



Meeting Summary

Hunters Point Naval Shipyard Community Informational Meeting

May 25, 2011

MEETING TIME/DATE: Wednesday, May 25, 2011, 6:00 p.m. to 7:45 p.m.

MEETING LOCATION: Bayview YMCA
1601 Lane Street
San Francisco, CA 94124

MEETING TOPIC: Update of Pier Survey and Removal Project and Status of the PCB Hot Spot Removal Action

I. Welcome/Introductions

Melanie Kito (U.S. Navy) introduced herself and welcomed participants to the Hunters Point Naval Shipyard (HPNS) Community Meeting. She also introduced Lara Urizar (U.S. Navy), the Project Manager for the polychlorinated biphenyl (PCB) hot spot removal action. In addition, the regulatory agency representatives attending the meeting introduced themselves: Mark Ripperda (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency [EPA]), Jackie Lane (EPA), and Ross Steenson (California Regional Water Quality Control Board [Water Board]).

II. Meeting Ground Rules

Ms. Kito introduced Yolanda Jones (Yolanda's Construction Administration and Traffic Control [YCAT]) as the meeting facilitator. Ms. Jones reviewed the ground rules for the meeting. Ms. Jones said everyone would have time to ask questions during the breakout sessions. Ms. Jones handed out comment cards to community members to use if they have additional comments at the end of the meeting.

III. Update of Pier Survey and Removal Project and PCB Hot Spot Removal Action

Ms. Kito reviewed the agenda, and identified the following two topics for the meeting: 1) an update on the pier survey and removal activities, and 2) an update on the PCB hot spot removal action. She also noted the Navy and regulatory agency members would like to obtain input and have an open discussion with community members during the open house portion of the agenda. Ms. Kito presented information about the pier survey and removal action followed by Ms. Urizar who presented information on the PCB hot spot removal action.

Pier Survey and Removal Action

Ms. Kito explained that pier surveys were conducted at the HPNS piers that were in the worst condition. These surveys were prompted because during each storm, wooden pieces of the piers will break off and fall into San Francisco Bay. The Navy was directed by the U.S. Coast Guard to address this problem because the wooden debris poses navigational hazards to ships in the area. The Navy determined it was most appropriate to demolish the piers during a removal

action since they are no longer useable. The piers that were surveyed for the removal action were use during the 1940s when ships were sandblasted and decontaminated. Some of the ships may have been impacted by radioactive testing and therefore, there is a potential that the piers were subsequently impacted by radiological material. Since the piers are potentially radiologically impacted, the Navy has been screening the pier materials during the demolition process. Ms. Kito referred to maps in the presentation that show the locations of the piers identified for demolition. The piers identified for removal from the north to the south of HPNS include: Berth 64, Berth 61, Submarine Piers B and C, Wharf Number 2 and the quay wall.

Ms. Kito showed pictures of the demolition activities at the piers. The Navy placed a boom in the water around the areas with demolition activities to catch any wood or other debris that might fall into the water. The piers are dismantled using heavy construction equipment and then the material is loaded onto a floating barge. The construction equipment used to dismantle the piers is also located on a floating barge. The debris barge takes the material to the North Pier, where it is segregated by type of waste (wood, concrete, etc.) and screened for radiological impact. If debris is radiologically impacted then it is segregated from the other debris so that it can be disposed at a special facility capable of accepting radiologically impacted waste. All other debris is disposed of at an appropriate facility based on results of the waste characterization.

To date, the Navy has removed 28,000 tons of debris (equaling approximately six football fields of debris) and none of the material has been identified as radioactively impacted.

During demolition activities, the Navy is monitoring water quality in San Francisco Bay and air quality around the project areas. To date, no problems with water or air quality have been identified. Water trucks are used on the piers to keep dust down during the demolition activities since controlling dust is a high priority at HPNS. Ms. Kito encouraged community members to call the Navy immediately if they ever observe a "puff of dust" in the air related to one of the Navy's projects.

The demolition was started in mid-March 2011 and is expected to be completed in September 2011. To date, the Navy is ahead of schedule with the demolition activities. The final report for the project will be issued in 2012.

PCB Hot Spot Removal

Ms. Urizar stated the time critical removal action (TCRA) at PCB hot spots in Parcel E-2 is ongoing. The removal action is being conducted along the shoreline of Parcel E-2 and also in some inland areas. The removal action includes digging up impacted soil and sediment and screening it before proper disposal. Currently, the project is approximately 25% complete. Ms. Urizar indicated during her presentation she would provide additional details about the removal action and schedule as well as an overview of the activities the Navy is doing to protect the community and environment during the removal action.

The soil and sediment being removed is impacted with PCBs, petroleum hydrocarbons, lead, and a solvent called tetrachloroethylene (PCE). The PCBs were used in electrical transformers at HPNS and drums containing PCBs were also found at this site. PCBs were banned in 1979 and the Navy is removing the impacted soil because unsafe-levels of PCBs are present. Petroleum hydrocarbons are present in fuels and were used in machinery. Lead has many uses associated

with industrial activities including lead batteries. PCE is a solvent that was used to clean all sorts of machinery at HPNS.

The removal areas were divided into different tier based on the types of contamination present. Ms. Urizar briefly identified the areas being removed on a map in the presentation. The removal areas are near to and adjacent to the Parcel E-2 landfill, however, no digging is occurring in the landfill. The largest removal area is along the shoreline.

The excavated material is being screened for materials potentially posing an explosive hazard and radiological impact. So far, they have found discarded practice rounds that have no explosive material in them. In areas where lead contamination has been found, the excavation activities have unearthed buried battery components. This indicates that the lead contamination might be from historic battery disposal in the area. Other materials encountered during the excavations include construction debris, tires, and wood. One of the excavation areas is along the San Francisco Bay shoreline, so excavation work in this area is done during low tide.

So far, approximately 6,500 cubic yards (400 truck loads) of soil and sediment have been excavated and there is an estimated 34,000 cubic yards that still need to be excavated. Tier 3 is approximately 30% complete. Excavation at Tier 2 began in October 2010 and is still ongoing, partly because of the large amount of surface debris (including concrete) that needed to be cleared from the site prior to excavation. The process is to dig, then sample the area, and send the samples to a laboratory. Based on the results of the laboratory analysis of the samples, the Navy determines whether they need to excavate more material. In some areas, the Navy needs to go back out and dig more. Each of the excavation sites is being backfilled with clean fill. Rock, concrete and boulders are being used to stabilize the excavation areas along the shoreline to prevent erosion. Other excavation areas will be reseeded with grass and wildflowers to provide erosion control.

Both air monitoring and dust control measures are being conducted during the excavation activities. The air monitoring is conducted both up- and down-wind from the project sites. Dust control measures include limiting vehicle speeds to 15 miles per hour (mph) at HNPS and 5 mph in the active work site areas. All trucks are loaded on plastic sheeting and brushed off before they leave the site. The trucks are tarped and only operate between 7:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m. The excavation activities are expected to continue through December and vehicles will be demobilized following site restoration activities in early 2012.

A question was asked about the intended reuse of the PCB hot spot areas. Ms. Urizar replied that Parcel E-2 is designated by the City's reuse plan to be open space.

Another community member thanked Ms. Urizar for promptly answering questions directed to the Navy last month about the "orange carpet" that was placed at Parcel B.

Michael Hamman, a community member, asked about the slope of the excavation along Earl Street as it rises towards Innes Street. He mentioned that it appeared steeper than the three to one (3:1) ratio that is required. Lara responded that this area has been excavated but not restored yet and the final slope will not be as steep.

Ms. Jones stated the Navy will host the next community meeting on June 22, 2011, at the Bayview Opera House. The Navy is also tentatively planning a bus tour in July 2011 that will be scheduled at a later date. Ms. Jones indicated the meeting participants would have

approximately 30 minutes during the breakout session to ask questions of the Navy and regulatory agencies' representatives.

IV. Open House Session

During the open house session, participants visited three tables to talk with Navy and agency representatives, who are working on the projects. The topics for the three tables included: "Pier Demolition and Survey," "PCB Hot Spot Removal," and "Meet the Regulators." A representative from each table was responsible for summarizing the comments and action items obtained during the open house. The following sections summarize the comments and questions at each of the three tables.

TABLE 1: Pier Survey and Removal Action

Ms. Kito summarized the questions she answered during the open house session.

Question: Why did the Navy allow the radioactive piers to decay to the point of becoming a community safety issue?

Ms. Kito's Response: The piers have been decaying over time and until now there hasn't been available funding to remove the piers.

Question: What is the contingency plan if the piers don't come out as planned and instead break apart creating a lot of smaller parts of pier debris?

Ms. Kito's Response: The boom in the water would contain pieces of the pier that fall into San Francisco Bay but so far that hasn't been a big problem at the site.

Question: Will the pier demolition and PCB hot spot removal have any negative effect on the work already completed at Parcel F?

Ms. Kito's Response: This work is not likely to have a negative impact on Parcel F, and additional sampling at Parcel F is planned.

Question: Mr. Hamman asked what happens to the debris that falls into San Francisco Bay during the removal of the pier? He also asked about metal debris from the piers falling and settling on the floor of San Francisco Bay.

Ms. Kito's Response: Wooden debris is collected in the boom that is placed around the work area. In addition, the Navy conducted an ultrasound scan of the floor of San Francisco Bay around each of the proposed pier removal areas. The Navy will conduct a second ultrasound scan after the pier removals for comparison. Any debris on the Bay's floor that might have come from the pier removal activities will likely be removed during Parcel F activities.

TABLE 2: PCB Hot Spot Removal Action

Question: Beculah Brown asked how far the hot spot removal action was from her house in Mariner's Village?

Ms. Kito's Response: It is very far away and should not cause concern for Ms. Brown. She indicated the predominant wind direction at HPNS is towards San Francisco Bay (away from Mariner's Village). If Ms. Brown should see anything that concerns her such as a puff of dust, then she should call Ms. Kito or Mr. Forman immediately.

Question: Ms. Brown asked who should he call with regards to complaints about the truck routes used at HPNS?

Ms. Kito's Response: *He can contact her (Ms. Kito) or Mr. Forman about problems with the truck routes. It may not be possible to change the route but they would look into any concerns to evaluate the options.*

Question: Ms. Brown asked where the soil from the hot spot removal goes?

Ms. Kito's Response: *Radioactive waste goes to an approved landfill in Utah or Idaho. Soil that is not radioactive is sent to an approved California landfill.*

TABLE 3: Meet the Regulators

Mark Ripperda (EPA) and Ross Steenson (Water Board) answered questions from meeting attendees. Mr. Steenson went over the discussion that took place at the "Meet the Regulators" table as follows:

Question: How can the public be certain that the Navy is cleaning up all the contamination?

Mr. Steenson's Response: *There is always some uncertainty with environmental cleanup activities; however, based on the known site history, 20 years of historic sampling resulting in a large data set, multiple rounds of confirmation sampling, excavations, treatability studies, and monitoring that has been conducted at HPNS, the regulatory agencies are comfortable with the level of uncertainty.*

Question: J.V. McCarthy asked about the persistent potential for another fire in the landfill area and if there was a comprehensive way to mitigate this potential in the future?

Ms. Kito's Response: *A 14-acre cap was installed over the landfill following the fire. The fire was likely a result of spontaneous combustion from the buried waste. Since the cap is in place, no source of oxygen into the landfill exists. A fire needs oxygen in order to start; therefore, the potential for another fire has been controlled. As far as mitigation measures for the fire at the landfill, there are ongoing maintenance, monitoring and inspections of the landfill four times per year.*

V. Open Forum

Question: Keith Tisdell, a community member, stated that Ross Steenson (Water Board) had mentioned uncertainties in regards to environmental cleanup at HPNS during the open house session. He would like to know if those uncertainties could come back to be problems later.

Mr. Ripperda's Response: *There are a number of controls placed on the property prior to transfer to the City of San Francisco. These controls will help keep people safe by putting special requirements on the HPNS properties. Some of these controls would be engineering or institutional controls (ICs) to help protect against the uncertainty.*

Question: Mr. McCarthy wanted to know the schedule for regulatory review of the cleanup work after a parcel is turned over to the City of San Francisco and what opportunities exist for the public to participate in this process.

Mr. Ripperda's Response: *There is a process for implementing the ICs on a property and those ICs are reviewed by both the regulatory agencies and the public as part of the remedial action plan or remedial design. Once the ICs are placed on a property, there is an annual requirement by the agencies to review those ICs to ensure they are performing as intended.*

Five-year Reviews are also performed and the public can review these reports. If the public observes any violations of the ICs or thinks the ICs are no longer protective on a property, then they should inform the regulatory agencies who will investigate these claims. Depending on the remedial design and permits, the City may conduct the reviews.

Comment: Michael McGowan (ArcEcology) recommended that a restoration advisory board (RAB) or similar body be established to provide input on early transfer documents or on the parcels should an early transfer occur and the property is no longer owned by the Navy. The City has the Community Advisory Committee (CAC) as that type of board. Mr. Tisdell mentioned that he tried to join the CAC and could not. He added that in his opinion, the CAC does not listen to outsiders. Mr. McGowan added that the Navy should start thinking about a board to review early transfer documents.

Ms. Kito's Response: *Comments noted.*

Question: Sudeep Rao, a community member, asked if the Navy could start meeting at 5:30 to allow for additional time for discussion. He indicated ending at 7:45 pm was too early.

Attendees' Response: *Most community members in the room responded that 5:30 was too early for them to attend.*

Question: Mr. McCarthy asked if any other piers at HPNS are scheduled for demolition?

Ms. Kito's Response: *The other piers at HPNS are not priorities for funding because they are still in good condition and the Navy does not plan to demolish piers that are not falling down.*

VI. Comment Cards

The following comments were provided on comment cards:

Ms. Brown:

1. "Please send me the minutes from this mtg."

Tanganyika White:

1. "I think it's really nice to have meetings filled with lots of updates and Q&A!"

VII. Action Items

1. The Navy will send Ms. Brown a copy of the meeting minutes from the May 25, 2011 meeting.