

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

M E E T I N G

---

HUNTERS POINT SHIPYARD  
RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD

---

REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT

April 25, 2002

San Francisco Police Department  
Bayview Station Community Room  
201 Williams Avenue  
San Francisco, California

Reported by Christine M. Niccoli, RPR, C.S.R. No. 4569

\*\*\*\*\*

NICCOLI REPORTING

619 Pilgrim Drive

Foster City, CA 94404-1707

(650) 573-9339

CERTIFIED SHORTHAND REPORTERS SERVING THE BAY AREA

1 FACILITATOR: QUIJUAN MALOOF - Pendergrass & Associates  
2 CO-CHAIRS: KEITH FORMAN - United States Navy SWDIV  
DOROTHY PETERSON - RAB member, Hunters  
3 Point resident  
CAROLINE WASHINGTON - RAB member, Southeast  
4 Community College Advisory Board  
5  
6 RAB MEMBERS:  
7 LANI ASHER - Communities for a Better Environment,  
Community First Coalition  
8  
LYNNE BROWN - Communities for a Better Environment,  
9 Community First Coalition  
10 AMY BROWNELL - San Francisco Department of Public Health  
11 BARBARA BUSHNELL - ROSES, resident  
12 CHARLES L. DACUS, SR. - Hunters Point resident, ROSES  
13 LAURIE ESPINOZA - Labor neighbor  
14 MITSUYO HASEGAWA - JRM Associates  
15 CHEIN KAO - California Dept. of Toxic Substances Control  
16 JACQUELINE ANN LANE - US Environmental Protection Agency  
17 JESSE MASON - Bayview-Hunters Point Community Advocates,  
Community First Coalition  
18  
MELITA RINES  
19  
JIM RODRIGUEZ - Portola Place Homeowners Association,  
20 ROSES  
21 CHRISTINE SHIRLEY - Arc Ecology  
22 AHIMSA PORTER SUMCHAI, M.D. - BVHP Coalition on  
Environment  
23  
KEITH TISDELL - Hunters Point resident  
24  
RAYMOND TOMPKINS - Bayview-Hunters Point Coalition on  
25 Environment

1 RAB ATTENDEES [Cont.]:

2 MICHAEL WORK - US Environmental Protection Agency  
3 LEILANI WRIGHT - JRM Associates (J. R. Manuel's alt.)  
4

5 ----oOo----

6 OTHER ATTENDEES

7 WAYNE AKIYAMA - IT Corporation  
8 DOUG BIELSKIS - Tetra Tech EM Inc.  
9 SHAWNTE' BROWN - Young Community Developers  
10 MYRON BRYANT - Community resident  
11 MAUDE BULLOCK - ADI Technology Corporation  
12 AL CAIN - A. M. Cain Trucking  
13 MAURICE CAMPBELL - Business Development, Inc.; Community  
14 First Coalition; New California Media; NEW BAYVIEW  
NEWSPAPER; SAN FRANCISCO BAY VIEW  
15 DOUGLAS DAVENPORT - Tetra Tech EM Inc.  
16 DAVID DeMARS - United States Navy  
17 CHARLES W. DePEW - United States Navy  
18 DARNELL ELLIS - Resident  
19 DONALD GREENE - Young Community Developers  
20 ERNEST HAYWARD - San Francisco League for Urban Gardeners  
21 LAMORCIRIE DANIEL HICKMAN - Young Community Developers  
22 BOB HOCKER - Lennar-Bayview-Hunters Point Team  
23 BILL HOWELL - 3-D Environmental  
24 CAROLYN HUNTER - Tetra Tech EM Inc.  
25

1                           OTHER ATTENDEES [Cont.]:

2           DWAYNE JONES - Young Community Developers

3           JAMES JONES - Young Community Developers

4           RONALD W. KEICHLINE - Bechtel National, Inc.

5           CHARLES LEWIS - Young Community Developers

6           KEVYN D. LUTTON - Resident

7           BEVERLY MAYBON - Resident

8           KAREN G. PIERCE - Bayview Advocates, BVHP Democratic Club

9           RICHARD J. PRIBYL III - United States Navy guest speaker

10          SARINA PURI - Bechtel National, Inc.

11          DAVID RIST - California Dept. of Toxic Substances Control

12          LEE H. SAUNDERS - United States Navy

13          JOYCE SUE - Hunters Point Boys & Girls Club

14          MIKE TOMASZKIEWICZ - Communities for a Better

15          Environment, Community First Coalition

16          MICHAEL J. WANTA, P.E. - Tetra Tech EM Inc.

17          ANTHONY WILLIAMS - Young Community Developers

18          PETER WILSEY - San Francisco Department of Public Health

19                           ----oOo----

1 SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA, THURSDAY, APRIL 25, 2002

2 6:00 P.M.

3 ---oOo---

4 MR. MALOOF: Welcome, everyone, to the meeting.  
5 We're going to start our meeting right now. Let's start  
6 off with introductions.

7 My name is Quijuan Maloof. I'm going to be  
8 your facilitator for tonight. Please be sure to turn  
9 off all pagers and cell phones.

10 We're going to start off with the  
11 introductions.

12 MS. BUSHNELL: I'm Barbara Bushnell, RAB  
13 member, member of ROSES, resident.

14 MR. DACUS: Charles L. Dacus, Sr., member of  
15 RAB and also a member of ROSES.

16 MS. PETERSON: Dorothy Peterson, Community  
17 Co-chair.

18 MR. WORK: Michael Work with the Environmental  
19 Protection Agency.

20 MR. KAO: Chein Kao, State Department of Toxic  
21 Substances Control.

22 MS. WRIGHT: Leilani Wright, RAB member.

23 MS. RINES: Melita Rines, RAB member, resident.

24 MR. KEICHLINE: Ronald Keichline, Bechtel  
25 community relations.

1 MR. HOCKER: Bob Hocker, Lennar BVHP.

2 MR. TOMASZKIEWICZ: Mike Tomas with Communities  
3 for a Better Environment.

4 MR. MALOOF: Next in the corner?

5 MR. BROWN: Oh, my turn?

6 MR. MALOOF: Yes.

7 MR. BROWN: Lynne Brown, Communities for a  
8 Better Environment, RAB, Hunters Point resident.

9 MS. WASHINGTON: Caroline Washington, Southeast  
10 Community Advisory Board.

11 MS. BROWNELL: Amy Brownell, San Francisco  
12 Health Department.

13 MS. SHIRLEY: Chris Shirley, Arc Ecology.

14 DR. SUMCHAI: Dr. Ahimsa Sumchai, RAB member.

15 MS. ASHER: Lani Asher, RAB member.

16 MR. DeMARS: Dave DeMars, lead RPM, Navy.

17 MR. PRIBYL: Hi. My name's Rich Pribyl. I'm  
18 Parcel B Project Manager for the Navy. I'm a civil  
19 engineer, environmental scientist as well.

20 MR. FORMAN: Keith Forman, your BRAC  
21 Environmental Coordinator.

22 MR. WANTA: Mike Wanta with Tetra Tech.

23 MR. BIELSKIS: Doug Bielskis with Tetra Tech.

24 MS. LUTTON: Kevyn Lutton, resident.

25 MS. LANE: Jackie Lane, community involvement

1 EPA.

2 MR. RIST: David Rist, State Department of  
3 Toxic Substances Control.

4 MR. DePEW: Charles DePew, Navy.

5 THE REPORTER: I'm sorry. "Charles" what?

6 MR. DePEW: Charles DePew, D-e-P-e-w,  
7 contracting officer for the Navy.

8 THE REPORTER: Thank you.

9 MR. GREENE: Donald Green, YCD.

10 MR. AKIYAMA: Wayne Akiyama, IT Corporation.

11 MS. BROWN: Shawnte' Brown, Young Community  
12 Developers.

13 MR. HICKMAN: Lamorcirie Daniel Hickman, YCD.

14 MR. HANIF: Chris Hanif, YCD.

15 MR. BRYANT: Myron Bryant with YCD.

16 MR. WILLIAMS: Anthony Williams, YCD.

17 THE REPORTER: I'm sorry?

18 MR. WILLIAMS: Anthony Williams, YCD.

19 THE REPORTER: Thank you.

20 MR. LEWIS: Charles Lewis, YCD.

21 MR. ELLIS: Darnell Ellis, YCD.

22 MS. MAYBON: Beverly Maybon, YCD.

23 MR. MALOOF: Okay. Did we get everyone?  
24 Okay. Just going to move on to agenda review.

25 DR. SUMCHAI: I -- I just wanted to raise the

1 point that I've raised in previous meetings that it's  
2 customary under Robert's Rules of Order as the first  
3 order of business to formally approve the agenda, and  
4 we -- we may want to -- to incorporate that as a -- a  
5 procedure for the RAB.

6 I -- I did want to point out to you that we  
7 have allocated ten minutes for the approval of the  
8 meeting minutes, announcements, and then the summary of  
9 the FOST presentations from the public meeting.

10 Now, the objective -- objection that I raised  
11 to the last month's meetings were that there was a  
12 addition to the minutes in which it was announced that  
13 the FOST would be presented to a subcommittee of the  
14 RAB, and that was not the motion that had been passed by  
15 the full body.

16 MR. MALOOF: Okay. First le- -- let me go to  
17 your first -- The first thing that we're going to be  
18 doing is just agenda review.

19 DR. SUMCHAI: Right.

20 MR. MALOOF: And the reason why we're just  
21 doing review is because this agenda has already been  
22 okayed by the co-chairs. So that's why it's just a  
23 review.

24 And as far as approval of the minutes, that's  
25 different. Is that what you're talking about?

1 DR. SUMCHAI: No. I'm saying that under  
2 Robert's Rules and Order [sic], a body approves the  
3 agenda. That's the first order of business under  
4 Robert's Rules of Order, approval of the agenda.

5 And I was suggesting that since the FOST was  
6 presented to a subcommittee, that it now be brought  
7 before the full RAB and that at least twenty minutes be  
8 allocated towards Mr. Forman's summary of the  
9 subcommittee meeting that was held on April 8th in which  
10 the FOST was presented.

11 MR. MALOOF: So you're saying that you need  
12 another twenty minutes onto this?

13 DR. SUMCHAI: No. I'm saying I need -- I'm  
14 suggesting that we take another ten minutes for a full  
15 twenty minutes, and we can get the ten minutes from the  
16 thirty minutes that had been allocated for the  
17 presentation on IR-07 and IR-18, since these are not as  
18 time-constrained issues.

19 MR. MALOOF: Okay. Would you like to make a  
20 motion?

21 DR. SUMCHAI: The first motion that I would  
22 like to make is that the RAB in this meeting and in  
23 subsequent meetings in keeping with Robert's Rules of  
24 Order vote to formally approve the agenda.

25 MS. SHIRLEY: I second that.

1 MR. MALOOF: Okay. Okay. It's been motioned  
2 and seconded.

3 Discussion?

4 MR. FORMAN: Couple of observations. I'm  
5 looking for the newly approved bylaws and what they say.  
6 Do they mention anything about operating under the  
7 Robert's Rules of Order?

8 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Yeah.

9 MR. FORMAN: Where's Mr. Tisdell?

10 MS. PETERSON: Robert's Rules of Order.

11 MR. FORMAN: Couple observations I'd like to  
12 make. Couple observations I'd like to make quickly.

13 First of all, Robert's Rules of Order may serve  
14 as a framework for many of the things, for instance,  
15 motioning, seconding; but we're not -- it's not  
16 necessarily an ironclad guideline for this meeting.

17 Many of the other RABs that I've attended  
18 across the country don't -- don't strictly adhere to  
19 Robert's Rules of Order. It's really the preference of  
20 the RAB members as to -- to how far we go with that.

21 The reason why I think that you ought to  
22 seriously consider on this point approving an agenda  
23 rather than just reviewing it is --

24 Actually, without exception, every RAB I've  
25 been it's actually reviewed, not approved. The reason

1 for that is because during the course of the month, as  
2 things come up, the BRAC environmental coordinator and  
3 the Navy representatives discuss with -- with your  
4 community co-chairs what the agenda's going to be.

5           It is traditionally -- At Restoration Advisory  
6 Board meetings, it's traditionally the role of the  
7 community co-chairs to look at the agenda to make  
8 suggestions and -- and then to approve it.

9           So if the day of the RAB, for instance, today  
10 we were actually to approve the agenda, you could run  
11 into quite a few problems there because there's already  
12 a presentation that's prepared. We have already  
13 organized the evening's events pretty much and gained  
14 the approval of the community co-chairs. To make  
15 some -- some wholesale changes to it when we're already  
16 in the meeting could really result in some problems, I  
17 would see.

18           I -- My personal preference on this would be  
19 that it be retained by the community co-chairs for them  
20 to approve during the month what the agenda's going to  
21 be.

22           What I think you could do to help assist the  
23 community co-chairs is develop a process whereby you  
24 provide input to the community co-chairs about the  
25 topics you want, maybe even how long you want each

1 presentation to be; and -- and then the community  
2 co-chairs would -- would talk to myself and the Navy  
3 team on that.

4 I think that's traditionally the way it is, and  
5 it -- it works out pretty smoothly compared to with the  
6 way it could be if we go to an approval system.

7 MS. PETERSON: That was done last month. It  
8 was determined what people wanted to hear this month.

9 DR. SUMCHAI: Well, I think that I can close  
10 the discussion very quickly.

11 We have approved the bylaws -- under 10,  
12 Bylaws, "Minutes": "RAB members shall review, comment,  
13 and approve minutes at the next regular meeting of -- of  
14 the RAB." And I think that, you know, in -- in keeping  
15 with that process for the -- the minutes, it just seems  
16 logical that we would also review, comment, and approve  
17 the agenda.

18 You've used the word "approved" three times in  
19 your comments, Mr. Forman. I think it's pretty clear.  
20 It certainly would serve to de-escalate some of the  
21 concerns about the agenda that have surfaced repeatedly  
22 in -- in the last year or so if we could simply as a  
23 body discuss and approve the agenda.

24 MR. MALOOF: Is there any more discussion?

25 MS. BUSHNELL: I'd like to just mention that

1 it -- that it seems to have operated a long way in the  
2 past, and it's -- you know, this is only supposedly a  
3 two-hour meeting; and for all this discussion about the  
4 agenda, it's going to be too time-consuming.

5           You have the opportunity in the month to call  
6 your community co-chairs and give the input that you  
7 want. And so if you don't feel your voice is being  
8 heard, then I don't know whether you're not using it or  
9 not talking to somebody. We clearly need to keep the  
10 meetings going because there's a great deal of things we  
11 need to hear.

12           DR. SUMCHAI: There was an effort I made to  
13 have the FOST placed on the agenda through  
14 Mrs. Washington two months ago, and that was  
15 disrespected, and that's one of the reasons why I think  
16 it is important for the body to be able to approve the  
17 agenda.

18           MR. MALOOF: Okay.

19           Miss Peterson?

20           MS. PETERSON: Okay. I thought last meeting  
21 this agenda was suggested and approved. There was an  
22 item voted on, and there was a -- well, I was asked why  
23 I didn't vote for it.

24           And I said, "Well, I don't know that it can be  
25 put on the agenda."

1           And I don't determine what is to go on the  
2 agenda. If items are given to me, I run them by Keith.

3           And Keith said, "They will go on the agenda."  
4 I am not a committee of one. It goes on the agenda.

5           So I -- it was my understanding that these two  
6 subjects were requested to be on the agenda and  
7 presented this month.

8           MR. MALOOF: Okay.

9           MS. PETERSON: Otherwise, I would have --

10          MR. MALOOF: Just one more.

11          MS. PETERSON: -- said something.

12          MR. MALOOF: Okay.

13          Miss Shirley?

14          MS. SHIRLEY: Well, I think that things can  
15 change during the month, and I think it's necessary; and  
16 things become timely or not, depending on what's  
17 happened during the month and when the agenda was  
18 published and all that. And I think it's -- it is -- I  
19 think it's necessary to -- to approve the agenda at the  
20 meeting so that we can take care of those emerging  
21 issues or de-emphasize ones that have been resolved.

22          MS. PETERSON: Well, if we got speakers, I  
23 don't know how we can . . .

24          MR. MALOOF: Are you ready to take this to a  
25 vote? Is there any last discussion?

1 MR. KEICHLINE: I -- I have a suggestion that  
2 we perhaps put as a standing item "Other Business" which  
3 would then cover those things, because otherwise, it's  
4 very difficult to plan for a meeting if we add or  
5 subtract certain things the day of the meeting.

6 But if you leave a slot of time for other  
7 business, that would perhaps take care of those things.  
8 That's a suggestion.

9 MR. MALOOF: Okay. Well, a motion has been on  
10 the floor. Are we ready to take a vote?

11 Okay. All those in favor of --

12 Dr. Sumchai, would you repeat your . . . ?

13 DR. SUMCHAI: In keeping with Robert's Rules of  
14 Order, as the first order of business, this body approve  
15 the agenda.

16 MR. MALOOF: All those in favor --

17 THE BOARD: Aye.

18 MR. MALOOF: -- raise your hand.

19 (Some members raise their hands.)

20 MR. KEICHLINE: Keep them -- keep them raised  
21 so I can count, please.

22 MR. KEICHLINE: Six.

23 MR. MALOOF: All those not in favor?

24 MS. PETERSON: We already approved it.

25 MR. MALOOF: Oh. Abstentions. I'm sorry.

1 (Some members raise their hands.)

2 MR. KEICHLINE: Six for, five against.

3 MR. MALOOF: Okay. The ayes have it.

4 MS. WRIGHT: I'd like to make an announcement.

5 MR. MALOOF: All right. Ready to go on to the

6 next order of business, approval of minutes.

7 MS. PETERSON: She --

8 MS. WRIGHT: I'd like to make a quick

9 announcement, if I could. It's rather timely.

10 MR. MALOOF: You have to speak up, please.

11 MS. WRIGHT: Oh. I'd like to make a quick

12 announcement. I have a loud voice, so I'm trying to

13 tone it down.

14 My announcement is: In addition to my capacity

15 as a RAB member, I'm also here as an alternate for J. R.

16 Manuel, who's not able to make it. I'd like that be

17 recorded in the official record.

18 MR. MALOOF: Next is the approval of minutes.

19 Is everyone --?

20 MS. PETERSON: Some people didn't get minutes.

21 MR. MALOOF: Are there people on the Board that

22 have not gotten minutes?

23 MS. PETERSON: If you didn't have e-mail, you

24 didn't get minutes, because hard copies didn't go out.

25 MR. MALOOF: Okay.

1 MS. PETERSON: So we're either going to have to  
2 approve last month's minutes and then hold approving  
3 these until everyone's read them or -- but . . .

4 MR. KEICHLINE: Actually, every -- all the RAB  
5 members who have e-mail were e-mailed the minutes.

6 The two RAB members that don't have e-mail I  
7 faxed them over; and the only person who wasn't --  
8 didn't have e-mail or fax was Charles Dacus, and I  
9 talked to him directly about it. All the RAB members  
10 should have had copies of the minutes.

11 MS. PETERSON: But Charlie Dacus is a member.

12 MR. KEICHLINE: Oh, I understand, yeah. And I  
13 called him. I s- -- I singled him out as the single  
14 exception --

15 MS. PETERSON: Right.

16 MR. KEICHLINE: -- to the RAB members.

17 MS. PETERSON: So, again, all RAB members did  
18 not get a copy of the minutes.

19 MR. MALOOF: Okay. Any . . . ?

20 DR. SUMCHAI: I'm willing to withdraw my  
21 objection to the March [sic] 28th meeting minutes  
22 because I objected to the fact that a announcement had  
23 been included in the minutes that said that a  
24 subcommittee of the RAB would be meeting to review the  
25 FOST.

1           And my objection was the fact that this was  
2 included in the minutes as if it reflected the conduct  
3 of the meeting when, in fact, it -- it did not occur in  
4 the -- in the minutes of the meeting. That is not  
5 actually what occurred during the -- the meeting.

6           So since we have scheduled for this meeting a  
7 discussion about the FOST that is being brought to the  
8 full body, which was the motion that was carried by the  
9 body, then I'm willing to accept -- move to accept the  
10 March minutes if we delete that announcement in the  
11 minutes.

12           MR. KEICHLINE: You mean the February minutes?  
13 Is that --? So we're on the -- The February minutes or  
14 the March --?

15           DR. SUMCHAI: March 28th meeting.

16           MR. MALOOF: It says March and February.

17           MR. KEICHLINE: The -- the minutes that were  
18 not approved for the last meeting were the February 28th  
19 minutes, and that was the one --

20           DR. SUMCHAI: Okay.

21           MR. KEICHLINE: So I just -- to make sure we're  
22 clear --

23           DR. SUMCHAI: All right.

24           MR. KEICHLINE: -- you're talking about  
25 February, okay.

1 MR. MALOOF: Okay. So the minutes --  
2 I guess, Dr. Sumchai, you're saying that you're  
3 okay with this now, then?  
4 DR. SUMCHAI: Right.  
5 MR. MALOOF: Okay.  
6 DR. SUMCHAI: And that I will move to accept  
7 the March 28th -- excuse me -- the February 28th RAB  
8 meeting --  
9 MR. MALOOF: Okay.  
10 DR. SUMCHAI: -- minutes.  
11 MR. MALOOF: Okay.  
12 Seconded?  
13 MS. SHIRLEY: I'll second that.  
14 MR. MALOOF: Great. Okay. So minutes  
15 approved.  
16 Next is --  
17 MS. ESPINOZA: Point of order: You have a  
18 motion for a vote.  
19 MR. MALOOF: Oh, I'm sorry. I skipped that  
20 part.  
21 Any -- any other discussion on this?  
22 Okay. Ready for the vote. All those in  
23 favor --  
24 THE BOARD: Aye.  
25 MR. MALOOF: -- raise your hand.

1 MR. ATTENDEE: What?

2 MR. MALOOF: Of approving minutes, approving  
3 the minutes.

4 MS. RINES: February 28th.

5 MR. MALOOF: February 28th minutes.

6 Any abstentions? Okay.

7 Navy announcements?

8 MR. FORMAN: Okay. We'll start with the --  
9 The open house information fair that I -- I promised you  
10 a couple months ago is going to happen. It's been  
11 widely promulgated, but you're about to see it also on  
12 the white board.

13 (Mr. Rodriguez arrives at 6:18 p.m.)

14 In the Southeast Community Center from 8:30 in  
15 the morning on just about the whole day until about  
16 4 p.m., we're going to be putting on a presentation that  
17 highlights -- that highlights the Navy's environmental  
18 cleanup program. And I welcome all of you to come, but  
19 not just that, I hope that you invite all those that are  
20 interested that you know to come to this meeting.

21 In addition to that, we're going to be talking  
22 also about community-based contracting, and we're going  
23 to have one of our senior contracting officers, Charles  
24 DePew, there. I'm going to be giving some general  
25 presentations.

1           And then what is of particular interest to --  
2 that we have found in many members of the community,  
3 we're going to have different booths set up with  
4 information and project managers that manage those  
5 projects on the base there for you to, if you wish, go  
6 one-on-one and informally ask questions, listen to what  
7 they have to say describing their -- their programs, and  
8 to learn about the Hunters Point environmental cleanup  
9 program. Okay?

10           I think it's going to be a big step forward if  
11 you can make it. Not only will we have quite a few  
12 handouts on things, but you'll really be able to ask a  
13 lot of questions in an informal setting and learn a lot  
14 about the program.

15           So I invite everybody to come out on this  
16 Saturday, April 27th, from 8:30 to 4:00, the Southeast  
17 Community College.

18           In addition to that, since we have last met, we  
19 had a public meeting on Revision 2 to the Finding of  
20 Suitability to Transfer for Parcel A. The meeting was  
21 not -- It was actually not particularly well attended  
22 on that -- on that evening, but several RAB members did  
23 show up and a couple of community members.

24           Kevyn Lutton from CFC showed up and submitted a  
25 formal comment, and her formal comment or at least her

1 first formal comment was requesting a 30-day review  
2 extension on the Finding of Suitability to Transfer  
3 par- -- for Parcel A document.

4           We met with the City of San Francisco, and then  
5 we also ran that up our chain of command there in the  
6 Navy, and we got an approval today for that.

7           So it's been extended 30 days for review and  
8 comment, which means that the new -- Ron, if you can,  
9 when you have time -- the new deadline now -- because it  
10 falls on a holiday weekend, we'll give you an extra  
11 day -- is going to be Tuesday, May 28th. You need to  
12 get your comments in to me by Tuesday, May 28th.

13           In addition to that, as a handout, there is a  
14 collection of all of the slides that were distributed --  
15 that were actually seen at the presentation there as  
16 they were delivered, and we'll continue to take comments  
17 and -- and questions from the public on that.

18           We then will respond to those comments, and  
19 you'll see those in an attachment to the Finding of  
20 Suitability to Transfer in, I believe, July, the  
21 schedule. June -- or late June.

22           MR. RODRIGUEZ: June 30th.

23           MR. FORMAN: June 30th? Okay.

24           Couple of things coming up that I need to  
25 remind everyone about is the RAB Community Co-chair

1 position: The current term expires at the June RAB  
2 meeting, and you -- well, we all need to be thinking  
3 about this because it's a process that takes -- really,  
4 the entire process takes three months. We need to begin  
5 thinking about who you wish to nominate to be your  
6 Community Co-chair.

7 (Messrs. Tompkins and Campbell arrive  
8 at 6:22 p.m.)

9 Nominations are to be accepted at the May  
10 Restoration Advisory Board meeting, and then we will  
11 have elections at the June Restoration Advisory Board  
12 meeting, and the new Community Co-chair will take their  
13 seat at the July Restoration Advisory Board meeting.

14 In July -- Also to answer another question  
15 that's been posed, we will -- I plan on having a July  
16 Restoration Advisory Board meeting. I guess that was a  
17 question as to whether we would skip a month or not. I  
18 think too much is going on at the base, and we're at a  
19 pretty critical point in too many projects to skip a  
20 month.

21 So I'm going to go out on a limb here for the  
22 team and say we're going to do a RAB meeting in July.  
23 If we're going to skip a month, it probably would be the  
24 traditional month to skip, which would be December, the  
25 holidays.

1 I want to apologize. As Ron Keichline alluded  
2 to, we were late in getting out the written side of the  
3 RAB mailer . . .

4 MS. PETERSON: Hard copy.

5 MR. FORMAN: . . . hard copy for the meeting  
6 minutes, so we'll work on that to make sure that doesn't  
7 happen again.

8 And finally, we -- using the guidelines of the  
9 Community Notification Plan, the CNP, we did put out a  
10 CNP message on some of our very preliminary findings of  
11 the landfill gas survey that we have begun to take out  
12 at -- on Parcel E, and many of you saw the notification  
13 there. In a nutshell, we -- we still have data coming  
14 in. We will be putting out a report shortly.

15 (Mr. Saunders arrives at 6:24 p.m.)

16 The Navy's committed to a couple of things.  
17 We're committed to putting together a package -- when we  
18 get the data putting together a package with the  
19 landfill gas data and then offering that up for review.  
20 It's not a formal document, but it will certainly be a  
21 package we put together for the public's review, the  
22 RAB's review, Supervisor Maxwell's review.

23 And indeed, the Board of Supervisors want to  
24 know everything they can about the landfill gas survey  
25 and the data gaps investigation we're doing, and the

1 Navy's committed to that before they would -- the Board  
2 of Supervisors will entertain a vote on the -- the  
3 finding of suitability to transfer for Parcel A. Okay.

4           And more news will be forthcoming on that, and  
5 that may well be my recommendation as one of the topics  
6 for -- for next month's Restoration Advisory Board  
7 meeting is discussing that, that survey.

8           MS. PETERSON: Somebody --

9           MR. FORMAN: Okay.

10          MR. MALOOF: Question?

11          MS. WRIGHT: Yes. Regarding the nominations  
12 next month, what format is that going to take? Is it  
13 going to be written ballots? Is it going to be verbal  
14 votes? How are you going to do that?

15          MR. FORMAN: That's a good -- I defer to  
16 the --

17          Dorothy and Caroline, did you hear the  
18 question?

19          MS. PETERSON: Mm-hmm.

20          MS. WASHINGTON: I wasn't -- What did she say?

21          MR. FORMAN: Could you repeat, ma'am?

22          MS. WRIGHT: Yeah. I was wondering, the  
23 nominations next month for co-chair, how are you going  
24 to implement that? Is it going to be written ballots?  
25 Verbal? How is that going to happen?

1 MS. WASHINGTON: You already have the  
2 nomination committee.

3 MR. TISDELL: All it --

4 MS. PETERSON: Wait, wait. I'm Dorothy, okay.  
5 Traditionally, all we've done is verbally  
6 nominated people, and the -- there was no ballot, no  
7 nomination ballot.

8 In other words, all you -- all you'd have to  
9 say is "I nominate" so-and-so, and the person accepts it  
10 or rejects it for a nomination. But the votes have  
11 traditionally also been by ballot.

12 MR. FORMAN: The -- So the votes have been by  
13 ballot, but the nominations are verbal?

14 MS. PETERSON: Yeah.

15 MR. FORMAN: Okay.

16 MS. WRIGHT: So the nominations happen in May,  
17 and then you get the ballot in June?

18 MS. PETERSON: Yes.

19 MR. FORMAN: Yes.

20 MS. PETERSON: And a month for nominations.

21 MS. WRIGHT: Okay.

22 MR. FORMAN: Okay. Thank you.

23 MR. MALOOF: Dr. Sumchai.

24 DR. SUMCHAI: I want to make some quick  
25 comments to the RAB that -- reflecting concerns I've

1 raised about the finding of suitability to transfer for  
2 Parcel A.

3           And a principle concern that I have -- we -- we  
4 don't necessarily have to get into a big discussion  
5 about it, you know, today; but certainly, at some point,  
6 I'd like the Navy to address the fact that there are two  
7 buildings on Parcel A, Buildings 815 and Building 821,  
8 that are designated as FUDS and that you have signed off  
9 on as needing no further investigation.

10           Building 815 certainly is a site of potential  
11 radiation contamination. It's been remediated. It  
12 fulfills all the criteria, grouping it Class I impacted  
13 area, and then Building 821 has not undergone any type  
14 of investigation because of remediation.

15           I also had the opportunity to review the  
16 Parcel A ROD, and I want to make it pretty clear to  
17 everyone in the RAB that there are some outstanding  
18 issues with regard to hazards on Parcel A that have not  
19 surfaced, to my knowledge.

20           Arsenic was detected in groundwater samples on  
21 parcel [sic] -- Parcel A above its PR- -- PRG, and this  
22 PRG was in 1995. And as everyone knows, arsenic  
23 allowable standards are much more stringent. They are  
24 tenfold more stringent now both on the ten -- on the  
25 state and federal level.

1           Also, the hazard index for manganese detected  
2 in soil at IR-59 exceeded 1. A hazard index above 1 is  
3 calculated -- was calculated for children exposed to  
4 soil, and it predicts noncarcinogenic health effects.

5           Also, motor oil and other petroleum products  
6 were detected in groundwater on Parcel A; and because  
7 the ROD -- because has -- petroleum products are outside  
8 of the definition of hazardous substances --

9           MR. MALOOF: Doc- --

10          DR. SUMCHAI: -- Section --

11          MR. MALOOF: Dr. Sumchai?

12          DR. SUMCHAI: -- 101 of CERCLA -- by the CERCLA  
13 Act, and so it was outside of the ROD.

14          So the point that I am making in response to  
15 Mr. Forman's presentation about the FOST is that there  
16 are some hazards in addition to the landfill gas that  
17 need to be addressed as part of the response to the  
18 FOST.

19          MR. MALOOF: Okay.

20          MR. FORMAN: Dr. Sumchai, will I -- will I be  
21 getting -- I think I'm going to see you tomorrow, aren't  
22 I, at the --?

23          DR. SUMCHAI: I didn't get confirmation of  
24 that; but if we are going to meet tomorrow, then that  
25 would be a good time to raise these concerns.

1 MR. FORMAN: Sure. Okay. I believe -- I  
2 think it's at 1 o'clock. One o'clock.

3 DR. SUMCHAI: Mm-hmm [nods].

4 MR. MALOOF: Okay. The next thing that we're  
5 going to go into is the Community Co-chair reports.

6 Miss Washington?

7 MS. WASHINGTON: I -- I don't have reports  
8 today.

9 MR. MALOOF: Okay.

10 Miss Peterson?

11 MS. PETERSON: Nope. You've already made the  
12 announcement about the open house, so that's it.

13 MR. MALOOF: Great. Thank you.

14 Okay. The next is a presentation on IR-07 and  
15 IR-08 -- 18.

16 Someone that can get the lights?

17 (Pause.)

18 MR. FORMAN: While -- while we're getting that  
19 together, if I may make one more announcement. Quijuan,  
20 is that fine? It's a short announcement. Also, I  
21 didn't want to forget this.

22 Dr. Sumchai, I'll also be meeting with you --  
23 you graciously invited us to your subco- -- Radiation  
24 Subcommittee meeting.

25 DR. SUMCHAI: Right.

1 MR. FORMAN: And that's at 10 o'clock on  
2 Wednesday, May 8th?

3 DR. SUMCHAI: Right.

4 MR. FORMAN: Okay. So we'll be there. And  
5 location?

6 DR. SUMCHAI: I can announce it under the  
7 "Subcommittee Report."

8 MR. FORMAN: Okay.

9 DR. SUMCHAI: It's at Bayview.

10 MR. FORMAN: Okay. Well, we'll -- we'll be  
11 there. Did you want us to give a presentation or there  
12 to listen and then answer questions?

13 DR. SUMCHAI: I -- I think that the principle  
14 focus would be to review, you know, the HRA; and we can  
15 talk about the format.

16 MR. FORMAN: Okay. All right. Thank you.

17 (Pause.)

18 MR. WANTA: It was working before.

19 MR. DACUS: It seemed that way.

20 MR. WANTA: Okay.

21 MR. RODRIGUEZ: While we're waiting, I do have  
22 a question. On the monthly progress report, you have  
23 nothing on Parcel A -- was there a reason for that? --  
24 and for -- in terms of parcel updates.

25 MR. FORMAN: Yeah. I believe that

1 traditionally falls under environmental cleanup program  
2 and CERCLA actions that we take, and Parcel A doesn't  
3 have any actions occurring on it.

4 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Okay.

5 MR. FORMAN: The -- the Finding of Suitability  
6 to Transfer document is -- is really a -- it -- it's a  
7 summary document and a real-estate document to support  
8 trying to determine whether a property's ready to convey  
9 or not.

10 MR. RODRIGUEZ: I'm understanding they changed  
11 the boundaries on Parcel A.

12 MR. FORMAN: Yes. That was one of the reasons  
13 why when you -- There were slight boundary changes.  
14 There was a portion of it that was actually taken out of  
15 Parcel A and made smaller, and then there was a portion  
16 of a road that at the request of the City of San  
17 Francisco that could have been put into "A." We added  
18 that into "A."

19 MR. RODRIGUEZ: And it doesn't have anything to  
20 do with the actual cleanup itself?

21 MR. FORMAN: No. The portion of the road  
22 doesn't -- and the portion that was taken out of  
23 Parcel A and put into Parcel B is part of what Rich  
24 Pribyl is going to touch on at Site 18, which is a  
25 Parcel B site which has grown into that -- into that

1 area.

2 Are we ready?

3 (Discussion off record.)

4 THE REPORTER: I don't hear that if you wish it  
5 on the record.

6 MR. ATTENDEE: You want it on the record?

7 MR. DeMARS: Yeah. Actually, at the Section 3  
8 of the MPR, we do mention the Parcel A FOST --

9 MR. FORMAN: Under "Other."

10 MR. DeMARS: -- briefly under "Other." It's a  
11 bit misleading, so it's kind of buried in the back.  
12 It's just like a couple of sentences.

13 MR. MALOOF: Yes.

14 MR. BROWN: Over there it says, "Economic  
15 Development." Is that somebody coming in from the  
16 administration back in Washington from the Commerce  
17 Department?

18 MR. KEICHLINE: No. I'm sorry, Lynne. That's  
19 Economic Development Subcommittee with Jesse Mason.  
20 That's -- Those are the subcommittee headings. Those  
21 are for times and dates. That's all that is.

22 MR. BROWN: But we do need somebody from  
23 Washington for our economic development.

24 (Laughter.)

25 MR. BROWN: You guys laugh. That's how the

1 community gets screwed all the time. We get screwed  
2 now.

3 MR. ATTENDEE: Are we ready?

4 MS. PETERSON: Okay. We're not going to have  
5 it recorded. We're going to have to wing it.

6 MR. BROWN: We've been screwed.

7 MS. SHIRLEY: Keith, while they are getting  
8 organized, can we do the subcommittee reports so we can  
9 make use of time?

10 MR. MALOOF: That makes sense.

11 MR. FORMAN: Good suggestion. Quijuan, do we  
12 want to move on to that agenda item?

13 MR. MALOOF: How long is this going to -- do  
14 you guys want to --?

15 MR. PRIBYL: We'll just keep messing with the  
16 computer to keep that first slide on; and then if the  
17 slide never comes up and my communication . . . I'll do  
18 the best I can.

19 MR. MALOOF: Did you want to continue right  
20 now?

21 MR. PRIBYL: No, no. Give them an opportunity  
22 to get it up because I think it will be a little bit  
23 easier for everybody to follow along if we have those  
24 slides. So just kind of slide me into the agenda.

25 MR. FORMAN: What she has suggested is moving

1 on to another agenda item to -- to keep the -- the  
2 meeting moving.

3 MR. ATTENDEE: Okay.

4 MS. PETERSON: Turn on the lights?

5 MR. MALOOF: Thank you.

6 Subcommittee reports. Sub- -- Are all the  
7 subcommittee chairs here?

8 MS. ATTENDEE: No.

9 MR. TOMPKINS: No.

10 MR. MALOOF: Okay. Why don't we just go down  
11 the list. Membership & Bylaws.

12 MR. TISDELL: Hi, my name is Keith.

13 Oh -- Okay. For our next month Membership  
14 Bylaws Committee meeting, it will be at -- on the 8th of  
15 May from 6:00 to 8:00 at the library, Third and Revere,  
16 Anna Warden.

17 MS. PETERSON: Anna Waden.

18 MR. TISDELL: Anna Warden.

19 MS. PETERSON: Waden.

20 MR. TISDELL: Who?

21 MS. PETERSON: Waden.

22 MR. TISDELL: Oh. Hey. Hey, I said, "Warden."  
23 Third and Revere. You can't miss it, you know.

24 Okay. And a -- a subject -- I'm throwing this  
25 up before the full RAB: We talked about having a

1 person -- a RAB member come to -- to the BC- -- BCT, and  
2 I like to make a motion that we nominate somebody, or  
3 you can send it back to the Membership & Bylaws  
4 Committee that a person be nominated to attend the BCT  
5 as a part of the -- of the RAB.

6 MS. PETERSON: Is that nomination now?

7 MR. TISDELL: Huh?

8 MS. PETERSON: You're making that nomination  
9 now?

10 MR. TISDELL: Well --

11 MR. ATTENDEE: Motion.

12 MR. TISDELL: -- somebody --

13 MS. PETERSON: I know you're making a motion  
14 now.

15 MR. TISDELL: Yes.

16 MS. PETERSON: Okay. Second.

17 MR. MALOOF: Okay. So the motion --

18 MR. TISDELL: -- is that a RAB member be  
19 allowed to -- to attend the BCT or if -- yeah.

20 MR. MALOOF: Okay.

21 MS. PETERSON: And you want nominations.

22 MR. MALOOF: Anyone second?

23 ATTENDEE: I second.

24 MR. TOMPKINS: Second.

25 MR. MALOOF: Any discussion?

1 MR. TISDELL: Anyone care?

2 MS. PETERSON: Yeah. I did.

3 MR. MALOOF: I'm sorry.

4 MS. PETERSON: And he wants nominations. One  
5 suggestion.

6 You want nominations tonight, or do we just  
7 have to get them to you by May 8th?

8 MR. TISDELL: Anybody want to come.

9 MS. PETERSON: No, no.

10 MR. TISDELL: Well --

11 MS. PETERSON: Nominations by May 8th?

12 MR. TISDELL: By May 8th, thank you, at the RAB  
13 meeting -- at the bylaws.

14 MS. PETERSON: As a membership bylaws.

15 MS. BUSHNELL: What is the location and times  
16 of the BCT meeting?

17 MR. TISDELL: [Shrugs.]

18 MR. DeMARS: Locations are -- typically they  
19 are the second Tuesday of every month.

20 MS. PETERSON: Okay.

21 MR. DeMARS: And they start at 10 o'clock and  
22 go till 4:00, and the location is the 18th floor of  
23 Tetra Tech's office. Address is 135 Main Street, which  
24 is right at the corner of Mission and Main. And it's in  
25 their main conference room. And again, that's the

1 second Tuesday of every month.

2 MR. MALOOF: Okay. So there's a motion on the  
3 floor. All the those in favor --

4 THE BOARD: Aye.

5 MR. MALOOF: -- raise your hand or say, "Aye."

6 THE BOARD: Aye.

7 MR. MALOOF: All those who oppose?

8 Any abstentions? Okay. Great.

9 MR. FORMAN: I think -- This is a -- this is a  
10 two-parter. So if the RAB wants that -- votes for that,  
11 this is a -- there's a -- two parts to this.

12 Now, what you're telling me is: You want a  
13 member other than Chris Shirley, who's also a RAB member  
14 and who already attends.

15 MR. TISDELL: Right. See, she's part of  
16 another organization.

17 MR. FORMAN: She's a RAB member.

18 MR. TISDELL: Right, right.

19 MS. SHIRLEY: I think the point is that we want  
20 to make it -- we want to put it in the bylaws and make  
21 it more official, because now it's informal.

22 MR. FORMAN: Oh, okay.

23 MS. SHIRLEY: So that's the point and gives --  
24 and gives --

25 MR. FORMAN: So are you amending the newly --

1 the newly approved bylaws?

2 MS. SHIRLEY: No. I think -- It's not  
3 necessary. I just think peep -- if people are  
4 interested in -- in being that representative, tell  
5 Keith, and we can discuss it at the committee.

6 MR. FORMAN: Okay.

7 MS. SHIRLEY: That's the point.

8 MR. FORMAN: What I meant by a two-parter here  
9 is that if -- if that is approved and forwarded and I  
10 have a name, then what I do need to do just as a  
11 courtesy is, well, I need to run it by the BRAC cleanup  
12 team regulators in their meeting and say, "Okay, how do  
13 you feel about this?"

14 MR. TISDELL: Okay. Background check?

15 MR. FORMAN: Pardon?

16 MS. ATTENDEE: What?

17 MR. FORMAN: If it is a background check,  
18 there's a lot of us that may not be attending.

19 MR. TISDELL: Okay. I'm just throwing some  
20 humor in there.

21 MR. MALOOF: Technical review, do we have a  
22 person --

23 MS. SHIRLEY: Yes.

24 MR. MALOOF: -- that represents --? Yes.

25 MR. TOMPKINS: I have a question for the Rules

1 Committee.

2           ATTENDEE: Who?

3           MR. TOMPKINS: The Rules Committee.

4           MR. TISDELL: Yes, sir.

5           MR. TOMPKINS: In the last committee meeting  
6 that I attended, when the rules were passed and we  
7 expanded the Board to 30 and narrowed down the quotas in  
8 terms of just general categories, we have people who's  
9 peti- -- who's petitioned to be a part of this Board;  
10 and it's been so, like, a suspension until the rules are  
11 in place.

12           Will it be at our next board meeting that they  
13 will be instated, or when will that come up on the -- to  
14 make that -- to get up to 30, to our numbers?

15           MR. TISDELL: Okay. It's -- okay. What -- I  
16 think Keith thought of it or --

17           Okay. There's a new a- -- There's a  
18 application coming out that's being formed, you know,  
19 designating the four categories.

20           And so that what -- that way, you know, it's --  
21 it's -- it's -- and then to choose one instead of you --  
22 the applications that we have now.

23           And the applications have not been finished,  
24 you know; and the -- at the -- at the Membership &  
25 Bylaws, we will sit down and talk about, like,

1 reclassif- -- well, re- -- regrouping everybody, since  
2 it's only, like, four groups and --

3           You u- -- you -- you understand what I'm  
4 saying? Everybody can fit and --

5           MR. TOMPKINS: Class them in regrouping.

6           MR. TISDELL: Right.

7           MR. TOMPKINS: But then what about the  
8 candidates for some people who have been waiting for up  
9 to six months --

10          MR. TISDELL: Who's that?

11          MR. TOMPKINS: -- for their --? With  
12 Dr. Pierce behind you. Remember? We had discussed in  
13 terms of the -- the -- and it's been a significant  
14 amount of time that her application should have been in.  
15 I'm only looking in fairness to somebody that's been  
16 waiting six months. There should be some type of  
17 priority for --

18          MR. TISDELL: Okay. At -- at the time when she  
19 submitted her applications, you know, that slot was  
20 filled --

21          MR. TOMPKINS: Yeah --

22          MR. TISDELL: -- you know.

23          MR. TOMPKINS: -- I understand.

24          MR. TISDELL: And -- and so -- and so, like,  
25 now, we've got -- you know, we're just kind of just

1 feeling our way instead of just jumping out there, you  
2 know.

3           And -- and everybody that I have applications  
4 for that -- in the past I still have them. And, you  
5 know, when we get, you know, rolling, you know, starting  
6 and knowing where we going instead of hitting and  
7 missing, you know, it --

8           MS. PETERSON: We feel --

9           MR. TOMPKINS: But then --

10          MS. PETERSON: We feel you.

11          MR. TOMPKINS: -- those that --

12          MR. TISDELL: Huh?

13          MR. TOMPKINS: -- submitted --

14          MS. PETERSON: We feel you.

15          MR. TISDELL: Oh, you feel me?

16          MR. TOMPKINS: I feel you, but I like definity  
17 [sic] -- definition.

18           In other words, those group -- that group of  
19 individuals who have submitted their application have  
20 been waiting for being considered --

21          MR. TISDELL: I mean, they are --

22          MR. TOMPKINS: -- they be the first before  
23 anybody else. That's all --

24          MR. TISDELL: Yeah.

25          MR. TOMPKINS: -- I want to make sure.

1 MR. TISDELL: Okay.

2 MR. MALOOF: Great.

3 MR. TOMPKINS: Thank you.

4 MS. BUSHNELL: One more. Even though we didn't  
5 approve the minutes, I will take them as being somewhat  
6 grass seed.

7 (Mr. Mason arrives at 6:44 p.m.)

8 It states here, when you introduce the bylaws,  
9 that you ignored the January and February items, because  
10 some portions were in conflict with the Department of  
11 Defense guidelines for the RAB.

12 The Department of Defense guidelines for RABs,  
13 which I have in my hand here, says:

14 To facilitate constructive dialogue,  
15 the RAB should generally be no larger than  
16 20 individuals and no smaller than it is  
17 necessary to adequately respect -- reflect the  
18 diversity of the community interest regarding  
19 installation reg -- restoration. If RAB  
20 membership significantly exceeds 20, efforts  
21 should be made to consolidate.

22 Those are the DOD guidelines. So we appear to  
23 be in violation of the guidelines for 30 members.

24 MR. TISDELL: Could -- could we -- Could I let  
25 Mr. --

1 MR. SAUNDERS: Saunders.

2 MR. TISDELL: -- Saunders . . . ?

3 MR. SAUNDERS: My only comment on that is that  
4 that is guidance in the sense that the DOD feels that  
5 that is probably an ideal number to have, but it's not  
6 restricted.

7 You can go over that amount or you can go  
8 under, but the ideal situation is to go with it -- those  
9 numbers, because, for example, we have had RABs that  
10 have 65 members, El Toro, for example. But El Toro  
11 represented a huge community, not just one city; but all  
12 the cities of Orange County are pretty much --

13 MS. BUSHNELL: Well, they --

14 MR. SAUNDERS: -- involved --

15 MS. BUSHNELL: You have to decide that it's  
16 important that the group be diverse and represent the  
17 community interests.

18 MR. SAUNDERS: Right, it should be diverse and  
19 represent the community.

20 MR. MALOOF: Okay. Right now it's -- we  
21 have -- it's a quarter to 7:00 right now, and I just  
22 want to make sure that we get everything -- and I guess  
23 you need exactly a half hour. So did we want to still  
24 continue with this?

25 MS. PETERSON: I have a question.

1 MR. FORMAN: We're ready to go now technically.  
2 Technically we're functioning, so we can go.  
3 MR. MALOOF: Okay.  
4 MR. FORMAN: But it's up to --  
5 MR. MALOOF: All right.  
6 MR. FORMAN: It's up to the Board.  
7 MR. MALOOF: Okay.  
8 MS. PETERSON: Yes. It was my understanding  
9 that 30 was supposed to be DOD guidelines. Now, are we  
10 sticking to DOD guidelines, or are we not sticking to  
11 DOD guidelines? You know, it can't be both.  
12 MR. FORMAN: Mr. Saunders, you want to clarify  
13 that --?  
14 MS. PETERSON: He can't clarify it if it's  
15 not -- you know, we were just -- we were told it was 30.  
16 MR. FORMAN: Really?  
17 MS. PETERSON: And so now it's in black and  
18 white it's 20. So, now, either these are DOD  
19 guidelines, or they are not, because we already know  
20 that we can decide; but the arbitrary number --  
21 MR. SAUNDERS: We're --  
22 MS. PETERSON: -- it was not --  
23 MR. SAUNDERS: We're splitting hairs.  
24 MS. PETERSON: -- just arbitrary.  
25 MR. SAUNDERS: We're splitting hairs.

1 MS. PETERSON: Sir --

2 MS. SAUNDERS: We're splitting hairs.

3 MS. PETERSON: Okay.

4 MR. SAUNDERS: There's a number that she's

5 reading from, I believe the proposed plan for -- for

6 RAB, which gives a recommended figure for membership --

7 MS. PETERSON: I understood that --

8 MR. SAUNDERS: -- on the RAB.

9 MS. PETERSON: -- but I'm saying we were told

10 30.

11 MR. SAUNDERS: There is no figure of 30 that

12 I've seen before --

13 MS. PETERSON: We were told that.

14 MR. SAUNDERS: -- policy from -- from DOD.

15 MS. PETERSON: We were told that.

16 MR. SAUNDERS: But we're -- we're splitting

17 hairs. The RAB can decide --

18 MS. PETERSON: I know.

19 MR. SAUNDERS: -- as to what they feel is a

20 functional number to work with.

21 MR. TISDELL: And --

22 MR. MALOOF: Last -- Go ahead.

23 MS. PETERSON: But we were told 30.

24 MR. TISDELL: Okay. And -- and to close that

25 off, that will be 30 RAB members with actually two --

1 the CAC and the PAC, those two seats are reserved, so  
2 that's actually 28.

3 MR. MALOOF: Okay. Last -- last one.

4 MS. ASHER: No. I just want to make a motion  
5 to move on because we are running out of time.

6 MR. MALOOF: Okay.

7 MR. DACUS: Second.

8 MR. MALOOF: All right.

9 Is --? Are you guys ready? Can you guys be  
10 able to give us a break in about ten?

11 MR. ATTENDEE: No.

12 MR. TISDELL: Go to the end.

13 MS. ASHER: Do it. We don't need a break.

14 MR. MALOOF: Okay. Just want to make it clear  
15 that we only have a few more minutes to go through  
16 the -- each one.

17 So is the Te- --?

18 (Female attendee interrupts.)

19 MR. MALOOF: Pardon? What they're going to do  
20 is: They're going to go after we have made all of our  
21 subcommittee reports.

22 So is the Technical Review --?

23 MS. SHIRLEY: Yes. I have -- I'm here.

24 MR. MALOOF: Great. Thank you.

25 MS. SHIRLEY: We did meet on 4/17 at the Waden

1 Library. We spent most of the meeting -- in fact, all  
2 of it -- discussing the manganese issue.

3           We decided immediately that we -- we felt as a  
4 committee that Bill Howell kind of missed the boat on  
5 manganese, so we decided to pretty much disregard his  
6 recommendations to us.

7           We do have a list of recommendations that we  
8 would -- or we -- The Technical Committee recommends  
9 that the RAB not concur with the manganese -- the  
10 current manganese proposal, because it was the  
11 committee's opinion the Navy has provided insufficient  
12 evi- -- evidence that high manganese concentrations are  
13 caused solely by naturally occurring rock.

14           Industrial ac- -- Two, industrial activities  
15 can't be ruled out as the cause of contamination.

16           Three, the Navy's methodology for selecting a  
17 new manganese background concentration is flawed,  
18 because it results in an artificially high basewide  
19 background concentration, and this is because the Navy  
20 applied concentrations that are typical of rock to the  
21 entire Shipyard -- of a certain rock, of the chert and  
22 basalt rock, to the entire Shipyard. And the whole  
23 Shipyard is not basalt and rock.

24           Four, the committee felt more sampling should  
25 be done on Parcel A if the Navy -- Navy wants to claim

1 that it's the source for the fill in the flat areas of  
2 the Shipyard. There are very few manganese samples  
3 actually taken on the Parcel A. We didn't see a direct  
4 enough link.

5           The committee felt the Depart- -- San Francisco  
6 Department of Health should set up a procedure for  
7 sampling residents on Hunters Point hill for manganese  
8 in their bodies.

9           Six, the Navy should evaluate health risks  
10 associated with dust inhalation during remedial  
11 activities and redevelopment.

12           And seven, we'd like the Navy to take a close  
13 look at IR-29, because it appears to be a definite  
14 manganese hot spot; and we don't believe that it's  
15 solely caused by chert and basalt.

16           So I have the minutes printed up here for the  
17 RAB members. I have 30 copies. So I'd appreciate it if  
18 the RAB folks would take a copy, and then the leftovers  
19 can go to the general public. If someone wants a copy,  
20 I can get it later to the public.

21           MR. MALOOF: Good.

22           MS. SHIRLEY: Oh, our next meeting will be the  
23 15th of May at 6 p.m. at the Waden Library.

24           MR. TISDELL: Jesse.

25           MS. ATTENDEE: Where?

1 MS. SHIRLEY: At the library at Third and  
2 Revere.

3 MR. MALOOF: Radiation?

4 DR. SUMCHAI: Litera- -- Literacy for  
5 Environmental Justice and Bayview-Hunters Point Health  
6 and Environmental Research Center have agreed to host a  
7 meeting of the Radiological Subcommittee. It will be on  
8 Wednesday, May the 8th, from 10 a.m. to 12 p.m. in the  
9 HERC offices. The address is 6201 Third Street, and the  
10 cross street is Paul Avenue.

11 MS. PURI: Can you repeat that, please?

12 DR. SUMCHAI: Okay. The meeting is going to be  
13 from 10 a.m. to 12 noon, Wednesday, May 8th.

14 MS. ATTENDEE: Okay.

15 DR. SUMCHAI: It will be in the offices of --  
16 of HERC, and that's 6201 Third Street, and the cross  
17 street is Paul.

18 MS. PIERCE: Cross street is Jamestown.

19 MR. BROWN: Jamestown.

20 DR. SUMCHAI: Oh, okay. Jamestown. Excuse me.  
21 And everyone is welcome. I -- I- -- it would  
22 be a good idea to have the R.S.V.P. because the -- the  
23 room size -- we need to accommodate folks for the room  
24 size.

25 MR. MALOOF: Thank you. Risk & Review -- or

1 Risk Review & Health Assessments?

2 MR. TOMPKINS: Yes.

3 MR. MALOOF: Is there someone representing  
4 that?

5 MR. TOMPKINS: Yes. Me as the chair. Thank  
6 you.

7 Our meeting will be on the 10th of May at  
8 5 o'clock at Bayview Advocates' office.

9 We did not have a formal meeting, informal. At  
10 this time for expedite the matters, I will refer --  
11 defer my comments until the 7:10 opportunity at that  
12 time in terms of I have that time period on the agenda  
13 in case that you may proceed at this time with the  
14 presentation.

15 MR. MALOOF: We still have Economic  
16 Development.

17 MR. TOMPKINS: Thank you.

18 MR. ATTENDEE: He stepped out.

19 MR. TOMPKINS: He stepped out. He has a eye --  
20 eye irritation problem.

21 MR. MALOOF: Okay. Good. It looks like we can  
22 start our break early right before -- okay. Is everyone  
23 ready to break?

24 ATTENDEE: Sure.

25 MR. MALOOF: Good. We're going to go for a

1 ten-minute break to be back at 7:05.

2 (Recess 6:53 p.m. to 7:05 p.m.)

3 MR. MALOOF: Okay. We're going to start off  
4 with our presentation. Can somebody dim the lights over  
5 there?

6 MS. PETERSON: Set your tails down is what he's  
7 saying.

8 MR. PRIBYL: Okay. Well, while everybody gets  
9 settled down again, I'll just go ahead and introduce  
10 myself and give a little prelude to the presentation.

11 My name's Rich Pribyl. I'm the Parcel B  
12 project manager. I work with the Navy, Keith Forman and  
13 Dave DeMars, report directly to Dave on Parcel B issues.

14 I've been working on the base since March 2000.  
15 So I've been kind of embroiled in it also, and I know  
16 pretty much everything there is to know about the base.  
17 And if I don't --

18 MS. ATTENDEE: Can't hear you.

19 MR. PRIBYL: I'm sorry.

20 So anyway, I've been involved with the base  
21 since March 2000, and Parcel B has been my little domain  
22 since then.

23 For those of you who aren't familiar with the  
24 base, it's subdivided into parcels with letters  
25 designating each one, and Parcel B is just the uppermost

1 area up here; and that's going to the focus of our -- of  
2 my discussion today.

3           And specifically the one area of that parcel  
4 which people have asked for additional information on  
5 has been IR-07. And that is this little area right over  
6 here on the farthest corner of the base. And with that,  
7 I'd like to begin my presentation.

8           Goals of this presentation are, one, to update  
9 you on the progress that we've made so far on Parcel B  
10 and give a brief history of about what we have -- what  
11 we have accomplished and what we have done and summarize  
12 our actions, identify the problem that we have  
13 encountered out on the field on Site 7, and then outline  
14 what we feel is going to be a path to a solution.

15           The progress of Parcel B: Selected soil  
16 cleanup is a result of discussion between the Navy and  
17 the regulators where jointly decided that excavation and  
18 off-site disposal made sense for taking care of the soil  
19 contamination on the base. That happened in 1997 as a  
20 result of the Record of Decision, or I think a lot of  
21 you probably heard the acronym "ROD."

22           So with that, the original estimate, which was  
23 kind of passed down from the feasibility study, and  
24 said, okay, this is how much soil that we're going to  
25 have to dig up, let's figure out what's going to be the

1 best way to do it or address was about 38,000 cubic  
2 yards.

3           And I have a hard time visualizing what a cubic  
4 yard is. So you think about the playing field over at  
5 3Com Park. You have an 18-foot-high pile of dirt on top  
6 of that field, and that would be 38,000 cubic yards.  
7 End zones are included.

8           Now, what have we done to date on Parcel B?  
9 Well, there was remedial action that was conducted  
10 during 1998 and 1999 where we removed 80,000 cubic yards  
11 of material, quite a bit more than 38,000, but we're  
12 making progress. 2000, 2001 we have removed over 70,000  
13 cubic yards. So to date we have removed more than  
14 150,000 cubic yards of soil.

15           Does anybody want to guess? Yeah, 70 feet  
16 would be the size of that pile on top of 3Com Park? So  
17 that's -- that's a lot of dirt that's been moving  
18 through the community, but we have been making -- making  
19 progress.

20           Now, Site 7 of all the sites on Parcel B, which  
21 involve 103 individual excavation areas out there, but  
22 Site 7 is our largest area. Why are we here? Why are  
23 we talking about Site 7? What made it our largest  
24 excavation in the area?

25           During the process, we have collected more than

1 400 samples to help characterize and determine the  
2 extent of contamination in this area. Most of those  
3 samples we have collected during 2000 and 2001 during  
4 the period that I've been involved with the project.

5           Our excavation in that area grew more than  
6 70,000 square feet, which is also about a little more  
7 than 1 1/2 acres. The volume that we have excavated at  
8 this point from this excavation is now about 50 times  
9 what the ROD estimate was for that particular area. ROD  
10 thought it was going to be about 280 cubic yards.  
11 Currently we've removed over 14,000 cubic yards from  
12 that location.

13           I'm sorry. I keep stepping on your foot.

14           Why are we talking about it today? Conditions  
15 that we are seeing out there could lead to possible  
16 future growth of 113,000 cubic yards. That's -- that's  
17 why we're additional, on top of the 150,000 cubic yards  
18 already removed. And that's why we're taking a harder  
19 look at the data to see what this means and what is it  
20 that's driving this excavation, because there are --  
21 have been some interesting things noted out in the  
22 field.

23           The way the excavation has progressed, the --  
24 the blue areas were areas that we excavated during 1998  
25 and 1999.

1           The green areas on the drawing represent what  
2 was begun again in March of 2001 for this particular  
3 excavation. We're working on other excavations in 2000.  
4 The purple areas were addressed in August of 2001, and  
5 then this yellow area was the latest addition. That was  
6 in October of 2001.

7           So the data has been spilling in over the  
8 course of the year, and we got the final set of data in  
9 in December, and we're looking at it.

10           And that was when we ended up talking to  
11 regulators, saying, "Hey, based upon the conditions that  
12 we're seeing in this area and the data and the sizes  
13 it's grown, we really need to sit down and talk about  
14 this," because the original site, which we're digging  
15 out in this area, is related to sandblast grit disposal  
16 area.

17           We have already accomplished that, and what we  
18 had started seeing was: We've moving into something  
19 different than what we are getting into here. It's no  
20 longer the sandblast grit. It's actually more of a  
21 debris or -- actually on the next slide.

22           Why is the excavation so darn large? Well,  
23 what we're seeing is in that new area that we're moving  
24 into a lot of scattered construction and demolition  
25 debris. Not a consistent layer, but we see pockets of

1 it here and there but still close enough that once you  
2 move through the one pocket, think you're getting into a  
3 clean area, and then you move and you get into another  
4 area of construction debris.

5           Sometimes it's mostly -- Explain: Construction  
6 debris is, like, wood, some old pier pilings -- one of  
7 the piers had burnt down at one point at Hunters Point.  
8 This area could be its final resting place -- bricks,  
9 concrete, metal and plastic, wire and thing likes that,  
10 things that you would see if you had demolished a  
11 building and used it to fill in a low area; and we also  
12 noticed some sandblast grit in some locations.

13           MS. HASEGAWA: Have you been finding asbestos  
14 in the concrete?

15           MR. PRIBYL: Haven't tested the concrete for  
16 asbestos.

17           MS. HASEGAWA: Are you treating it as a  
18 hazardous waste?

19           MR. PRIBYL: Everything that we have removed so  
20 far has gone off in several different categories. We  
21 have removed some Class 2 waste. There has been some  
22 Class 1 as well as some California nonhazardous and some  
23 RCRA waste.

24           Oh. Sorry.

25           MR. TOMPKINS: But her question was -- excuse

1 me.

2 MS. PIERCE: So what is the question?

3 MR. TOMPKINS: But her question was: Are you  
4 treating the material as hazardous waste? Are you  
5 saying some of things are and some of them haven't, or  
6 you haven't found it necessary --? For example, we did  
7 an observation. Will the trucks be covered? Are  
8 there --

9 MR. PRIBYL: All trucks --

10 MR. TOMPKINS: -- containers?

11 MR. PRIBYL: All trucks leaving the base are  
12 covered. Every pile that is segregated on base after  
13 excavation is controlled -- control run-on or runoff  
14 until the point in time that that pile is characterized.

15 And then as it's characterized, the pile is  
16 handled appropriate with the appropriate regulations.

17 MS. HASEGAWA: But you haven't done any tests  
18 on it?

19 MS. PIERCE: Speak up, please.

20 MS. HASEGAWA: You haven't done any tests on  
21 the -- on the concrete?

22 MR. PRIBYL: We have got --

23 Wayne, can I invite you for a second?

24 MR. AKIYAMA: Sure.

25 MR. PRIBYL: Does it get tested for asbestos

1 for characterization purposes?

2 MR. AKIYAMA: Concrete usually gets recycled.

3 THE REPORTER: I can't hear this person speak.

4 MR. AKIYAMA: The concrete -- the concrete gets  
5 recycled. It's broken up, the rebar gets removed, and  
6 the concrete gets recycled.

7 MR. PRIBYL: So that's how that material is  
8 handled.

9 MR. TOMPKINS: No, it's not.

10 MR. PRIBYL: Getting back to the  
11 presentation -- throw up the next bullet there -- what  
12 we have seen with the distribution of contamination out  
13 in this area is that it varies both by type as well as  
14 by concentrations. The type contaminants that we are  
15 dealing with in this area involve metals, PAHs, and  
16 PCBs.

17 So I'll explain that really quick. Metals,  
18 antimony, arsenic, cadmium, copper, zinc, mercury, the  
19 PAHs. PAHs, so Benzo(a)pyrene and -- and a litany of  
20 others, but we're really looking at about four principal  
21 ones. If you have specific questions on that, I can  
22 answer it after because I don't want to get too  
23 detailed.

24 MR. TOMPKINS: What --? Briefly, what are the  
25 four specific ones, PAHs?

1 MR. PRIBYL: The specific PAHs were  
2 Benzo(a)anthracene, Benzo(a)pyrene,  
3 Benzo(b)fluoranthene, and Benzo(k)fluoranthene.

4 MR. KEICHLINE: I have note cards if anybody  
5 has questions who wants to hold off to the end. I can  
6 give them a note card and wait till the end.

7 MR. PRIBYL: Thanks, Ron.

8 MS. BULLOCK: Do you want to explain very  
9 briefly what PAHs are, I mean very briefly?

10 MR. PRIBYL: Yeah, yeah.

11 MS. BULLOCK: You just kind of go on.

12 MR. PRIBYL: Just kind of touch on it. PAHs  
13 are pretty widespread. You find them in a lot of  
14 different things in the environment.

15 If you have a fire and you burn a piece of wood  
16 and then you have the coals left over after you burn  
17 that piece of wood, those coals have PAHs in them. You  
18 have PAHs in your automobile exhaust. You have PAHs in  
19 that crust on the steak if you take it well done. It  
20 has PAHs.

21 So it's -- it's -- it's in a lot of different  
22 things.

23 MS. ASHER: And it's not naturally occurring,  
24 though. It's in industrial waste residue; is that not  
25 correct?

1 MR. PRIBYL: In this particular location, PAHs  
2 are light. This used to be a parking lot, that whole  
3 area in IR-07.

4 So you find PAHs in asphalt residue. You'd  
5 find PAHs associated with the burned wood that we have  
6 actually dug out some of these locations, which probably  
7 was from the pier when that got burned down.

8 MS. PIERCE: Aren't some PAHs carcinogenic?

9 MR. PRIBYL: Yes, ma'am.

10 MS. PIERCE: And aren't PAHs now being found in  
11 breast milk? I can --

12 MR. PRIBYL: I --

13 MS. PIERCE: -- answer that yes.

14 MR. PRIBYL: Okay.

15 MS. ASHER: And they are -- and they are not  
16 naturally occurring. Industrial waste.

17 MR. PRIBYL: Well, yeah, they are not just  
18 industrial waste, but they do occur in lots of different  
19 products, and you do get exposed to them through many  
20 different avenues in the environment.

21 PCBs -- PCBs are also kind of a weird thing.  
22 Historically people associated them with transformer  
23 oils or industrial oils. They are known for their  
24 lubricating properties and things like that. And  
25 that's -- that's most likely one of the sources out

1 here.

2           PCBs aren't that really widespread. There's  
3 only about two locations on the site that we're talking  
4 about.

5           One of the odd things that I had stumbled  
6 across just in my research on it, just a little factoid,  
7 but -- but you actually -- I don't know if anybody  
8 remembers, any ladies, the kissproof lipstick; that had  
9 PCBs in it.

10           So it's been used in some very -- very unusual  
11 ways over time.

12           But, I mean, that's kind of enough on the  
13 contaminants.

14           MR. TOMPKINS: Well, hold on. PCBs, that's a  
15 misuse.

16           PCBs, for your education, on Parcel D, it had  
17 exceeded the EPA's standard above 38,500 times when the  
18 Navy dumped over the old transformers, and the oil and  
19 everything was spread everywhere.

20           And that we have known through research, since  
21 I was part of the team that did the research and review  
22 of the data on breast cancer of African-American women  
23 at Bayview-Hunters Point, although we didn't, you know,  
24 were allowed to do biopsies, and neither were we allowed  
25 the right to do the breast milk examination; but

1 African-American women in this community have the  
2 highest breast cancer rate in the world, and there's a  
3 direct correlation of PCBs and breast cancer, using the  
4 zero estrogen factor.

5           So please don't downplay that. It's a very  
6 significant and important factor in this community and  
7 in the African-American community.

8           MR. PRIBYL: I didn't mean to downplay it, Ray.  
9 The concentrations of PCBs in the distribution in IR-07  
10 may or may not warrant additional investigation and  
11 intention, but we do have to do some more research on it  
12 to figure out what's occurring there. I agree that it  
13 can be an issue, and we do need to look at it, you're  
14 right.

15           With the contaminants we're seeing  
16 concentrations in these locations, that varied quite a  
17 bit. People don't -- People aren't a lot familiar with  
18 the way the sampling had been done out on Parcel B.

19           RI identified -- the earlier studies --  
20 identified a location. We collected samples there.  
21 Based upon those concentrations, we moved out from that  
22 location and into other areas where it would seem like  
23 there was something going on.

24           So you move out and consent -- you got circles  
25 to get away from the hot spot, if you will, and get to

1 the edges of wherever the spill ends. What we're seeing  
2 out here is that it really doesn't flow like a spill.  
3 It kind of ebbs and tides.

4           So you have maybe a high concentration at one  
5 point, and then 3 feet below it you don't have anything,  
6 and a foot above it you don't have anything. Right next  
7 to it you might not have anything. But then you move  
8 another 10 feet away, and then you see another  
9 concentration of a different chemical out there.

10           And all this is really associated with the  
11 varied debris that we're seeing out there, which is this  
12 construction-type debris.

13           Well, knowing all that, why was this stuff used  
14 as fill material? That was -- that was my question and  
15 started looking into it.

16           And with the development in or around San  
17 Francisco, we saw a lot of development occurring around  
18 19- -- 1924 and later. What is significant about the  
19 1924 data is that at that point, the City of San  
20 Francisco became responsible for the garbage collection.

21           When the City became responsible for garbage  
22 collection, they needed a place to put it. So a lot of  
23 things got put in fill areas around the wharf areas for  
24 development.

25           Some of these examples of some fill areas

1 include Albany Bulb area, Point Isabel, Berkeley Meadow,  
2 and Emeryville Crescent. All this is part of the  
3 East -- was it Calif- --? East Bay Park. It's on the  
4 other side of the bay. Most of the fill material in  
5 there is construction debris, similar to what we're  
6 dealing with right now at Hunters Point.

7           The lower University Avenue in Berkeley used to  
8 be the old Berkeley wharf area back in, I think, like,  
9 1857. But all that lower ar- -- Berkeley Avenue, out  
10 kind of flows on the street at the high points and the  
11 low cavities in the street. The high points are the  
12 little timbers from the wharf area, and the low area's  
13 where things start settling down.

14           And lastly, I think most of San Francisco  
15 Marina District's probably the most historic fill area  
16 of all time after the great tragedy in 1906 with the  
17 earthquake and in the fires throughout the city of San  
18 Francisco. They had a lot of destruction, and they  
19 needed to move that material out of the way to get on  
20 with redevelopment; and a lot of that became San  
21 Francisco Marina, or what we have now as the San  
22 Francisco Marina.

23           So what -- what have we learned about Site 7 at  
24 this point? That we have a variety of different  
25 contaminants that don't track really well with each

1 other. They are isolated in different little groups,  
2 but they are spread out over a very large area,  
3 probably, like, about 10 acres we're talking about in  
4 IR-07.

5           What we have done so far when we have collected  
6 these samples and the process that we have applied is:  
7 We have applied -- We have looked at point  
8 concentrations in each sample and apply it and look at  
9 the cleanup goals that were developed in those decision  
10 documents that I had spoke of earlier.

11           And those specific goals were selected to be  
12 very conservative in order to be able to make quick  
13 decisions in the field and know that you are achieving  
14 what you needed to achieve.

15           Therefore, where you were below the goals  
16 theoretically you have no problem with them because you  
17 have set them so conservatively.

18           What we're looking at now is that, well, we  
19 have these point exceedances, but we really don't  
20 understand how that point exceedance plays into an  
21 exposure scenario over an area to a potential receptor.  
22 And -- that's where we get into how we are viewing the  
23 problem and how we are looking at it moving forward.  
24 But further evaluation is needed.

25           The -- the quick comparison of a point-to-point

1 led to, hey, you know, there -- there's something  
2 happening in this location, and we need to -- we need to  
3 look at it more in order to make an informed decision  
4 about what's -- what's appropriate for this area, which  
5 says, well, what -- what are we doing at IR-07 right  
6 now?

7           Well, we have a big hole in the ground, and  
8 we're backfilling the 10-foot portion that we have  
9 completed. And 10 feet was the -- according to the  
10 agreements that we had.

11           And for demarcation of it, we have used orange  
12 snow fencing as well as the surveying technology in  
13 order to make sure that if we do need to go back to any  
14 given location, we can find where we ended and where  
15 we're going to pick up again. This helps control the  
16 site and make sure that, you know, there aren't any  
17 significant hazards out there.

18           In addition to that, we're still maintaining  
19 the fences in and around that area as well as doing dust  
20 control. And dust control uses the water trucks that  
21 you've probably seen running around the base. And we  
22 also use this product called Soil-Sement which helps  
23 pack the soil particles down.

24           Preparing data summaries, figures. And we just  
25 collected a whole slew of data this last year,

1 approximately this 400 samples that I spoke of, and  
2 really gotten a first really good look at some of those  
3 just back in December and start talking to the agencies  
4 on that in December, January.

5           So we're processing that and getting all that  
6 information together to give our regulators a better  
7 picture of the site so that they are able to work with  
8 us and determine a solution or potential solutions for  
9 this area.

10           What we will be determining with the  
11 regulators is what are some of the advance risk  
12 assessment options which we can employ to make sure that  
13 whatever is applied to this area results in a protective  
14 remedy that's suitable for reuse.

15           With that, we're also looking at what kind of  
16 requirements we have with the data. Where might we need  
17 to collect some additional data or supplement the data  
18 that we already have out there with other information in  
19 order to help make these conclusions?

20           And then lastly, developing a clear set of  
21 rules for proceeding forward in the site and how we --  
22 how we progress. And that's important; so that as  
23 you're moving through the process, you're not left  
24 scratching your head, and you have a clear path forward.

25           So what happens next? I'm going to continue to

1 update the RAB on progress as we move through IR-07.  
2 We're still very early in the stages on this and working  
3 with the regulators. They have only seen some initial  
4 information from us back in -- I think February was  
5 probably the first package that they received. So, I  
6 mean, this is -- this is brand-new stuff. You guys are  
7 getting the cutting edge on this.

8           I need to schedule a technical worker with the  
9 regulators, and this is where I'm going to rely on my  
10 contractor with their risk assessor. I'm an engineer,  
11 not a risk assessor. But get the risk assessors and  
12 scientists into a room and talk about what the options  
13 are and how is the best way to proceed on this.

14           And now we're going to package it all together  
15 and memorialize it into a technical memorandum. So  
16 there will be a written document at the end of this  
17 saying what was discussed and how things were moved  
18 along and what was -- what were the options that were  
19 evaluated.

20           And in that we'll summarize the fill history  
21 conditions to talk about how that area was filled,  
22 evaluate those contaminate health effects, recommend a  
23 solution that supports reuse.

24           And then lastly, as we move through the  
25 process, and then we get the thing finalized with the

1 regulators so we understand that the Navy and the  
2 regulators have -- have an agreement on what's re- -- or  
3 on how we will be able to approach this site, prepare a  
4 presentation for the RAB subcommittee to kind of get all  
5 the technical jargon -- technical memorandum, something  
6 that I can understand and everybody else can understand  
7 too.

8           And lastly, we'll apply it and solve the  
9 problem. Sorry. I think that's the end of the slides.  
10 So I'm ready for some questions.

11           MR. TOMPKINS: Okay. Who's . . . ?

12           MR. MALOOF: Go first.

13           MR. RODRIGUEZ: In regard to your technical  
14 memorandum and summarizing the fill history conditions,  
15 you describe other comparable landfills, like Albany,  
16 Emeryville Crescent.

17           It would behoove you to use comparative studies  
18 that they may have done in their environmental impact  
19 reports for their development to see how they compare to  
20 the Parcel B sites and if there is a difference and  
21 there is a fact of more PCBs or more PAHs so that we can  
22 use that as a baseline for, you know, the -- we can't  
23 just go by the guidelines and you say, "Oh, it's safe."  
24 We have to -- Compared to what is it safe? And say how  
25 these other communities have dealt with these problems

1 as well.

2           So that's -- that's just a -- a recommendation  
3 on your technical review and -- and how you're going to  
4 find -- come to a conclusion on --

5           MR. PRIBYL: Yeah.

6           MR. RODRIGUEZ: -- on the sites.

7           MR. PRIBYL: I understand what you're saying,  
8 and I agree.

9           I just want to clarify if that's the impression  
10 other people were getting. I do not intend to portray  
11 or display a safe condition out here. I don't -- I  
12 don't know enough about that site to say that right now.  
13 That is why the Navy needs to sit down with the  
14 regulators and review the data and see what we have.

15           What I do know is that we have point  
16 exceedances out there. I don't know the significance of  
17 those point exceedances. Are they -- are they a threat?  
18 If they are a threat, how much of a threat they are.  
19 And then what do we need to do about it? And that's --  
20 that's the level that we're at now what we're trying to  
21 figure out.

22           MR. MALOOF: Ms. Asher?

23           MS. ASHER: Yeah. I was just -- According to  
24 the ROD, when you do your sampling, what -- what is the  
25 size of the parcel that you use when you do a sample

1 testing? How large is it?

2 MR. PRIBYL: Like, how large is -- the

3 individual sample is?

4 MS. ASHWER: Yeah. When --

5 MR. PRIBYL: Or . . . ?

6 MS. ASHER: No. When you do a sample, how

7 large is the parcel that you sample on?

8 MR. PRIBYL: Oh. How -- how large of an

9 area --

10 MS. ASHER: Yeah.

11 MR. PRIBYL: -- of sampling --?

12 MS. ASHER: Do you normally --? According --

13 according to the ROD, what -- what is it?

14 MR. PRIBYL: There were preceding documents to

15 the ROD, the remedial investigation and feasibility

16 study; and those laid out samples on a grid. I'm not

17 sure --

18 MS. ASHER: You don't know the size of the

19 grid?

20 MR. PRIBYL: I -- I don't know the spacing of

21 the original grid that was -- that was agreed upon

22 between the regulators and the Navy in order to

23 accomplish that.

24 MS. ASHER: Does anyone else here know the

25 answer to that?

1 MR. KAO: Maybe I can answer that question.  
2 Original -- the risk -- risk assessment to Parcel B as a  
3 residential use was based on a twen- -- 200 and -- 22  
4 hu- -- 22,500 --  
5 MS. BROWNELL: 2500.  
6 MR. ATTENDEE: Yeah.  
7 MR. KAO: Huh?  
8 MS. BROWNELL: 2500 square feet.  
9 MR. KAO: Yeah, twenty-fi- -- 2500 square feet,  
10 which base on City's recommendation that's standard size  
11 lot for residential.  
12 MS. SHIRLEY: But that was a risk assessment.  
13 The sample was not undertaken on a grid. Only the risk  
14 assessment was done on the --  
15 MR. KAO: The ROD does not -- the ROD does not  
16 specifically prescribe how do you sample. ROD basically  
17 just prescribes the cleanup goals.  
18 MS. ASHER: I see.  
19 MR. MALOOF: Okay. Let's go down the line.  
20 Mr. Tompkins?  
21 MR. TOMPKINS: Thank you. Three, Mr. Chein  
22 Kao, in our previous discussions and our meetings and  
23 all, are you satisfied with the proposal of the  
24 sampling, or has the Navy addressed that, or is it still  
25 the same in terms of your review of inadequate sampling?

1 MR. KAO: For I- -- for --?

2 MR. TOMPKINS: Parcel B.

3 MR. KAO: For Parcel B or for IR-07 or 7 -- 18?

4 MR. TOMPKINS: Parcel B and -- as well as the  
5 two parcels within it.

6 MR. KAO: Well, they are -- I'm -- I'm not sure  
7 they have proposed a new sampling procedure for IR-07 or  
8 18 yet. They have not.

9 MR. PRIBYL: We haven't proposed --  
10 I'm sorry, Chein. Were you looking for me to  
11 interject?

12 MR. KAO: Right.

13 MR. PRIBYL: Okay.  
14 We have not proposed a new sampling scheme for  
15 that area yet. We are in the process of reviewing the  
16 data. The regulators are in the process of reviewing  
17 the data package and the data that we have provided them  
18 already.

19 And before -- before we can do anything else in  
20 that area for sampling, it's going to be very important  
21 that the Navy and the regulators all come to an  
22 agreement on what's going to be appropriate to fill in  
23 any gaps that are out there in order to make a decision  
24 on what will be the appropriate path forward.

25 MR. TOMPKINS: So, therefore, they haven't

1 addressed it, responded to the state at that time for  
2 adequate addressing that issue.

3           Secondly, dealing with our theme earlier with  
4 Keith and other members, why not an inclusion of members  
5 of the RAB board and not just exclude and just  
6 regulators are making risk assessment in terms of it?  
7 'Cause there's a lot of data gaps in there that you have  
8 no idea who are.

9           And later on when I go into risk assessment  
10 presentation, I'll give a dramatic presentation on where  
11 it showed that it fell extremely short on the -- on the  
12 data information that you have.

13           So I strongly suggest that residents and  
14 members of this RAB board be included to help assist and  
15 advise the regulators, because a lot of you are new and  
16 not familiar with the neighborhood or the land usage or  
17 how things are spread or contamination spread. And  
18 therefore, you have all the good intentions; but not  
19 knowing the history, you fall short of really doing a  
20 good cleanup job.

21           And that would be one of my recommendations.  
22 Would you obje- -- would you object to having members of  
23 the RAB participate in the -- in the meetings that  
24 you're talking about for risk assessment data, analysis?  
25 We have some excellent scholars here.

1 MR. FORMAN: Okay. Yeah. Ray, for something  
2 like that, I -- I'd want to ask the BRAC cleanup team  
3 members and discuss that with them of which they are not  
4 all here.

5 MR. TOMPKINS: Okay.

6 MR. FORMAN: But now that you have that down on  
7 the record, we can talk about that, participation. Are  
8 you talking about yourself?

9 MR. TOMPKINS: No, sir. I'm -- I'm -- not just  
10 me. As a collective. We have different expertise, two  
11 technical committees. We also have a physician on board  
12 besides just myself. That's why I said, "members of the  
13 RAB." Barbara has a science background as well.

14 So that -- there are several members of this  
15 committee, not just me -- I ain't pushing Ray -- but  
16 members of the committee participate that could assist  
17 and do a better job in assessing some historical data  
18 and information and -- as well as our perspective in  
19 some of the issues as well. So that's for  
20 consideration.

21 MR. FORMAN: Okay.

22 MR. TOMPKINS: One last point: Health effects.  
23 Are you -- in terms of a historical summarization and  
24 the full history evaluation contamination health  
25 effects.

1           Now, I'll go back again and be a stickler. I  
2 went over to Treasure Island, and I was there. The head  
3 of your health risk assessment made his presentation,  
4 and he put my little picture on the last newsletter or  
5 whatever. I was very definitive about subset  
6 populations and susceptibility. I will go into this in  
7 depth in another part.

8           Manganese is known -- and it was also addressed  
9 by a consultant as well. He did in our meeting provide  
10 lip service that those people who have higher content of  
11 melanin in their skin are more susceptible to manganese  
12 poison toxicity than those with less. Using risk  
13 assessment measurements, it is based on 35-year-old  
14 healthy white males.

15           Given my neighborhood that is a predominant  
16 neighborhood of people of color, Somoan, Filipino,  
17 African-Americans, and that I -- that I think it is  
18 inappropriate measurement. How do you address this,  
19 since you have this in the document?

20           MR. FORMAN: The -- the point is, Ray,  
21 currently we don't. We don't. And you may have -- I  
22 don't know. I'm not sure if anyone knows yet. You may  
23 have a good point on that.

24           From --

25           MR. TOMPKINS: I think I do.

1           MR. FORMAN: Well, couple of -- just two things  
2 I'll draw on quickly. One, what you are suggesting, if  
3 I understand you correctly, is changing the paradigm,  
4 changing a parameter in the risk assessment based on  
5 melanin content in the skin because of increased  
6 sensitivity.

7           Now --

8           MR. TOMPKINS: Yes, but then when you're --

9           MR. FORMAN: -- what --

10          MR. TOMPKINS: The gentleman who was in  
11 charge -- I forget his name -- who was a chief  
12 spokesman, he stated that is supposed to be included in  
13 the risk assessment. When we were at Treasure Island,  
14 we had all the RABs over there in the training.  
15 Therefore, where is that included?

16          MS. PIERCE: Say yes or no.

17          MR. TOMPKINS: Yes. I'm changing the  
18 paradigm -- well, actually, I'm not changing it. He  
19 said it's supposed to be in here, Karen.

20          And so I'm asking, where is it? Where is that  
21 in the book, to be paraphrasing?

22          MR. FORMAN: Okay. I think when you would --  
23 The best thing for you to do is to show me this.

24          MR. TOMPKINS: No. Just have to go through the  
25 minutes of the RAB -- of the regional meeting that they

1 held at Treasure Island, okay.

2 MR. FORMAN: Okay.

3 MR. TOMPKINS: I would -- When you took my  
4 picture, those were the specific questions I was asking  
5 the gentleman who was the presenter who did the CD.  
6 They state -- He stated very clearly that subset  
7 populations -- because I asked it very clearly -- are  
8 considered in the re- -- in the risk assessment.

9 If so, then, where is it in there according to  
10 Parcel B manganese in our increased susceptibility to  
11 manganese exposure?

12 MR. FORMAN: Okay. You've given me a  
13 homework --

14 MR. TOMPKINS: And is it included?

15 MR. FORMAN: You've given me a homework  
16 assignment. I'll do that. I need to go back to the --  
17 I was not at this. Was this last year?

18 MR. TOMPKINS: Yes, sir.

19 MR. FORMAN: Okay. The Treasure Island RAB  
20 meeting?

21 MR. TOMPKINS: Right, one they have all the  
22 different -- Dorothy, several of the members, all  
23 different -- Mare Island, all over.

24 MR. FORMAN: Okay.

25 MR. TOMPKINS: Thank you.

1 MR. SAUNDERS: Just a comment. The risk  
2 assessments are set by regulators, right?

3 MR. FORMAN: Well --

4 MR. SAUNDERS: The standards?

5 MR. FORMAN: What I was getting about -- No,  
6 they are not set by the s- -- We follow the -- The  
7 Navy follows what it's required to follow. There are  
8 very specific guidelines established by the US EPA --

9 MR. SAUNDERS: That's what I'm --

10 MR. FORMAN: -- okay?

11 MR. SAUNDERS: -- talking about.

12 MR. FORMAN: All right, because this field  
13 involves -- it involves epidemiology, toxicology. Those  
14 standards, those federal standards, that are promulgated  
15 usually by the US EPA are what the Navy strictly adheres  
16 to. If the US EPA changes its standards, we must change  
17 our standards.

18 MR. SAUNDERS: And that's what I was  
19 addressing, those standards --

20 MR. FORMAN: Okay.

21 MR. SAUNDERS: -- that --

22 MR. FORMAN: Okay. What that doesn't, though,  
23 answer is Ray's question about what -- what a  
24 gentleman's presentation about subset population is.

25 So I have to do my homework on that and read

1 that, Ray, because I'm not aware of that.

2 MR. TOMPKINS: Okay. Thank you.

3 MR. MALOOF: Okay. Dr. Sumchai?

4 DR. SUMCHAI: Yeah. I -- I have concerns about  
5 the completeness and the adequacy of the presentation,  
6 particularly given the fact that you -- you haven't at  
7 all addressed some of the historical significance of the  
8 radiological evaluations at IR-07 as well as IR-18.

9 This is the site that was identified in 1992 as  
10 having gamma count rates for soil in the area of more  
11 than 1.5 times that of expected background. And in --  
12 the Navy's own Phase II radiological investigation  
13 determined that the gamma counts were higher than the  
14 general Hunters Point Shipyard background.

15 And although it was determined that this was  
16 due to naturally occurring radioactive isotopes,  
17 uranium, thorium and radium 226, I have some -- some  
18 moral and ethical issues that I -- I take with this  
19 conclusion and the fact that the Department of Health  
20 Services signed off on this area. This was not -- This  
21 was, you know, landfill that you determined came from  
22 another location in California.

23 Gamma radiation is ionizing radiation. There  
24 are waves that travel -- you know, that travel hundreds  
25 of feet in the air. They strip, you know, human tissue

1 of electrons. And even if you've determined that it's  
2 naturally occurring, this is still at risk.

3           And to me, it is very unfair to have a  
4 community where ionizing radiation and its sources were  
5 imported in, used as bay fill; and, you know, you go in  
6 and you do a study and you determine that it's elevated,  
7 it's there, and then, you know, say that you're not  
8 going to do anything about it or that you're not even  
9 going to include it in further radiological  
10 investigations.

11           So I have some real, real serious problems with  
12 the way the radiation issues in this area, as well as  
13 IR-18, have been handled; and I plan to be very, very  
14 vocal about my concerns.

15           MR. FORMAN: Okay.

16           MR. MALOOF: Mr. Mason?

17           MR. MASON: Yeah. I was just listening to the  
18 presentation, and I was really concerned about, you  
19 know, the -- the excavation and fill in.

20           One of the -- one of the questions I wanted to  
21 ask you was: Was IT using any of the soil that was  
22 brought in from the airport BART situation for some  
23 backfill?

24           MR. ATTENDEE: Yes.

25           MR. PRIBYL: Yeah. Some of the BART soil has

1 been used on that.

2 MR. MASON: I -- I understand that soil was  
3 contaminated. You know, I understand that we had some  
4 information that this soil was contaminated.

5 So if they're using it as backfill, why?

6 MR. PRIBYL: What the particular instance, I  
7 believe, you're referring to -- and I could elaborate  
8 that for the rest of the people in the room -- was:  
9 BART soil -- Before -- before we accept any soil on  
10 base, BART does extensive classification on it, because  
11 they are removing it, and they are trying to dispose of  
12 it.

13 So they do a bunch of classification on it.  
14 Then we get it, and we also run tests on it as well to  
15 make sure that what we're getting is okay.

16 Now, we took a five-point composite from the  
17 representative area to form this classification. And  
18 what it turned up was: We had arsenic concentrations in  
19 excess of the Hunters Point ambient level in a  
20 five-point composite. I believe it was --

21 What was that exact concentration?

22 MR. ATTENDEE: I think it was 14.

23 MS. PETERSON: Speak up.

24 MR. PRIBYL: Thank you very much.

25 I'll reiterate that. The exact concentration

1 was 14 --

2 MR. ATTENDEE: Milligrams, milligrams per  
3 kilogram.

4 MR. PRIBYL: -- milligrams per kilogram of  
5 arsenic in that five-point composite.

6 So first order of business was: Oh, okay,  
7 well, what's going on with that? Because everything  
8 else had said that was coming in was okay.

9 So IT went back, and each one of the points  
10 that went into that five-point composite they had  
11 retained.

12 So they went back and they sampled each one of  
13 those individual points. You know, they collected,  
14 like, a 5-gallon bucket and took a piece out of each  
15 bucket and mixed it up; and that was your composite.

16 So now they went back and analyzed each bucket  
17 individually. Say: Okay. Well, maybe something's  
18 really wrong with one of those buckets.

19 So they went back, analyzed that; and all of  
20 those concentrations came back considerably lower than  
21 11 [sic] milligrams per kilogram.

22 So what you're dealing with was some fraction,  
23 or small piece, that got into the part of the soil that  
24 was into the lab sample and got fed into the machine  
25 that kicked it up higher, but it's not representative of

1 the overall population, as subsequent analysis dictated.

2           So, no, the soi- -- BART soil is not  
3 contaminated. We're not using contaminated fill to fill  
4 in any of the areas on the base. We wouldn't do that.  
5 But I do understand and I appreciate your concern.

6           MR. MALOOF: Mr. Tisdell?

7           MR. TISDELL: Yeah. I like to refer my comment  
8 to the young man right here, you know, that -- that said  
9 that -- that concrete is getting recycled.

10          MR. PRIBYL: Okay.

11          MR. TISDELL: And you -- how you recycling  
12 concrete that's coming up off of contaminated soil?

13          MR. AKIYAMA: The concrete, as I understand it,  
14 is -- in the soil below, it's been tested, and any loose  
15 soil that's adhered to that concrete is brushed off, and  
16 it's put in the stockpiles.

17                 The concrete itself is stockpiled separately,  
18 and -- and that is at the -- at -- at such time when  
19 we're -- when we're ready to dispose of it, that's  
20 broken up, and the metal de- -- metal debris that's in  
21 the concrete is taken out for recycling, and the -- and  
22 the concrete pieces are then sent for recycling off  
23 site.

24          MR. MALOOF: Yes, Mr. Brown.

25          MR. BROWN: Okay. I'd like to know, how could

1 you compare the 1924 garbage land -- things that are  
2 used for the landfill when that landfill wasn't started  
3 until 1951?

4           Another thing: Over in the HRA --

5           MR. MALOOF: Why don't you let them answer that  
6 question first?

7           MR. BROWN: Okay.

8           MR. PRIBYL: All I was doing in the  
9 presentation was giving examples of other fill areas  
10 that had occurred in or around San Francisco that -- I  
11 mean, I'm not comparing 1924 garbage to what ended up in  
12 that area or construction debris from early 1900s to  
13 now, but you'd still find PAHs in the rubble from 1906.  
14 I feel very comfortable in saying that.

15           MR. BROWN: Okay. Also, in HRA Volume I, an  
16 Historical Radio- -- Radiological Assessment, they  
17 talked about the sandblast grit that was throw- -- that  
18 was thrown in the landfill was being radioactive came  
19 back from the doing the NN- -- Naval Nuclear Propulsion  
20 Program was going on over there.

21           Also, you didn't talk about liquefaction that's  
22 in there, Historical Radiation Assessment, Volume I,  
23 also that's going on. It didn't --

24           MR. MALOOF: Okay. Wait a minute. Wait. Do  
25 you --?

1 MR. FORMAN: That doesn't pertain to his  
2 presentation.

3 MR. BROWN: Okay. And one more thing and I'm  
4 finished.

5 And what you need to do is -- you said you  
6 going to do something else -- you need to ask the  
7 community resident what was over there, because the NRDL  
8 building that was disposed -- torn down, we heard that  
9 they went over there in that landfill over there.

10 So not only are you messing with the -- the  
11 piers and stuff, but the buildings that were demolished  
12 are over there too.

13 MR. PRIBYL: Actually, let me just clarify that  
14 fill history a little bit 'cause you're stating a lot of  
15 inaccuracies, and I don't want anybody to leave with the  
16 wrong impression about that area.

17 That entire area had been filled largely in  
18 support of the war effort and had been completed by  
19 1946, and NRDL did not really kind of get up and rolling  
20 until that time period and later, and the OPERATION  
21 CROSSROADS boats did not come back until after that.

22 MR. BROWN: But hold on. I'm not talking about  
23 that. I'm talking about the Naval Nuclear Propulsion  
24 Program.

25 MR. PRIBYL: Yeah. They didn't disassemble

1 that program until after that area was filled. That's  
2 my understanding, but I --

3 MR. BROWN: You should do your reading, though,  
4 on --

5 MR. PRIBYL: HRA --

6 MR. BROWN: -- Historical Radiol- --  
7 Radiological Assessment, Volume I, and I read it from --  
8 it's your guys'. It's your stuff.

9 MR. PRIBYL: Yeah. Somebody else actually  
10 produced that document. My --

11 MR. BROWN: Tetra Tech.

12 MR. PRIBYL: My -- my purview is Parcel --  
13 Parc- --

14 (Interruption.)

15 MR. PRIBYL: My purview is Parcel B, and IR-07  
16 is what I was talking about today.

17 MR. BROWN: And that's what --

18 MR. PRIBYL: But -- but I was not talking about  
19 the historical radiological document.

20 MR. BROWN: Okay.

21 MR. PRIBYL: I'm really not the best person to  
22 answer your questions --

23 MR. BROWN: I understand.

24 MR. PRIBYL: -- on that.

25 MR. MALOOF: All right. Any more questions

1 from the RAB?

2           Okay. Question from the audience.

3           MS. PIERCE: What happened to the oral history  
4 that the Navy had committed to doing a couple of years  
5 ago? And -- and one of the reasons for that was because  
6 they recognized at the time that they didn't know where  
7 some of these fill locations were.

8           And people in the audience were saying, "You  
9 have a fill location over here because I dumped over  
10 there, and you have a field lo- -- fill location over  
11 there because I dumped over there."

12           And there was a commitment made that a o- -- an  
13 oral history would be completed to help in identifying  
14 these spots that are unknown to the Navy. So you know  
15 what happened to that?

16           MR. FORMAN: When was that commitment made? I  
17 need to -- I need to rely on some of the long-standing  
18 RAB members here. I'm obviously not aware of it, but  
19 that doesn't mean . . .

20           MS. PETERSON: Charlie's been here the longest  
21 and so has Laurie.

22           You remember it, Charlie?

23           MR. MALOOF: Anyone else? Does anybody else  
24 remember?

25           MR. TISDELL: I -- I think when Ray made that

1 if not at last meeting, it was the meeting before --

2 MS. PIERCE: No. No, no, no.

3 MR. TISDELL: -- as -- as far as --

4 MS. PIERCE: This -- this commitment was  
5 made --

6 MR. TOMPKINS: -- two years --

7 MS. PIERCE: -- shortly --

8 MR. TISDELL: Oh.

9 MS. PIERCE: -- after the fire.

10 It had been discussed before the fire, and it  
11 was made shortly at the fi- -- after the fire at a RAB  
12 meeting that -- that the -- the Navy acknowledged that  
13 there were serious gaps and that they could be -- those  
14 gaps could be informed by doing an oral history, and  
15 then that was going to occur.

16 MR. SAUNDERS: Just go back and look at the  
17 transcript. That's all you have to do.

18 MR. WANTA: That was after the fire was. I  
19 believe Richard was discussing -- Richard Mach was  
20 discussing that people from the community would be  
21 interviewed to help with it. They got possession of the  
22 landfill; am I correct?

23 MS. PIERCE: Yes.

24 MR. WANTA: Some of that -- some of that has  
25 already been started. However, it's not complete yet.

1 I know that some people have been interviewed. I  
2 don't -- I can't even give you names or the number of  
3 people at this point, but I know that is part of the  
4 assessment that is being undertaken at this time.

5 MS. PIERCE: That's a good idea.

6 MR. MALOOF: Is there --?

7 MS. PIERCE: Move that forward quickly.

8 I have another question.

9 MR. MALOOF: And we're running out of time --

10 MS. PIERCE: Yeah.

11 MR. MALOOF: -- just so that you'll know that  
12 we're running out of time.

13 MS. PIERCE: Yeah.

14 Have you made any initial determinations about  
15 how to proceed?

16 You talk about you're going to bring this to  
17 the regulators, et cetera. So you must have some  
18 initial determinations about how to proceed.

19 MR. PRIBYL: Yeah. I mean, really, right now  
20 we have not received any feedback from the regulators on  
21 the data packages and information that we have presented  
22 them. And I don't want to presume what the ultimate  
23 remedy might be that's yet decided or the possible  
24 alternatives for remedy.

25 I would -- Like I said before, we're still

1 really early in this process, and I -- and I don't want  
2 it to be -- I don't want to dictate anything.

3 MS. PIERCE: Just real quick. Can we have a  
4 copy of the -- the data, the documents you gave to the  
5 regulators?

6 MR. PRIBYL: Yeah, the BCT data package. We  
7 have it on -- we have it on CD that I think we could end  
8 up making available.

9 It's pretty preliminary data, though. And  
10 really, some of it may not have been validated, and I  
11 would have concern about releasing unvalidated data out  
12 to the public.

13 But I can check and see; and if it has been  
14 validated and I stamp draft on all the figures, I think  
15 we could probably do that. So let me -- be sure to talk  
16 to me after the meeting. I'll give you my business  
17 card.

18 MS. PIERCE: Okay.

19 MR. MALOOF: Okay. We're going to get ready to  
20 move on. Do you have a last point? This is the last  
21 person.

22 MS. ASHER: Yeah. I --

23 MR. TOMPKINS: Point of order. Due to time,  
24 that we are past 7:50, I still have a report to give.  
25 Could we ask the body to extend the meeting so that --

1 for fifteen minutes?

2 MR. MALOOF: Before we even do that, at  
3 8 o'clock we are going to have to break for the reporter  
4 to get a break.

5 So would you like to make a motion on that?

6 MR. TOMPKINS: How -- how much of a rest do you  
7 need?

8 MR. MALOOF: We have five minutes.

9 THE REPORTER: Now.

10 MR. MALOOF: It looks like we have about,  
11 say --

12 MR. TOMPKINS: 8:30.

13 MR. MALOOF: -- probably twenty minutes of work  
14 here.

15 MR. TOMPKINS: Okay. 8:30 --

16 MR. MALOOF: So --

17 MR. TOMPKINS: -- I will be way done before  
18 then.

19 MR. MALOOF: Okay.

20 Is everyone else --? Do you want to . . . ?

21 MR. TISDELL: I make a motion that -- that the  
22 RAB meeting be extended to 8:30, and that's it.

23 MR. MALOOF: That's it. Okay.

24 MR. TOMPKINS: Including her break.

25 MS. WASHINGTON: Second.

1 MR. MALOOF: Okay. It's been second. It will  
2 be a ten-minute break, okay?

3 MR. DACUS: No. We take a break?

4 MS. PETERSON: No, she has to.

5 MR. MALOOF: At 8 o'clock we have to take a  
6 break. Okay.

7 Any more discussion?

8 All -- Anyone that wants to vote on -- All  
9 those in favor, say, "Aye."

10 THE BOARD: Aye.

11 MR. MALOOF: All those that oppose, say, "Aye."  
12 (No verbal response elicited.)

13 MR. MALOOF: Any abstentions?  
14 Okay. So we will go forward until 7:30 [sic].

15 MS. ATTENDEE: I have abstention.

16 MR. MALOOF: Okay. One abstention. Okay.

17 MR. DACUS: What's the next thing on the  
18 agenda?

19 MR. MALOOF: Are we finished? Do you still  
20 have your question?

21 MS. ASHER: I guess I wanted to say from what I  
22 understand about what you said that in your  
23 investigation is: The more you look -- the more you  
24 look, the more you find.

25 So I'm just curious about how you're going to

1 know when you're finished just because the more you dig,  
2 the more there -- there is to find.

3 MR. PRIBYL: One of the things that we do know  
4 from the review of aerial photographs of the area --  
5 There's just a wealth of aerial photographs on how  
6 things progress, and what we -- what we have seen has  
7 been that the area that we have been talking about  
8 tonight has been the IR-07 area right here, and it  
9 has -- it might involve a portion of Site 18.

10 Along this road here -- I'm trying to follow  
11 the dot, but as it curves along like that -- I'm sorry  
12 about that -- that wasn't one of the historic  
13 shorelines, and the other areas of Parcel B have been  
14 more of an engineered fill, which involved technical  
15 documents on how things were placed and --

16 MS. ASHER: And are you looking by historical  
17 record? That's how you're --

18 MR. PRIBYL: Yeah.

19 MS. ASHER: -- proceeding, right, and not any  
20 sort of --

21 MR. PRIBYL: Yeah.

22 MS. ASHER: -- overall grid investigation?

23 MR. PRIBYL: Well --

24 MS. ASHER: The more you dig, the more you  
25 find, right?

1 MR. PRIBYL: The area that we limited it to  
2 would be this area, but I would expect that the  
3 conditions that we're seeing at the tip of the  
4 excavation here likely extend into some of these other  
5 areas where we have not dug yet.

6 MS. ASHER: Okay.

7 MR. PRIBYL: I just want to be clear on that.

8 MS. ASHER: Thank you.

9 MR. MALOOF: Great. Thank you very much for  
10 your presentation, Rich.

11 And it looks like we can break right now.  
12 Okay. Be ten minutes. Be back at 7:10.

13 MS. ATTENDEE: No.

14 MR. ATTENDEE: 8:10.

15 MR. MALOOF: Oh, I'm sorry. 8:10.

16 (Recess 7:56 p.m. to 8:05 p.m.)

17 MR. MALOOF: Okay. We're going to start.

18 Going along the agenda, the next thing that we have is  
19 testimony from former Shipyard employees.

20 Mr. Tompkins, do you have that information?

21 MR. TOMPKINS: Thank you. One --

22 unfortunately, I had gentleman we lost, was ill. But  
23 I'll ask him to attend next meeting.

24 I did have additional information, and it  
25 addresses some of the issues that we were discussing

1 earlier about risk assessment and knowing, as Karen and  
2 other members of the community have brought up about,  
3 knowing the history.

4           For example --

5           MR. MALOOF: Is this -- is this about testimony  
6 from former Ship- --?

7           MR. TOMPKINS: Testimony, yes, sir. I'm on  
8 target. I'm putting it in context so everybody can  
9 understand --

10          MR. MALOOF: Okay.

11          MR. TOMPKINS: -- the significance of it.

12          One, dealing with Parcel B and then with the  
13 manganese issue and then increase susceptibility of  
14 subset populations and exposure -- and that's why I  
15 asked about measurements earlier in this meeting --  
16 Mr. Campbell, who is also my alternate for this RAB  
17 board, had interviewed restaurant workers who been at  
18 Dago Mary's for years, decades.

19          Parcel B was used as a heliport landing for  
20 helicopters. That brought about then if we know that  
21 dust and manganese dust and exposure factor's a real  
22 issue, you land a helicopter, you kick up a lot of dust.

23          My house that I bought on Jerrold street is  
24 overlooking Parcel B that my brother now lives at and  
25 his family. The dust, then, is on that property. Part

1 of my concern I was sharing with Keith is that, one,  
2 there are no measurements -- and I've been an advocate  
3 of this -- in the neighborhood.

4           When we had the fire on part -- on Parcel E,  
5 there were never any measurements in the neighborhood to  
6 deal with the effects on this population that lives here  
7 in this community. I feel this is morally, ethically --  
8 I do feel that it is wrong, and the Navy is negating its  
9 responsibility.

10           It's almost like as a parent when I send my  
11 child into the room to go get their shoes and the child  
12 stands in the middle of the room, says "I look," and had  
13 come back to me; and I ask, "Did you look under the  
14 bed?" "No." "Did you look in the closet?" (Shrugging  
15 his shoulders.) "Then you didn't look." And he does  
16 this two or three times and he becomes airborne, and he  
17 finds them shoes.

18           The Navy needs to quit just looking at the  
19 property line and start looking at the community and  
20 doing measurements in the community. The issue's  
21 exposure to the community adjacent, under the -- and  
22 Maurice could address this even much clearer with the  
23 law and the responsibility of base closure -- closure  
24 and cleanup in terms of your obligation.

25           If we're dealing with the Superfund site

1 affecting the community, I think it's a 2-mile radius;  
2 that the Navy needs to address this issue. It has not  
3 done this in a responsible manner in my view as the  
4 chair of the subcommittee. It has not addressed this in  
5 a responsible manner over the fire. It has not  
6 addressed the issue.

7           When Mr. Campbell and myself sat down in this  
8 room with the representatives from the US Navy and when  
9 we expressed to him that the concerns of the residents  
10 and parents when I'm at the school talking about they  
11 had to pay \$800 that was not covered for emergency-room  
12 response, the Navy's response: It is psychosomatic.

13           MR. BROWN: Right.

14           MR. TOMPKINS: I find that insulting. I find  
15 the Navy owes this community an apology over their lack  
16 of professional humanity or concern.

17           I do not think my neighbors or my brother or  
18 their children are insane or running a scam to get two  
19 pennies to pay a medical bill.

20           I would like formal approval and sent forth  
21 from this RAB asking the city and county, which I have  
22 done twice, to get the medical records of emergency-room  
23 admissions, since the Navy failed to turn in in a timely  
24 manner to the Department of Public Health -- they  
25 weren't notified. I'm not going to get into it -- that

1 they are -- in a timely manner of the fire so that then  
2 they can inform the physicians so the physicians can  
3 treat the patients because of what the Navy's response  
4 is, "Bring me back the proof, and we will address it."

5           If you set the game, the rules for the game,  
6 well, you can't win. You will not have the proof. When  
7 they failed to notify, the physicians would have ordered  
8 a different type of a test for toxicity. They thought  
9 it was normal pulmonary inflammation and other diseases  
10 and not looking for this.

11           The Navy, I feel, has an obligation to ask for  
12 these records and turn them over to us to see whether it  
13 was an increase six weeks prior to the fire, so we know  
14 what patterns were, and six weeks after the fire of all  
15 the hospitals.

16           The data that the health department that  
17 Rich -- Rich Baheave [phonetic] of the Health  
18 Environment Department sent me were inappropriate in  
19 that they only sent me General Hospital's records. I'm  
20 sorry, but not everybody in Bayview-Hunters Point goes  
21 to General Hospital and that it should be for the entire  
22 ten hospitals in this community so we can get an idea of  
23 what took place.

24           I'm asking this in a formal resolution that my  
25 board members do attend and approve this, that, one, we

1 ask that the city and I -- and the state, through the  
2 state, give us a report showing whether or not there was  
3 an increase of hospitalization rates from prior -- six  
4 weeks prior to the fire of 2000 and six weeks after.

5 MR. MASON: Is that a motion?

6 MR. TOMPKINS: That's a motion.

7 MR. MASON: Then I second it.

8 MR. TOMPKINS: Emergency-room admissions.

9 That's what I'm asking for the zip code of 94124 only.

10 MR. MASON: I think this --

11 MR. TOMPKINS: This gets real political.

12 MR. MASON: I think this is the second time

13 I've seconded that motion.

14 MR. MALOOF: Okay. Yeah, but he was continuing

15 to talk.

16 MR. MASON: No. I'm talking about I seconded

17 that motion last RAB meeting.

18 MR. MALOOF: Oh. Okay.

19 Any more comments, discussion?

20 MR. TOMPKINS: Call for the question.

21 MR. MALOOF: Okay.

22 MR. TOMPKINS: Call . . .

23 MS. ASHER: I'd also like to throw in that

24 there are a number of tenants that are directly on the

25 Shipyard that they should also be included in any sort

1 of health risk assessment as well. We're not in the  
2 neighborhood 24/7, but we are right in the Shipyard.

3 MR. MALOOF: Okay.

4 MR. TISDELL: I -- I --

5 MR. MALOOF: Mr. Tisdell?

6 MR. TISDELL: -- got a question.

7 Now, okay, that's for residents covered within  
8 the 92- -- 94124, right?

9 MR. TOMPKINS: Yes, sir.

10 MR. TISDELL: Even if -- Say, even if you go  
11 to the hospital in South City, like Kaiser, right?

12 MR. TOMPKINS: They should --

13 MR. TISDELL: I mean, I'm just trying to get an  
14 understanding.

15 MR. TOMPKINS: Mm-hmm.

16 MR. TISDELL: All right. And I was just trying  
17 to get an understanding.

18 MR. MALOOF: Any more discussion?

19 DR. SUMCHAI: Just that I believe that it is  
20 possible as a RAB community member -- members that we  
21 could get a TAPP grant to do this and that that might be  
22 a better option --

23 MR. SAUNDERS: No.

24 DR. SUMCHAI: -- because --

25 No?

1 MR. SAUNDERS: I don't think so.

2 DR. SUMCHAI: Okay.

3 MR. SAUNDERS: The TAPP grants are primarily  
4 used to review technical documents.

5 MR. SUMCHAI: Okay.

6 MR. TOMPKINS: I have a second part. So . . .  
7 call the question.

8 MR. MALOOF: Great.

9 Mr. Forman?

10 MR. FORMAN: Yeah. I just -- In reference to  
11 your comment, which I don't know how long ago this  
12 occurred about, the Navy saying that it was a psy- --

13 MR. TOMPKINS: Richard Mach.

14 MR. FORMAN: -- psychosomatic --

15 MR. TOMPKINS: Yes, sir.

16 MR. FORMAN: -- is that in the record anywhere?  
17 Is there anywhere I --

18 MR. TOMPKINS: No.

19 MR. FORMAN: -- can turn to to see that?

20 MR. TOMPKINS: It was right there at that  
21 table. Richard Mach -- was a meeting that we had after  
22 the RAB that issues that became on the liquefaction and  
23 other issues that it was asked that we have a separate  
24 meeting with Mach and other attendants --

25 Who else was there, Maurice -- do you

1 remember? -- that we had a separate meeting here, and I  
2 gave Richard a couple pieces --?

3 MR. CAMPBELL: We had -- we had a separate  
4 meeting, and I believe some of the people from IT --

5 MR. TOMPKINS: IT.

6 MR. CAMPBELL: -- was in that meeting.

7 MR. TOMPKINS: Everybody was at this meeting.

8 MR. FORMAN: Okay. Well --

9 MR. TOMPKINS: And it was a separate meeting,  
10 and Rich was in that chair where your hand was on. I  
11 was sitting across on this side. Maurice was right next  
12 to the gentleman that is seated at, and we sat there --

13 MR. FORMAN: Okay. I just want to make sure,  
14 Mr. Tompkins and Mr. Campbell, that you know that that  
15 is not an official Navy position, and that is not my  
16 position, and that's not what I believe and --

17 MR. CAMPBELL: Can -- can I respond to that?

18 MR. FORMAN: Apparently, it's an off-the-record  
19 comment, so we'll leave it at that. I just want to make  
20 sure that it was not any sort of official position.

21 MR. CAMPBELL: Excuse me.

22 MR. FORMAN: Sure.

23 MR. CAMPBELL: There was an official position  
24 at one of the RAB meetings after the fire. We asked  
25 Richard specifically had he thought anybody had been

1 injured, because there had been a lot of complaints.

2 And I said -- I questioned him. And he -- I said, "Is  
3 your answer unequivocal?"

4 And he says, "I never answer anything  
5 unequivocally."

6 So I asked for percentages.

7 He wouldn't give them. But it was just a basic  
8 denial that anybody was injured. That I will bring in  
9 in the next meeting from the transcript. We do have  
10 that.

11 MR. MALOOF: Okay.

12 MR. TOMPKINS: Call for question.

13 MR. BROWN: Okay. Call for question.

14 MR. MALOOF: Okay.

15 MR. BROWN: No. I was going to call for  
16 question.

17 MR. MALOOF: Okay. All those --? Well, we  
18 already have a motion on the table, and it's been  
19 second.

20 All those in favor of getting the information  
21 is what your motion was?

22 MR. TOMPKINS: Just so for the emergency-room  
23 hospitalization rates six weeks prior to the fire and  
24 six weeks after the fire.

25 MR. MALOOF: All those in favor, say, "Aye."

1 THE BOARD: Aye.

2 MR. MALOOF: Any opposed?

3 (No verbal response elicited.)

4 MR. MALOOF: Any abstentions?

5 (No verbal response elicited.)

6 MR. MALOOF: Okay.

7 MR. TOMPKINS: Secondly, then in the --

8 MR. MALOOF: Is this part of . . . ?

9 MR. TOMPKINS: That's still testimony, and then

10 I'll refer last few minutes to Mr. Campbell.

11 MR. TOMPKINS: Then dealing with also

12 historical piece and dealing with how on Parcel B that

13 the helicopters were kicking up all this dust and it's

14 going into the community, will the Navy start testing in

15 the community?

16 'Cause I can't see how risk assessment -- and

17 we're not dealing with subsets. We're just dealing with

18 exposure and pathways of exposure, that this property

19 was used as a heliport, and the dust was being kicked up

20 by these choppers landing there on a consistent basis,

21 to quote the woman, who -- "used to rattle the windows

22 out there at Dago Mary's, and you think they were going

23 to land on the building, but you got used to it after a

24 while."

25 Knowing that history and the land usage of it,

1 do you not feel the Navy's compelled to have an  
2 obligation to deal with testing when you're doing your  
3 risk assessment and making a characterization of  
4 Parcel B that the possibility of contamination in this  
5 community is there and how cleanup should be done?

6 MR. FORMAN: I think it's -- it's two entirely  
7 different subjects, whether you're running a risk  
8 assessment and evaluating pathways to contaminants on  
9 the base. That's completely separate than doing a --  
10 the kind of thing that I --

11 I think the kind of study that you're  
12 indicating is something that's something like the US  
13 Public Health Service might undertake for an  
14 epidemiological study or a study of -- basically a  
15 community health study. That's outside -- outside of our  
16 world. It's outside of what we do. It's outside of --  
17 of the Department of Defense's program.

18 I'm not saying that there -- that may not be an  
19 interesting study and one that's -- needs to be done.  
20 But I think there's another government source, probably  
21 a federal government source, that you would go to for  
22 something like that, but not -- but not the Department  
23 of Defense.

24 MR. TOMPKINS: Well, if the contamination came  
25 from -- and we know that this source -- shouldn't that

1 be included? 'Cause we're dealing with impacts under  
2 the -- from this into the community.

3 MS. PIERCE: Ray? There's a suggestion back  
4 here that ATSDR is the proper agency and --

5 MR. TOMPKINS: You're kidding.

6 MS. PIERCE: -- and -- well, bad as they are,  
7 at least it's not someone with self-interest in mind.

8 MR. TOMPKINS: Yeah, but they measured  
9 Sunnydale on the fire.

10 MS. PIERCE: Well, I'm just telling you that --

11 MR. MASON: We need --

12 MS. PIERCE: I'd rather have ATSDR than the  
13 Navy do this --

14 MR. TOMPKINS: Okay.

15 MR. MASON: . . . the Navy --

16 MS. PIERCE: -- since --

17 MR. MALOOF: Okay.

18 MS. PIERCE: -- PAHs --

19 MR. TOMPKINS: I would like that --

20 MS. PIERCE: -- are a background.

21 MR. TOMPKINS: -- for time factor, please, let  
22 me turn the remainder of my period over to Mr. Campbell,  
23 please, because he has another point.

24 MR. CAMPBELL: The very subject of the ATSDR,  
25 in April 2001, there was a response to the fire. I

1 guess they got out and interviewed people. You weren't  
2 here at that point.

3           They did their study on 94134. As you know,  
4 the Shipyard is in 94124. So it would have been outside  
5 of your 2-mile boundary there. So that's one.

6           There's an e- -- executive order on 23898. And  
7 I think if you look at your current executive order as  
8 it stands, it talks about traffic patterns on the impact  
9 of health. I think that really has to be revisited; and  
10 I believe for anything that the Navy is doing in terms  
11 of conveying, et cetera, that will have to be revisited.

12           And the last point as far as the health  
13 assessments or risk assessment, that is in the -- the  
14 base cleanup plan. There is specifics having to do with  
15 that and what needs to be written up. And as we have  
16 talked about the base cleanup plan, you know, you've  
17 informed me it is the Bible of the base, and you've been  
18 on several bases.

19           MR. FORMAN: Right.

20           MR. CAMPBELL: And this is the first base that  
21 you've said that you haven't seen one except the very  
22 old one.

23           MR. FORMAN: Right.

24           MR. CAMPBELL: And as far as Mr. DeMars is  
25 concerned, you mentioned when I questioned you in front

1 of Pelosi that a base cleanup plan was completed, would  
2 you like to retract that?

3 MR. DeMARS: No, not at all. The base cleanup  
4 plan I believe you were talking about was the annual  
5 report to Congress that you had asked for about two RAB  
6 meetings ago, but I do have a copy of that for you here  
7 tonight.

8 MR. CAMPBELL: No, no. I'm just talking about  
9 specifically the base cleanup plan which -- BRAC's  
10 cleanup plan guidelines, very thick and very specific as  
11 far as the base. It's very important to this RAB body  
12 and the community.

13 MR. DeMARS: At the Pelosi meeting, then I  
14 misunderstand you, because I believe that you had asked  
15 for the annual report to Congress and the  
16 cost-to-complete numbers for Hunters Point --

17 MR. CAMPBELL: No.

18 MR. DeMARS: -- which I do have.

19 MR. CAMPBELL: No, no. We have the  
20 cost-to-complete numbers.

21 MR. DeMARS: Okay.

22 MS. PIERCE: But -- but you asked for the base  
23 cleanup plan.

24 MR. CAMPBELL: Yes, I did.

25 MR. BROWN: Right.

1 MS. PIERCE: And he described it just the way  
2 you did now.

3 MR. BROWN: Right.

4 MS. PIERCE: There was confusion in front of  
5 the congresswoman, but not confusion here.

6 MR. CAMPBELL: So I would like to, you know,  
7 request on -- as part of the -- Ray's committee that we  
8 would like to see -- like to see that, because there's a  
9 lot of discussion on the risk assessment, and it does  
10 talk about community relations.

11 It -- it does talk about -- It gives an  
12 overview -- a management overview -- A very clear  
13 management overview is required, and I think that would  
14 take a lot of this misinformation out, because it's  
15 management by objectives.

16 MR. FORMAN: No. I agree with you. And I  
17 think, like we were speaking at the break, with the  
18 Department of Defense to bring you up to date currently  
19 with what they do is an abbreviated form of -- of this  
20 base cleanup plan, the -- the BCP, and they called it  
21 just a BP, a --

22 MR. ATTENDEE: Right.

23 MR. FORMAN: -- business plan.

24 MR. ATTENDEE: Right.

25 MR. FORMAN: And you're right, I -- I have --

1 this is the first base that I have ever been involved  
2 with in a program that -- that doesn't have a current  
3 one.

4 MR. ATTENDEE: Right.

5 MR. FORMAN: And -- and I would recommend that  
6 we do that.

7 What I meant, it's -- the question about it  
8 being a Bible, the really reference document --

9 MR. ATTENDEE: Right.

10 MR. FORMAN: -- is for the Restoration Advisory  
11 Board members --

12 MR. ATTENDEE: Right.

13 MR. FORMAN: -- because --

14 MR. ATTENDEE: Right.

15 MR. FORMAN: -- it's -- what the business plan  
16 will do is: It shows you where the program is --

17 MR. BROWN: Right.

18 MR. FORMAN: -- and then shows you the previous  
19 year in review.

20 MR. ATTENDEE: Right.

21 MR. FORMAN: So, like, if we did one in January  
22 of 2003 -- typically they come out in January.

23 MR. ATTENDEE: Right.

24 MR. FORMAN: And it would be the year 2002 in  
25 review. It will bring you up --

1 MR. ATTENDEE: Right.

2 MR. FORMAN: -- to date with the entire program  
3 with what occurred in that last year.

4 MR. ATTENDEE: Right.

5 MR. FORMAN: And it has a small section at the  
6 end what's -- what does the BRAC cleanup team plan to do  
7 in the next year --

8 MR. ATTENDEE: Right.

9 MR. FORMAN: -- you know.

10 And yeah, I think that that would be a valuable  
11 document. It is on -- on any base.

12 MR. TOMPKINS: Can we, then, for this RAB body  
13 get the full document, as Maurice has been able to get,  
14 to each one of our members a hard copy; and then also  
15 you revised, as you say, that you have, so that we have  
16 a measurement stick what is supposed to be done, clear  
17 objectives, outcomes, and then also what is being done  
18 currently as you submitted in?

19 MR. FORMAN: Okay.

20 MR. TOMPKINS: In other words, I'm asking  
21 because none of this -- what the problem is that most of  
22 the members don't have that document. If it wasn't  
23 for --

24 MS. SHIRLEY: It was a --

25 MR. TOMPKINS: -- Mr. Campbell's --

1 MS. SHIRLEY: -- 19- -- the 198- --  
2 MS. ATTENDEE: '97.  
3 MS. SHIRLEY: -- '97 version.  
4 MR. TOMPKINS: Mm-hmm. And new members don't  
5 have it. I don't have it.  
6 MS. SHIRLEY: No. I -- It seems to me that we  
7 need a middle ground. We need something that's between  
8 the full-blown --  
9 MR. FORMAN: Well, that's what I'm proposing.  
10 MS. SHIRLEY: -- base cleanup and -- and --  
11 MR. FORMAN: I guess I'm --  
12 MS. SHIRLEY: -- abbreviated --  
13 MR. FORMAN: -- I didn't clearly state this.  
14 I -- I'm willing to commit to doing -- I -- We  
15 should have, I believe, a business plan; but let's --  
16 let's do it for the year 2002 in review.  
17 I can get -- We talked about this a little bit  
18 at the break. I can get some funding to do that in the  
19 new fiscal year, which starts in October, and we can do  
20 a business plan.  
21 Typically across the country when you -- when  
22 you do this for a base, it comes out in January, and it  
23 reviews the immediate year in review. I mean, that --  
24 that's -- that is typically the way it's done. I -- I  
25 think it will be valuable to do that.

1 MR. MALOOF: Okay.

2 MS. SHIRLEY: I have a --

3 MR. MALOOF: Miss --

4 MS. SHIRLEY: -- suggestion --

5 MR. MALOOF: Miss --

6 MS. SHIRLEY: -- with respect to that.

7 It might be helpful if we, the committee chairs

8 and any interested RAB member, go through the big

9 guide -- guidance for the base cleanup plan, pick out

10 those parts we really want the business plan to focus on

11 just in ca- -- in case the guidelines for the business

12 plan might not include all of the --

13 MR. FORMAN: Well, I know -- there aren't

14 really that --

15 MS. SHIRLEY: Just so you -- just so --

16 MR. FORMAN: Okay.

17 MS. SHIRLEY: -- you know what -- what hot

18 buttons are, what in- -- what we're hankering for --

19 MR. FORMAN: Okay.

20 MS. SHIRLEY: -- that's not available.

21 MR. FORMAN: Well, you're right, I think, in

22 the sense that that is the work of a subcommittee.

23 That -- that's a good, appropriate time to do that.

24 MR. MALOOF: Okay. Hold on. Wait. Wait a

25 minute. Miss Peterson or Miss Pierce, is it?

1 MS. PIERCE: Yes. I just -- I'm Karen Pierce,  
2 and I want the record to reflect that when Mr. DeMars  
3 re- -- responded to a specific question about the base  
4 cleanup plan, what he told the congresswoman was about a  
5 completely different document.

6 MR. MALOOF: Okay.

7 MS. PIERCE: I want that clear in the record.

8 MR. MALOOF: Mr. Brown?

9 MR. BROWN: And I would like to make sure that  
10 one of the main things that being -- this base -- the  
11 BC -- Community involvement, you know, that's a big  
12 part that hasn't been shown that -- you know, because it  
13 hasn't -- Richard Mach just closed everything down, and  
14 community involvement is major in this thing. It tells  
15 us what we supposed to do and what we can do, you know,  
16 as being partners.

17 MR. MALOOF: Okay. Are we done with this?

18 MS. SHIRLEY: I just have one --

19 I just want to --

20 MR. MALOOF: Okay.

21 MS. SHIRLEY: -- say one thing about --

22 MR. MALOOF: This is the last.

23 MR. TOMPKINS: Have this done.

24 MS. SHIRLEY: -- that the Navy is also supposed  
25 to have a Community Relations Plan, and I don't -- I

1 don't know that there is one that's current. Maybe --

2 Jackie, can you --?

3 MS. LANE: Navy.

4 MS. SHIRLEY: Yeah, okay.

5 So if we can -- if we can roll it up into  
6 the -- into the same deliverable, that would be very  
7 nice, that we can also get a current Community Relations  
8 Plan.

9 MR. MALOOF: Okay. Thank you.

10 MR. TOMPKINS: So are those the two --  
11 Community Relations Plan and then the overall --?

12 MR. FORMAN: Community Relations Plan, the CRP,  
13 is completely different than the BP. But you're right,  
14 it is a requirement.

15 MR. BROWN: Right.

16 MR. TOMPKINS: No. We were asking, 'cause  
17 Chris asked for that at the end, so I was ho- -- so that  
18 you're clear that we're asking for that to be delivered  
19 prior to the next RAB meeting. Is that possible to mail  
20 copies of it?

21 MR. FORMAN: Okay. Of the most up-to-date one,  
22 the most recent?

23 MR. BROWN: 2001.

24 MS. ATTENDEE: The most recent.

25 MS. ATTENDEE: The most recent one might be

1 1976.

2 MR. RODRIGUEZ: What?

3 MR. BROWN: Most recent what?

4 MR. TOMPKINS: 197- --

5 MR. FORMAN: Community Relations Plan.

6 MR. TOMPKINS: Plan and as well as the recent  
7 document that Maurice has a copy of.

8 MR. MALOOF: Okay. We -- we only have four  
9 more minutes left, and we already had our last comment.

10 This was --

11 Mr. Tompkins, thank you very much for your  
12 presentation.

13 We are just going to have to move on to the  
14 next part: Future agenda topics.

15 Mr. Charles DePew with the Navy, did you  
16 have . . . ?

17 MR. DePEW: Oh. Just -- just real quickly.  
18 Aside from the meeting that you're going to see here  
19 this Saturday, we're planning a follow-up meeting on the  
20 15th of May. We're going to have fliers available at  
21 the meeting on Saturday be passed out to folks.

22 There's people in the local community helping  
23 out, which is the Bayview-Hunters Point Business  
24 Resource Center, let's see, the Asian-American  
25 Contractors Association. And we're trying to -- we're

1 going to try to collect questions and whatnot for that  
2 meeting so --

3 MS. BULLOCK: Community-based contracting.

4 MR. DePEW: -- basically for the  
5 community-based contracting effort that we're trying to  
6 do. So it's one of the follow-ons that we're -- we're  
7 looking forward to doing, and that is on the 15th of  
8 May.

9 MS. BULLOCK: 6:00 to 8:00, right?

10 MR. DePEW: It will be 6:00 to 8:00.

11 I'm sorry. What -- what did we call --?

12 What was the title?

13 MS. BULLOCK: It's community-based contracting  
14 informational meeting.

15 MR. DePEW: Okay. Community-based contracting  
16 informational meeting.

17 MR. MALOOF: Okay. Mr. Brown?

18 MR. BROWN: I'd like to know, on Saturday will  
19 RASO be here?

20 MR. DeMARS: Yes, they will.

21 MR. FORMAN: Yes.

22 MR. BROWN: Okay.

23 MR. FORMAN: Oh, you mean at the information  
24 fair?

25 MR. BROWN: Right.

1 MR. FORMAN: Yes.

2 MR. BROWN: Okay.

3 MR. TOMPKINS: I have one quick --

4 MR. MALOOF: Mr. Mason?

5 MR. TOMPKINS: -- question.

6 MS. PIERCE: You're out of order.

7 MR. MALOOF: Mr. Mason?

8 MR. MASON: Well, one -- one of my biggest

9 concerns, Mr. DePew, is, you know, I understand the

10 contracting situation; and I want to find -- I want to

11 ask you, how much information have you put out about the

12 community contractors, you know, to be a part of what

13 the Navy is doing? Is --?

14 MR. DePEW: On the 15th?

15 MR. MASON: Will you be putting that

16 information out?

17 MR. DePEW: Yes.

18 MS. BULLOCK: Yes.

19 MR. DePEW: That -- that's one of the -- that's

20 one of the major thrusts that we're trying to do,

21 focus --

22 MR. MASON: One of our -- one -- one of our

23 biggest concerns is this: You know, we have contractors

24 in the community that have been -- you know, that --

25 that just out of the loop, that having a great deal of

1 technical problems.

2 Will -- will -- will -- will the Navy be able  
3 to help us with -- with some of our technical  
4 situations? We have contractors, building contractors;  
5 we have technical contractors which we are already  
6 working with.

7 MS. BULLOCK: Jesse, I need to get your list,  
8 Jesse, because I'm pulling that together for -- for  
9 Charles, so, like, real specific -- specific things you  
10 want as the chair of the Economic Development Committee.  
11 I just need to get your list.

12 MR. DePEW: In an effort to try to answer some  
13 of that, part of what I have done is: I've -- I've gone  
14 through, and I have a pretty extensive list of a lot of  
15 contractors that are within the local community or in  
16 this particular zip code.

17 MR. MALOOF: Okay. It's 7:30 now.

18 ATTENDEES: 8:30.

19 MR. MALOOF: I'm sorry. I'm going on that  
20 clock. It's 8:30.

21 MR. TOMPKINS: Well, you better catch up.

22 MR. MALOOF: It's 8:30.

23 MR. BROWN: Is that it?

24 MR. MALOOF: And we can -- I guess for future  
25 agenda topics, we can see Ron.

1           Let me see. I think that's about it.

2           MS. PIERCE: Announcements?

3           MR. MALOOF: We need to --

4           Yes, announcements.

5           MS. PIERCE: Okay. The next two weeks we are

6 going to have the first meeting to plan the boycott of

7 Fleet Week. We don't know if Fleet Week --

8           MR. BROWN: Right.

9           MS. PIERCE: -- is going to occur this year or

10 not, but we want to get a head start on that.

11          MR. MALOOF: Any more announcements?

12          Thank you.

13          Okay. Ready to adjourn?

14          MS. RINES: Yes.

15          MR. TOMPKINS: It's all done.

16          MR. MALOOF: Good. It's been second.

17 Meeting's adjourned.

18          MS. RINES: Second.

19                    (Off record at 8:30 p.m., 4/25/02.)

20                               ---oOo---

CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

I, CHRISTINE M. NICCOLI, Certified Shorthand Reporter of the State of California, do hereby certify that the foregoing meeting was reported by me stenographically to the best of my ability at the time and place aforementioned.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF I have hereunto set my hand this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, \_\_\_\_.

---

CHRISTINE M. NICCOLI, C.S.R. NO. 4569