

**HUNTERS POINT SHIPYARD**  
**RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD MEETING MINUTES**  
**23 OCTOBER 2003**

These minutes summarize the discussions and presentations from the Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) meeting held from 6:00 P.M. to 8:45 P.M., Thursday, 23 October 2003 at Dago Mary's Restaurant (Building #916 at the Shipyard). 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 [www.efdsw.navy.mil/Environmental/HuntersPoint.htm](http://www.efdsw.navy.mil/Environmental/HuntersPoint.htm). The list of agenda topics is provided below. Attachment A provides a list of attendees. Attachment B includes action items that were requested and/or committed to by RAB members during the meeting.

**AGENDA TOPICS:**

- 1) Welcome/Introductions/Agenda Review
- 2) Approval of Meeting Minutes from 25 September 2003 RAB Meeting
- 3) Landfill Gas Removal Action Update
- 4) HRA Update
- 5) Subcommittee Reports
- 6) Future Agenda Topics/Open Question & Answer
- 7) Adjournment

**MEETING HANDOUTS:**

- Agenda for 23 October 2003 RAB
- Meeting/Minutes from 25 September 2003 RAB Meeting
  - Includes: Action Items from 25 September 2003 RAB Meeting; and
  - Table 1, RAB Roll-Call Sheet
- Monthly Progress Report, August 2003
- Monthly Progress Report, September 2003
- PowerPoint Presentation, Parcel E Landfill Gas Removal Action Update, 23 October 2003
- PowerPoint Presentation, HRA Update, 23 October 2003
- HPS Fact Sheet No. 4, Historical Radiological Assessment, October 2003
- Meeting Minutes, HPS RAB, Economic Committee, 07 October 2003 with Handouts regarding CECC-C, 27 March 2000; and Section 2912 of the FY 1994 Defense Authorization Act
- Meeting Minutes, HPS RAB, Membership/Bylaws & Community Outreach Subcommittee, 14 October 2003
- Flyer, ARC Ecology, Community Open House, 07 November 2003
- Pamphlet, San Francisco Department of Public Health, We Can Help
- Post Card, San Francisco HRC, Environmental Racism Workshop IV, 29 October 2003

**Welcome / Introductions / Agenda and Meeting Minutes Review**

Marsha Pendergrass, facilitator, called the meeting to order at 6:00 P.M. All in attendance made self-introductions. Ms. Pendergrass began the meeting and asked if there were any changes to the agenda; of which there were none.

Ms. Pendergrass reviewed the Action Items contained in the September minutes and asked for a status of each item. The Navy will continue to evaluate the RAB's recommendation to collect air-quality samples from all future Shipyard fires. Of the six new action items, Marie Harrison,

1 RAB member, stated that she never received a copy of the sublease agreement that Don  
2 Capobres, San Francisco Redevelopment Agency, (SFRA), said he mailed to her. This item will  
3 carry-over until it is resolved. In addition, related to Item number 2, Ronald Keichline,  
4 Innovative Technical Solutions, Inc (ITSI), was asked to alert the RAB once a copy of the  
5 Basewide Environmental Baseline Survey is available in the Anna Waden Branch Library  
6 Information Repository. The remaining action items were resolved to the satisfaction of the  
7 RAB.

8 Ms. Pendergrass called for a motion to approve the meeting minutes. Maurice Campbell, RAB  
9 member, asked for two amendments to the minutes. The proposed amendments were acceptable  
10 and the revised meeting minutes were approved pending the revisions.

#### 11 **Navy and Community Co-chair Reports/Other Announcements**

12 Keith Forman, RAB Navy Co-chair, encouraged RAB attendees to come to the Community  
13 Information Fair, scheduled for Saturday, 15 November, at the Earl P. Mills Community Center.  
14 Mr. Forman also announced that his e-mail address and telephone number are changing,  
15 effective 28 October, to [keith.s.forman@navy.mil](mailto:keith.s.forman@navy.mil) and 415-308-1458. He also said that the latest  
16 Fact Sheet, Radiological Fact Sheet No. 4, is available as a handout.

17 Lynne Brown, RAB Community Co-Chair, pointed out that the date for the upcoming  
18 Community Information Fair conflicts with a Citizens Advisory Council (CAC) workshop on the  
19 Development and Disposition Agreement (DDA) scheduled for the same day. Keith Tisdell,  
20 RAB member, expressed frustration at having to choose between the two events, which are both  
21 very important. Ahimsa Sumchai, RAB member, and Mr. Brown agreed with Mr. Tisdell.  
22 Ms. Pendergrass closed the discussion on this topic and suggested that Mr. Forman and  
23 Mr. Brown contact the CAC and open discussion with them on possibly rescheduling.

24 **Reminder: The next RAB meeting will be held from 6:00 to 8:10 P.M., Thursday evening,**  
25 **4 December 2003 at Dago Mary's Restaurant, Building #916 on the Shipyard.**

#### 26 **Landfill Gas Removal Action Update**

27 Charles Mazowiecki, Navy, introduced himself to the RAB and outlined his presentation for the  
28 evening. He said that the presentation would include the landfill gas removal action, a brief  
29 discussion of the gas control system that was installed, the levels of methane encountered, and  
30 some of the repair work that involved grouting the barrier wall.

31 He began the presentation explaining that in April 2002 methane was detected above regulatory  
32 limits on the University of California, San Francisco (UCSF) property at the edge of Parcel E.  
33 The Navy initiated a removal action to reduce the levels of methane to less than 5 percent on the  
34 UCSF property. Using a combination of a barrier wall, gas monitoring probes (GMP), passive  
35 venting, and active venting, the Navy successfully reduced the methane levels beyond the  
36 Shipyard property.

37 Mr. Mazowiecki said they continued monitoring and improving the system. The Navy noted that  
38 there appeared to be some methane still crossing the barrier in some places. They grouted  
39 sections of the wall to the west of GMP 03A to limit the "communication" across the barrier  
40 wall. In addition, turbines were installed on some of the passive vents. Further monitoring  
41 showed the maintenance activities to be effective. As a precaution, the Navy went ahead and  
42 grouted the remainder of the sections west of GMP 03A.

43 Marie Harrison, RAB member, asked if the methane gas pass through the plastic barrier wall or  
44 could dissolve into the groundwater and find a way under the barrier. Mr. Mazowiecki replied

1 that the barrier wall is not completely impervious and that methane could diffuse through the  
2 wall. However, that would take a very long time. Methane is insoluble in water however, so it  
3 could not get under the barrier since the wall extends two feet below the groundwater level.  
4 Ms. Pendergrass asked that the audience hold their questions until the end of Mr. Mazowiecki's  
5 presentation.

6 Mr. Mazowiecki continued his presentation with special attention on GMP 24. He explained that  
7 earlier in the month, the Navy noted that the methane level at that location spiked to 4.9 percent.  
8 They installed a number of temporary monitoring probes to better understand the situation.  
9 Mr. Mazowiecki said they started extracting from GMP 24 and have corrected the situation.  
10 They are continuing to monitor to determine where the methane came from.

11 Dr. Sumchai said that it is worrisome that the methane level was that high so close to a  
12 laboratory. She asked if the Navy knew where the methane spike came from. Mr. Mazowiecki  
13 replied that methane was in the soil, not in the building, and has been corrected. Right now, he  
14 does not know the source of the methane but in December the Navy will install six additional  
15 GMPs on Crisp Avenue and will submit a monitoring work plan to the regulatory agencies in  
16 February 2004.

17 Ray Tompkins, RAB member, said he understands that a typical landfill will produce methane  
18 for about 30 years and asked why the Parcel E Landfill was still generating methane this long  
19 after being closed. He said the Navy should focus on removing the source of the methane rather  
20 than spending time and money on "Band-Aid" remedies. Mr. Mazowiecki replied that the  
21 30-year number is a generalization and not always the case. When Mr. Tompkins said that it was  
22 not cost-effective to extract the methane versus removing the landfill material, Mr. Mazowiecki  
23 replied that estimates on the cost to excavate the landfill run upwards of half a billion dollars.

24 Jesse Mason, RAB member, asked who is the contractor that was brought in to work on the  
25 barrier wall. Mr. Mazowiecki replied that ITSI used a contractor to do the additional grouting but  
26 otherwise all the work has been done by either ITSI or Tetra Tech. Mr. Mason asked how many  
27 people from the community participated in the action. Mr. Mazowiecki replied that he did not  
28 know. Ms. Pendergrass added that the question should be directed to somebody else in  
29 contracting.

30 Maurice Campbell, RAB member, commented that Mr. Mazowiecki's statement that the Navy  
31 has supplemented the passive vents with turbine blowers means it is no longer a passive  
32 extraction system on the landfill side of the barrier wall. He also asked where the original  
33 shoreline was in relation to the landfill and whether there might be a buried runoff pipe acting as  
34 a conduit for the methane gas. Mr. Mazowiecki indicated on a map where the former shoreline  
35 was in relation to the landfill. He also said that the trench where the barrier wall is located was  
36 dug to a depth of 17 feet, and no pipes or utilities were encountered during the installation.  
37 Mr. Campbell said that he understands that methane is being detected on both sides of the barrier  
38 and asked if the barrier had breaches in it. Mr. Mazowiecki replied that there is a good  
39 probability that there are punctures in the barrier wall. The grouting is intended to help seal the  
40 punctures and provide further support against methane migration across the barrier.

41 Mr. Tisdell asked if the methane from the landfill was related to the fire in June 2003.  
42 Mr. Mazowiecki replied that it was a brush fire and was not related to the methane. Ms. Harrison  
43 asked if the installation of the barrier wall contributed to the numerous fires on private property  
44 near the Shipyard. Mr. Mazowiecki replied that the methane levels above-ground are far too low  
45 to support combustion and dissipates rapidly in open air. Ms. Harrison stated that she is  
46 concerned that the August 2000 landfill fire started as a result of some unknown buried heat  
47 source which could start another fire when combined with the methane in the landfill.

1 Mr. Mazowiecki replied that the fire department records stated that the August 2000 fire started  
2 as a brush fire on the surface. The landfill cap was constructed to cut-off oxygen to the landfill  
3 and extinguish the underground smoldering. He added that cutting off oxygen eliminates one of  
4 the three required ingredients for a fire – fuel, oxygen, and heat. The Navy monitors the oxygen  
5 level in the landfill as part of their regular monitoring program.

6 Break called (7:00 P.M.)

### 7 **Landfill Gas Removal Action (cont.)**

8 Ms. Pendergrass called the meeting back to order and resumed taking questions from the floor.  
9 Dr. Sumchai stated that the landfill is only partially capped and therefore it is not impossible that  
10 oxygen could enter the landfill from outside the capped area to the southwest. She also stated her  
11 theory that the continued smoldering in August 2000 ignited the chemical contents within the  
12 landfill. The resulting chemical reactions and decompositions are possibly the cause of the  
13 increased methane generation in the landfill. She also expressed concern that the landfill is  
14 poorly characterized and that there is going to be a potential for lateral migration of gases. She  
15 questioned the Navy's confidence about their ability to control the migration. She asked if the  
16 methane detected at GMP 24 might represent subsurface lateral migration from beneath the  
17 barrier wall. Mr. Mazowiecki replied that the GMP detected methane at about 12 feet below  
18 ground surface (bgs). The barrier wall extends to 17 feet bgs, which includes two feet into the  
19 groundwater. He said the likelihood of the methane traveling horizontally through the water and  
20 below the barrier is extremely low. He added that they Navy has five other GMPs on the UCSF  
21 property and they have not detected methane at these locations, nor along the "fence line" GMPs.  
22 Mr. Mazowiecki said that his theory about the methane spike is that there was a "cloud" of  
23 methane, perhaps underneath Building 830, that was not extracted during the active extraction  
24 phase. It simply migrated to an area of lower pressure at GMP 24.

25 Mr. Tisdell had the final comment of the presentation. He said it seemed to him, listening to the  
26 presentation, that the barrier wall wasn't working. Mr. Mazowiecki replied that the barrier wall is  
27 working and if it weren't, the GMPs on the UCSF property would have methane readings similar  
28 to those from April 2002. Mr. Tisdell asked why, then, the Navy was replacing the barrier wall.  
29 Mr. Mazowiecki replied that they did not replace the wall but, rather, reinforced it with grout.  
30 Ms. Pendergrass closed the discussion at this point to continue the meeting per the agenda.

### 31 **Historical Radiological Assessment Update**

32 Laurie Lowman, Navy Radiological Affairs Support Office (RASO), made a presentation on the  
33 HRA Update. She apologized for rescheduling her presentation that was scheduled for last  
34 month, but Hurricane Isabelle caused significant damage on the East coast and interfered with  
35 travel. She began with an update on the HRA. She said they have researched additional archive  
36 records and are currently preparing a second draft of the HRA. Due to many factors detailed in  
37 her presentation, the August 2003 release date for the second draft of the HRA will be delayed.

38 The additional records were reviewed at the Naval Sea Systems Command Archive but there  
39 wasn't much information on the radiological operations at conducted by the Navy Radiological  
40 Defense Laboratory (NRDL) at Hunters Point Shipyard. She said there was a lot of information,  
41 however, on the Triple A contracts and Ms. Lowman hopes to extract some building information  
42 from those records. An additional number of records were researched from files at the National  
43 Association of Atomic Veterans. Most of those records pertained to technical details of exposure  
44 resulting from atomic tests; very little had to do with the Shipyard or NRDL operations.  
45 Ms. Lowman said that review of records at other agencies have yielded similar sparse results  
46 though they are continuing to review new records as they become available. For example,

1 Ms. Lowman said the Defense Threat Reduction Agency (DTRA) just recently provided a large  
2 number of records that RASO has not yet had time to review.

3 Ms. Lowman said they are now preparing for the second Department of Defense (DoD) review.  
4 The second review is warranted because of significant changes to the first HRA, and will also  
5 include review by DTRA and the Army Corps of Engineers (ACOE) will be providing comments  
6 on the document.

7 Ms. Lowman said that RASO has concluded the personnel interviews for the HRA Update. She  
8 added that multiple attempts were made to contact Tom Olson, at the RAB's request, but RASO  
9 has been unable to locate him for an interview. RASO is also compiling the responses from the  
10 personnel interviews they conducted.

11 Regarding the new release date for the second draft, Ms. Lowman said that RASO was originally  
12 aiming for distribution in August. The scheduled was rearranged for a November distribution  
13 when the DRTA records came available and then Hurricane Isabelle also contributed to a delay.  
14 Ms. Lowman then outlined the new timeline for the HRA. RASO will distribute the internal draft  
15 for DoD review in November. Then, so as not to conflict with the upcoming holidays, RASO  
16 will wait to distribute the draft final to regulators and the public until early 2004.

17 Ms. Lowman then briefed the RAB on some field projects at the Shipyard. Ms. Lowman referred  
18 to a Navy Fact Sheet distributed at the last RAB meeting that provided information about low  
19 levels of radium and cesium contamination in parts of the old ventilation system and floor drains  
20 in Building 366. She explained what the Navy is doing to address the concerns of the artists in  
21 that building. Removal of the ventilation system and floor drains will require the relocation of  
22 the artists in the building. The Navy is also presently conducting dose assessment calculations  
23 based on the levels of contamination present in the ventilation and drains.

24 Ms. Lowman said the levels of contamination detected in the samples collected were very low.  
25 She spent some time explaining that the release levels for cesium and radium include background  
26 radiation. She said the levels were established with the US EPA to ensure the long-term  
27 protection for everyone at the site. Ms. Lowman then said that four of the samples collected from  
28 the ventilation system in Building 366 reported cesium and/or radium above the release limits.  
29 Four of the samples collected from the floor drains also reported cesium and/or radium above the  
30 release limits. Ms. Lowman said that once the contaminated material has been removed, a final  
31 status survey will be conducted, in accordance with the Multi-Agency Radiation Survey and Site  
32 Investigation Manual (MARSSIM) to document that the building is ready for free release.

33 Another field effort Ms. Lowman discussed was Installation Restoration (IR)-02 northwest and  
34 central, commonly referred to as the radium dial disposal area. Ms. Lowman commented that the  
35 name is misleading since the area probably was not a true disposal area. No HRA records  
36 indicate the area was used for radium dial disposal but she acknowledged that there is a large  
37 concentration of dials present, which necessitated the need for the removal action. Ms. Lowman  
38 said the Navy has prepared a work plan for the dial removal and RASO is presently reviewing  
39 the draft. The Navy will take all prudent safety precautions though Ms. Lowman said that they  
40 probably will not enclose the excavation area in a tent, as suggested by the RAB in a previous  
41 meeting. Ms. Lowman explained that the tent would likely pose a safety hazard; equipment could  
42 get tangled up in tent, even a very large tent, and an enclosure could prevent the dissipation of  
43 radon gas creating a safety hazard inside the tent. Ms. Lowman assured the RAB that RASO has  
44 given the request very serious consideration but feels it is not warranted at this time. Similar  
45 removal actions have been conducted at other bases without the need for enclosures.  
46 Ms. Lowman then continued with additional technical details on the IR-02 removal action. The

1 radium dials and any mixed waste (hazardous waste with a radiological contaminant mixed in)  
2 will be tested and properly profiled for disposal.

3 Ms. Lowman briefly discussed a small sandblast grit area, IR-121, that will be more thoroughly  
4 investigated. An effort is currently underway to build up the shoreline to prevent any migration  
5 of material off the site. The sandblast grit will be sampled for potential radiological  
6 contamination and then a decision will be made whether or not to remove it based on the  
7 laboratory results.

8 The final field effort Ms. Lowman discussed was the Parcel E shoreline survey that was  
9 conducted in the summer 2001. She explained that the Navy surveyed 1½ miles of the shoreline  
10 from the lowest low tide line up to 50 feet above the mean tide mark. The shoreline was divided  
11 into 150-foot-wide grids and methodically scanned; over 90,000 readings were taken. The focus  
12 of the survey was on identifying areas of concern for future actions. The Navy will conduct  
13 sampling in areas with the highest count rates and will conduct time-critical removal actions in  
14 areas of concentrated elevated counts. Ms. Lowman concluded her presentation and asked if  
15 there were any questions.

16 Georgia Oliva, RAB member, asked for clarification regarding dose assessment calculations for  
17 the 29 artists in Building 366. Ms. Lowman replied that the calculation is based on a person  
18 working in Building 366, 12 hours a day, seven days a week, for ten years. Ms. Oliva requested  
19 that the Navy consider performing a medical procedure on one of the artists. Ms. Lowman  
20 replied that neither the dose assessment nor the dosimeter devices from the personnel conducting  
21 the surveys indicated the need for medical procedure at this time. Ms. Oliva suggested that  
22 dosimeters be provided to the 29 shipyard artists. Ms. Lowman replied that she would look into  
23 this request.

24 Ms. Oliva also questioned Ms. Lowman about RASO's recommendation *not* to tent the IR-02  
25 excavation area. She asked if any of the non-tented excavations that Ms. Lowman mentioned  
26 during her presentation were in areas close to a residential population. Ms. Lowman replied that  
27 even in the event a tent is not used at this site, the Navy will take all proper safety precautions,  
28 including dust minimization and air quality sampling upwind and downwind from the site.

29 Jesse Mason, RAB member, inquired about any special certification requirements for local  
30 truckers seeking to haul low-level radioactive waste. Ms. Lowman replied that some instances  
31 may require special certifications but none of the material the Navy has removed so far has  
32 required the additional certifications. Ms. Lowman added that she would coordinate with Pat  
33 Brooks, Navy Lead RPM, if there is any additional requirements needed by the local truckers.

34 Mr. Tisdell said that the wind comes across the landfill and up onto the residences, and disagreed  
35 with Ms. Lowman's decision not to tent the excavation. Ms. Lowman reassured Mr. Tisdell that  
36 they would have continuous air monitoring to ensure no radioactive material left the work site.

37 Mr. Tompkins asked Chen Kao, Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC), if DTSC and  
38 the Navy have resolved their differences regarding the Navy's plan to re-deposit excavated soil  
39 back into the IR-02 excavations without screening for possible chemical contamination. Mr. Kao  
40 replied that they are still in disagreement with the Navy, though DTSC has not yet seen the  
41 proposed work plan. Mr. Tompkins then asked Ms. Lowman if the Navy's risk assessment  
42 methodology takes into account more susceptible populations than the standard model of a 35-  
43 year-old healthy white male. Ms. Lowman replied that the Navy calculations will probably be  
44 based on the traditional model. Mr. Tompkins also expressed concern about the how old the  
45 California Department of Health Services (Cal. DHS) standard is that the Navy will be using for

1 the Building 366 radiological clean-up. Ms. Lowman reassured him that the Cal. DHS level that  
2 the Navy is cleaning to is, in fact, more conservative than the current clean-up standard of today.

3 Lani Asher, RAB member, said she does not have a lot of confidence in the Navy's assertion that  
4 they will take all prudent safety precautions when, for the last few years, artists and residents  
5 have been exposed to large amounts of dust and particulates with regard to Navy cleanup  
6 procedures. She added that she is anxious to see the work plan

7 Second break called (8:10 P.M.)

8 Ms. Pendergrass reconvened the meeting and continued taking questions from the RAB.  
9 Ms. Lowman responded to Ms. Asher's question just before the break. She said that the Navy  
10 hasn't yet completed the internal review of the draft work plan. Pending completion of the  
11 internal review, the work plan will go out to the public and the regulators for review. Dates of the  
12 actual field work will be included in the work plan so the public will know what activities are  
13 going on while the removal action is progressing.

14 Before asking her question, Dr. Sumchai very briefly highlighted the Radiological Subcommittee  
15 report which she e-mailed to most of the RAB members. She said she shares some of the  
16 concerns expressed by the audience but many of the questions have been addressed at the  
17 subcommittee and explored in greater depth. With regard to the dosimeters the workers wear,  
18 Dr. Sumchai cautioned that the instruments do not measure cumulative effects of chronic  
19 low-dose radiation. She also commented that the Cal. DHS standard is being challenged in the  
20 California Superior Court and also the cleanup standard may need to be revisited in November  
21 with regards to passage of bills in the California legislature. Dr. Sumchai said that the ventilation  
22 system in Building 366 may have been operational as recent as a year ago, which means that  
23 artists working in the building may have been exposed to contaminated dust from the ventilation  
24 system. Her final comment was advocating the need for a radiation risk assessment. She said that  
25 the Navy is conducting human health risk assessments for Parcel D and it seems to her that a  
26 radiation risk assessment would be warranted. Ms. Lowman commented that the Radiological  
27 Subcommittee was indeed a good meeting. She agreed that the subcommittees have a different  
28 atmosphere and there is more opportunity for one-on-one questions. Responding to the cleanup  
29 level, Ms. Lowman said that the Navy is watching the bills coming out of the California  
30 legislature.

31 Ms. Harrison asked why the Army Corps of Engineers wanted to review the HRA document and  
32 if it is related to the Army's supposed dumping of materials at Parcel E. Ms. Lowman replied  
33 that she has not seen any records the Army dumping any material at the Shipyard. The ACOE  
34 has jurisdiction for managing the Formerly Utilized Defense Sites (FUDS) at Hunters Point  
35 Shipyard. Ms. Lowman said that she would look for records of materials coming from the Army.

36 J.R. Manual, RAB member, said that people should be given the benefit of the doubt, whether  
37 they are regulators, Navy, or community members. He said that at the September RAB meeting  
38 there seemed to be an agreement that the RAB would not try and delay the IR-02 northwest and  
39 central removal action but would wait until the Navy published the work plan. Mr. Manual asked  
40 the Navy if the artist buildings were safe for occupation and if the buildings were tested for  
41 radiation before allowing people to use the spaces. Ms. Lowman answered that the Navy is  
42 investigating every site that has potential for any residual radioactivity. She said that when  
43 NRDL left the Shipyard, all of their buildings were surveyed to the proper standards of the time.

1 Mr. Brown asked for an inventory of what the Atomic Energy Commission removed from the  
2 NRDL buildings. Ms. Lowman replied that the reference documents will be provided on CD  
3 when the HRA is published.

#### 4 **Subcommittee Updates**

5 Ms. Pendergrass said that the meeting is running long and suggested that tonight's subcommittee  
6 reports be abbreviated and only include action items or motions requiring RAB input. This  
7 proposal met with the RAB's approval.

#### 8 **Membership, Bylaws, and Community Outreach Subcommittee (Keith Tisdell, Leader)**

9 Mr. Tisdell gave the report for the Membership, Bylaws and Community Outreach  
10 Subcommittee. He made a motion to approve Charles Dacus' RAB Membership Renewal  
11 Application. The motion carried. Mr. Tisdell also stated the Caroline Washington and Sulu  
12 Palega are hereby removed from the RAB due to excessive absences. They are encouraged to  
13 reapply to the RAB if they are still interested.

14 The next meeting of the Membership & Bylaws Subcommittee will be 6:00-8:00 P.M.,  
15 November 5<sup>th</sup>, at the Anna Waden Branch Library.

#### 16 **Technical Review Subcommittee (Lea Loizos, Leader) held jointly with the Risk Review and** 17 **Health Assessment Subcommittee (Karen Pierce, Leader)**

18 Karen Pierce, RAB member, made a motion to direct the Membership, Bylaws and Community  
19 Outreach Subcommittee to seek active participation by the San Francisco Redevelopment  
20 Agency and the San Francisco Police Department (SFPD) in their SFPD's sublease negotiations.  
21 No vote was taken as the motion was accepted by the Bylaws subcommittee.

22 Lea Loizos, RAB member, said that the joint subcommittees will be at 6:00 P.M., November  
23 18th, at the Community Window on the Shipyard, 4634 Third Street.

#### 24 **Economic Development Subcommittee (Maurice Campbell, Leader)**

25 Mr. Campbell made a motion that the Navy be required to adhere to Section 2912 of the 1994  
26 Defense Authorization Act establishing preference for local businesses located in the vicinity of  
27 Base Closure and Realignment work and include this preference for local businesses in all new  
28 Request for Proposals (RFPs). Ms. Pendergrass replied that the RAB does not have the authority  
29 to make that motion, but could make one that states the RAB supports Section 2912 establishing  
30 preference for local businesses. The motion carried and Mr. Campbell said the subcommittee  
31 would put the recommendation in writing.

32 Mr. Campbell said the next meeting of the subcommittee will be at 2:30 P.M., November 18<sup>th</sup>, at  
33 the Anna Waden Library.

#### 34 **Radiological Subcommittee (Ahimsa Sumchai, Leader)**

35 Dr. Sumchai said the next meeting of the subcommittee will be 3:00-5:00 P.M., November 19<sup>th</sup>, at  
36 The Greenhouse.

#### 37 **Other Discussions/Topics**

38 The following items were also discussed at the RAB meeting. A verbatim account of these  
39 discussions is included in the Information Repository for HPS and may also be found on the HPS  
40 web page at [www.efdsw.navfac.navy.mil/Environmental/HuntersPoint.htm](http://www.efdsw.navfac.navy.mil/Environmental/HuntersPoint.htm)

- 1       • Sam Ripley, attendee, said that the Navy is failing to reach-out to the Pacific Islander and  
2 Samoan community in Bayview-Hunters Point. He asked what the Navy was doing to  
3 reach the Samoan community. Mr. Forman replied that the Navy has been working with  
4 RAB member Sulu Palega to reach the Samoan community. He asked Mr. Ripley to stay  
5 after the RAB so they could discuss the issue more.
- 6       • Mr. Brown announced that the Southeast Community facility is sponsoring a workshop  
7 on October 29<sup>th</sup> on the issue of Environmental Racism pertaining to the Southeast Sewage  
8 Treatment Plant.
- 9       • Francisco Da Costa, attendee, said the Shipyard artists are being displaced because of  
10 political pressures to build 1,600 housing units at the Shipyard. He asked that state  
11 regulators monitor the process very carefully.

12    **Future Agenda Topics**

13    In addition to the standard agenda topics and subcommittee updates, the following topics  
14 suggested for next month's RAB meeting include:

- 15       • Information about Goats-R-Us being used for vegetation control at the Shipyard

16    There were no further announcements. The meeting was adjourned at 8:45 P.M.

17    **Reminder: The next RAB meeting will be held from 6:00 to 8:10 P.M., Thursday evening,**  
18 **04 December 2003 at Dago Mary's Restaurant, Building #916 on the Shipyard.**

## ATTACHMENT A

**23 OCTOBER 2003 - RAB MEETING  
LIST OF ATTENDEES**

Name	Association
1. Christine M. Niccoli	Niccoli Reporting, court reporter
2. Marsha Pendergrass	Pendergrass & Associates
3. Quijuan Maloof	Pendergrass & Associates
4. Keith Forman	<b>Navy RAB Co-chair</b>
5. Pat Brooks	Navy, Lead RPM
6. Charles Mazoweicki	Navy
7. Laurie Lowman	Navy, RASO
8. Richard Lowman	Navy, RASO
9. Lee Saunders	Navy, PAO
10. Peter Stroganoff	Navy, ROICC Office
11. Lynne Brown	<b>RAB Community Co-chair</b> , Communities for a Better Environment, CFC
12. Lani Asher	RAB member, Communities for a Better Environment, CFC
13. Barbara Bushnell	RAB member, R.O.S.E.S.
14. Maurice Campbell	RAB member, BDI, CFC, New California Media
15. Charles Dacus	RAB member, R.O.S.E.S.
16. Marie Harrison	RAB member, CBE, San Francisco Bay View, Greenaction
17. Mitsuyo Hasegawa	RAB member, JRM Associates
18. Helen Jackson	RAB member, All Hallows Gardens Residents Association
19. Lea Loizos	RAB member, ARC Ecology
20. Kevyn Lutton	RAB member, resident
21. J.R. Manuel	RAB member, JRM Associates, India Basin resident
22. Jesse Mason	RAB member, CFC
23. James Morrison	RAB member, Environmental Technology
24. Georgia Oliva	RAB member, CBE, CCA member
25. Karen Pierce	RAB member, Bayview Advocates, BVHP Democratic Club, HEAP
26. Melita Rines	RAB member, India Basin Neighborhood Association
27. Harry Shin	RAB member, Associated Builders
28. Ahimsa Sumchai	RAB member, Bayview-Hunter Point Health & Env Resource Center
29. Keith Tisdell	RAB member, resident
30. Raymond Tompkins	RAB member, BVHP Coalition on the Environment
31. Leilani Wright	RAB member, JRM Associates
32. Amy Brownell	RAB member, SF Dept of Public Health
33. Chen Kao	RAB member, Cal Dept Toxic Substances Control
34. Jackie Lane	RAB member, US EPA
35. Julie Menack	RAB member, SF Regional Water Quality Control Board
36. Michael Work	RAB member, US EPA
37. Arvind Acharya	Innovative Technical Solutions, Inc
38. Nadine Andrakin	Katz & Associates
39. Ronald Batiste	EEC
40. Doug Bielskis	Tetra Tech EM Inc
41. Andrew Bozeman	Southeast Sector Community Development Corp
42. Victoria Coker	Tetra Tech EM Inc
43. Francisco DaCosta	Environmental Justice Advocacy
44. Steve Delhomme	Tetra Tech EM Inc
45. Rebecca Fox	Shipyards artist
46. Miguel Galarza	Yerba Buena Engineering and Construction, Inc
47. Bob Hocker	Lennar/BVHP
48. Carolyn Hunter	Tetra Tech EM Inc
49. Feng Jin	Shipyards artist
50. Ronald Keichline	Innovative Technical Solutions, Inc

- |                                  |  |
|----------------------------------|--|
| 51. Lafo Laulu                   | Resident   |
| 52. Lisa Laulu                   | Resident   |
| 53. Debra Moore                  | Innovative Technical Solutions, Inc                      |
| 54. Rev. Joe Niumalelega         |  |
| 55. Sealiimalietoa Sam<br>Ripley | Samoan American Media Services                           |
| 56. Dennis Robinson              | Shaw Environmental & Infrastructure, Inc                 |
| 57. Ivan Sepuloba                |  |
| 58. Mathew L. Sharps, Esq.       | Paul Hastings, LLP, for Lennar                           |
| 59. Clifton J. Smith             | CJ Smith and Assonates, Eagle Environmental Construction |
| 60. Miya Stanoff                 | Shipyards artist   |
| 61. David Terzian                | The Point  |
| 62. Alison Turner                | Katz & Associates  |
| 63. Renee Underwood              | Ideal Daycare  |
| 64. Julia Vetromile              | Tetra Tech EM Inc  |
| 65. Jason Webster                | Shipyards artist   |
| 66. Peter Wilsey                 | SF Dept of Public Health                                 |

**ATTACHMENT B****23 OCTOBER 2003 - RAB MEETING  
ACTION ITEMS**

<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Action Item</b>	<b>Due Date</b>	<b>Person/Agency Committing to Action Item</b>	<b>Resolution Status</b>
Carry-Over Items				
1.	Navy to report back to RAB regarding recommendation that air quality samples be collected for all future HPS fires.	December RAB	Navy	
2.	Navy to ensure 1998 Basewide Environmental Baseline Survey (EBS) available to RAB	ASAP	Navy/ITSI	
3.	SRFA to provide Marie Harrison with a copy of the Lease Agreement Document	ASAP	SFRA – Don Capobres	
New Items				
4.	Navy to provide information to Jesse Mason regarding additional bonding/radioactive waste hauling certifications, if any.	ASAP	Navy/ITSI	
5.	Economic Subcommittee to prepare a letter in support of Section 2912, Defense Authorization Act, establishing preference for local businesses.	December RAB	M. Campbell	