

**HUNTERS POINT SHIPYARD  
RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD (RAB) - MEETING AGENDA  
THURSDAY, AUGUST 23, 2007**

**Day/Date:**  
Thursday – August 23, 2007

**Location:** Alex L. Pitcher Jr. Room

**Time:**  
6:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m.

**Southeast Community Facility  
1800 Oakdale Avenue  
San Francisco, CA 94124**

**Facilitator:** Marsha Pendergrass

<b>Time</b>	<b>Topic</b>	<b>Leader</b>
6:00 p.m. – 6:05 p.m.	Welcome/Introductions/Agenda Review	Marsha Pendergrass <i>Facilitator</i>
6:05 p.m. – 6:15 p.m.	Approval of the July 26, 2007 RAB meeting minutes <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Action Items Review</li> </ul>	Marsha Pendergrass
6:15 p.m. – 6:40 p.m.	Navy Announcements	Keith Forman <i>Navy RAB Co-chair</i>
	Community Co-chair Report/Other Announcements	Leon Muhammad <i>Community Co-chair</i>
6:40 p.m. – 7:15 p.m.	Overview of the Parcel E Remedial Investigation (RI) Report	Dane Jensen <i>Navy Remedial Project Manager (RPM)</i>
<b>7:15 p.m. – 7:25 p.m.</b>	<b>BREAK</b>	
7:25 p.m. – 7:40 p.m.	Overview of the Parcel E RI Report (Continued)	Dane Jensen <i>Navy RPM</i>
7:40 p.m. – 7:45 p.m.	Technical Assistance Grant Update	Dr. Raymond Tompkins <i>Community First Coalition</i>
7:45 p.m. – 7:55 p.m.	Subcommittee Reports <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Membership Bylaws and Community Outreach</li> <li>• Economic</li> <li>• Technical</li> </ul>	Subcommittee Leaders
7:55 p.m. – 8:00 p.m.	Community Comment Period	Marsha Pendergrass
8:00 p.m.	Adjournment	Marsha Pendergrass

HPS web site: <http://www.bracpmo.navy.mil/bracbases/california/hps/default.aspx>

RAB Navy Contact: Keith Forman (619) 532-0913 or (415) 308-1458  
[keith.s.forman@navy.mil](mailto:keith.s.forman@navy.mil)

RAB Community Contact: Leon Muhammad (415) 641-0663  
[lmuha4@aol.com](mailto:lmuha4@aol.com)

**HUNTERS POINT SHIPYARD**  
**RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD MEETING MINUTES**  
**23 August 2007**

These minutes summarize the discussions and presentations from the Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) meeting held from 6:00 to 8:00 p.m. Thursday, August 23, 2007, in the Alex L. Pitcher, Jr. Room at the Southeast Community Facility. A verbatim transcript was also prepared for the meeting and is available in the information repository for Hunters Point Shipyard (HPS) and on the Internet at <http://www.bracpmo.navy.mil/bracbases/california/hps/default.aspx>. The list of agenda topics is provided below. Attachment A provides a list of attendees. Attachment B includes action items that were requested or committed to by RAB members during the meeting.

**AGENDA TOPICS:**

- (1) Welcome/Introductions/Agenda Review
- (2) Approval of Meeting Minutes from the July 26, 2007 RAB Meeting
- (3) Navy Announcements
- (4) Community Co-Chair Report/Other Announcements
- (5) Overview of the Parcel E Remedial Investigation (RI) Report
- (6) Technical Assistance Grant (TAG) Update
- (7) Subcommittee Reports
- (8) Community Comment Period
- (9) Adjournment

**MEETING HANDOUTS:**

- Agenda for August 23, 2007, RAB Meeting
- Meeting Minutes from the July 26, 2007 RAB Meeting
- Navy Monthly Progress Report, August 23, 2007
- Understanding Radioactivity in Soil at Hunters Point Shipyard
- Power Point Presentation, Parcel E Revised Remedial Investigation (RI) Draft Report
- Understanding Radioactivity in Soil at Hunters Point Shipyard
- Membership, Bylaws, and Community Outreach (MBCO) Subcommittee Meeting Minutes from August 16, 2007

**Welcome/Introductions/Agenda Review**

Marsha Pendergrass, facilitator, called the meeting to order at 6:03 p.m. Ms. Pendergrass welcomed everyone to the meeting. All attendees introduced themselves and the organization they represent. She confirmed that there was a quorum of community RAB members present to conduct business at the meeting.

Erich Simon introduced himself as the new San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board (Water Board) representative for HPS and said he is looking forward to meeting everyone. Jim Ponton, Water Board, stated that he has appreciated working with everyone at HPS and he is looking forward to Mr. Simon joining the HPS team.

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

2 Ms. Pendergrass said that approval of the minutes is needed for the RAB meeting on July 26,  
3 2007. The RAB meeting minutes were approved as written with one abstention and were  
4 accepted into the record.

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

6 **Carry-over Item Number 1:** Michael Cohen, San Francisco Redevelopment Agency (SFRA),  
7 to provide the RAB with the Conceptual Framework document for the combined project for  
8 Candlestick Point and HPS. Amy Brownell, San Francisco Department of Public Health, stated  
9 that all the Conceptual Framework documents for HPS are available on the Lennar website for  
10 HPS at [www.hunterspointshipyard.com](http://www.hunterspointshipyard.com). She indicated that anyone who would like a hardcopy  
11 of the documents can email her and she will forward those documents as an attachment. Ms.  
12 Pendergrass requested that the website address be provided to Carolyn Hunter, Tetra Tech EMI,  
13 for distribution to the HPS RAB. This action item was completed and will be removed from the  
14 table.

15 **Carry-over Item Number 2:** The HPS RAB will comment on the draft Parcel E-2 Remedial  
16 Investigation/Feasibility Study (RI/FS) that the RAB cannot provide significant comments based  
17 on the inadequacy of information since the Radiological Addendum has not yet been submitted.  
18 Sudeep Rao, RAB member, said that he planned to send a link to Leon Muhammad, Community  
19 RAB Co-Chair, but was unable to find the website link for submitting comments to the Navy.  
20 Keith Forman, HPS Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) Environmental Coordinator (BEC),  
21 explained that there is no Navy website link for submitting comments. There are many ways to  
22 submit comments to the Navy, however, including emailing comments to him  
23 ([keith.s.forman@navy.mil](mailto:keith.s.forman@navy.mil)), to Ms. Hunter ([carolyn.hunter@ttemi.com](mailto:carolyn.hunter@ttemi.com)), or to Melanie Kito,  
24 Navy Lead Remedial Project Manager (LRPM), ([melanie.kito@navy.mil](mailto:melanie.kito@navy.mil)). Mr. Rao indicated  
25 that he would forward the RAB comment on the Parcel E-2 RI/FS to the Navy via email. This  
26 action item will be carried over until September 2007.

27 **Carry-over Item Number 3:** The RAB will contact the San Francisco Police Chief via  
28 telephone and request a response letter to be drafted to the RAB on their speeding concerns on  
29 and around HPS. Barbara Bushnell, RAB member, indicated that she placed a phone call to the  
30 police department in July 2007 and was told the department had sent a response letter to the  
31 Navy Commander in charge of real estate. When she followed up with the police department  
32 again in August 2007, the department was apologetic that the letter had not been received by the  
33 Navy, and was supposed to follow up with a second letter. She has received no further response  
34 from the police department, but she had no difficulties contacting the police chief's office.

35 Mr. Forman indicated that he has heard of no one at the Navy receiving this letter, and there is no  
36 "Navy Commander in charge of real estate." He requested a meeting with Ms. Brownell to  
37 confirm that the police department did send a letter to the Navy as he finds it difficult to believe  
38 they would not have copied many other interested parties. He and Ms. Brownell will then report  
39 back to the RAB on the status of the response. This action item will be carried over until  
40 September 2007.

41 **Carry-over Item Number 4:** The RAB will draft a follow-up letter to the San Francisco  
42 Mayors Office, the Police Chief, and the Police Department based at HPS requesting a written  
43 response to the letter submitted in March 2007. Ms. Bushnell indicated that she offered to call  
44 the police department but did not volunteer to draft a letter. Keith Tisdell, RAB member, stated  
45 that he authored the original letter the RAB sent to the police department when he was RAB

1 Community Co-chair, so the follow up letter would be handled by the current Co-Chair. Ms.  
2 Pendergrass requested that Mr. Tisdell and Mr. Muhammad work together to draft the follow up  
3 letter from the RAB. This action item will be carried over until September 2007.

4 **New Action Item Number 1:** Community RAB Members will provide contact information they  
5 are okay with the rest of the RAB members having to Ms. Hunter. A list of all approved contact  
6 information for RAB members will be distributed at the August 2007 meeting. Ms. Hunter  
7 stated that the contact list was submitted to the Navy, regulators, and RAB members today. She  
8 is still in the process of getting information from a few RAB members she has been unable to  
9 reach, so those entries were left blank on the current contact list. This action item was completed  
10 and will be removed from the table.

11 **New Action Item Number 2:** Provide an understandable correlation for picocuries per gram  
12 radiation level such as the level from a luminous watch face. Mr. Forman stated that Laurie  
13 Lowman, Navy Radiological Affairs Support Office (RASO), outdid herself providing a handout  
14 that is available this evening on the information table. The handout is titled “Understanding  
15 Radioactivity in Soil at Hunters Point Shipyard,” and is in a question/answer format. Paragraph  
16 6 in the handout, “How do these dose levels compare with radiation doses in everyday life?”  
17 provides interesting comparable statistics. This action item was completed and will be removed  
18 from the table.

19 **New Action Item Number 3:** Provide the RAB with monthly air monitoring reports for  
20 Radiological Time Critical Removal Action (TCRA) activities. Mr. Forman indicated that he  
21 received the air monitoring data from Bill Dougherty, Tetra Tech ECI, and will forward it to Mr.  
22 Rao. Mr. Rao explained that his intent for this action item was for the entire RAB to receive  
23 monthly air monitoring data. Mr. Forman stated that the monthly data could be posted a website  
24 for access rather than emailing a Community Notification Plan (CNP) message each month.  
25 This action item will be carried over until September 2007.

26 **New Action Item Number 4:** The RAB will review the Monthly Progress Report (MPR) format  
27 and provide the Navy comments for providing additional information. Mr. Forman explained  
28 that the August 2007 MPR available tonight has a new format and it is colorful, straightforward,  
29 and easy to read. It has been streamlined to list current activities and upcoming activities or the  
30 next milestone for each parcel. In some cases, the next milestone for a parcel may be several  
31 years away. Robert Van Houten, RAB member, provided suggestions for a revised format so the  
32 MPR could be scanned quickly to determine the status, upcoming activities, and document  
33 comment periods for each parcel. The special recognition section for the August 2007 MPR  
34 focused on Ms. Hunter.

35 Mr. Forman indicated that this is the first attempt at creating a new improved MPR format. RAB  
36 members can provide additional suggestions for improvements during tonight’s RAB meeting, or  
37 can email suggestions to him or Ms. Hunter over the next month. On page 2 of the MPR, there is  
38 a box for current field work that describes fieldwork the Navy is currently conducting at HPS.  
39 At this time, the Navy is in the field conducting radiological sanitary sewer and storm drain  
40 removal for Parcel D. Any basewide activities will be listed after the Parcel F section. The back  
41 cover of the MPR has a two-month calendar listing upcoming meetings, which is an addition,  
42 suggested by several RAB members.

43 Kristine Enea, RAB member, suggested adding public comment period deadlines to the calendar  
44 on the back cover. Mr. Forman noted that public comment periods are listed with the  
45 information for each parcel. The reason for this listing is that public comment periods are  
46 usually 45-days, and are often extended to 60 to 90 days, which is longer than the 2 month period

1 covered by the calendar. Ms. Enea suggested putting the public comment period deadlines on  
2 the back-cover calendar as well when they fall in that two month period. This action item will be  
3 carried over until September 2007 for the RAB to provide additional suggestions for  
4 improvements.

5 Mr. Muhammad stated that at the last Technical Review Subcommittee meeting, there was  
6 mention of Lennar plans for construction at Parcel B. That construction is not listed in the  
7 August 2007 MPR. Mr. Forman clarified that Mr. Muhammad is referring to Lennar plans to  
8 build bioretention ponds at Parcel B. That construction would most likely take place after the  
9 Navy conveys rights to the Parcel B property to the City of San Francisco so that is a future  
10 construction activity.

11 Mr. Muhammad stated that he understands that activities at HPS are divided into Navy activities  
12 and Lennar activities on property that has been conveyed. He suggested that the HPS RAB  
13 consider having RAB members attend the City of San Francisco Citizens Advisory Committee  
14 (CAC) meetings where Lennar activities at former Parcel A are discussed, and request copies of  
15 agendas and minutes for the CAC be provided to the RAB.

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

17 Mr. Muhammad asked if Mr. Rao could provide information on a youth program he has  
18 established related to the HPS RAB. Mr. Rao explained that he is pleased to report that in efforts  
19 to better engage the community in southeast San Francisco, the Literacy for Environmental  
20 Justice (LEJ) was successful in obtaining a grant from the California Environmental Protection  
21 Agency (Cal/EPA). The grant's main objective is to engage youth in the community to learn  
22 about the HPS RAB process and assist in communicating information from the RAB back to the  
23 community.

24 Mr. Rao introduced Nancy Abdul-Shakur who is the environmental health and justice manager  
25 for the LEJ. There are also three LEJ youth interns in attendance here tonight and three more  
26 interns who were not able to make it to tonight's meeting. He asked that the HPS RAB members  
27 work to communicate with the LEJ interns to regularly share ideas. He added that he envisions  
28 the LEJ interns participating in a green economy for the community, and learning how the Navy  
29 environmental program at HPS works. This youth program is a commitment LEJ is making as  
30 an organization and as a team. He will be glad to answer questions about the program now or at  
31 the break.

32 Aleta Bryant, RAB member, asked if the LEJ youth program needs HPS RAB member  
33 volunteers, and is there a process in place for the interns to better understand activities at the  
34 RAB meetings. Mr. Rao responded that one of his responsibilities for the interns is to coordinate  
35 orientation meetings to explain the RAB process, the RAB meeting minutes, the Navy  
36 documents, and the people involved in the HPS RAB. The first orientation meeting has already  
37 taken place. The process also involves debriefing sessions after the RAB meetings for the  
38 interns to discuss information and communicate what they learned. The interns will provide  
39 quarterly reports to the HPS RAB on what they have done in the community. Quarterly articles  
40 will also be prepared for publication in the local newspaper so the broader community will know  
41 about the LEJ intern community activities. Interns will also conduct surveys to ensure they are  
42 effectively sharing information with the community and bringing community input back to the  
43 HPS RAB.

44 Mr. Muhammad asked if Mr. Rao would provide the RAB with a one-page summary on the LEJ  
45 youth program, including its objective and goals, funding, plan of action, intern selection

1 process, and connection to the HPS RAB. He added that this program plays a part in  
2 environmental sustainability. The HPS RAB may want to consider outreach to community high  
3 school students to support this program in its first year.

4 Mr. Muhammad stated that the RAB subcommittees have elected new chairs. Raymond  
5 Tompkins, RAB member, is the new chair for the Technical Review subcommittee, and Mr. Van  
6 Houten is the new chair of the MBCO Subcommittee. The Economic Subcommittee still needs  
7 to elect a new chair and that will most likely be addressed at the September 12, 2007 meeting.  
8 He asked that anyone interested in chairing the Economic Subcommittee please contact him. In  
9 electing new subcommittee chairs, the RAB is looking for a change in how the business of the  
10 subcommittees is conducted, to be more honest in policies and practices, and more progressive  
11 and community oriented. Subcommittee business should be conducted so there is no hint of  
12 favoritism or leverage used with the chairs because the subcommittee chairs help represent the  
13 HPS RAB to the local community.

14 Mr. Muhammad explained that he has a report of a notice of violation for Lennar that was issued  
15 on August 17, 2007. A Department of Health inspector observed dust plumes crossing onto  
16 Navy property from Lennar activities with truckers dumping dirt behind Building 808. Mr.  
17 Forman was not informed of this notice of violation until Mr. Muhammad contacted him, and  
18 then he discussed the violation with Amy Brownell earlier today. Mr. Muhammad requested  
19 information from the Department of Health on the policy for informing the Navy when dust  
20 plumes cross over onto Navy property. He also requested a response from the Navy on why this  
21 occurred without proper monitoring in place that would inform the Navy, and the Navy policy  
22 for responding to this type of situation.

23 Ms. Brownell explained that the Department of Health, under Article 31 of the Health Code,  
24 inspects Lennar activities on a regular basis and has been conducting inspections since Lennar's  
25 project began on April 25, 2006. An inspector observed the dust issues on Lennar property  
26 during a regular inspection on August 17, 2007. The trucks, however, were putting excess soil  
27 from grading activities into a soil pile behind Building 808 (which is not on Navy property), so  
28 this was not illegal dumping. Lennar was watering the soil, but it was not enough to prevent a  
29 dust plume.

30 Ms. Brownell stated that the dust control plan for Lennar has very stringent regulations on how  
31 long dust can be present and prohibits dust crossing the property boundary. The inspector  
32 observed that there was not enough watering, and puffs of dust from truck movement along the  
33 property boundary were crossing over onto Navy property. Nothing observed that day is a health  
34 issue. The notice of violation involves work practices and that is why the Department of Health  
35 inspects Lennar activities regularly and issues these notices to correct any dust control issues.  
36 Since there have been previous violations, Lennar activities were shut down for two days for  
37 them to review procedures and issue a response to the violation. This is part of the job the  
38 Department of Health does on a regular basis as part of our regulatory authority. The Navy was  
39 not informed of the violation because it was not a health issue, but a construction oversight issue.  
40 Ms. Brownell offered to set up a protocol to copy the HPS RAB on any future notices of  
41 violation for Lennar activities as soon as those notices are issued.

42 Mr. Muhammad asked if Ms. Brownell could read the August 17, 2007 notice of violation  
43 verbatim to the RAB because it appears that Ms. Brownell may be minimizing the violation. Ms.  
44 Brownell indicated that she could pass the notice around for the RAB members to review. She  
45 does not have enough copies for all the RAB members, but she can email a copy of the violation  
46 or mail copies to the RAB members.

1 Ms. Pendergrass asked if Mr. Muhammad would like to suggest an action item regarding this  
2 notice of violation or if he is looking for a particular outcome from this discussion. Mr.  
3 Muhammad replied that he would like to ensure a protocol is in place for the Navy to be  
4 informed of these types of occurrences, which in turn leads to the HPS RAB being informed.  
5 Ms. Pendergrass clarified that this would be an action item authored by Mr. Muhammad with a  
6 response from Ms. Brownell and Mr. Forman, to provide a written protocol for informing the  
7 Navy of dust control issues that cross over the property boundary. This action item would be  
8 addressed by September 2007.

9 Mr. Muhammad stated that there is misinformation in the local community that the HPS RAB is  
10 associated with Lennar development on former HPS property; that the Navy and Lennar are  
11 working on the same project. He explained that he thinks there needs to be a clear statement on  
12 record from the Navy that the HPS RAB and the Navy is not associated with Lennar, that there  
13 are two different entities. When RAB members hear about HPS in the community, all activities  
14 are referred to as Navy activities. The statement from the Navy could be presented here at the  
15 RAB meeting, at a CAC meeting, or RAB members could hold a town hall meeting for HPS.  
16 Ms. Pendergrass indicated that it is her understanding that RAB members have a responsibility to  
17 communicate clearly back to people in the community. Mr. Muhammad responded that the  
18 message would have more emphasis coming from the Navy.

19 Mr. Forman indicated that he can echo Mr. Muhammad's message here tonight at the RAB  
20 meeting. Community outreach, however, is the RAB members' responsibility, so they will need  
21 to communicate within their circles in the community to address these issues. He has gone to  
22 CAC meetings in the past, but any message he delivers from the Navy has a short shelf life and  
23 new people have not heard the message. Continuity for the community comes from the HPS  
24 RAB members, who can educate and inform the community based on volunteer service on the  
25 RAB, and correct misstatements made by members of the community.

26 Mr. Forman provided a statement to clarify the Navy's position on the HPS program for the  
27 record. The Department of Defense established a system for military facilities based on a  
28 program originated by Congress called "Base Realignment and Closure" (BRAC). Part of the  
29 BRAC program established RABs as a forum for the military, the Navy in the case of HPS, to  
30 inform the community of the environmental cleanup program for a particular military base that  
31 was being closed or realigned. The mission of the RAB is to understand the environmental  
32 cleanup program at the base, ask questions, review documents, and ensure that information and  
33 knowledge is shared with the community. Each RAB member, then, becomes an ambassador to  
34 the community to provide information on the environmental cleanup program for a particular  
35 base.

36 Mr. Forman explained that in the City of San Francisco, there is a parallel body called the  
37 Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC). The CAC has a different mission tied to events that occur  
38 once property is conveyed from the Navy to the City of San Francisco, which is the local reuse  
39 authority (LRA). Congress established the LRAs for bases in the BRAC program, and for HPS  
40 the LRA is the City of San Francisco. When the Navy eventually completes environmental  
41 cleanup, and approval for conveyance has been granted on a parcel-by-parcel basis, property is  
42 then ready for conveyance to the LRA. In most cases, the LRA chooses a master developer to  
43 redevelop the property, and the master developer for HPS is Lennar. This is the process for  
44 bases across the country.

45 Mr. Forman stated that the City of San Francisco also established the San Francisco  
46 Redevelopment Agency, which manages the day-to-day activities for redevelopment of HPS.

1 When property was conveyed to the City, the CAC became the forum to provide information on  
2 redevelopment to the community. The CAC has a separate mission to review plans and provide  
3 community input for redevelopment at HPS. The CAC also acts as a watchdog providing  
4 oversight for redevelopment at HPS and to provide a voice for community concerns as property  
5 is integrated back into the community.

6 Mr. Forman noted that he is unsure if there are still RAB members who regularly attend the CAC  
7 meetings, but three to five years ago there were several RAB members who regularly attended  
8 those meetings. He also attends the CAC meetings whenever he is invited, occasionally  
9 providing a presentation on a particular subject, or just as a member of the audience. In fact, it  
10 was sometimes difficult to recruit for RAB members since the RAB discusses technical  
11 environmental issues that are not glamorous topics. In contrast, the CAC talks about  
12 redeveloping HPS for it to be part of the community again. The most powerful way to support  
13 the HPS RAB at the CAC meetings is to attend the meetings, discuss the HPS program, ask  
14 questions and demand information, and ensure the developer is protective of the environment as  
15 the property is redeveloped. The Navy is required to focus the RAB meetings on what the Navy  
16 is accountable for, the environmental cleanup program at HPS, and the progress being made to  
17 reintegrate this property into the community. Consequently, the RAB and CAC provide different  
18 forums to address community concerns on different issues. Lennar is not associated with  
19 environmental cleanup at HPS and the Navy and RAB are not associated with redevelopment of  
20 HPS property.

#### 21 **Navy Announcements**

22 Mr. Forman stated that he wants to thank Mr. Ponton for being part of the HPS team, and this  
23 will be his last HPS RAB meeting. He has a great deal of respect for Mr. Ponton, who has  
24 worked hard on the HPS program and is a knowledgeable, action-oriented regulator.

#### 25 **Overview of the Parcel E RI Report (Presentation)**

26 Mr. Forman explained that Parcel E is the largest land parcel at HPS, and is located between  
27 Parcel D where the proposed forty-niners stadium would be located, and Parcel E-2 where the  
28 landfill is located. Parcel E is approximately 138 acres in size and has a long coastline. The  
29 MPR shows that Parcel E is in the RI phase of the Comprehensive Environmental Response,  
30 Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) process. This is a draft version of the revised  
31 Parcel E RI, so this is the first time the RAB has had a chance to look at this report.

32 Mr. Forman provided an overview of the Parcel E RI presentation. The presentation will review  
33 the purpose and objectives of the RI, a history of Parcel E, and the data evaluation and RI results.  
34 Human health and ecological risk assessments were also performed for the RI and the  
35 presentation will review that data and the risk on different portions of Parcel E. The proposed  
36 preliminary remediation objectives for the RI, summary and conclusions, and recommendations  
37 will also be covered in this presentation.

38 Mr. Forman reviewed the purpose and objectives for the revised Parcel E RI. The revised RI  
39 updates and revises the 1997 draft final Parcel E RI. The Navy has conducted a large number of  
40 investigations and collected data since the 1997 RI to prepare the improved revised RI. The RI  
41 characterizes soil and groundwater based on a conceptual site model (CSM) developed for Parcel  
42 E to better understand how chemicals move and react in the environment. A risk analysis was  
43 conducted for the revised RI based on sampling results and the CSM, to evaluate risk to humans  
44 and animals at Parcel E. The RI utilizes the risk analysis to determine potential areas that require



1 remediation also known as a clean up action. The RI also develops recommendations for  
2 cleanup actions for the next phase in the CERCLA process, the Feasibility Study (FS). It is  
3 important to understand the RI because it contains all the data for Parcel E, and is the foundation  
4 for proposing cleanup actions that need to take place at the parcel.

5 Mr. Forman provided a figure of the CERCLA process. He explained that the Navy has not only  
6 been gathering data for Parcel E, but has also conducted a number of removal actions at the  
7 parcel in the last two years. Removal actions have been conducted for the metal debris reef, the  
8 PCB hot spot, and for an area where radium dials were disposed of.

9 Mr. Forman reviewed the history of Parcel E. It is a large flat area just above sea level that was  
10 created on San Francisco Bay in 1940 using material from the surrounding hillsides, remote  
11 areas, and approximately 500,000 cubic yards of material from dry dock 4. Parcel E is mostly an  
12 artificial fill parcel, with the original shoreline at the north end of the parcel only, near Parcel A.

13 Dane Jensen, Navy RPM, provided aerial photographs from 1942 and 1946 illustrating how  
14 Parcel E was created using material pushed out into the Bay. In a 1965 photograph, there are  
15 Quonset huts, a large industrial warehouse, and old power plants as the parcel is being filled in.  
16 A 1975 photograph shows Parcel E much as it appears today, before it was leased to Triple A in  
17 1976.

18 Mr. Jensen provided a figure showing a cross section for Parcel E. This is similar to Parcels B  
19 and E-2 with fill material from Parcel A that was pushed out into the Bay. There is Bay mud that  
20 washed up onto tidal flats, and the placement of the fill material over the Bay mud created a  
21 shallow groundwater layer that is referred to as Aquifer A. Below the Bay mud is a deeper  
22 aquifer, Aquifer B. Below the deeper aquifer is another layer of Bay mud followed by  
23 Franciscan bedrock.

24 Mr. Jensen reviewed the revised Parcel E RI report organization. The RI is organized into 13  
25 redevelopment blocks that were developed by the SFRA. There are 5 industrial blocks, one  
26 maritime-industrial block, 1 mixed use block, 1 research and development block, and 5 open  
27 space blocks along the shoreline at Parcel E. The mixed use block could potentially have  
28 residential, retail, or other uses.

29 Mr. Jensen explained that the Navy has performed 20 studies at Parcel E over the last 20 years.  
30 The studies have been detailed and focused searches to identify potential sources of  
31 contamination at the parcel. The Navy looked at past historical records of industrial activity and  
32 interviewed people who worked at Parcel E to focus on areas where contaminants were  
33 potentially released. This provided a basis for a biased sampling approach as grid-based  
34 sampling was deemed not practical or effective for Parcel E. There is also groundwater data  
35 from the early 1990s through December 2004 for the Parcel E RI. In the last 3 to 4 years there  
36 has also been a robust basewide groundwater monitoring program with sampling performed  
37 quarterly.

38 Mr. Jensen provided a figure showing all the soil sampling locations from the 20 studies over 20  
39 years. Soil sampling has generally focused on the area from 0 to 10 feet below ground surface  
40 (bgs). A coring is collected and soil samples are generally collected from the top foot and at  
41 various depths depending on where contaminants are potentially located. Sediment samples  
42 were also collected along the shoreline. A figure was provided showing the groundwater  
43 monitoring wells located throughout Parcel E to determine where groundwater contaminant  
44 plumes are located. There are wells that monitor the upper aquifer and separate wells that  
45 monitor the lower aquifer because there are different contaminants and different pathways for

1 contaminants to move through the environment in the upper and lower aquifers. The parcel has  
2 many groundwater monitoring wells monitoring the aquifers for different contaminants.

3 Mr. Jensen explained that the RI evaluated 24 acres of ecological habitat at Parcel E. There is  
4 grassy habitat on the parcel and mostly rodents, and birds that feed on the rodents are found in  
5 the grassy areas. There are also hawks, foxes, raccoons, reptiles, and amphibians found in the  
6 grassy habitat. In addition, there is shoreline habitat consisting of intertidal wetlands, crabs,  
7 clams, and barnacles can be found in the wetlands.

8 Mr. Jensen reviewed the data evaluation for the Parcel E RI. All the data from the soil,  
9 groundwater, and sediment sampling are used in a nature and extent evaluation to determine the  
10 type and extent of chemicals present at the parcel based on past industrial uses. The nature and  
11 extent evaluation also determines which chemicals are likely to be of concern for human health  
12 or the environment. The nature and extent evaluation uses various screening criteria to evaluate  
13 contaminant concentrations from multiple sources at the parcel. There are screening criteria for  
14 soil and groundwater based on reuse plans for the parcel, and Hunters Point ambient levels for  
15 soil, groundwater, and sediment are also used. The nature and extent results indicate that there  
16 are metals (arsenic, copper, and lead), organics (polychlorinated biphenyls [PCBs] and volatile  
17 organic compounds [VOCs]), and petroleum products present in soil and groundwater at the  
18 parcel, and there are metals and organics present in sediment.

19 Mr. Jensen reviewed the fate and transport evaluation in the Parcel E RI and provided a figure  
20 showing how the CSM was developed for the parcel. Fate and transport evaluates what could  
21 potentially occur with subsurface contamination that moves through the environment.  
22 Contaminants could leach out of soil into groundwater, groundwater contamination could reach  
23 the Bay, or soil or groundwater contaminants could vaporize into the air.

24 Mr. Jensen explained that receptors, humans and animals, can come into contact with  
25 contaminants at Parcel E so a risk assessment is performed. The risk assessment analyzes the  
26 data using future reuse scenarios including residential, industrial, and recreational. Chemicals in  
27 soil, groundwater, and sediment are identified that pose a risk to human health or the  
28 environment. The risk assessment then identifies areas with elevated risk that will require  
29 cleanup actions. Those areas are carried forward to the FS, where alternatives to cleanup  
30 contamination are developed. The human health risk assessment (HHRA) results indicate that  
31 there is risk from metals (arsenic, copper, and lead) and organics in soil and groundwater. The  
32 baseline ecological risk assessment results (ERA) indicate that there is risk from metals (copper  
33 and lead), organics, and VOCs in soil. The shoreline risk evaluation that was performed as part  
34 of a shoreline study indicates that there is human health risk for a recreational user, and  
35 ecological risk, from metals and organics in shoreline sediment.

36 Mr. Jensen explained that the soil risk assessment for soil was developed on a grid basis that  
37 breaks down the large redevelopment blocks into small grid sections. Figures are generated  
38 showing the soil risk grids for the parcel based on the planned reuse. The groundwater risk  
39 assessment identifies risk plumes with elevated groundwater contaminant concentrations and  
40 generates figures showing the risk plumes. Parcel E has groundwater risk plumes for metals,  
41 PCBs, total petroleum hydrocarbons (TPH), and VOCs.

42 Mr. Jensen reviewed the preliminary remedial action objectives (RAOs) developed for the Parcel  
43 E RI. The RAOs are specific to soil and groundwater and have to be protective of human health  
44 and the environment. The RAOs take into account future land use and are based on completed or  
45 potentially completed pathways for exposure to contaminants.

1 The preliminary RAOs for soil include:

- 2 • Human: Prevent exposure to chemicals in soil at concentrations above the remediation goals  
3 based on exposure pathways
- 4 • Ecological: Prevent exposure of birds and mammals to chemicals at concentrations above  
5 remediation goals in soil in the shoreline and open space areas.

6 The preliminary RAOs for groundwater include:

- 7 • Human
  - 8 – Prevent direct exposure to chemicals of concern in the B-Aquifer through household use  
9 of well water.
  - 10 – Prevent breathing in chemicals of concern from vapors coming from groundwater
  - 11 – Prevent breathing in or skin contact with chemicals of concern for construction workers  
12 in trenches.
- 13 • Ecological
  - 14 – Prevent or minimize chemicals of concern moving in groundwater towards the Bay.

15 The preliminary RAOs for sediment include:

- 16 • Human
  - 17 – Prevent exposure to chemicals of concern above our risk goals by eating shellfish from  
18 the Parcel E shoreline.
- 19 • Ecological
  - 20 – Prevent exposure to chemicals of concern above our risk goals for shellfish, worms,  
21 crabs, birds, and mammals.

22 Mr. Jensen reviewed the RI results for Parcel E. The RI characterized the nature and extent of  
23 contaminants in soil, groundwater, and sediment. Human health and ecological risks were  
24 characterized in the RI, and areas with elevated risks were identified. The RI also developed  
25 preliminary cleanup objectives for soil, groundwater, and sediment for the areas with elevated  
26 risks.

27 Mr. Forman explained that the next steps for Parcel E include utilizing the data analysis from the  
28 RI to develop the Parcel E FS. The FS will develop and evaluate cleanup alternatives for the  
29 parcel. The Draft Revised Parcel E RI was issued for review on July 27, 2007 with comments  
30 due back to the Navy by September 12, 2007. The Draft Final Revised RI is scheduled for  
31 submittal on December 6, 2007. The Final Revised RI is scheduled for submittal on February  
32 21, 2008. For those who do not have the time to review the entire RI, the executive summary  
33 provides a short summary of the RI.

34 Ms. Enea asked how long is the executive summary, and is the draft revised Parcel E RI  
35 available in the library. Mr. Jensen replied that the executive summary is approximately 10  
36 pages, and the RI is available in the information repository at the Anna Waden library. Ms. Enea  
37 asked if it would be possible to have copies of the executive summaries for all HPS reports  
38 provided as handouts at the RAB meetings. Mr. Forman indicated that the Navy could provide  
39 those handouts at the RAB meetings depending on the particular length of an executive  
40 summary.

41 Ms. Enea asked if the green risk grids on the figure showing soil risk are areas where there is  
42 little risk. Mr. Jensen said that the green grids are areas where risk is below elevated risk  
43 criteria. The risk areas, however, are intermixed on the redevelopment blocks. A small area

1 with elevated risk within a larger redevelopment block means that a solution is applied to the  
2 entire reuse block.

3 Harrell Powell, resident, asked why the HPS map was revised for Parcel E. Mr. Forman replied  
4 that the map was not revised, but in 2004, the Navy divided Parcel E into Parcels E and E-2 to  
5 deal with the landfill site separately. A line was drawn on the map separating Parcels E and E-2,  
6 but the HPS boundaries have not changed. Mr. Powell noted that the Parcel E boundaries also  
7 appear to have changed. He stated that he would bring an old map to the next RAB meeting to  
8 show where the boundaries have changed.

9 Mike McGowan, RAB member, stated that all the HPS reports are available at the Community  
10 Window on the Shipyard office. Anyone can visit their office and print out copies of the  
11 executive summaries. The address is 4634 Third Street.

12 Mr. Rao stated that he would suggest having a presentation on HPS reports closer to the start of  
13 the public comment period for the report. It is now less than two weeks before comments are  
14 due on the RI. Mr. Forman responded that the Technical Review Subcommittee meeting held a  
15 week ago was devoted to review of the Parcel E RI, so the RI has been reviewed at more than  
16 one meeting. The challenge has been that many major milestone documents for HPS have been  
17 issued over the last six-month period.

## 18 **Subcommittee Reports**

### 19 **MBCO Subcommittee**

20 Mr. Van Houten indicated that the meeting minutes for the August 16, 2007 MBCO  
21 Subcommittee meeting are available on the information table. The minutes provide an update on  
22 the MBCO Subcommittee. The minutes document the subcommittee's mission, list goals, and  
23 has a chart showing membership percentages. Community Outreach is one of the goals of the  
24 MBCO subcommittee.

25 Mr. Van Houten stated that one of his goals for the near future is to contact each RAB member to  
26 determine how they currently communicate with the community they represent and help them  
27 better communicate with the community. The next MBCO Subcommittee meeting will focus on  
28 adjustments to the HPS RAB Bylaws. He asked RAB members to please read the Bylaws and  
29 email him or Ms. Hunter with any adjustments they feel are necessary. Suggestions for  
30 adjustments can also be provided at the meeting. The adjustments to the Bylaws will be  
31 finalized at the Thursday September 13, 2007 MBCO meeting. The Bylaws will then be  
32 presented at the September 27, 2007 RAB meeting for a final RAB vote.

33 The next MBCO meeting will be held on September 13, 2007 from 6:30 to 8:30 p.m. at the Anna  
34 Waden library.

### 35 **Economic Subcommittee**

36 Mr. Mason stated that he would like to have an Economic Subcommittee meeting in August  
37 2007, but the Navy would not be able to attend. The next meeting will be on September 12,  
38 2007 from 6:00 to 8:00 p.m. at the Anna Waden library. There are some issues to discuss  
39 including the local community obtaining work at the shipyard, and the trucker situation with  
40 payment of invoices. He indicated that his main concern is how the community can get a fair  
41 share of the work with the Navy.

1 **Technical Review Subcommittee**

2 Dr. Tompkins explained that he has not had an opportunity to complete the minutes for the  
3 Technical Review Subcommittee meeting as he has been ill in the hospital and in therapy. The  
4 August 2007 subcommittee meeting was very constructive with the Navy providing an in depth  
5 presentation on the Parcel E RI. The plan is to have further review of the RI at a future meeting.

6 Dr. Tompkins indicated he has prepared a draft agenda for the September 11, 2007 meeting. He  
7 requested that the Stanford research department that is doing observational analysis at Parcel F  
8 attend the next subcommittee meeting. He would like to confirm a new location for the meeting  
9 with Mr. Muhammad so the agenda does not list an address for the meeting. The August 2007  
10 subcommittee meeting had to leave the library before all discussion was complete, so there is a  
11 need for additional time to cover everything. He asked that RAB members contact him if they  
12 would like to provide additional topics for the meeting agenda.

13 Dr. Tompkins stated that an additional topic for consideration at the next meeting is review of  
14 the Parcel E-2 RI/FS, so the RAB can vote on a formal recommendation to the Navy. Ms.  
15 Pendergrass clarified that discussion of a RAB position on the Parcel E-2 RI/FS would be  
16 discussed at the subcommittee meeting and recommendations would be brought to the RAB  
17 meeting for a vote.

18 Dr. Tompkins explained that he had an additional topic for the September 2007 Technical  
19 Review Subcommittee meeting to cover air monitoring issues. He will present Mr. Forman with  
20 a memorandum at the meeting that formally requests date specific air monitoring data. He will  
21 also discuss community concerns with air monitoring exceedances at former Parcel A and dust  
22 blowing onto Navy property. He asked if the air monitoring units in the field have tape readouts  
23 of data and if so, could the Navy please provide those readouts. The subcommittee would like to  
24 do a comparative analysis of the air monitoring data the Navy provides and the data that was  
25 provided to the public.

26 **TAG Update**

27 Dr. Tompkins explained that due to funding, a decision was made that the TAG advisors would  
28 not review the Parcel F FS. Mr. McGowan with Arc Ecology who is a scientist and marine  
29 biologist will take the lead to provide RAB comments on that report.

30 **Community Comment Period**

31 Dr. Tompkins stated that it is important for the Navy to come forth at other community meetings  
32 and state that the Navy is not a part of development activities at former Parcel A. He explained  
33 that he has occasionally ended up in arguments with people in the community who are confused  
34 about Lennar's responsibility for development on former Parcel A. He has also been accused of  
35 being a Navy or Arc Ecology employee. Mr. McGowan added that he is also aware of  
36 community confusion regarding an overlap between the missions for the HPS RAB and the  
37 CAC. He explained that he and other scientists attend the CAC meetings and provide input on  
38 redevelopment, so there are avenues for exchanging information on environmental cleanup and  
39 development.

40 Ms. Enea indicated that she has one suggestion that may meet Dr. Tompkins needs. The Navy  
41 could provide a short written statement on letterhead that the Navy is no longer involved with  
42 activities at former Parcel A, rather than making statements at various community meetings.  
43 That might be sufficient evidence that there is a distinction between Navy environmental cleanup

1 and redevelopment activities. Ms. Pendergrass added that the HPS RAB could also draft a short  
2 informational fact sheet covering the distinction between Navy activities and development on  
3 former Parcel A that could be distributed to the community. Mr. Van Houten responded that he  
4 would draft that fact sheet as part of the MBCO Subcommittee's community outreach mission.

5 John McCarthy, a member of the audience, stated that regarding the distinction between the  
6 Navy and Lennar, the City has fallen short of its duty to clarify that distinction. He is  
7 particularly concerned with the issue of site control. He has been asking questions about site  
8 control at HPS for a year and a half. He thinks the RAB would have a position on site control  
9 that could be provided to the CAC and the City since this is not a trivial issue. If these types of  
10 issues are not addressed, there will be worse issues than dust blowing onto Navy property.

11 Ms. Pendergrass adjourned the meeting at 8:03 p.m.

12 **Reminder: The next RAB meeting will be held from 6:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m., Thursday,**  
13 **September 27, 2007, at the Alex Pitcher Jr. Room, 1800 Oakdale Avenue, San Francisco,**  
14 **California 94124.**

**ATTACHMENT A**  
**23 August 2007- RAB MEETING**  
**LIST OF ATTENDEES**

Name	Association
1. Amir Abdul-Shakur	Literacy for Environmental Justice (LEJ)
2. Nancy Adbul-Shakur	LEJ
3. Ryan Ahlersmeyer	Tetra Tech ECI
4. Brian Baltimore	Resident, Tetra Tech ECI
5. Patricia Brown	RAB member, Shipyard Artist
6. Amy Brownell	San Francisco Department of Public Health
7. Aleta Bryant	RAB member, CAMKAL Trucking
8. Barbara Bushnell	RAB member, Resident of the Southeast Sector (ROSES)
9. Charles Dacus	RAB member, Bayview/Hunters Point Resident
10. Bill Dougherty	Tetra Tech ECI
11. Jolanda Ellenberger	LEJ
12. Kristine Enea	RAB member, ROSES
13. Keith Forman	Navy RAB Co-chair
14. Larry Frias	RAB member, Waste Solutions Group
15. Steve Hall	Tetra Tech EMI
16. Wynne Hasakawa	Shipyard Artist
17. Carolyn Hunter	Tetra Tech EMI
18. Sarah Koppel	Navy Remedial Project Manager (RPM)
19. Dane Jensen	Navy RPM
20. Jackie Ann Lane	U.S. EPA Region IX
21. Tom Lanphar	Department of Toxic Substances Control
22. Mayra Madriz	RAB attendee
23. Jesse Mason	RAB member, resident
24. Lonnie Mason	First Generation
25. John V. McCarthy	Resident
26. Mike McGowan	RAB member, Arc Ecology
27. Gianna Muhammad	RAB attendee
28. Leon Muhammad	RAB member, University of Islam, Center for Self Improvement
29. Max Naver	RAB attendee
30. Christine Niccoli	Niccoli Court Reporting
31. Yohji Ono	Tetra Tech EMI
32. Marsha Paendergrass	Pendergrass & Associates
33. Karen Pierce	RAB attendee
34. Jim Ponton	San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board
35. Harrell Powell	Resident
36. Sudeep Rao	RAB member, LEJ
37. Mark Ripperda	U.S. EPA Region IX
38. John Scott	RAB attendee
39. Connie Shahid	LEJ
40. Gaynorann Siataga	RAB member, All Islanders Gathering as One
41. Erich Simon	San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board
42. Peter Stroganoff	Navy, Resident Officer in Charge of Construction (ROICC) Office
43. Keith Tisdell	RAB member, Resident
44. Raymond Tompkins	RAB member, Community First Coalition
45. Robert Van Houten	RAB member, Morgan Heights Resident
46. Angela Williams	Barajas & Associates

**ATTACHMENT B**  
**23 August 2007 – RAB MEETING**  
**ACTION ITEMS**

Item No.	Action Item	Person Authoring the Action Item	Due Date	Person/Agency Committing to Action Item	Resolution Status
<b>Carry-Over Items</b>					
1.	The HPS RAB will comment on the draft Parcel E-2 RI/FS that the RAB cannot provide significant comments based on the inadequacy of information since the Radiological Addendum has not yet been submitted.	Sudeep Rao, RAB Member	July 2007	Leon Muhammad, RAB Community Co-Chair	This action item was completed on August 27, 2007.
2.	The RAB will draft a follow-up letter to the San Francisco Mayors Office, the Police Chief, and the Police Department based at HPS requesting a written response to the letter submitted in March 2007.	Keith Tisdell, RAB Member	July 2007	Mr. Tisdell and Mr. Muhammad	This action item to be completed during September 2007.
3.	On the BRAC PMO Website, provide the RAB with monthly air monitoring reports from Radiological Time Critical Removal Action activities.	Mr. Rao	September 2007	Bill Dougherty, Tetra Tech ECI	This action item to be completed during September 2007.
4.	The RAB will review the Monthly Progress Report (MPR) format and provide the Navy comments for providing additional information.	Keith Forman, Navy	August 2007	RAB Members	This action item was completed.
<b>New Action Items</b>					
1.	Establish a policy for informing the Navy when dust plumes cross property boundary.	Mr. Muhammad	September 2007	Mr. Forman Amy Brownell Dept. of Public Health	This action was completed at the RAB meeting. The Navy BEC is now on the City's distribution list for notices on Lennar's redevelopment activities (including Notice of Violation [NOVs]).
2.	Prepare statement clarifying the distinction between Navy and RAB activities at HPS, and Lennar and CAC activities with redevelopment and former Parcel A.	Ray Tompkins, RAB member	September 2007	Robert Van Houten, RAB member	This action item to be completed during September 2007.