in September 2003. Installation Restoration (IR) Sites 1, 3 and 4 fall within the remaining transfer areas and are included in the FOSET. In addition, the responsibility for the environmental cleanup of the remaining large underground storage tanks (USTs) is also included

in the FOSET. Early Transfer means that property is transferred before all remedial actions are complete. The Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) covenant (the agreement that all remedial action is complete) is deferred (postponed) until the property recipient completes the response actions. Then the Navy will issue the covenant and legally record it. The governor must approve the Early Transfer. Benefits of Early Transfer are efficiency (cleanup and redevelopment activities are integrated), land is cleaned up to the level required for the intended reuse, and the property becomes usable sooner. Mr. Bloom introduced Mr. Robinson to continue the presentation on the FOSET.

The Early Transfer process for Point Molate is as follows: 1) the City requests Early Transfer of the property; 2) the Navy develops the draft FOSET for the property; 3) the public has 30 days to comment on the draft FOSET; 4) the Navy prepares a responsiveness summary of the public comments received and prepares the final FOSET; 5) the Navy prepares a Covenant Deferral Request (CDR) package for the governor's review; 6) the governor reviews and approves the CDR package; and 7) Early Transfer occurs. Mr. Gosney asked how the public knows about the 30-day review. Mr. Robinson explained that copies of the FOSET will be sent to Mr. Gosney to distribute to RAB members, copies are sent to the information repositories for public availability, and a notice is placed in the local newspaper announcing the FOSET availability. Mr. Bloom said the Navy will post an e-copy of the FOSET on its BRAC Program Management Office web site. Mr. Leyva said he can post a copy on the Water Board's GeoTracker web site. Ms. Maves said she has not found access to the internet successful and would like a copy of the FOSET on CD. Mr. Bloom and Mr. Robinson agreed to provide the FOSET on CD to all RAB members.

Mr. Robinson explained the purpose and contents of a FOSET. The purpose is to document the environmental condition of the property and to provide the statement that the Navy finds the property suitable for Early Transfer. The FOSET contains: 1) a description of the property and the nature and extent of contamination; 2) the intended future use; 3) response and corrective action requirements; 4) a responsiveness summary of public comments received during the public review period; 5) notices, covenants, and restrictions to be included in the property transfer deed; and the Environmental Transfer Cooperative Agreement (ETCA) between the Navy and City.

Disposal areas discussed in the FOSET include: Area 3 (IR Site 3), Area 5 (IR Site 4 - Drum Lot 2/Building 87), Area 10 (IR Site 1), and Area 13 (IR Site 4 - Drum Lot 1). The FOSET describes the environmental status of IR Sites 1, 3, and 4 as well as updates on USTs and pipelines, aboveground storage tanks (ASTs), asbestos-containing materials, lead-based paint, radon, pesticides, and polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs). The FOSET also provides: 1) analysis of future land use and whether land use restrictions will be necessary; 2) the requirements for remedial, corrective, and response actions and operations; and 3) information on notices, restrictions, or covenants that will be required in the deed, based on current environmental property conditions.

Mr. Robinson said the FOSET will also discuss long-term monitoring (LTM) and environmental responsibilities for areas transferred in 2003. Mr. Kitchingman asked about response actions for IR Site 3. Mr. Bloom said those actions are not known yet; the Navy will report what it knows to date but the final response action will be up to the property recipient. Mr. Kitchingman then asked about LTM and remedies selected for Site 3, and what could be said about the response actions. Mr. Bloom answered that what the Navy knows is presented in the summary of alternatives in the FOSET. When asked if the issue of cost of remedies is addressed in the document, Mr. Bloom said that it is not.

Dr. Clark asked if only onsite contamination is being looked at and whether any contamination is coming in from the tides. Mr. Robinson said that the Navy is not aware of contamination coming

in from the bay. Dr. Clark asked if any changes in groundwater were observed due to rain and tides. Mr. Robinson said that data from years of monitoring do not show any contamination increase due to rain or tidal activity. Mr. Levine of Upstream Point Molate LLC (Upstream) added that contamination trends in the groundwater are generally decreasing over time. Mr. Inglis asked if a feasibility study (FS) report was done that evaluated cleanup options. Mr. Bloom said yes, the RAB reviewed the Draft FS Report and Corrective Action Plan (CAP) in 2005 but the report has not been finalized. Mr. Inglis asked how Site 3 will be affected by the Early Transfer. Mr. Levine responded that Upstream will take over remediation of the site following transfer.

Mr. Beyaert asked if the City and Upstream reviewed the proposed future land uses and whether there are any land use restrictions or controls on the property. Mr. Levine said that current land use controls can be lifted once the cleanup is done. Ms. Maves asked if Early Transfer means that Site 3 will go to Upstream with Water Board oversight and if that meant the RAB would be gone. Mr. Levine said he would discuss that in his presentation.

Mr. Robinson continued discussing the FOSET. The appendices contain notification of hazardous substances stored, released, or disposed of on the property; a responsiveness summary of the comments received on the Draft FOSET; and the negotiated agreement (ETCA) between the Navy and City. The ETCA outlines the responsibilities, tasks, and budget necessary to complete the remaining environmental response actions. The CDR package to the governor includes: 1) a cover letter requesting deferral; 2) FOSET (with appendices); 3) Site Cleanup Requirements Order; 4) Land Use Covenant; and 5) Quitclaim Deed. The governor reviews the package and then approves the Early Transfer. Ms. Whitty asked how comments on the Draft FOSET are addressed. Mr. Robinson said comments are responded to in the responsiveness summary and included in the Final FOSET that goes to the governor. The schedule calls for the Draft FOSET to be reviewed from June 11<sup>th</sup> to July 10<sup>th</sup>, 2008, and the Final FOSET and CDR package sent to the governor probably in October 2008. Mr. Rao asked if this process could take more time or possibly less time. Mr. Robinson replied that he has heard reports that the governor's office is getting faster at reviewing FOSETs as more are prepared, so it could take less than the 60-day expected time frame for review and approval. Mr. Kasendorf asked if the governor chooses not to sign for some reason, can the Navy revise the FOSET/CDR and resubmit. Mr. Robinson said yes, but that it would depend on the reason. Mr. Da Silva added that only a few FOSETs have actually gone through approval. Mr. Levine said they will work with the governor's staff throughout the process.

Mr. Beyaert asked how Upstream Point Molate LLC is involved with the quitclaim deed. Mr. Levine said he will discuss that during his presentation; however, when the City receives the property it assumes environmental responsibilities, and when the property is transferred from the City to Upstream the responsibilities are transferred as well. Ms. Maves asked if the FOSET should be reviewed by the RAB's Technical Document Review Committee. Mr. Gosney said that anyone who wants to review and comment on the FOSET would have the opportunity. Comments can be incorporated into one document for the Navy to respond to or submitted individually. Mr. Levine said that if questions arise during the RAB's review of the FOSET, his team is available to answer questions and will work with the RAB on the review process.

Mr. Kitchingman asked how long it will take to get the Site 3 FS revised and finalized. Mr. Levine replied that Early Transfer involves site cleanup to the Water Board's satisfaction and approval. Upstream proposes an aggressive cleanup approach; he expects the Final FS and Remedial Action Plan in 2009. Mr. Robinson added that the FOSET will not contain much detail on the Site 3 FS. Mr. Beyaert asked if there are associated National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and/or California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) documents. Mr. Robinson said

those are not required for the FOSET. Mr. Bloom added that a NEPA/CEQA document, the Environmental Impact Statement/Environmental Impact Report (EIS/EIR), was prepared by the Navy and City prior to the 2003 property transfer.

Mr. Gosney reiterated the following: 1) the Navy will e-mail the RAB members regarding access to the Navy's web site where the FOSET will be posted; 2) the Navy will provide the FOSET on CD to RAB members; 3) three hard copies will be given to Mr. Gosney; and 4) copies will be placed in the information repositories. He noted that the review period is 30 days and suggested coordinating review comments.

Dr. Clark asked whether there is any perception that politics will affect the property reuse, since a casino is proposed. Mr. Bloom said that in the FOSET, no; the FOSET discusses land use in terms of the signed NEPA Record of Decision. Dr. Clark understood, but reiterated a potential for concern about politics in light of a casino. Mr. Levine said his team does not think there is any issue with the FOSET regarding whether or not a casino is a component of the development at Point Molate. Mr. Salmon of Upstream added that the RAB can play an important role as the official link to the community.

### **III. Proposed Environmental Remediation Approach and Proposed Redevelopment**

Mr. Gosney introduced Mr. Jim Levine of Upstream Point Molate LLC to present his firm's proposed environmental remediation approach and information on the proposed redevelopment of former Point Molate property. Overheads accompanied his presentation and a handout was made available at the end of the meeting.

Mr. Levine explained that Upstream Point Molate LLC, hired by the City, has been given the responsibility by the City to negotiate for this early agreement. Initially, the Navy and the City/Upstream were quite far apart, but they have worked honestly and openly about what needed to be done to reach an Early Transfer agreement. A cleanup plan is ready that Upstream believes is agreeable to all parties, including the Water Board. The RAB is getting a first look at this plan tonight. While redevelopment is not specifically within the RAB's area of responsibility, once Early Transfer occurs, if RAB members wish to continue involvement in Point Molate it would be welcome. The presentation would address the proposed redevelopment, schedule, and continuing role for the RAB.

Mr. Levine explained that the Navy kept the parcels that needed work (these were not included in the September 2003 property transfer to the City). The Navy has made progress on those parcels since 2003, so the Early Transfer is not considered a "walk-away" for the Navy. Current property owners are the City of Richmond and the Navy. The property transferees are the City, Winehaven Partners LLC, and the Bureau of Indian Affairs. The developer is Upstream Point Molate LLC and Winehaven Partners LLC. The lead regulatory agency is the California Water Board, San Francisco Region. Mr. Kitchingman asked who the project backers are. Mr. Levine said he could not name them yet, but it is not Harrah's, as originally proposed.

The agreement reached, after three years of discussions between the City/Upstream and the Navy, is for transfer of the remaining parcels from the Navy to the City with a one-time payment of \$28.5 million to complete remediation and provide environmental insurance. Winehaven Partners LLC will provide an additional estimated \$4 million. The Water Board staff has reviewed the cleanup approach and a new Water Board Order for cleanup is being developed. The target transfer date is December 2008 with payment expected in January 2009. Mr. Levine said that if the Navy kept the property, the cleanup would cost more due to long-term monitoring and the

potential for continuing cleanup activities over a long time period. Upstream is planning a once-and-for-all cleanup, so the time period to achieve closure is shorter. The cleanup approach for Site 3 is more aggressive than the Navy's plan and will involve excavation of larger amounts of petroleum-affected soils that could be a source of mobile product. The Draft EIS/EIR for this project is scheduled for release in July or August 2008 and will be available for public review. Land-use options evaluated in the EIS/EIR include tribal mixed-use, residential, commercial, and parkland. Mr. Kitchingman asked if the potential for hazardous releases from ChevronTexaco were considered in the impacts evaluation. Mr. Levine replied that Chevron performed alternative-release scenarios for the earlier EIS/EIR, but did not include prevailing winds or the hill on the property. Chevron therefore concluded that residential use should be excluded. The current EIS/EIR evaluated hazard scenarios that include the prevailing winds and the hill, and concluded that residential use is not restricted. Mr. Kitchingman asked what the contaminant of concern from Chevron is; Mr. Levine said it's ammonia.

Mr. Beyaert asked for clarification of the payment. Mr. Levine said the \$28.5 million disbursement, expected in January 2009, will be detailed in an agreement and will go into an escrow account. Mr. Beyaert asked for assurance that the money would not go into the City's general fund; Mr. Levine said it would go into a separate account. Mr. Mendicino asked if the \$32 million total is exceeded, who would pay the difference. Mr. Levine said the project insurance carried by Upstream would pay the difference. The insurance carried will be twice the amount of the expected remediation cost.

Mr. Levine showed maps with both gaming and non-gaming footprints, both of which are evaluated in the EIS/EIR. Mr. Beyaert asked if the project pencils out cost-wise for the non-gaming alternative. Mr. Levine said yes, except the projected revenue for the City would be much lower with the non-gaming alternative.

Mr. Levine reviewed the IR sites, petroleum sites, off-shore sediments, and firing range in terms of remediation to date and proposed actions.

Site 1–Landfill Area: Record of Decision (ROD) signed; post-closure maintenance and monitoring plan in place; Water Board requested an additional compliance well and the Navy is installing. No development is proposed on this part of the hillside area.

Site 2–Sandblast Grit Area: ROD signed; no further action required.

Site 3–Sump Pond Area: Groundwater extraction and treatment system operating since 1995; pipelines removed; Draft FS and CAP prepared in 2005; Navy conducted additional studies in 2007. Upstream proposes an aggressive approach: remove about 100,000 cubic yards of contaminated soils; backfill the area with clean soil; modify the sheet pile wall to allow groundwater to flow along the bottom; and conduct monitoring along the shoreline. Most of the cleanup money will be spent here. Upstream will finalize the 2005 Draft FS and CAP.

Mr. Delcollo asked about the expected useful life of the sheet pile wall at Site 3. Mr. Levine said it should have a long life; however, since the mobile product at Site 3 will be removed, the sheet pile wall won't have anything to contain. Mr. Rao asked how the shoreline will be monitored. Mr. Levine said there are downgradient shoreline monitoring wells in place that will be used. Mr. Beyaert asked what the soil removal depths mean for land use controls. Mr. Levine said that following remediation the land in the Site 3 area will be appropriate for recreational and residential use, except for single-family homes. No volatile solvents will be left at the site. This plan has been presented to Upstream's insurance company and they are comfortable with it.

Ms. Maves asked how long the remediation would take; Mr. Levine said one season. Ms. Butt asked if soil could be cleaned up on site rather than trucked off site. Mr. Levine replied that some clean soil is available on site by removing one of the small hills and this will be used for backfilling, but trying to remediate the contaminated soil on site would hold up the project, as heavy petroleum compounds take longer to bioremediate than lighter ones. Also, trucks leaving the site go right onto the freeway and do not travel through local neighborhoods. The soil trucked off site will be taken to one of three licensed disposal facilities. Ms. Butt asked if the topsoil and native plants will be saved when the hill is taken down. Mr. Levine said the area is dominated by invasive species but the plan is to restore the site with native plants, and Upstream is hoping the RAB will help with restoration. Dr. Clark said he was concerned about past experiences where trucks carrying contaminated soil dumped it into local canyons instead of taking it to disposal facilities. Mr. Levine assured him that won't happen here.

Site 4—Drums Lots 1 and 2/Bldg 87: Draft risk assessments submitted; work conducted at Drum Lot #2 included pesticides removal action at Building 87; Upstream plans to remediate the small amounts of chlorinated solvents in soil and groundwater as per the Water Board's request.

Large Hillside USTs/ASTs and Pipelines: CAP implemented; structural closure received for all USTs, and environmental closure on seven USTs to date; Upstream will complete environmental closure on all remaining USTs. [Two more tanks have received environmental closure, for a total of nine].

Off-shore Sediments and Firing Range: Risk assessment indicated no risk to ecological receptors, with concurrence by regulatory agencies; small lead removal action conducted at firing range and no further action required; both areas closed.

The proposed remediation schedule is as follows:

- Development of Water Board Order – June through August 2008
- Covenant Deferral Request (FOSET, ETCA, Consent Agreement, real estate documents) – May through September 2008
- Land Transfer from Navy to City – December 2008
- Remedial Plan Documents Submitted – April 2009
- Water Board Review & Approval – June 2009
- Proposed Plans and Records of Decision – August 2009
- Public Participation – August through December 2009
- Water Board ROD Approval – December 2009
- Remediation Design – March 2010
- Remediation Implementation – Summer/Fall 2010; monitoring to continue

Mr. Levine said that Upstream would like the advisory board to continue its work and expand its role into ecological site restoration. The goal is to develop a robust ecological restoration plan within two years, and citizen participation is important. Dr. Clark asked if the citizens' advisory role would continue through the construction phase. Mr. Levine said that would be fine with Upstream. He thinks the City would support such community involvement and he noted that this RAB is a good, functional group. He suggested RAB members discuss the idea and provide feedback to Upstream in about month about whether members wish to continue and expand the role into ecological restoration.

Mr. Inglis said he appreciated Upstream's openness. He asked how the City/Upstream will commit to community involvement as there is no legal requirement. Mr. Levine said it's in their best interests; the advisory group works for free and helps the developer and the tribal people (Pomo), who are the project proponents. Upstream is willing to make a long-term commitment until the project is done. Dr. Clark commended the commitment and said continuing an advisory board is a good idea. He also commended Upstream for its "green" vision, which he said is not often seen in other brownfields projects. He would like to see community involvement until project completion. Mr. Beyaert inquired whether parts of the property (specifically, the beach) could be opened to the public before cleanup is completed, since it will take two-plus years until cleanup is complete; Mr. Levine said probably not because that is in the middle of the proposed remedial and site construction.

Mr. Levine discussed the vision for the former Point Molate property. Development of a destination resort and ecological village at Point Molate is an opportunity to revitalize the economic and cultural life for the Guidiville Band of the Pomo Indians, the City, and the region. Open space will be preserved, the Winehaven building will be restored and preserved, and the development of a resort will provide economic development and financial sustainability for the City and Richmond area.

Mr. Kasendorf noted that other developers have said similar things but failed to follow through. He asked how the community could hold Upstream to its commitment. Mr. Levine said there is a commitment to provide \$20 million per year from gaming to the City through this project. Mr. Kasendorf observed that the community may not end up with the money, that the City has spent such funds elsewhere in the past. Mr. Levine said Upstream has faith in the City's ability to fund important projects with the money, but also, the project has additional budget to directly support community initiatives.

The proposed development ("destination resort and ecological village") would provide for tribal government, housing, a cultural center, and economic foundation for future generations of Pomo; and a world-class resort with hotels and conference centers, retail, a casino, outdoor recreation and family attractions, entertainment, education, and environmental sustainability. It must be an extraordinary project for an extraordinary piece of land. The development footprint is proposed for areas already disturbed, protecting existing open space areas and the shoreline through conservation easements. Extensive use of photovoltaics to provide solar power, alternative-fuel vehicles and ferries, water recycling (use of "gray water"), high-efficiency building insulation, passive heating and cooling, low-flow water fixtures, recycling and food-waste composting, and an organic garden are planned. A "zero carbon footprint" is envisioned for on-site energy use.

Mr. Delcollo asked if BART would provide additional parking for people going to the casino. Mr. Levine said the project will not take away parking, but people will take BART to Richmond and casino shuttles will provide a seamless trip. In addition, the pier will be retrofitted for direct ferry service. Dr. Clark noted that BART shuttles will help reduce greenhouse gas emissions. He asked if East Bay Municipal Utility District (EBMUD) is involved in the recycled water. Mr. Levine said EBMUD will provide potable water, but the project is going beyond by reclaiming gray water.

Mr. Levine said that an innovative sustainability program helps reclaim the indigenous ways of living combined with the latest technologies. Native plants and ecological principles will thrive. Volunteer and job opportunities will be available for tribal and Richmond youth through a conservation corps-type program. The project is envisioned as a social reinvestment partnership with the Richmond community. Economic benefits to the region include the following:

- 17,000 direct and induced jobs, coupled with job-training programs and union partnerships;
- A construction stimulus of \$1.68 billion in wages, supplies, and vendor contracts;
- Strong tourism will bring millions of dollars into the local economy;
- Project operation will bring more than \$500 million in new wages; and
- Benefits are expected to outweigh and potential economic or social impacts of problem gambling

The local hiring goal is 40 percent. Ms. Fuller asked if workforce development is included; Mr. Levine said yes, and that union jobs and apprenticeship programs for tribal and local people are included.

Mr. Levine reviewed the history of the Pomo in the area before the tribe was moved north during the California Gold Rush. This project is embraced by the Guidiville Pomo community as a way of regenerating the tribal economy and culture. Reciprocal benefits for the Pomo and Richmond communities are built into the project, offering partnerships to achieve common goals. Mr. Levine thanked the RAB for its interest.

#### **IV. Water Board Update**

Mr. Gosney introduced Mr. Leyva to provide an update on recent Water Board activities since the last RAB meeting. Mr. Leyva noted that Mr. John Kaiser of the Water Board was also present. Mr. Leyva reiterated that the FOSET describes sites being transferred and includes frank discussions of what is known about the sites, good and bad. The Water Board will write a new Board Order, based on the conceptual plan presented as part of the Early Transfer, and it will be ready after the FOSET is final. The public will have 30 days to review and comment on the Order before it is approved.

#### **VI. City of Richmond Update**

Mr. Gosney introduced Mr. Da Silva to present an update on City activities. Mr. Da Silva, reporting on behalf of Janet Schneider, said that the FOSET will go to the City Council for study on June 17<sup>th</sup> and then go before the Council for a vote on June 29<sup>th</sup>.

#### **VII. Public Comment/Wrap-Up**

Mr. Gosney asked for public comments; there were none.

The next RAB meeting is scheduled for the second Wednesday of September, the 10<sup>th</sup>, at 7 PM, due to a conflict with the Labor Day holiday. The location is TBD pending availability of the Whittlesey Room. The meeting was adjourned at 9:40 p.m.

*RAB meeting minutes are located on the Navy's BRAC Program Management Office Web Page:*

<http://www.bracpmo.navy.mil/basepage.aspx?baseid=50&state=California&name=ptmolate>

*Water Board GeoTracker Web Page:* <http://geotracker.swrcb.ca.gov/>

FINAL  
04 JUNE 2008 RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD  
MEETING MINUTES

DATED 18 NOVEMBER 2008

THIS RECORD IS ENTERED IN THE DATABASE AND FILED AS  
RECORD NO. N30519\_000552



ENVIRONMENTAL COMPLIANCE CONTRACT TRANSMITTAL MEMORANDUM

Contract No. N-68711-03-D-5106

File Code: 132921-02/1

TO: Contracting Officer
Naval Facilities Engineering Command
Southwest
1220 Pacific Highway
San Diego, CA 92132-5190

DATE: December 29, 2008
D.O. # BAI-07-S-0007-CTO 33
LOCATION: Point Molate, CA
DCN # BAI.5106.0033.0005

Attention: Cynthia Mafara

FROM: Betty Schmucker
Project Manager

DESCRIPTION: Restoration Advisory Board Support - Revised Final Meeting Minutes for June 4, 2008, RAB Meeting\*

\* one change on Page 6, 1st paragraph, as per correction made at 12-03-08 RAB meeting - no change needed to attachments previously submitted

TYPE: Deliverable (Cost) [ ] Deliverable (Technical) [X] Other [ ]

VERSION: Final REVISION #:

ADMIN RECORD: Yes [X] No [ ] Category [ ] Confidential [ ]

DELIVERY DATE: 29 December 2008

NUMBER OF COPIES SUBMITTED: 3C/5E

COPIES TO (include Name, Navy Mail Code, and No. of Copies):

Table with 3 columns: NAVFAC SW, BC/BAI, OTHER (Distribution done by BC). Rows include names and copy counts like C. Mafara, 06CM (O), P. Kumar, BAI (1C/1E), etc.

O = "Original" transmittal and letter C = "Copy" of transmittal and letter E = "Enclosure" one enclosure