

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

July 26, 2001

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: RICHARD G. MACH JR., US Navy Co-chair
2 CO-CHAIRS: DOROTHY PETERSON, RAB member, HP resident
CAROLINE WASHINGTON, RAB member

3

A T T E N D E E S:

4

ENA AGUIRRE - Resident

5

JAMES ANSBRO - Resident

6

LANI ASHER - Communities for a Better Environment,
7 Community First Coalition

8 ELIZABETH BARR - Bechtel National, Inc.

9 JULIAN BILLOTTE - Shipyard Trust for the Arts

10 JEFFREY BLANKFORT - KPOO, San Francisco Liberation Radio,
TUC Radio

11

LYNNE BROWN* - Communities for a Better Environment,
12 Community First Coalition

13 AMY BROWNELL* - San Francisco Department of Public Health

14 MAUDE BULLOCK - ADI Technology Corp.

15 BARBARA BUSHNELL* - Roses, resident

16 AL CAIN - A. M. Cain Trucking

17 MAURICE CAMPBELL - Business Development, Inc.; Community
First Coalition, NEW BAYVIEW NEWSPAPER, New California
18 Media, SAN FRANCISCO BAY VIEW

19 A. DON CAPOBRES - San Francisco Redevelopment Agency

20 CYNTHIA CASEY - Smallbear, Inc./ADI Technology

21 DOUG COMSTOCK - Coalition for SF Neighborhoods

22 CHARLES L. DACUS, SR.* - HP resident, Roses

23 PHILIP DE ANDRADE - Congresswoman Nancy Pelosi
representative

24 _____

25 *RAB member

1 ATTENDEES [Cont.]:

2 DAVID DeMARS - United States Navy

3 NEIL EISENBERG

4 LAURIE ESPINOZA* - Labor neighbor

5 PATRICIA E. EVANS - Resident

6 FILBERT FONG - NRDL retiree

7 JILL FOX* - India Basin Neighborhood Association

8 JON C. GEISBUSH - ADI Technology

9 MITSUYO HASEGAWA - JRM Associates

10 LUKE HAYES - Business Development, Inc.

11 BOB HOCKER - Lennar-BVHP Team

12 CAROLYN HUNTER - Tetra Tech EM Inc.

13 CEDRIC JACKSON - Smallbear, Inc.

14 GARRETT JENKINS - SFNAPA

15 KRISTEN JENSEN, Esquire - Sheppard Mullin RH for Lennar

16 BRAD JOB* - Calif. Regional Water Quality Control Board

17 RONALD KEICHLINE - Bechtel National, Inc.

18 JACQUELINE ANN LANE* - US Environmental Protection Agency

19 LAURA L. LOWMAN - United States Navy Radiological Affairs
Support Office (RASO)

20

21 RICHARD LOWMAN - United States Navy Radiological Affairs
Support Office (RASO)

22 J. R. MANUEL - JRM Associates, India Basin resident

23 JESSE MASON* - Bayview-Hunters Point Community Advocates

24 _____

25 *RAB member

1 ATTENDEES [Cont.]:

2 PAUL McCONNELL - Resident, activist

3 KIMBERLY MELTON - SAN FRANCISCO BAY VIEW

4 LEUREN MORET - Scientists for Indigenous People,
Association for Women Geoscientists

5 DOUG NORBERG - Collision Course

6 GEORGIA OLIVA - Communities for a Better Environment

7 JULIE OVANDO - Resident, activist

8 JOHN PELOSI - United States Navy

9 JOHN POLYAK - New World Technology

10 WILLIE RATCLIFF - SAN FRANCISCO BAY VIEW

11 MELITA RINES - Communities for a Better Environment

12 JIM RODRIGUEZ* - Portola Place Homeowners Association

13 STEVE ROSE - Freelance TV reporter

14 LEE H. SAUNDERS - United States Navy

15 CHRISTINE SHIRLEY* - ARC Ecology

16 RICHARD SERAYDARIAN - US Environmental Protection Agency

17 TORU SUGITA - Artist in Hunters Point

18 AHIMSA PORTER SUMCHAI, M.D.* - BVHP Coalition on
19 Environment

20 JACQUES TERZIAN - The Point

21 MIKE TOMASZKIEWICZ - Communities for a Better
Environment, Community First Coalition

22 RAYMOND TOMPKINS* - BVHP Coalition on Environment

23 LOUISE VAUGHN - Community activist

24 _____

25 *RAB member

1 ATTENDEES [Cont.]:

2 JULIA VIERA - Friends of Islais Creek

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

4 ANNA M. WIZIARDE

5 LEILANI WRIGHT - JRM Associates

6 WALT ZINGER

7 WANDA ZINGER - Artist at Hunters Point

8 ---oOo---

1 SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA, THURSDAY, JULY 26, 2001

2 6:04 P.M.

3 ---oOo---

4 MR. MACH: Good evening. My name's Richard
5 Mach. I'm the Navy's BRAC Environmental Coordinator for
6 Hunters Point Shipyard. This is the July Restoration
7 Advisory Board meeting for Hunters Point Shipyard.

8 John Scott, who is our normal facilitator, is
9 unable to attend this evening. He was in an automobile
10 accident. I've been told that he's getting better.

11 I don't know if Maurice is here.

12 And if you've got any more update on how John's
13 doing . . .

14 MR. CAMPBELL: John is recovering nicely at
15 this point.

16 MR. MACH: Okay. So while John recovers, I
17 will go ahead and fill in as the facilitator as well as
18 the Navy Co-chair for this evening's meeting.

19 Let's go ahead and go around the room, do a
20 quick round of introductions. We do have a court
21 reporter here. So she does take down verbatim
22 transcript of everything that's said. And so if you can
23 give your name out there, she makes sure that it's on
24 the transcript; and if there are any follow-up questions
25 that we need to respond to, we know who to get back to.

1 So let's go ahead around the room.

2 MS. HUNTER: Carolyn Hunter with Tetra Tech.

3 MR. DACUS: Charles Dacus, Sr., member of RAB,
4 also affiliated with Roses.

5 MS. BUSHNELL: Barbara Bushnell. I'm with
6 Roses. I live in the community and I'm a RAB member.

7 MS. PETERSON: Dorothy Peterson, community RAB
8 co-chair -- RAB community co-chair.

9 MR. TOMPKINS: Ray Tompkins, executive director
10 of Bayview-Hunters Point Coalition on the Environment
11 and bunch of other organizations and committees in the
12 community.

13 MR. JOB: Brad Job, Regional Water Quality
14 Control Board.

15 MR. SERAYDARIAN: Rich Seraydarian from US EPA
16 sitting in for Michael Work.

17 MR. KEICHLINE: Ronald Keichline, Bechtel
18 community relations.

19 MR. MACH: Why don't we keep on this side of
20 the room, come down the middle section.

21 MR. FONG: Phil Fong, unattached.

22 MR. R. LOWMAN: I'm Dick Lowman. I'm with
23 NAVSEADET RASO from Yorktown, Virginia.

24 MS. WRIGHT: Leilani Wright, JRM Associates.

25 MR. MANUEL: J. R. Manuel.

1 MS. HASEGAWA: Mitsuyo Hasegawa, JRM
2 Associates.

3 MR. MACH: Laurie, you want to keep going?

4 MS. L. LOWMAN: Laurie Lowman with NAVSEADET
5 RASO in Yorktown, Virginia.

6 MR. ANSBRO: Jim Ansbro, resident.

7 MR. PELOSI: John Pelosi, US Navy.

8 MS. VIERA: Julia Viera, 17-year resident,
9 Friends of Islais Creek, San Francisco Bureau Sophie
10 Maxwell's office, and I was on the original RAB.

11 MS. VAUGHN: Louise Vaughn, community activist,
12 grandmother, mother, citizen of the world; and I'm very
13 concerned about the Navy's injustice to this community.

14 MR. GEISHBUSH: Jon Geisbush from ADI.

15 MS. BULLOCK: Maude Bullock with ADI.

16 MS. CASEY: Cyndi Casey with Smallbear.

17 MR. POLYAK: John Polyak, New World Technology.

18 MS. BARR: Elizabeth Barr, Bechtel.

19 MR. MACH: Go ahead, Jill.

20 MS. FOX: Jill Fox, community member.

21 MR. MACH: Let's keep going around the back
22 row.

23 MR. ROSE: Steve Rose, freelance TV reporter.

24 MS. AGUIRRE: Ena Aguirre, resident, volunteer.

25 MR. McCONNELL: Paul McConnell, resident and

1 activist.

2 MS. OVANDO: Julie Ovando, resident, activist.

3 MS. MORET: Leuren Moret, citizen scientist,
4 president Scientists for Indigenous People.

5 MR. CAMPBELL: Maurice Campbell, New California
6 Media, BDI, Community First Coalition.

7 MR. CAIN: Al Cain, A. M. Cain Trucking.

8 MR. SAUNDERS: Lee Saunders, Environmental
9 Public Affairs Officer, US Navy.

10 MR. DE ANDRADE: Phil De Andrade, Congressman
11 Nancy Pelosi.

12 MR. CAPOBRES: I'm Don Capobres. I'm the
13 project manager at Hunters Point Shipyard for the
14 Redevelopment Agency.

15 MS. ZINGER: Wanda Zinger, artist at Hunters
16 Point.

17 MR. ZINGER: Walt Zinger.

18 MR. BLANKFORT: Jeffrey Blankfort, KPOO.

19 MR. TOMASZKIEWICZ: Mike Tomasziewicz,
20 Communities for a Better Environment and the Community
21 First Coalition.

22 MS. OLIVA: Georgia Oliva, Shipyard artist.

23 MS. ASHER: Lani Asher, Shipyard artist and
24 member of the Community First Coalition.

25 MS. JENSEN: Kristin Jensen with Sheppard

1 Mullin for Lennar.

2 MR. HOCKER: Bob Hocker, Lennar Team.

3 MS. MELTON: Kim Melton, SAN FRANCISCO BAY
4 VIEW.

5 MS. LANE: Jackie Lane, EPA community
6 involvement.

7 MS. WASHINGTON: Caroline Washington, Co-chair
8 of RAB.

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

10 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Jim Rodriguez, member Roses and
11 various numerous community organizations.

12 MS. SHIRLEY: Chris Shirley, ARC Ecology.

13 MR. BROWN: Lynne Brown, Communities for a
14 Better Environment, Community First Coalition.

15 MR. DeMARS: David DeMars, lead project manager
16 with the Navy.

17 MR. NORBERG: Doug Norberg, cable TV producer.

18 MR. MACH: And Amy, I think you're the last one
19 that came in.

20 MS. BROWNELL: Amy Brownell, San Francisco
21 Health Department.

22 MR. MACH: Great. And another thing, if you do
23 have questions and you're not a normal RAB meeti- --
24 member, if you could state your name so that the court
25 reporter can get that down in the transcript, that would

1 be appreciated.

2 I wish Jesse Mason was here, because he has
3 bugged me several times that I love to fish and I smoke
4 fish, and I brought some smoked tuna for everyone
5 here -- but at his request -- in the back. So I hope
6 that at some point you're able to partake of some of
7 that.

8 MR. TOMPKINS: Where? Be definitive.

9 MR. MACH: Okay. I did get here a little late,
10 so it may have already been gone, in which case I'm sure
11 Jesse will -- will remind me of that for the next
12 meeting.

13 Okay. There were meeting minutes put together
14 for the last meeting back in June. Those were
15 distributed to the RAB members. Hopefully, you've had a
16 chance to review those. Are there any questions?
17 Concerns?

18 MR. TOMPKINS: Yes. As I just talked to . . .

19 MR. KEICHLINE: Ronald.

20 MR. TOMPKINS: . . . Ronald, there's a lot of
21 problems with the e-mail and having this unzip.
22 Couldn't -- Everything was scrambled, and I couldn't
23 decipher or have an opportunity. Therefore, I would
24 ask -- I was able to deal with -- review -- The
25 newsletter came across --

1 MR. MACH: Okay.

2 MR. TOMPKINS: -- but the minutes did not. In
3 previous -- I don't know what has changed, but in --
4 previously I was able to pull that down.

5 I'd ask, one, that approval of the minutes be
6 passed because me- -- other members of the community
7 haven't had time to review or look at it. Not be passed
8 at this meeting. Correction. Not be passed --

9 MR. MACH: So you're making a motion to just
10 postpone approval of the minutes --

11 MR. TOMPKINS: Postpone --

12 MR. MACH: -- till next month?

13 MR. TOMPKINS: -- approval of the minutes and
14 that, secondly, to deal with this, that a hard copy be
15 mailed out to us at this time until we can deal with
16 technical difficulties. Not all the members of the RAB
17 have --

18 MR. MACH: Have other members --

19 MR. TOMPKINS: -- computers.

20 MR. MACH: -- had difficulties opening --?
21 Does not everyone --? There are still hard copies that
22 go to members who have not said that they only want
23 electronic. So was there anyone --?

24 MS. FOX: Just tell the Bechtel people to put
25 you on the hard-copy list. That's what I did, 'cause I

1 had the same problem.

2 MR. TOMPKINS: Yeah, I can -- that's what I'm
3 asking.

4 MR. MACH: Okay.

5 MR. TOMPKINS: But unfortunately, I haven't had
6 a chance to review, and the gentleman said other members
7 have discussed about their inability to unzip it.

8 Therefore, I'd ask, let the other members have
9 an opportunity to review the minutes, and they'll be
10 able to put their input into it.

11 MR. MACH: Is there a second to that motion
12 to --?

13 MS. PETERSON: What are we asking? That --
14 Just a minute.

15 MR. MACH: Should we postpone --?

16 MS. PETERSON: Clar- -- Point of
17 clarification, please.

18 MR. MACH: Okay.

19 MS. PETERSON: What are we asking? That we
20 don't approve any minutes? Point of clarification.
21 Just tell me what you're asking.

22 MR. MACH: If I understand it -- and Ray,
23 clarify if I'm wrong -- you'd like to postpone approval
24 of these meeting minutes until the August RAB meeting so
25 that everyone has a chance to review it; and I would say

1 that if anyone does not have a copy or was not able to
2 open a copy, let us know, and we'll get you a copy so
3 you can have those to review and approve by the August
4 meeting?

5 MR. TOMPKINS: Exactly.

6 MR. MACH: Okay. Is there a second to that
7 motion?

8 MR. BROWN: Second.

9 MR. MACH: All in favor?

10 THE BOARD: Aye.

11 MR. MACH: Opposed?

12 (No verbal response elicited.)

13 MR. MACH: Great. We'll postpone it.

14 Okay. I do have a couple of brief
15 announcements. The first is: We did provide a map last
16 month of the FUDS property, and FUDS are Formerly
17 Utilized Defense Sites. It's essentially anything --
18 any property that was owned, used, leased by the
19 government, Department of Defense, and used for any sort
20 of military operations that was closed in the past or
21 ceased to be used in the past.

22 So it covers essentially everything except
23 currently active bases where we have cleanup programs
24 underway and BRAC bases, like Hunters Point, like
25 Alameda, like Mare Island that are closed under the Base

1 Realignment And Closure Act.

2 So FUDS is anything that was done before then.

3 It goes back to camps, Army camps, areas that the Navy
4 owned, that the Air Force owned.

5 And the f- -- There is a fact s- -- There was
6 a map provided last month. We have taken that map, and
7 we have completed the fact sheet that basically
8 describes the FUDS property that is associated with or
9 adjacent to Hunters Point Shipyard.

10 There are essentially just about 10.3 acres of
11 land that were transferred from the Navy to private
12 entities in the 1970s and the 1980s. So some of that
13 went to Ted Lapenski, and some of that went to the
14 University of California, San Francisco.

15 There's 10.3 acres that was transferred. That
16 is not covered by BRAC. That is not covered by this
17 cleanup program.

18 And so what I've done is provided a fact sheet
19 that describes what that property is, where it is, and
20 put in there points of contact for the Army Corps of
21 Engineers. And I know that sounds weird, but the Army
22 Corps of Engineers has been designated as the lead
23 agency to oversee all FUDS property.

24 So they -- they were brought into one of our
25 cleanup team meetings with the regulatory agencies last

1 March, March of 2000. We discussed those properties
2 with them. We discussed when they have them programmed
3 for funding.

4 And they know about those properties. They
5 have them programmed. And in a couple of years, they
6 will be going back out there to look at those properties
7 in more detail.

8 So I have provided that information. It's in
9 the -- in the back. Hopefully, you'll have a chance to
10 take a look at that. But that is not something that --
11 that our team will be addressing. So that is in the
12 back.

13 Also, I want to make some quick introductions.
14 We awarded a contract this week to ADI Technology. This
15 is a company that we have hired to help us in the Navy
16 with community outreach, working closer with the
17 communities, working closer with some of the
18 subcommittees, getting information out better.

19 And what we have done is: We phased the award
20 of their contract. It's two phases. First one is the
21 first 60 days, which is an opportunity for them to come
22 here and meet with us and meet with the Navy and meet
23 with the community and try and scope out how we can make
24 this process a little better.

25 And so we're hoping -- and our proposal is

1 going to be that we work with one of the subcommittees,
2 possibly the By-Laws & the Membership Subcommittee, to
3 try and get these people together and talk about what
4 are the needs of the community, what are the resources
5 available from our contractor to do that.

6 And secondly, we had talked about setting up a
7 public meeting in a different -- basically, instead of a
8 RAB meeting, it would be more of a public meeting where
9 we would provide more information on specific topics.

10 And Dorothy had gone with me to a meeting that
11 the Navy sponsored with all of the different RABs, all
12 of the different co-chairs, both from the community side
13 and the Navy side, back in May, and that one of these
14 ideas was presented at that meeting. So we're looking
15 at something like that.

16 We had talked about doing it late in August. I
17 don't think we have time to do that. We're looking at
18 now September, and we're actually looking at possibly
19 doing it in lieu of a RAB meeting, possibly in lieu of
20 the September RAB meeting, having three hours or so in
21 talking to some other people who had --

22 I guess we did this in the past, like, four or
23 five years ago, and it was done on a Saturday; and not a
24 lot of people attended, so we want to try and scope out
25 what the best way is for the community to get this

1 information out.

2 So one second, Jill, if I could.

3 MS. FOX: Sure.

4 MR. MACH: I just want to introduce -- there
5 are four people that are here that will -- we'd like to
6 try and maybe meet at some point with some of the
7 subcommittee members, if that is acceptable to the
8 subcommittee, to work it that way and start setting up
9 maybe some meetings to work through this process over
10 the next 60 days.

11 First is Maude Bullock.

12 Maude, could you raise your hand.

13 Maude's with ADI. She is the project manager.

14 We have also got Cyndi Casey.

15 MS. PETERSON: Hi, Cyndi.

16 MR. MACH: She's a community outreach
17 specialist. We've got Jon Geisbush. He's more into the
18 technology.

19 MS. PETERSON: Hi, Jon.

20 MR. MACH: And Cedric Jackson is also going to
21 be on this, and I don't believe he's here right now.

22 MS. PETERSON: He's not.

23 MS. TOMPKINS: No.

24 MS. PETERSON: No, he's not here.

25 MR. MACH: Okay. So he is also working with

1 them. So . . .

2 Jill, you had a question on this?

3 MS. FOX: Just a comment.

4 We actually had -- remember last summer? We
5 had a big community meeting, the PAC, the CAC, and the
6 RAB, and we had two Saturdays in lieu of the June
7 meeting or the July 2000.

8 MR. MACH: June 22nd, right.

9 MS. FOX: So -- and we had a pretty decent
10 turnout, actually, of community folks who came out with
11 the combined of the two days.

12 MR. MACH: Right. And we're trying to make it
13 a little less us presenting stuff and a little more
14 poster-board sessions, information to hand out to
15 provide and have -- and have --

16 And here's Cedric.

17 We were just talking about you, Cedric.

18 MR. JACKSON: Hi. How are you?

19 MR. MACH: Good.

20 MR. JACKSON: I'm late. Excuse me.

21 MR. MACH: -- and have people at each of the
22 different stations to talk about, you know, questions
23 that come up.

24 Some of the things we want to talk about were
25 radiation, as that is definitely a big topic in

1 everyone's mind, possibly some information about how the
2 whole CERCLA process works; and we're -- we're operating
3 under Superfund, which is the Comprehensive Envir- --
4 Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act,
5 or CERCLA. As the law, it talks about how we do all
6 this.

7 Have some information about CERCLA. Maybe have
8 some information about some of the cleanup technologies
9 that we're using and any other ideas that you guys have.

10 MS. PETERSON: And remediation.

11 MR. MACH: And remediation techno- --
12 technologies and any other ideas that you're thinking
13 about. And this would be the first of several of these
14 type of outreach meetings. So we're hoping to get that
15 established.

16 The only other announcement I had was to go
17 through the action items. I don't know if -- Ray had
18 mentioned something about sending a letter to Nia
19 Crowder about her no longer being a member. We didn't
20 do that for any other members. I don't know if you were
21 still planning on doing something or if the Membership
22 Subcommittee was going to do something with that.

23 MR. TOMPKINS: Yeah, we brought up for
24 discussion for the previous items before we move on.

25 MR. MACH: Oh.

1 MS. PETERSON: Membership Committee.

2 MR. MACH: Okay.

3 MR. TOMPKINS: Was there --? I don't remember
4 on -- reviewing or seeing on the agenda items ADI
5 contract for community outreach. I don't remember the
6 discussion of it.

7 MR. MACH: It wasn't.

8 MS. TOMPKINS: If you could refresh me. I
9 don't --

10 MR. MACH: It wasn't. This is the first time
11 you heard about it.

12 MR. TOMPKINS: Okay.

13 MR. MACH: They have been at the last couple of
14 meetings kind of observing, making recommendations on
15 how they can help. But it hasn't been discussed yet.

16 MR. TOMPKINS: The contract has been awarded?

17 MR. MACH: Contract has been awarded, yes.

18 MR. TOMPKINS: Okay. There was no open bidding
19 or anything like that? You just automatically --?

20 MR. MACH: We had already had open
21 solicitations through a GSA contract, and so we awarded
22 for a GSA contract. GSA is Government Services --

23 MS. FOX: -- Administration.

24 MR. MACH: -- Administration?

25 MS. FOX: Okay, okay.

1 MR. MACH: The other quick things on the action
2 items was: Maurice was going to get me some information
3 about some of the records that have been destroyed. I
4 received that yesterday, I think.

5 MR. CAMPBELL: Yeah, that's correct. And I
6 also have a second hard copy notification. It talks
7 about some of the maps being destroyed at San Bruno. So
8 I can make that available.

9 MR. MACH: And I think we have a little -- a
10 little bit more information to talk about on that,
11 right?

12 Okay. And I was going to forward that to RASO,
13 and I showed that to them today.

14 So the action items are done.

15 MR. JOB: Can I just --? I had an announcement
16 too. This -- Tonight will be my last mee- -- meeting
17 as your -- your representative for Parcels B through E,
18 and that's going to be now handled by a fellow named
19 Mike Rochette.

20 And so I'm going to be responsible for
21 Parcel F, the offshore parcel, you know, for the see --
22 foreseeable future. I'll be back to meetings where
23 that's a topic on the agenda. But for those other
24 parcels, that will be that new fellow, so . . .

25 MR. MACH: Okay. I'm going to take -- I'm

1 going to take these three questions; then we're going to
2 move on with the agenda.

3 Ena?

4 MS. AGUIRRE: Yeah. My question was that you
5 seem to be recommending a different pattern, you know,
6 in terms of meetings. Now, is this something that we
7 are going to be discussing, or is this something that's
8 going to be implemented?

9 You -- you suggested that it might be possible
10 that instead of having a meeting on September or in the
11 future sometime, that it might be more of a workshop
12 issue.

13 MR. MACH: I don't want to dictate this, and
14 that's why I'm suggesting that it go to the -- to the
15 subcommittee. They discuss it. We can come back and
16 discuss it at the August meeting and then make a
17 decision whether or not to do it in lieu of the
18 September meeting or as another meeting.

19 MS. AGUIRRE: Well, you know, well -- but that
20 brings my question. I signed up for two meetings, and
21 I've never heard of any meetings, any subcommittee
22 meeting.

23 MR. MACH: We will get to that on the agenda.
24 There's --

25 MS. AGUIRRE: Oh, okay.

1 MR. MACH: -- a discussion about subcommittees.

2 Yes, Lani.

3 MS. ASHER: My name is Lani Asher, and I'm an
4 artist at the Shipyard.

5 I would just like to put it on the public
6 record that I don't feel comfortable with the fact that
7 Mr. Mach is running this meeting in lieu of the previous
8 discussions we have had at other meetings.

9 I find it very peculiar that you didn't think
10 it was necessary to get a moderator for this evening.
11 So I just would like to put that in the record.

12 MR. MACH: And I did discuss it with Dorothy
13 before this --

14 MS. ASHER: Well, I think it --

15 MR. MACH: -- decision was made. So . . .

16 MS. ASHER: -- inappropriate, Mr. Mach.

17 MR. MACH: Well, okay.

18 And Ray?

19 MR. TOMPKINS: For action item on announcement,
20 how you wish to define it, in the last meeting, I
21 discussed about how we're getting -- we've outgrown this
22 facility and that I'd asked for --

23 MR. MACH: It's on the agenda.

24 MS. PETERSON: Point of order.

25 MS. FOX: Okay. Where at?

1 MR. MACH: 6:30 to 6:45: "Possible Alternate
2 Locations For Future RAB Meetings --"

3 MR. TOMPKINS: Thank you.

4 MR. MACH: "-- (handout to be provided)."

5 Okay. With that, we can move into "RAB Member
6 Applicants." Since the subcommittee hasn't met, I don't
7 know if there was a discussion about whether we keep
8 going through this on a month-by-month basis or not.

9 MS. PETERSON: Well, no -- it -- there was --
10 there was no meeting called. So -- But I think after
11 this meeting, all those who want to be the Member &
12 By-Law Committee, I think we should just -- we do need
13 to set up a meeting, because it's my understanding that
14 Keith is the chairperson, and he didn't --

15 MR. MACH: Right.

16 MS. PETERSON: He didn't call a meeting.

17 MS. FOX: Right.

18 MS. PETERSON: So --

19 MS. AGUIRRE: Who's the chair again?

20 MR. MACH: Keith.

21 MS. AGUIRRE: Who's Keith?

22 ATTENDEES: Tisdell.

23 MR. MACH: Keith Tisdell. He's one of the RAB
24 members.

25 MS. AGUIRRE: Oh, okay, yeah.

1 MS. PETERSON: Yeah. And there wasn't one
2 called. So maybe --

3 MR. MACH: Well, let me read off the names,
4 then, if they are here.

5 MS. PETERSON: Yeah.

6 MR. MACH: The members can decide whether to
7 vote them in or not.

8 MS. PETERSON: And for those -- because I want
9 to be a part of that. So if you want to meet afterwards
10 and we set up a meeting date, that -- that's fine.
11 Otherwise --

12 MR. MACH: Okay.

13 MS. PETERSON: -- we'll go another month and --

14 MR. MACH: Okay.

15 MS. PETERSON: Okay.

16 MR. TOMPKINS: Point of information on that.
17 Reason why Keith wasn't -- wife has breast cancer, and
18 she was in surgery, and there were several complications
19 where she had to go in twice for infection and as well
20 as additional removal of tissue in her lymph nodes, so
21 that it wasn't he neglected his responsibility. It was
22 family emergency. Just for clarity --

23 MR. MACH: Okay. Thank you.

24 MR. TOMPKINS: -- people know.

25 MR. MACH: Okay. The people that I have on the

1 list are Mack Anthony, Betty Banks, Richard Ganley,
2 Mitsuyo --

3 You're here. I don't know how to pronounce
4 your last name.

5 MS. HASEGAWA: "HAU-see-GOU-wa" [phonetic].

6 MR. MACH: Okay. Hasegawa.
7 Thomas Lacey?
8 Alex Lantsberg is not here.
9 J. R. Manuel's here.
10 Patricia Mitchell?
11 Jim Rodriguez, you already got voted in.
12 Harry Shin?
13 Mildred Thomas-Bruno. Okay.

14 MS. PETERSON: Louise Vaughn.

15 MR. MACH: So we have --

16 MS. PETERSON: Louise Vaughn.
17 MS. FOX: Louise Vaughn.
18 MR. MACH: Okay. I must have an old list.
19 MS. PETERSON: And someone handed in another
20 one.

21 MR. MACH: Okay. Louise Vaughn.
22 Is there anyone else I missed that we have
23 applicants for?

24 MS. PETERSON: Yeah.
25 DR. SUMCHAI: She just handed one in.

1 MR. MACH: She just handed one in?

2 MR. KEICHLINE: I haven't made copies of it. I
3 just got it tonight.

4 MS. ATTENDEE: Since you're here . . .

5 MR. MACH: Why don't you just read off what's
6 on there.

7 MR. KEICHLINE: Leilani Wright, JRM &
8 Associates.

9 MR. MACH: Okay. Okay. So we have four people
10 that are in attendance that -- that we have applications
11 for.

12 Does anybody want to make a motion? Discuss?

13 MS. PETERSON: Make a motion that we accept the
14 four, as we did with the previous applicants.

15 MR. DACUS: Second.

16 MR. MACH: "Second."
17 Any discussion on that?
18 Ray?

19 MR. TOMPKINS: I thought we were going to -- it
20 was going to be referred to the committees to review --

21 MS. AGUIRRE: That was the decision last time.

22 MR. TOMPKINS: -- us what's happening.

23 MR. MACH: Well, because --

24 MR. TOMPKINS: Could I get clarity?

25 MR. MACH: -- because the subcommittee has not

1 met yet, the RAB members have put forth a motion to
2 accept these until the subcommittee has a chance to meet
3 and discuss this further.

4 MS. PETERSON: Exactly.

5 MR. MACH: Yes.

6 MR. TOMPKINS: I'm sorry. The subcommittee
7 has . . . ?

8 MR. MACH: I said, because the subcommittee --

9 (Attendee sneezes.)

10 MR. MACH: -- has not met over -- bless you --
11 over the last month, the me- -- several members have
12 just made a motion that in lieu of waiting for the
13 subcommittees, since we have four members here, they put
14 a motion forward to accept those four members.

15 Yes.

16 MR. TOMPKINS: One question. Then as I -- for
17 the last candidate, will they be able to make a two-year
18 commitment in terms of serving on the Board --

19 MR. MACH: Okay.

20 MR. TOMPKINS: -- since not everybody --

21 MR. MACH: Well, what Ray's talking about is
22 the by-laws. He talks about a request for a two-year
23 commitment to be a member of the RAB; and that if you
24 have more than four absences in a row, then you're
25 automatically no longer a member.

1 So we just go real quick, are you acceptable
2 for a --?

3 MS. VAUGHN: I did read that.

4 ATTENDEE: It says it on the application.

5 MS. VAUGHN: I read that. It says it on the
6 application.

7 MR. MACH: So you accept --?

8 MS. VAUGHN: I read that.

9 MR. MACH: So you accept that?

10 MS. VAUGHN: Barring an emergency, like the
11 other member that's not here.

12 MR. MACH: And you accept that, ma'am?

13 Okay. Ray, everyone has said that they would
14 sign for a two-year commitment.

15 Yes.

16 MR. RODRIGUEZ: In lieu of the fact that
17 there's been a marked interest in applications in
18 membership on the RAB Board, I believe that the
19 subcommittee should be allowed to review the
20 applications, and I'll include myself as well as being
21 part of the application process, because I think that we
22 need to use a lot more discretion in the choosing of a
23 RAB more -- uh, RAB members henceforth.

24 So I'm one to suggest that perhaps the
25 subcommittee should be allowed to review the

1 applications prior to the full approval by the Board.

2 MR. MACH: Okay.

3 Is there any more discussion?

4 Yes, Ahimsa.

5 DR. SUMCHAI: A number of the people who have

6 applied have had applications in for a long time. I

7 certainly have had an opportunity to look at these

8 membership applications for at least three meetings.

9 And additionally, there are people who have
10 applied who have a very, very long-standing history of
11 commitment to the community and are well known. And you
12 know, my personal feeling is that, you know, I believe
13 that the current crop of individuals, you know, probably
14 have had opportunity to undergo the type of surveillance
15 we need to feel as if we can trust their input and
16 judgment and intuition into this body.

17 MR. MACH: Okay. If there's no other
18 discussion, we can put this to a vote. All those in
19 favor of accepting the four members that are here,
20 please say, "Aye."

21 THE BOARD: Aye.

22 MR. MACH: Any opposed?

23 (No verbal response elicited.)

24 MR. MACH: Okay. Welcome to the RAB.

25 MS. VAUGHN: Thank you.

1 MS. SHIRLEY: So can I say something? Alex
2 Lantsberg --

3 MR. MACH: Yes.

4 MS. SHIRLEY: -- you can take his application
5 out.

6 MR. MACH: Okay.

7 MS. SHIRLEY: He went back to school, and he
8 can't get here on Thursday nights.

9 MR. MACH: Okay. We -- we will do that. Thank
10 you.

11 Okay. With that, we'd like to move on to
12 "Community Reports."

13 Caroline, do you have anything to report to the
14 RAB?

15 MS. WASHINGTON: Only thing I -- I have is: I
16 gave copies of this closure report that was sent to me
17 to the community, and I'd like for them to comment on
18 that now.

19 MR. MACH: Okay. And that closure report is
20 available in the library.

21 What Caroline's talking about is: We had a
22 project where we were closing above-ground and
23 underground storage tanks. And so this report documents
24 the activities that were done to remove the contents of
25 the tank, to remove the tanks, survey around the tanks

1 for the above-ground tanks to see if there were visual
2 signs of leakage and to close several underground tanks.

3 Basically, everything was clean when we were
4 done with the exception of one area. And as you know --
5 as we discussed in the past, there's a removal action
6 where we were cleaning up several sites on Parcel C and
7 D, that one site that did not meet our cleanup goals has
8 been referred and added into that cleanup program.

9 So that report is available in the library for
10 a 30-day review.

11 Okay. Dorothy?

12 MS. PETERSON: I want to defer to Jill. She
13 said she wanted to make a speech.

14 MS. FOX: This is a little speech that segues
15 into community co-chair nominations. I promise it's
16 really short.

17 For those of you who don't know me, I was the
18 community co-chair for a couple of years working with
19 Dorothy and Caroline; and I thought that I would just
20 put out some of the -- like, when you leave a job and
21 they ask you to write up your job description for the
22 person taking your job, this is what I came up with:

23 This shouldn't be considered an honorary
24 position. It should be given to someone who has the
25 time and experience to put into it. There really is

1 more hours than just coming to the RAB meetings involved
2 with being a community co-chair.

3 One of the main things is: You have to be
4 ready to deal with a lot of different kinds of people,
5 and you have to represent the community to the
6 regulators and to the -- to the Navy and its contractors
7 and not just your own agenda but the community that you
8 represent.

9 All the important information from the
10 community should pass through the co-chair and now with
11 the help of the committee chairs, which will be a real
12 help to the next co-chair, because you do deal with
13 community issues throughout the month. There's hardly a
14 day that goes by that you are not dealing with RAB
15 issues when you're the community co-chair.

16 It's probably a good idea if the community
17 co-chair has e-mail, access to e-mail, because of the
18 amount of communication that you have to do with Richard
19 and with other community members.

20 You also need to establish some kind of
21 relationship with the other involved agencies, the
22 Redevelopment Agency through the PAC and the CAC, at
23 least know who the people are so when you have interests
24 in common, you know who to talk to, who's, like, your
25 counterpart there.

1 The community co-chair really needs to
2 understand the by-laws of the RAB and the CERCLA process
3 so you know when it is even an issue for the RAB or if
4 it's for the CAC or the PAC or not our problem at all.

5 It helps to have some kind of meeting
6 management skills or experience so that you can help
7 Richard in making the agenda for the meetings so that
8 these can run efficiently.

9 And you have to be really willing to come here
10 every month. I mean, you really -- it's bad when the
11 co-chair misses a month.

12 And at these other workshops that are being
13 suggested, when we had the workshops last summer, we had
14 two extra meetings. I tracked my hours. I put in
15 80 hours helping to put together those meetings. That's
16 a lot of unpaid time.

17 You sometimes get questions from the press,
18 like, on the fires and other issues. They contact the
19 community co-chair 'cause your contact number is out
20 there officially.

21 We also get contacted sometimes by other RABs,
22 like, Fort Ord and Alameda, to share information about
23 how our meeting's run and that kind of thing.

24 I personally think there should be just one
25 co-chair to sort of simplify matters working with the

1 four committee chairs. I think that's enough
2 management.

3 It's really a very thankless job. It's hard
4 work. And I think Caroline and Dorothy have kept this
5 organization going the past year, and they really
6 deserve our appreciation.

7 And that's it.

8 MR. MACH: Thank you.

9 And also, I had received an e-mail from -- was
10 kind of Dorothy, Jill, and Barbara asking that Barbara
11 could have a few minutes to speak as well. So during
12 this, I'd like to let Barbara speak for a second.

13 MS. BUSHNELL: Thank you. Basically, I want to
14 talk about: After joining the RAB Board four months
15 ago, I have been troubled by some of the discussions,
16 procedural maneuvers, and conduct of other apparently
17 new RAB board members.

18 This board has some very good people who have
19 served this board for a number of years. It appears
20 their experience and expertise is being disregarded and
21 ignored. They rarely are allowed time to express their
22 opinions in meetings.

23 Time is occasionally wasted on petty details,
24 and the agenda is largely ignored. It is difficult
25 enough for new members and almost impossible to hear

1 public comment. An adversarial atmosphere has been
2 created.

3 In order to be heard, I asked for about five
4 minutes, and I'll try not to keep it any longer than
5 that.

6 My suggestion is: What we need to deal with is
7 what's here and now.

8 I had my radiological information. I asked
9 questions, and I got answers from it. I was given this
10 final radiological report -- this report which I
11 reviewed.

12 This was cited as having lies and errors in it.
13 It was difficult reading this as a -- as a standard
14 Environmental Impact Report to find out where those lies
15 and errors were. It was put together by a reliable
16 team. It looks like a standard environmental report,
17 and they produced data. It is not anything you can
18 question about. Data is data.

19 I further conducted some research at the
20 library at U.C.S.F. based on information I got out of
21 that. Historical investigation of what went on at the
22 Navy Shipyard is very useful, but we need to deal with
23 what's there now.

24 The Shipyard was constructed during World
25 World II, and the Navy didn't use the bombs because --

1 didn't have radioisotopes out there because it was cool
2 to have radioisotopes. Had a lot to do with the atomic
3 bomb.

4 The overwhelming power of that bomb and the
5 understanding of nuclear power when it was released upon
6 the world on August 6, 1945, in Hiroshima has changed a
7 lot of the way we deal with things.

8 Be clear, the US Government through the Navy is
9 funding the ship -- Shipyard cleanup.

10 With the bomb we found out how much is too much
11 nuclear power. We do not necessarily know what the
12 minimum amount is. Numerous medical research studies by
13 scientists throughout the world have been conducted to
14 realize this impact, and it's still ongoing.

15 Since then nuclear power has been used for
16 power plants; it's used in medical research and in
17 medical practice every day. Today patients get
18 irradiated blood to treat their cancers. Nuclear
19 medicine has used radiation to follow tumors and to
20 diagnose problems. It's also ra- -- Radioactivity is
21 also a natural part of our lives and will continue to be
22 so.

23 I first worked with radioisotopes in medical
24 research in Berkeley in the early '60s. We handled
25 radioisotopes with a great deal of precaution, care; and

1 they monitored us very carefully. Interestingly enough,
2 today we are using some of those standards of practice
3 in medical practice today handling blood specimens.

4 The Shipyard's been there for 60 years, and the
5 damage has been done. What's the rush to need to know
6 now?

7 What we really want to do with that property
8 is -- is -- which is almost 10 percent of the property
9 in San Francisco, on the San Francisco Peninsula, is use
10 it for the benefit of our families, our children, new
11 businesses, and generally enjoyment of San Francisco
12 Bay. The previous use of this land requires that we
13 ensure that it's safe and can be used for this purpose.

14 Despite the fact we are not being paid to
15 attend these meetings and that those representing the
16 Navy are is not really relevant. Our payback is having
17 in our community this bay-front property which will be
18 able to create beautiful houses, housing, parks,
19 businesses.

20 And this is not the only RAB Board in the
21 United States. We have been offered vast networking
22 possibilities with a group in Denver. Mare Island in
23 Vallejo is experiencing the same problems we are.

24 Locally at this RAB Board, I've experienced
25 penny tricks. We have invited speakers who have a

1 combined 50 years of experience in radiological work
2 called liars after we asked them to present this report.
3 Then the experts were not allowed to give a full report
4 before we asked questions.

5 One local newspaper has consistently not
6 supplied details or accurately described the same RAB
7 meetings I attended. There were articles about
8 informational community meetings concerning RAB, and
9 these meetings were not held -- were not publicly
10 noticed and were not held at times when most working
11 people could attend.

12 Let me focus on some data in the August 2000
13 report that I believe bears looking at it, and that's
14 two radioisotopes: cesium-137 and radium-226.

15 Cesium-137 is a fission product for nuclear
16 weapons, whether bombs or power plants. Cesium-137 is a
17 mineral that's used by the body. It's similar to sodium
18 and potassium and will incorporate into human tissue
19 through water or plants.

20 Principal source of this in our environment in
21 past years has been the atomic testing of bombs for
22 countries through -- from throughout the world. Between
23 1960 and 1970, every country in the world practically
24 was shooting bombs out in the air.

25 There was extensive studies done on this -- how

1 this was dealt by humans. It goes into the water we
2 drink and into the soil where we grow inside the plants
3 and the food we eat, and this becomes internalized.

4 Everyone on earth has concerns about this.

5 Cesium-137 has a half-life of 30 years. That
6 means half of it will be gone 30 years from now, and
7 then 30 years from then another half.

8 Radium 226: This occurs naturally in nature
9 and is a bright -- by-product of the decay of
10 uranium-238, which is in our rocks around here. It also
11 will decay into radon gas, which really becomes more of
12 an indoor problem.

13 Between 1910 and 1950, radon's [sic]
14 alpha-emitting properties were used in fluorescent p- --
15 with paint to create fluorescent dials, which were on
16 our clocks. It allowed us to see in the dark. It was
17 used extensively in ships' dials and gauges of the World
18 War II vintage ships.

19 Radium-226 has a half-life of 1600 years. You
20 now understand why we really need to be concerned about
21 the radon -- the radium at the Shipyard.

22 We are all here to work on the same problem,
23 the community, the Navy; and we need to work together
24 and not let our perception of what's going on interfere
25 with the reality of the job we need to do. Thank you.

1 ATTENDEE: Hear, hear.

2 MR. MACH: Thank you, Barbara.

3 Okay. Take one question, Ahimsa.

4 DR. SUMCHAI: Sure, sure.

5 I want to -- I want to say I commend you for
6 the courage of your -- your statement. I do want to
7 refer you, however, to the questions and the answers
8 that --

9 MR. MACH: Which we will get to, Ahimsa.

10 DR. SUMCHAI: Okay, because, you know, clearly,
11 there was human experimentation done with radioactive
12 materials, you know, at the Shipyard. Very, very
13 clearly, radioactive isotopes were produced.

14 We have, you know, evidence here that there
15 was -- there were at least two nuclear accelerators, you
16 know, that we have been able to determine that were
17 there. So these are not, you know, naturally occurring
18 radionuclides that we are looking at.

19 As a medical doctor who's been practicing for
20 20 years, let me also say that there are many
21 complications from radiation therapy and that the most
22 significant risk to the development of cancer that's
23 been determined has been from ionizing radiation. But I
24 do commend your statements.

25 I certainly have used the word "lie" in this

1 meeting, and I used it in reference to a Navy fact sheet
2 which says that Building 364 was found to be safe.

3 Building 364 is currently under remediation,
4 and even after remediation postexcavation data shows
5 that there are elevated radionuclides there.

6 And I have -- I have continued and will
7 continue to make reference to unfactually based
8 information in the fact sheets that needs to be
9 challenged, and that is one issue that I will continue
10 to publicly challenge.

11 MR. MACH: Okay. And with that, we've moving
12 onto "RAB --"

13 MS. SHIRLEY: I have an announcement. This is
14 a good announcement.

15 MR. MACH: Okay. We're going to have another
16 announcement, because it's good.

17 MS. SHIRLEY: Well, I think it's good.

18 MR. MACH: Don't back that up.

19 MS. SHIRLEY: ARC Ecology and a coalition of
20 other groups in the area, couple of them from the
21 Bayview, have been given a grant to study the -- well,
22 to plan the restoration of South Basin. Do you want to
23 see where that is on the map? It's that area
24 [indicating] and the Yosemite slough area.

25 So for the next two years, we have been given a

1 pot of money to evaluate what pollutants are going into
2 the area, what's existing there now, and what
3 technologies are available to clean them up.

4 So hopefully, we can -- we'll be getting a lot
5 of help from everyone in the room in determining what
6 businesses and activities cause bad stuff to get in that
7 basin and also in envisioning a future for that area,
8 because right now it's not exactly the prettiest place
9 on the earth, unless you're looking out towards the bay.

10 MR. MACH: From a boat.

11 MS. SHIRLEY: From a boat, right.

12 MR. MACH: Okay. Thank you, Chris.

13 Okay. With that, I'd like to move into
14 nominations for community co-chair, and we will have
15 elections in the August meeting. Would anyone like to
16 nominate someone else? Or I guess you can
17 self-nominate. We did that last year. So . . .

18 MS. PETERSON: I nominate myself not to run.

19 MR. MACH: Dorothy self-nominates her
20 nonnomination.

21 Jesse.

22 MR. MASON: I'd like to nominate Lynne Brown to
23 be community co-chair.

24 MR. MACH: Okay. There's no speeches with
25 this, right? It's just nominate, right?

1 MS. FOX: Right.

2 MR. MACH: You were here the lo- --

3 MR. JOB: You give the acceptance speech, kind
4 of like the --

5 MR. TOMPKINS: Election.

6 MS. FOX: No. In August you can -- Ray --
7 every --

8 MR. TOMPKINS: This is just nominating.

9 MS. FOX: There should be time for each person
10 to make a statement before we vote.

11 MR. MACH: One or two minutes would be fine?

12 MS. FOX: Yes.

13 MR. MACH: Okay.

14 MR. DACUS: I would like to nominate Barbara.

15 MR. MACH: Okay. Barbara.
16 Yes, Caroline?

17 MS. WASHINGTON: I nominate myself.

18 MR. MACH: All right.

19 MS. PETERSON: Okay.

20 MR. MACH: Are there any other nominations?
21 (No verbal response elicited.)

22 MR. MACH: Okay. We'll have three potential
23 co-chairs running next month.

24 Okay. I had put in here "Subcommittee Updates"
25 because I kind of thought there would be a few more

1 meetings, although we did have one subcommittee meeting
2 in the last month, and that was the Ad Hoc Radiation
3 Subcommittee.

4 So Ahimsa, would you like to say a couple words
5 about that --

6 DR. SUMCHAI: Well --

7 MR. MACH: -- since you are the leader
8 or . . . ?

9 DR. SUMCHAI: -- let me thank you, Richard, for
10 everything that you did to coordinate the meeting which
11 was held in the IT trailer at the Naval Shipyard on July
12 the 17th.

13 I also did want to just take a brief minute to
14 concur with Jill that the community co-chairs probably
15 are going to need to be on line.

16 I spent some time trying to catch up with
17 Richard by phone. You know, I played phone tag with him
18 quite for a long time before communicating with him via
19 e-mail, and it's going to be costly and it's going to be
20 very time-consuming if you're not able to communicate by
21 e-mail.

22 But there was a very, very good turnout, both
23 from community members as well as from the regulatory
24 agencies.

25 There were representatives from IT, Maurice

1 Campbell, Lynne Brown. The Department of Public Health
2 had representation, Jesse Mason. There was RASO
3 representation, Jesse Blout from the mayor's office,
4 Chris Shirley, Brad Job -- let's see -- Bill Harvey from
5 a technical concern -- let's see -- Leuren Moret from
6 the Radiation Public Health Project, Darnell Blackwell,
7 a young man who's vice president of marketing for Waste
8 Solutions Group, Deirdre Dement from the State of
9 California Department of Health Services.

10 I want to thank everybody for attending.

11 We actually got through a pretty crowded agenda
12 in which we talked about some of the goals of the
13 subcommittee and the dissemination of information and
14 the current status of the HRA, Parcel B update, response
15 to some of the questions that have been asked by
16 community -- community members with regard to current
17 radiological operations.

18 I think that there was a significant block of
19 time that was talked about in which we talked about, you
20 know, the need for completion of the historical
21 radiological survey, which is scheduled for publication,
22 I believe, in October.

23 And that's a document that will give us some
24 idea as to what the nature of operations were for the
25 Naval Radiological Defense Laboratories, the potential

1 risk of contamination by radionuclides on the base where
2 these contaminants are; and this survey can act as a
3 guide to the kinds of investigations and technical
4 interventions that would disclose sources of radiation
5 that may be harmful.

6 There was a great deal of emphasis on the need
7 for completion of -- of this study prior to transfer of
8 land.

9 And there was some discussion also about the
10 need for confirmation, let's see, confirmation by the
11 full Board of Su- -- Board of Supervisors prior to
12 transfer suitability for any of the parcels that Jesse
13 Blout emphasized that there needs to be a full sign-off
14 by the regulatory agencies and a review by the Board of
15 Supervisors before any of the parcels can be accepted by
16 the city, including Parcel A, which is in the process of
17 being transferred.

18 There was a great deal of talk about some of
19 the technical aspects of the current radiological
20 surv- -- surveys, and I don't think that I'm going to go
21 into a great deal of detail about that. I think that
22 what I'll try to do is have a written documentation of
23 the flow of the meeting available to you, you know, for
24 the next meeting.

25 And then we had a RASO representative who

1 talked about some of the responses of RASO to the
2 questions that had been received by the BRAC team to
3 date.

4 There was a point of -- of issue that was
5 rai- -- raised by Maurice Campbell that probably should
6 be noted that the current fires -- that there is an
7 overlay of the current fires at the Shipyard on some of
8 the radioactive sites, and that's of concern because
9 there's a great deal of scientific evidence that shows
10 that radionuclides can be disseminated when they are
11 subjected to a heat; and that was evidence and
12 information that was forwarded to us by Dr. Leuren
13 Moret.

14 We did schedule a -- an up-and-coming meeting
15 date -- and let's see . . . for August.

16 MR. MACH: August 8th, 10:00 to 12:00.

17 DR. SUMCHAI: Okay. August 8th, 10:00 to
18 12:00.

19 MR. MACH: And you're still going to confirm a
20 location and try and possibly get the auditorium in
21 Building 101?

22 DR. SUMCHAI: Well, we will --

23 MR. MACH: It's a Wednesday.

24 DR. SUMCHAI: -- preliminarily set it for the
25 IT trailer; and depending upon the response, we can look

1 at another site that may have a greater, you know,
2 capacity. I think there's some issues with regard to
3 intimacy and the acoustics of the environment that, you
4 know, we need to think about. But tentatively I think
5 the IT trailer.

6 MR. MACH: That's fine. The IT trailer will be
7 available, so . . .

8 MS. FOX: What time?

9 MR. MACH: 10:00 to 12:00.

10 DR. SUMCHAI: 10:00 to 12:00.

11 MR. MACH: One of the things that I'd like to
12 bring up on this was: It was a little difficult in
13 scheduling trying to figure out who's on which
14 subcommittees and how the notification was going to go
15 and making sure that if the entire RAB wanted to at
16 least be notified of it, how that would happen.

17 And I'm hoping that the subcommittees or
18 possibly the By-Laws & Membership will set up the
19 procedures of how these subcommittees are going to run.

20 It was -- it was a little, as Ahimsa said,
21 difficult for she and I to coordinate on schedule,
22 location; and it's part -- part of that is just learning
23 pains from the first one, but make sure we got the word
24 out to everyone. So I'm hoping that the subcommittee
25 for by-laws and the -- and the membership can work on

1 that.

2 Okay. Was there anything else you wanted to
3 update, Ahimsa? And some of the things you brought up
4 we are going to discuss this evening too, RASO being
5 here.

6 DR. SUMCHAI: We also had an opportunity to
7 tour some of the sites on the Shipyard, and it was very,
8 very instructional.

9 I did want to say candidly that while the tour
10 helped to familiari- -- familiarize me with, you know,
11 some of the sites that are being referenced a lot, you
12 know, in our discussions, it really didn't do a lot to
13 attenuate my anxieties about the radiological, you know,
14 risk at the base.

15 We actually did go out to one site, and with a
16 Geiger counter, I identified that there were elevated
17 levels of radium, you know, at one of the -- you know,
18 one of the regions.

19 So, you know, there are some real
20 considerations here, and I don't think that we should in
21 any way try to minimize the concerns that the community
22 has about these risks.

23 MR. BROWN: Thank you.

24 MR. MACH: Okay. Ray?

25 MR. TOMPKINS: Subcommittee, right? How do

1 you -- how do you plan to handle this? Each one of the
2 chairmans --

3 MR. MACH: We --

4 MR. TOMPKINS: -- what?

5 MR. MACH: Well, we --

6 MR. TOMPKINS: Since there are several others.

7 MR. MACH: We can get in there a little more,
8 or we can try and move quickly into the RASO --

9 MR. TOMPKINS: I'd like --

10 MR. MACH: -- since we did bring them here to
11 answer some of the concerns that were brought up last
12 month. Do you have something to update on --?

13 MR. TOMPKINS: Yeah, Risk Assessment Committee,
14 yes, sir.

15 MR. MACH: Okay. Great. Then go ahead.

16 MR. TOMPKINS: One, that the Risk Assessment
17 probably be meeting next month on that.

18 What I have done is for the members who signed
19 up, I'm not the fastest typist, but dealt with risk
20 assessment and covering the topics of what it is, what
21 are the alleged biases within risk assessment, and then
22 what changes, recommendations we as collective.

23 And the first segment I've -- rather than some
24 of the other meetings and with Chris and I have talked
25 about other organizations we share, sometimes those in

1 the technical field be arguing debates, and then other
2 residents not in the technical field do not have a feel
3 or an understanding and sometimes interpret a position
4 that we may take as a personal attack on somebody or
5 integrity, but actually these points of science that we
6 are arguing about are interpretation.

7 And rather than first to go into it, I'd first
8 like to start out: What is risk assessment, defining
9 risk, going to the history of risk assessment, the
10 function of a risk assessment, the risk assessment
11 debate in terms of within the community, scientific
12 community, what we -- the limits.

13 Risk assessment guidelines are hazardous
14 identification; dose and response analysis, which there
15 is a definite dispute on some of these; exposure
16 assessment; risk characterization. In other words, what
17 are the components that go off to a risk assessment?

18 Selecting hazards, in terms of as we do a
19 prioritization of that as well.

20 Then, as I've given a previous tidbit lecture
21 on, what is the alleged bias within the risk assessment,
22 and there are two different sections as well.

23 Then finally, as a body, as a team, after we
24 have a base of knowledge; then to come together in terms
25 of what we see in terms of approving and start going

1 through some of the issues on some of the risk
2 assessments that have been presented to us so that then
3 we're having debates and information that is presented
4 to us, then it won't be just me or one or two people
5 sitting and asking questions but rather the majority of
6 the community in expanding the base knowledge, 'cause
7 it's about all of us understanding, since all of us live
8 here.

9 MR. BROWN: Right.

10 MR. TOMPKINS: I hope to host the meeting at
11 City College. I need to get with those who are
12 interested -- and I have copies.

13 MS. PETERSON: Where?

14 MR. TOMPKINS: On 1800 Oakdale to host -- use
15 one of the classrooms in the evening based on a
16 convenient period of time for everybody. I do have some
17 time restraints on my evenings that are available.
18 Monday and Fridays appear to be my very best dates in
19 terms of availability. But I will try and amend the
20 schedule to the rest of the community members to please
21 meet with me afterwards.

22 I only have limited -- one, two, three, four,
23 five, six, seven -- eight copies available. If I can
24 get dupe -- my printer ran out of ink, and --

25 MR. MACH: You can give a copy to Ron, and

1 he'll take care of it.

2 MR. TOMPKINS: And anyone else in the public
3 who's interested, please. And whatever mechanisms we
4 set up in terms of notification to other members of the
5 public, I'd be more than happy to amend the procedures.

6 MR. MACH: Okay. Ena?

7 MS. AGUIRRE: Yeah. Has that committee met
8 yet?

9 MR. TOMPKINS: No, ma'am.

10 MR. MACH: None of the other comm- --

11 MS. AGUIRRE: Well, then, you know, it would
12 seem to me, that committee would have to approve
13 whatever it is that the subcommittee's going to be
14 doing.

15 MR. MACH: And that's what the Membership &
16 By-Laws Subcommittee --

17 MS. AGUIRRE: Right.

18 MR. MACH: -- will hopefully --

19 MS. AGUIRRE: No, no, no, no, no. No. All
20 right. Fine. I thought it was something else.

21 MR. MACH: At some point one -- once Ray gets
22 his --

23 MR. TOMPKINS: Yeah.

24 MR. MACH: -- subcommittee together, they --

25 MS. AGUIRRE: Right.

1 MR. MACH: -- they will then --

2 MS. AGUIRRE: They will then approve all of
3 that.

4 MR. MACH: -- approve what their --

5 MR. TOMPKINS: Right, from -- Right --

6 MR. MACH: Right.

7 MR. TOMPKINS: -- because I'd like Chris to
8 bring in another -- several documents that she --

9 MS. SHIRLEY: Right.

10 MR. TOMPKINS: -- had forwarded but I misplaced
11 in terms of deference so that we get as our invite
12 previously other members from different institutions to
13 participate in the risk assessment from the toxicology
14 materials, hazardous as well as health department, so
15 that we get a diversity of people within the discipline
16 as well and sit down and say, are these parameters --?
17 What additions?

18 I was going to say, you missing something.

19 I suggest those who participate, there will be
20 a lot of reading material in it. So plan time to do
21 with reading and -- 'cause everybody that participates,
22 please, we need your input. But take the time and plan
23 your time for reading and digesting it.

24 And part of it I figure as we read it, to then
25 go over questions, make sure we understand it, then move

1 over to the next topic, 'cause it is a complicated
2 discipline.

3 MS. AGUIRRE: Thank you.

4 MR. MACH: Thank you.

5 MR. TOMPKINS: Thank you.

6 MR. MACH: Are there any other subcommitt- --?

7 Jesse, I know you're meeting tomorrow.

8 MR. MASON: Yeah. And first of all, I want to
9 apologize for being late.

10 But I -- if there are any contractors in here
11 that is concerned about getting involved with the
12 community contracting, please be at Building 101 at
13 1 o'clock tomorrow in the Shipyard. We're having an 8-A
14 and SBA hub zone certification. So if you're
15 interested, come on through.

16 That's basically what we're trying to do with
17 that Economic Development Subcommittee is set up where
18 our community truckers will have an opportunity to get
19 certified so that they will have an opportunity to get
20 some of those contracts within the hub zone, meaning
21 94124.

22 So that's our biggest concern, because we are
23 not really getting an all-out effort with one of your
24 contractors. But I'm not going to go there yet.

25 MR. MACH: Okay.

1 Any other subcommittees?

2 MS. SHIRLEY: Yeah. I'd just like to say, when
3 we break, can -- people come -- that are interested in
4 the Technical Review Subcommittee, I'd like to meet
5 either the 7th -- Tuesday the 7th or Tuesday the 21st in
6 the evening. Or if there's a better time also . . . So
7 at the break, seek me out. We'll figure it out.

8 MR. TOMPKINS: Same thing for the Risk
9 Assessment, those interested . . .

10 MR. MACH: Okay. We're --

11 MR. TOMPKINS: Thank you.

12 MR. MACH: We're getting there real quick.

13 There have been several discussions that have
14 come up about moving the location of this meeting, and
15 we have had many discussions about this. It's gone to a
16 vote several times. And I think the last vote was about
17 three or four months ago, and I held up this pretty
18 little evaluation of all the places we looked into that
19 we can move it to and the pros and cons of each and why
20 this was the most appropriate location.

21 So I've made that available. Everyone can have
22 it in the back.

23 I don't want to get into a discussion of it
24 right now. If the RAB wants to get into it again, I
25 suggest it go to a subcommittee so we don't take up all

1 the time in the RAB meeting discussing where this thing
2 goes back and forth, because you guys keep asking for
3 RASO to be here. They're here, and we're already
4 fifteen minutes into their time, so . . .

5 MR. MASON: Let's cut it and start.

6 MR. MACH: So with that, I'm not going to take
7 any comments on that --

8 MR. DACUS: Thank you, thank you.

9 MR. MACH: -- and I'm going to move into the
10 five-minute break. Talk to people that you want to
11 about this, and we're going to hit RASO at five past.

12 (Recess 7:00 p.m. to 7:08 p.m.)

13 MR. MACH: Okay. I'm going to start talking,
14 so hopefully you guys will stop talking.

15 We have three people here that are going to
16 talk to you about radiation at Hunters Point. We have
17 Ms. Laurie Lowman. She's from the Radiological Affairs
18 Support Office in -- in Yorktown, Virginia. She's been
19 here before. We also have her husband, Dick Lowman. He
20 also works for the Radiological Affairs Support Office,
21 again in Yorktown, Virginia.

22 And a question was brought up, can we find
23 anyone who's a former employee of NRDL, and we have
24 Mr. Phil Fong here, and Dick is going to give a quick
25 introduction on -- on Mr. Fong. And Dick's walking in

1 right now.

2 So Dick, can you introduce Mr. Fong, please?

3 MR. R. LOWMAN: Yes, I would.

4 I've read your RAB minutes. I'm sorry we
5 weren't here last month at your -- at your meeting. And
6 I had read in your minutes that we have gotten from
7 Richard you wanted to have someone who had worked at
8 NRDL come to one of your meetings.

9 So I contacted Mr. Fong to see if he was still
10 around, and sure enough, he was over in the East Bay.
11 He's retired now. He worked at NRDL in 19- -- from 1957
12 till 1969 closure. He was in the health physics
13 division there, which is the radiation station --

14 MR. MASON: I can't really hear you.

15 MR. R. LOWMAN: I'm sorry.

16 Mr. Fong worked at NRDL from 1957 to 1969
17 when -- when they closed it. He was in the health
18 physics division there, which is the radiation safety
19 division.

20 In just a couple of hours talking to him, we --
21 see, what we're trying to do now is review these old
22 records. Sometimes we know what they did, but we don't
23 know why they did it looking at the records. We just
24 don't know that now.

25 MR. BROWN: Right.

1 MR. R. LOWMAN: Fortunately, this gentleman has
2 that information as to why they did certain things. We
3 were at kind of a loss. In answering a couple of the
4 questions, we were at some of -- kind of a loss. We
5 didn't know.

6 He's provided us with more information just
7 from his personal knowledge of what went -- what went on
8 there on the radiological side and the radiological
9 safety side.

10 So he has graciously volunteered to come over
11 here tonight at his own expense and talk to you and
12 answer questions from you as to what went on at NRDL in
13 the radiological side.

14 I know you have a lot of questions. I don't
15 blame you. Perhaps we haven't given you enough
16 information. Perhaps you may not be as familiar about
17 radiation or what they do and how these labs work and
18 their safety precautions in what they do.

19 And I understand your concerns. I really do.
20 I worked in this business a long time. I've talked with
21 a lot of people. There are times that I've been
22 concerned for my own safety in particular things that we
23 have done. So you always have to watch out for yourself
24 too when you're doing these types of things.

25 But Mr. Fong has come and he's here.

1 MR. FONG: Can I say a few words?

2 MR. R. LOWMAN: Yes, sir, please.

3 MR. FONG: I want you to know that I came on my
4 own. Even though Dick Lowman was the one who contacted
5 me, he has not given me one cent to come here. And I'm
6 retired. I'm not beholden to the Navy, to the
7 Department of Health, to the City of San Francisco,
8 okay? I'm speaking for myself.

9 And what I'm going to say is strictly as I
10 recall what happened at NRDL. I'm not going to pull any
11 punches. There's no reason for me to do so.

12 And to begin with, I was born and raised in San
13 Francisco. This is my city. I went to San Francisco
14 State. That's where I graduated. So San Francisco is
15 my town, and the Navy is in Washington.

16 So anyway, I'll answer any question you want to
17 ask me.

18 MR. MACH: Okay. When we talked with the
19 subcommittee the other week about how to try and
20 structure this, there were a number of questions that
21 were provided to us before last month's meeting that we
22 provided answers to in written format that we didn't get
23 to discuss. And there were some concerns.

24 There were a lot of concerns about what those
25 answers were, and there were concerns on our side as to

1 what the question meant, and so that -- that may be part
2 of it. So we decided we would try -- we would try and
3 go through those questions and answer the concerns, make
4 sure we understood the question right and answer what we
5 could.

6 It was also another -- There were two more
7 sets of questions that came into us. So that we didn't
8 get into the same trap we did last month, all we did
9 was: We typed out what those questions were, and they
10 were from Community First Coalition again and from
11 Dr. Sumchai.

12 So we typed out what those were, and we
13 basically put three columns together, one where we know
14 the answer or we think we know the answer, and we'll
15 discuss it with you this evening.

16 Two, it's going to be something that's going to
17 be in the HRA report that is due on October 1st.

18 Or three, we have questions about what your
19 question is, and hopefully we can get that clarified,
20 and then we can determine whether we have the
21 information to answer it or there's something we still
22 need to look into, and then we can put it into the HRA.

23 So we were just going to go through that. If
24 there are more questions that come up, we will answer
25 what we can; and then, you know, we'll also take

1 advantage of having Mr. Fong here if there are further
2 questions that you want to know about NRDL.

3 So I'm going to hand it over to Laurie, and
4 she's going to start going through the questions from
5 last month.

6 MS. L. LOWMAN: We are going to start with the
7 ones from the last month, right?

8 Okay. Now, we put together answers for you
9 based on the questions that we had, and unfortunately we
10 were not able to ask questions of you concerning what
11 the meaning of the questions were. So the answers we
12 have provided were somewhat generic, and they were
13 phrased that way on purpose because we weren't -- we
14 weren't exactly sure of the specifics of the questions.

15 The first question was: "Were scientists
16 for --" Well, maybe I should -- for "NRDL affiliated
17 with the Atomic Energy Commission or DOE?"

18 And we answered that one stating that the
19 personnel that actually worked for NRDL were Navy
20 employees. There were scientists that came from other
21 agencies that worked with them.

22 Was there any further questions regarding this
23 one?

24 Yes?

25 MR. CAMPBELL: Okay. When you say they were

1 Navy employees, you don't mean on the Navy working as a
2 representative of the Navy of the armed forces --

3 MR. BROWN: Right.

4 MR. CAMPBELL: -- versus being a scientist
5 that's a civilian scientist that is working for the
6 Navy? Is that what I'm understanding?

7 MS. L. LOWMAN: There were two categories, I
8 would imagine. Mr. Fong can probably better answer
9 this. Most Navy commands have the standard Navy
10 personnel, military personnel, enlisted or officer
11 personnel, and then they also have civil service
12 workers.

13 I am a civil service worker. I work for the
14 Navy in the position that I have. I am not part of the
15 Navy, but I do work for them.

16 There are also Navy contractors. We have a
17 Navy contractor here tonight, New World Technology, John
18 Polyak. He is one of the contractors for the Navy. He
19 works for the Navy but through a contract and actually
20 works for another company.

21 So when I say they "work for the Navy," that's
22 what I'm saying.

23 MR. FONG: Yeah. Let me answer that this way.

24 They are civilian employees of the Navy. At
25 NRDL there were 600 civilian employees of the Navy, a

1 hundred were military, their association with DOE.
2 There's no -- It wasn't DOE at that time. It was all
3 AEC. Their association with AEC was strictly researcher
4 talking to researcher.
5 AEC, as you well know, Lawrence Berkeley Lab,
6 Lawrence Livermore Lab, they have their own group of
7 researchers. The Navy have their own group of
8 researchers. We talk to each other constantly. We --
9 we have meetings and so forth and so on. But the
10 scientists at NRDL are basically Navy civilian
11 scientists.

12 MS. L. LOWMAN: NRDL was established to do
13 research on the effects of nuclear weapons, which was a
14 brand-new thing when it was first established. That was
15 a new industry. It was a new -- I hate to say nuclear
16 weapons is an industry, but it was a new science, and
17 that's what NRDL was established to do was to study the
18 effects of the nuclear weapons.

19 They did a lot of work with any other agency
20 that was doing the same type of work. Okay?

21 Any other questions?

22 Yes?

23 MS. MORET: I have a question for Mr. -- Wong?

24 MR. FONG: Fong.

25 MS. MORET: Fong.

1 MR. FONG: Call me Phil, okay?

2 MS. MORET: Phil. Thank you, Phil.

3 What I would like to know -- I was an employee
4 of the Livermore Labs and --

5 MR. FONG: Right.

6 MS. MORET: -- the Lawrence Berkeley Lab, and I
7 would like to know how -- was the NRDL like the hub for
8 nuclear research in the United States?

9 MR. FONG: Not for the United States. Only for
10 the Navy and any contractor who wants to give money to
11 the Navy to run a particular project.

12 So we had -- we had contracts in the Air Force.
13 We had contracts from the Army. We have contracts with
14 Atomic Energy Commission. We have contracts with the
15 Office of Civilian Defense.

16 Remember that's the group that tell you to duck
17 your head underneath the table at the time of nuclear
18 disaster? Well, that group funded quite a bit of money
19 at NRDL to do decontamination. And that part of the
20 project and program was done basically in Camp Parks,
21 which is not part of Hunters Point.

22 MS. MORET: But I know that Brookhaven National
23 Lab, it was more than just national labs. There were
24 academic institutions, such as U.C.L.A. and
25 U.C.-Berkeley, who were also involved --

1 MR. FONG: Yes.

2 MS. MORET: -- with the research here.

3 MR. FONG: Right.

4 MS. MORET: And I don't see how the NRDL
5 couldn't have been the supreme institution for doing
6 research on radiation.

7 MR. FONG: Well, for the Navy only. Remember,
8 the Atomic Energy Commission, the sponsor of all those
9 national labs, have much more people working, more than
10 600 people. Do you agree to that?

11 MS. MORET: Working at NRDL.

12 MR. FONG: They did not come in to work at
13 NRDL.

14 MS. MORET: But they all collaborated.

15 MR. FONG: They collab- -- That's true, yes.

16 MS. MORET: And they all went to conferences
17 and --

18 MR. FONG: Right.

19 MS. MORET: -- they wrote papers together, and
20 the money got all --

21 MR. FONG: Atomic bomb test through Bikini and
22 Nevada.

23 MS. MORET: Okay.

24 MR. FONG: Yes, that's true.

25 MS. MORET: So you can't really say that NRDL

1 was working separately from academic institutions and
2 other national labs.

3 MS. L. LOWMAN: Excuse me.

4 MR. FONG: No.

5 MS. L. LOWMAN: We had a question, and I think
6 we're going to have to kind of keep to the questions if
7 we want to keep moving.

8 MS. MORET: Well, I'm asking this question
9 because I want to find the papers -- the research
10 papers, a thousand a year, that came out of the NRDL.

11 MS. L. LOWMAN: I'm sorry. I didn't hear
12 exactly what you said.

13 MS. MORET: The NRDL produced a thousand
14 research papers a year. And so I have to know what
15 institutions were collaborating with the NRDL.

16 MR. R. LOWMAN: Any of the national labs.

17 MS. ATTENDEE: Okay.

18 MR. R. LOWMAN: Any of the national labs and
19 AEC.

20 MS. MORET: But wait a minute.

21 MR. R. LOWMAN: They all work together.

22 MS. MORET: But academic institutions also.

23 MS. L. LOWMAN: I understand. But what we have
24 here is a set of questions that the RAB members have
25 submitted. What we're going to try to do is get through

1 the questions; and if we get sidetracked, we won't have
2 the opportunity to provide the answers to the questions
3 that have already been asked.

4 MR. R. LOWMAN: Could I ask you if you -- if
5 you -- when -- please remember what the name of NRDL --
6 everybody always says, "NRDL." Remember what the name
7 was? Navy Radiological Defense Lab. Its primary job
8 was to try to find ways to defend the ships against a
9 nuclear attack, and that was their primary job. They
10 were not offensive in nature. They were defensive in
11 nature.

12 How do we decontaminate sailors? How do we
13 decontaminate ships? Can we survive? How do we build
14 our ships so that they can survive a nuclear test?

15 Remember, this was a brand-new science,
16 absolutely brand-new science.

17 MR. FONG: I think one of the most interesting
18 research that went on in NRDL in the early days was bone
19 marrow transplant. We take it quite commonly now, but
20 at that time it was found that radiation caused blood
21 picture changes and depletion of red blood cells, and of
22 course that's due to the depletion of the bone marrow.

23 And when the bone marrow gets down, there was
24 no way for the -- for an animal or a person to survive
25 that radiation damage until this lady -- her name was

1 Marguerite Swift, and she was the one that start working
2 on bone marrow transplant, taking good bone marrow from
3 one animal and move it to another. And today we have
4 bone marrow transplant. And that was back in 1945,
5 1950.

6 MR. MACH: Let me see if I can get us back on
7 track a little bit.

8 MR. FONG: Sorry.

9 MR. MACH: That's okay.

10 The focus of the RAB is the cleanup of Hunters
11 Point Shipyard. I think Barbara did a great job of
12 saying, you know, yeah, we know what happened in the
13 past, but let's go on with cleaning the thing up.

14 So, you know, Leuren, if you want more
15 information about all the thousands of research papers,
16 we're not going to get into that. We are not going to
17 get into it at the RAB.

18 If you want to bring it up in subcommittee, we
19 can provide you points of contact where you can follow
20 up on that. But that is not part of our job, to find
21 out what was there, and make sure we clean it up and get
22 on with the transfer of this property.

23 MR. TOMPKINS: Point of order.

24 MS. MORET: How do you know what was there if
25 you don't ask questions about why -- what was conducted

1 here?

2 MR. MACH: Ma'am, we --

3 MR. MORET: The research is where those answers
4 are.

5 MR. MACH: No. The -- the -- the research into
6 what was done in each of those buildings, what isotopes
7 were used, it doesn't matter how they used them, why
8 they used them. We just need to know what was used
9 there, and then we need to know whether or not we have
10 done the surveys to clean it up, and then get buyoff
11 from the state.

12 And if we have not, then we'll go and do
13 additional surveys, and we'll look for it. And if it's
14 not there, then we're done.

15 And why they did it, where that research went,
16 that is not our concern to get this place cleaned up.

17 MR. TOMPKINS: Point of order, Rich.

18 We have had discussion previously in terms of
19 statements and that. It is important that we know usage
20 or historical analysis of prospective or degree. That
21 is important that we do know where what was done so that
22 maybe outside of your property, for example, we may
23 understand why there may be, as I asked in the last
24 meeting, where were the two accelerators at? What was
25 the location? I asked for maps.

1 MR. MACH: We're going to get --

2 MR. TOMPKINS: It may be adjacent --

3 MR. MACH: We are going to get to that --

4 MR. TOMPKINS: But I said that's why that it's
5 important --

6 MR. MACH: -- if we can get moving on this.

7 MR. TOMPKINS: -- the significance. So don't
8 summarily dismiss when people ask historical
9 information. It is relevant in terms of how we approach
10 a cleanup to know what was done, what possibilities may
11 be there, so that we can do -- move in the most safest
12 and soundest method in terms of cleanup. So there's a
13 relationship. And please don't summarily dismiss --

14 MS. L. LOWMAN: I would like --

15 MR. TOMPKINS: It was interpreted as that. You
16 may not have meant it, but it came across --

17 MS. L. LOWMAN: (Interrupting.)

18 MS. PETERSON: Wait, wait, wait. We've got
19 these questions, and this is the second time. Can we
20 get through?

21 MR. MACH: Yes.

22 MS. L. LOWMAN: Yes. That's what I'm trying to
23 do, and I want to make a statement too.

24 There is a Historical Radiological Assessment
25 coming out. It will have three sections: It will have

1 a section on the Hunters Point Naval Shipyard; it will
2 have a section on NRDL, and it will also have a section
3 on OPERATION CROSSROADS and the ships that were brought
4 back from OPERATION CROSSROADS.

5 It is due for publication in draft form for
6 public comment in October. It will be a very extensive
7 document. There is unbelievable amount of research
8 being done across the country by multiple historians for
9 the documentation, and a lot of the historical questions
10 will be answered at that time. These are very large
11 documents. They're very comprehensive.

12 And hopefully, what we are going to do tonight
13 is get through the questions that have already been
14 posed by the RAB members. They have been submitted in
15 writing. And we ki- -- if we don't move on, we are not
16 going to have time to get through them.

17 MR. MACH: And all of the information that are
18 references for this document that are not classified --
19 and most of them are not -- are all being scanned, and
20 they will be put on CDs so that you will be able to look
21 at all the documents that -- that are references to the
22 HRA.

23 MS. L. LOWMAN: It will be on a Web site, and
24 they'll be available on CD.

25 MR. MACH: It may not be all the signed papers,

1 but they will talk about what was done in those
2 buildings.

3 MS. L. LOWMAN: Okay. And just like you need
4 to know what was done, we also at RASO need to know what
5 was done because that makes a difference on the approach
6 we take towards cleaning up a situation out there.

7 MR. R. LOWMAN: That -- As I told you before,
8 the information I've gotten from Mr. Fong in just a
9 couple of days is extremely important.

10 MS. L. LOWMAN: Okay.

11 MR. R. LOWMAN: So just leave it at that for
12 the moment.

13 MS. PETERSON: We need to move on.

14 MS. L. LOWMAN: Yes, we need to move on.

15 The second question was: Were scientists for
16 NRDL funded in any way by the Atomic Energy Commission
17 or DOE?

18 DOE didn't exist when NRDL was an active
19 command.

20 Now, Mr. Fong has already stated that there
21 were numerous other agencies that provided funding for
22 operations there. That's pretty standard in any
23 military group these days, and it was back then also.

24 Are there any other questions associated with
25 that question?

1 Okay. Let's move on to No. 3. "Did the NRDL
2 have a Kevatron particle accelerator in the Hunters
3 Point Navy Shipyard?" And "What was it used for?"

4 MS. PETERSON: And what is it?

5 MS. L. LOWMAN: Mr. Fong, you want to give a
6 very brief, brief brief, Mr. Fong?

7 MR. FONG: It's a machine in Building 816 that
8 generates what is called neutrons. There's one MeV
9 neutrons, and they are small, I mean small in the sense
10 of it's not a reactor. What we use it for is to
11 calibrate neutron instruments, which are used to measure
12 neutrons in various situations.

13 And they do some research with the neutron
14 generation for dosimetry purposes, to measure the amount
15 of neutron with different devices that -- they were
16 being designed and built at that time.

17 But it is not a reactor that you can get
18 billio- -- you know, thousands of neutrons coming up and
19 make things radioactive. That was not the reason. That
20 is not the type of --

21 MS. L. LOWMAN: That was the one in 816?

22 MR. FONG: 816, right.

23 MR. R. LOWMAN: The Van de --

24 MS. L. LOWMAN: Right.

25 MR. R. LOWMAN: The Van de Graaff was in 816.

1 The Cockcroft-Walton --

2 MS. L. LOWMAN: The Cock- --

3 MR. R. LOWMAN: -- was in 8- --

4 MS. L. LOWMAN: Cockcroft-Walton --

5 MR. R. LOWMAN: -- was in 629.

6 MS. L. LOWMAN: -- which is --

7 MR. R. LOWMAN: Or 529.

8 MS. L. LOWMAN: -- similar to a Kevatron, that

9 was in 529.

10 MR. FONG: And the other one was an x-ray

11 source to give --

12 MS. L. LOWMAN: It wasn't a source.

13 MR. FONG: -- gamma radiation.

14 MS. L. LOWMAN: It wasn't a source. It was

15 machine source.

16 MR. R. LOWMAN: On, off.

17 MS. L. LOWMAN: It was not a radioactive

18 source.

19 DR. SUMCHAI: So what exactly were -- what were

20 the exact number of nuclear accelerators that were at

21 the Shipyard as part of NDR- -- NRDL during its entire

22 course?

23 MR. R. LOWMAN: They're not --

24 MR. FONG: I can answer for NRDL. Zero. There

25 were no nuclear reactor at NRDL.

1 MR. TOMPKINS: No accelerator?
2 MR. MACH: Accelerator.
3 DR. SUMCHAI: Accelerator.
4 MR. FONG: Accelerator. Okay.
5 MR. BROWN: Right.
6 MS. L. LOWMAN: There was one Van de Graaff
7 that was operational.
8 MS. MORET: Would you let him answer the
9 question.
10 MR. FONG: Yes. One.
11 DR. SUMCHAI: Well, there were two, though. We
12 were talking about the 816.
13 MR. FONG: The other one was an x-ray machine.
14 MS. L. LOWMAN: It was the Cockcroft-Walton,
15 Mr. Fong.
16 DR. SUMCHAI: So it's true --
17 MS. L. LOWMAN: So it's never operational.
18 MR. FONG: No, no, no. The cyclotron was never
19 operational.
20 MS. L. LOWMAN: The cyclotron.
21 MR. FONG: Yeah.
22 MR. ATTENDEE: You guys --
23 DR. SUMCHAI: Okay. I'm confused. Operational
24 or nonoperational?
25 MR. FONG: One operational; one was not

1 operational.

2 DR. SUMCHAI: So three --

3 ATTENDEE: Operational.

4 DR. SUMCHAI: -- altogether?

5 MR. ATTENDEE: Three over there?

6 MR. ATTENDEE: Three.

7 MR. FONG: The cyclotron was never turned on --

8 DR. SUMCHAI: Okay.

9 MR. FONG: -- okay. So we are talking about

10 two.

11 MR. TOMPKINS: Two operational, one non.

12 MR. FONG: Okay. Yes.

13 MS. PETERSON: And what's the difference?

14 MR. FONG: One is the neutron instrument, okay?

15 One MeV had very low level.

16 MS. MORET: That was the Van de Graaff?

17 MR. FONG: And the Van de Graaff -- That's the

18 Van de Graaff --

19 MS. MORET: Right.

20 MR. FONG: -- right.

21 And the Cockcroft-Walton is an x-ray machine --

22 MS. MORET: Oh.

23 MR. FONG: -- essentially.

24 MS. L. LOWMAN: That would be the one similar

25 to the Kevatron.

1 MS. MORET: And what was the Kevatron?

2 MS. L. LOWMAN: There was no Kevatron.

3 MR. FONG: No Kevatron.

4 MR. R. LOWMAN: The Kevatron and the
5 Cockcroft-Walton are one and the same. They were
6 developed by a gentleman. And they were very low
7 energy, and you used them to bombard targets, create
8 neutrons.

9 MR. TOMPKINS: Okay.

10 MR. R. LOWMAN: The Van de Graaff is a two MeV,
11 and it was used to bombard targets to get neutrons for
12 the dosimetry and for the radiacs that they use so they
13 could calibrate those.

14 MR. TOMPKINS: Okay. I have a quick question.
15 Therefore, on the instruments that you --

16 MS. PETERSON: I think you can point.

17 MR. TOMPKINS: I'm a teacher. I can't help it.
18 I teach.

19 For clarity, therefore, for example, research
20 in particles, break -- separate the atoms, did you
21 do --?

22 MR. R. LOWMAN: No, sir. They --

23 MR. TOMPKINS: Were --?

24 MR. R. LOWMAN: No.

25 MR. TOMPKINS: What was done with --?

1 MR. R. LOWMAN: What they did is: They
2 bombarded a hydrogen three target. Hydrogen three is
3 radioactive hydrogen. It has an extra neutron in it.
4 They knock that neutron loose, and that's the neutron
5 they wanted to detect with the radiac and with the
6 neutron dosimetry. So that's what they were doing.

7 What they were doing is: After you hit the
8 hydrogen three and you knock the neutron loose, now you
9 have hydrogen two. That's heavy hydrogen, but that's
10 not radioactive hydrogen.

11 MS. MORET: See --

12 MS. L. LOWMAN: Okay. We have only got --

13 MS. MORET: -- tritium --

14 Was there tritium here?

15 MR. R. LOWMAN: Yeah.

16 MR. FONG: There was tritium use in
17 Building 816.

18 MS. L. LOWMAN: Hydrogen three is the same as
19 tritium.

20 MR. FONG: Yes, at the target --

21 MS. L. LOWMAN: We have --

22 MR. FONG: It's a target for the --

23 MS. L. LOWMAN: It is 7:30. I've got to move
24 on. We have only done three questions. Okay?

25 Question No. 4: "Was there a tie (between or

1 to) any of the following, NRDL, LBLL, LLNL, LLL," okay,
2 "Brookhaven, and Los Alamos?"

3 I think we have already determined that there
4 definitely was. We covered that topic.

5 Is there any other question?

6 MR. FONG: Can I ask, why was that question
7 asked?

8 MS. L. LOWMAN: No. No.

9 MR. MACH: No.

10 MS. L. LOWMAN: We don't have time to ask
11 questions here. All right.

12 MR. BROWN: I got a question. I have a
13 question.

14 MS. L. LOWMAN: Okay.

15 MR. BROWN: If the NRDL came into existence in
16 1946, how did the atomic bomb get on the U.S.S.
17 Indianapolis in 1945?

18 MR. R. LOWMAN: It was not going from NRDL. It
19 went to -- What they were doing was moving the atomic
20 bombs to Tinian where they were going to drop them on
21 the Japanese from. And so you have to move them on
22 something. They moved them on a Navy cruiser. The
23 U.S.S. --

24 MR. BROWN: From Hunters Point?

25 MR. R. LOWMAN: U.S. Indi- -- U.S.S.

1 Indianapolis, it was loaded at the Shipyard, and then it
2 sailed from here to Tinian Island.

3 At Tinian Island they -- they took the planes
4 out and dropped them. And then as you well know, the
5 U.S.S. Indianapolis was sunk by Japanese sub on the way
6 home.

7 MR. BROWN: Yeah.

8 MS. L. LOWMAN: Okay. Wait, wait, wait. We
9 got to move on in the questions. These are questions
10 that haven't been asked that can be submitted. We'll
11 come back and we'll answer questions some more. But
12 right now we have to go through the questions that have
13 already been submitted that the people have already
14 submitted in writing formally the way the question's
15 supposed to be submitted.

16 MR. MASON: Listen, can I -- can I say
17 something to you? We want you to understand that we
18 brought you here because we wanted to ask some of these
19 questions.

20 MS. L. LOWMAN: But I --

21 MR. MASON: Well, listen. Listen.

22 You guys seem to be controlling. We want to
23 make sure that we get the answers that we deserve, you
24 know.

25 MR. MACH: You know, Jesse, if the RAB wants to

1 just ask questions and we just throw these things to the
2 side --

3 MR. MASON: Well, Richard --

4 MR. MACH: -- I -- I'm fine --

5 MR. MASON: -- listen.

6 MR. MACH: -- I'm fine with that.

7 MR. MASON: Listen.

8 MR. MACH: But it went through the
9 subcommittee --

10 MR. MASON: Can I say --?

11 MR. MACH: -- and the sub- -- Jesse, please.

12 The subcommittee said this is how we want to do it.

13 MR. MASON: Well, that's all fine, Richard, but
14 you guys --

15 MR. MACH: And you were there.

16 MR. MASON: -- you guys seem to be giving
17 more -- more verbiage than -- than questions. We want
18 questions and answers.

19 So if you just go on with it, we will be fine
20 with it. But if you want to talk --

21 MR. MACH: That's what we're trying to do.

22 MR. MASON: -- let's talk.

23 MR. MACH: We're trying to go through it.

24 MS. L. LOWMAN: Question 5, "Did the N- --?"

25 MR. MACH: Go. You go. She, no.

1 MS. L. LOWMAN: What?

2 MS. PETERSON: I go, she no.

3 MS. L. LOWMAN: "Did the NRDL conduct Human
4 Radiological Experiments? Were any of the residents of
5 BVHP," which I assume is Bayview-Hunters Point, "used in
6 any of the Human Radiological Experiments? via air,
7 water, soil or in the surrounding community?"

8 We answered this one. And is there any
9 questions about the answer that we have provided?

10 MR. ATTENDEE: Well, what's the answer?

11 MS. PETERSON: What was the answer?

12 MS. L. LOWMAN: You want to hear the answer
13 too?

14 MR. TOMPKINS: Yes, please.

15 MS. L. LOWMAN: Okay.

16 Yes, NRDL did conduct human radiation
17 experiments under controlled conditions as
18 authorized by an Atomic Energy Commission
19 license in coordination with the Navy's Bureau
20 of Medicine and Surgery. Information on these
21 experiments may be obtained in a DOD report on
22 Search for Human Radiation Experiment Records,
23 1944 to 1994, Volume I, issued by the Assistant
24 to the Secretary of Defense.

25 And it also then goes into where the report can

1 be found.

2 Now, is that sufficient information, or do you
3 need additional information, or do you have questions
4 about that answer?

5 MS. SHIRLEY: I'd like to hear what Phil has to
6 say.

7 MS. L. LOWMAN: Wait. No. I need questions
8 'cause we have to go on. We can't just --

9 MS. SHIRLEY: I wasn't here.

10 MR. FONG: I think I have to answer the part
11 that you didn't answer.

12 MS. ATTENDEE: Okay. I --

13 MR. FONG: And the question --

14 MS. L. LOWMAN: Just a minute.

15 MR. FONG: -- that's implied, that Bayview
16 residents were used as --

17 MS. L. LOWMAN: Right.

18 MR. FONG: Were you going to answer that?

19 MS. L. LOWMAN: Right -- No, I'm not
20 answering.

21 MR. FONG: I want to -- yeah. I want to answer
22 that question.

23 Bayview residents were never involved in the
24 human experimentation. All the human experimentation
25 was done within the lab. They had -- they had forms to

1 complete. They have to sign the -- The volunteer has
2 to sign it. It has to be submitted to a committee for
3 review, and then it can go on. None of the residents of
4 Bayview was involved in this type of use of radioactive
5 material.

6 MR. BROWN: Miss -- Dr. Ahimsa.

7 MR. MACH: Okay. Ahimsa?

8 DR. SUMCHAI: Okay. I challenged this in the
9 Radiation Subcommittee. Your -- your answer here:
10 There is no indication that any of the Bay View
11 residents or --

12 MS. L. LOWMAN: We didn't get to that one yet.

13 DR. SUMCHAI: -- or the air, water, soil of the
14 surrounding community were directly involved in any
15 human research experience -- experiments.

16 However, under 10 you admit that there were
17 intentional releases of hazardous materials.

18 MS. L. LOWMAN: Well --

19 DR. SUMCHAI: And you don't have information,
20 specifically "An accounting of each release is not
21 available at this time." This is a contradiction here.

22 If you released hazardous radioactive materials
23 into the air, water, or soil and you admit it, then the
24 people of this community were affected. You had
25 dropped -- We had dropped two bombs.

1 MS. L. LOWMAN: Ex- --

2 DR. SUMCHAI: You know, we knew that this was
3 hazardous, you know, material. So --

4 MR. FONG: The bomb and the fission product
5 that resulted from the bomb is much different than the
6 amount of radioactive we were using in the laboratory,
7 just as much as the cobalt for using -- for cancer
8 therapy is different than the amount of radioactive
9 material that's used in the nuclear medicine pharmacy.

10 DR. SUMCHAI: But I'm not arguing that it was
11 damaging. I'm arguing that there were intentional
12 releases to the air and the environment of this
13 community, and you admit that they are, and you further
14 say that you can't account --

15 MS. L. LOWMAN: Dr. --

16 DR. SUMCHAI: -- for these releases --

17 MS. L. LOWMAN: -- Sumchai --

18 DR. SUMCHAI: -- so you don't --

19 MS. L. LOWMAN: Dr. --

20 DR. SUMCHAI: -- have --

21 MS. L. LOWMAN: -- Sumchai --

22 DR. SUMCHAI: -- the specific information.

23 MS. L. LOWMAN: -- Mr. Fong did not prepare
24 those answers. I prepared those answers.

25 DR. SUMCHAI: I know, but you're allowing him

1 to answer.

2 MS. L. LOWMAN: No, I'm not allowing him to
3 answer for me. I'm allowing him to provide ap- --
4 amplifying information.

5 MR. R. LOWMAN: Could I answer on the -- on
6 that question that you've asked, Doctor?

7 DR. SUMCHAI: Sure.

8 MS. L. LOWMAN: Let's go through --

9 MR. MASON: Let him finish. Let him finish.
10 Let him finish the question.

11 DR. SUMCHAI: No. This is an important
12 issue --

13 MR. R. LOWMAN: I can do this --

14 DR. SUMCHAI: -- okay?

15 MR. R. LOWMAN: I can do this in 30 seconds.

16 DR. SUMCHAI: Now, let's not skirt around it.

17 MR. R. LOWMAN: I can do this in 30 seconds.

18 DR. SUMCHAI: This is an important issue.

19 MR. R. LOWMAN: We wanted to make sure we did
20 not give you a bad answer. We wanted to make sure that
21 we did not give you an incomplete answer where you would
22 find some information that it was wrong, so we assumed
23 because of some of the things we know back in the 1940s
24 when they brought the ships back here.

25 We do know that as they decontaminated some of

1 the nontarget ships, that the evaporators had some
2 contamination in them with the fission products. They
3 used a low-level acid to clean it. This is -- They
4 were trying to find the best ways to clean these. They
5 used a low-level acid.

6 At some point they -- they disposed of the
7 sandblast grit in the Farallones or at sea. They did
8 not dispose of the low-level acid there. They dumped
9 the low-level acid into the bay in -- in a manner of
10 dilution.

11 So if I told you there was never any
12 releases --

13 DR. SUMCHAI: Right.

14 MR. R. LOWMAN: -- intentional releases, and
15 then you turned around and said "Wait a minute, Dick,
16 you're wrong, because you guys --" you know, "there's
17 records there that you --"

18 DR. SUMCHAI: Sure.

19 MR. R. LOWMAN: "-- dumped this stuff into the
20 bay," then you could call me a liar. So I'm not going
21 to let you call me a liar. That's why that answer is
22 worded that way, ma'am.

23 DR. SUMCHAI: Okay. So when -- my point is
24 that you can't say . . .

25 MR. MACH: They were not done as human

1 experiments.

2 MR. ATTENDEE: They were not part of --

3 DR. SUMCHAI: Right.

4 MR. ATTENDEE: -- human experiments.

5 MR. R. LOWMAN: Yes.

6 MR. TOMPKINS: But there were --

7 MR. MACH: There -- there were medical research

8 done that were medic- -- that were human experiments.

9 There were releases done that were not human

10 experiments. Now, did they affect people? Potentially.

11 But --

12 MS. L. LOWMAN: At the time --

13 MR. MACH: -- I -- I mean, if you're trying to

14 set us up and you -- all you want to do is --

15 MS. MORET: No.

16 MR. MACH: -- argue here --

17 MS. MORET: I'd like to --

18 MR. MACH: -- then -- then --

19 MS. MORET: -- there isn't a single facility --

20 MR. MACH: Excuse me. I am the facilitator.

21 MS. MORET: -- where they did radiation --

22 MR. MACH: Excuse me. Ma'am, you're not a RAB

23 member.

24 MS. MORET: -- where the communities that were

25 not exposed. Every single facility in the United States

1 where they were doing radiation experiments, communities
2 were deliberately exposed without their knowledge and
3 without their consent.

4 MR. ATTENDEE: That's right.

5 MS. L. LOWMAN: I have found --

6 MS. MORET: And that happened here too.

7 MR. R. LOWMAN: No, ma'am, it didn't.

8 MS. MORET: It did.

9 MR. R. LOWMAN: It did not.

10 MS. L. LOWMAN: I would like to go on --

11 MR. ATTENDEE: Of course it happened.

12 MR. MASON: Can I ask a question?

13 MS. L. LOWMAN: -- to question No. 6.

14 MR. ATTENDEE: Ask a question.

15 MR. MASON: Can I ask a question? Because
16 we're talking about human experiments, aren't we? Can
17 I -- can I ask a question?

18 MR. MACH: Go ahead, Jesse.

19 MR. MASON: In -- in -- in your human
20 experiments, you know, I had a conversation with a
21 gentleman -- I think it was about a week ago -- and he
22 was talking about Vacaville, Vacaville, the prisons, and
23 that --

24 MR. FONG: Vacaville?

25 MR. MASON: Vacaville.

1 MR. TOMPKINS: Vacaville. It's a state prison.

2 MR. FONG: Mental --

3 MR. MASON: Mental --

4 MS. ATTENDEE: Yeah.

5 MR. MASON: -- and --

6 MR. TOMPKINS: It's a state prison.

7 MR. MASON: -- and a penitentiary system --

8 MR. ATTENDEE: Right.

9 MR. MASON: -- that there was some human
10 experiments that were going on that was involved with
11 the correctional facilities, you know.

12 And when you say there were no people from
13 Bayview-Hunters Point, how do you know anybody that you
14 were experimenting human -- you know, human experiments
15 were not from Bayview-Hunters Point? We had quite a few
16 people that were in the penitentiary system during that
17 time.

18 MR. JOB: Can I share something?

19 MR. R. LOWMAN: NRDL did not do experiments in
20 the prison system. NRDL was allowed to do certain
21 experiments. They did it with their own staff
22 members --

23 MR. FONG: That's right.

24 MR. R. LOWMAN: -- at Building 815. They did
25 other ones at Camp Parks. But that wasn't human

1 experiments. But they did them at Stoneman, Camp
2 Stoneman in Pittsburg, California. And they were Army
3 personnel that they did that with.

4 MR. ATTENDEE: Right.

5 MR. R. LOWMAN: But they were not done here at
6 NRDL.

7 MS. L. LOWMAN: I need to keep --

8 MR. MACH: Okay, okay.

9 MS. L. LOWMAN: -- going.

10 MR. MACH: We're -- we're mo- -- we're moving
11 on.

12 Next question, please.

13 MS. L. LOWMAN: Next question: "When did the
14 NRDL stop Human Radiological Experiments? Or have
15 they?"

16 NRDL doesn't exist anymore, so the second part
17 of that is -- there's no answer to.

18 The answer was: "Records located to date,
19 indicate that human radiological experiments were
20 concluded in 1963." Okay?

21 Is there any other questions related to when
22 human radiological experiments stopped?

23 Okay. Let's go on -- oh, I'm sorry.

24 MS. ATTENDEE: Real quick, no.

25 If -- Are you saying since the NRDL was not in

1 existence, were you saying that last date was?

2 MS. L. LOWMAN: It says, "Or have they?" In
3 other words --

4 MS. ATTENDEE: Okay.

5 MS. L. LOWMAN: -- "or have the experiments
6 stopped?"

7 Well, NRDL was disestablished in 1970.

8 MS. ATTENDEE: Okay. Do --?

9 MS. L. LOWMAN: So it -- it doesn't exist
10 anymore.

11 MS. ATTENDEE: Okay. Do you know if any other
12 agency was still doing human experiments?

13 MS. L. LOWMAN: Not that I am aware of having
14 to do with Hunters Point.

15 MS. ATTENDEE: Okay.

16 MR. R. LOWMAN: There were other agencies doing
17 experiments.

18 MS. ATTENDEE: Right, right.

19 MS. L. LOWMAN: There were other agencies.

20 MR. R. LOWMAN: If you look at the president's
21 commission report, there were other agencies on into the
22 '70s doing that.

23 MS. ATTENDEE: Well, do you know --

24 MS. L. LOWMAN: Okay.

25 MS. ATTENDEE: -- in that sense of but not

1 still --?

2 MS. L. LOWMAN: Not at --

3 MR. MACH: Not at Hunters Point.

4 MS. L. LOWMAN: Not at Hunters Point.

5 Question No. 7: If the NRDL was not part of
6 the Hunters Point Naval Shipyard command structure, who
7 were they reporting to? Is the Navy responsible for
8 NRDL actions and waste contamination at the Hunters
9 Point Naval Shipyard?

10 Answer: The original NRDL was structured
11 as a department of the San Francisco Naval
12 Shipyard in 1946. In these earlier years,
13 NRDL's direction came from the Bureau of Ships
14 and the Bureau of Medicine and Surgery who
15 answered to the Chief of Naval Operations. In
16 1951, NRDL became a separate command that
17 reported to the Bureau of Ships and received
18 additional direction from the Bureau of
19 Medicine and Surgery. Navy was and is
20 responsible for NRDL actions and residual
21 contamination at the former Hunters Point Naval
22 Shipyard.

23 Is there any other question having to do with
24 this? Nothing?

25 Okay. Let's go on to Question No. 8: "If the

1 NRDL was not under the command of Hunters Point Naval
2 Shipyard, Whose command did the NRDL report to?" And
3 who they were -- "Who were they funded by?"

4 Again, we covered the command structure in the
5 previous question, and the funding came from Navy
6 sources and also --

7 MR. BROWN: Taxpayers.

8 MS. L. LOWMAN: -- from other commands that we
9 covered earlier in one of the earlier questions.

10 Is there any additional questions on this?

11 Okay. Let's go on to Question No. 9: "Does
12 the Navy know where all NRDL radiological sites and
13 waste, et cetera, are?"

14 The answer was: The Navy has conducted
15 extensive historical research and radiological
16 surveys and sampling to identify sites where
17 NRDL used radioactive materials or processed
18 and packaged radioactive waste. The assessment
19 of residual contamination --

20 Just a minute.

21 MR. BROWN: I'm --

22 MS. L. LOWMAN: -- from past operations is an
23 ongoing effort. In addition, the Navy and
24 other federal agencies have extensive archives
25 on the radiological research conducted by NRDL

1 and assessment of these archives is continuing.
2 Archival research and past radiological surveys
3 and sampling results will be in the HRA.

4 Okay. Questions on this one?

5 MR. MACH: Lynne.

6 MR. BROWN: Did July 6th fire burn over any
7 radiological sources?

8 MR. MACH: That is on the next page of
9 questions when we get there.

10 MS. L. LOWMAN: Okay. I --

11 MR. MACH: Ray?

12 MR. TOMPKINS: From a historical standpoint,
13 previously in your earlier presentation on -- I'm sorry.
14 I'm pointing.

15 MS. L. LOWMAN: That's all right. I
16 understand. Use a pen if you want to.

17 MR. TOMPKINS: It's in my hand.

18 Question: In previous -- One of my other
19 colleagues, who is not present, from hazardous waste, we
20 were concerned when you were giving a discussion about
21 facilities being torn down to be moved during this
22 period of time prior to. Do you have any historical
23 information, which we were kind of -- we were puzzled,
24 as to how the buildings and how it was transported
25 through the community?

1 MS. L. LOWMAN: On how it was transported
2 through the --

3 MR. TOMPKINS: Mm-hmm.

4 MS. L. LOWMAN: -- community?

5 MR. TOMPKINS: I mean, it was just in your
6 statement. You previously stated these facilities which
7 were found to be contaminated or torn down or destroyed;
8 these buildings don't exist, we then -- but we didn't
9 have time or opportunity to ask the questions. How were
10 they removed and carried? Could you at a later date
11 please provide us --

12 MS. L. LOWMAN: I will --

13 MR. TOMPKINS: -- on how or --

14 MS. L. LOWMAN: -- have to do research on that.

15 MR. TOMPKINS: -- research how do they dispose
16 of these contaminated buildings?

17 MS. L. LOWMAN: Uh-huh.

18 MR. TOMPKINS: Thank you.

19 MR. MACH: But -- and part of what the HRA is
20 going to do is: It's going look at all the surveys that
21 were done to clear these different buildings, whether we
22 have those records. Hopefully get, you know, DHS to buy
23 off on the ones that are clean, recommend additional
24 surveys whether they're not or if they're just
25 foundations.

1 And if we find the records on the transport, we
2 will put them in there, but those may not be in the same
3 locations.

4 MR. TOMPKINS: From a risk assessment, do you
5 understand why we would be concerned --

6 MS. L. LOWMAN: Right. No.

7 MR. TOMPKINS: -- in terms of --

8 MS. L. LOWMAN: Makes perfect sense.

9 MR. TOMPKINS: -- exposure to population?

10 MS. L. LOWMAN: Perfect sense.

11 MR. MACH: Dorothy?

12 MS. PETERSON: At the open house public
13 meeting, can we get more detailed information?

14 MR. MASON: Can't hear you. Can't hear you.

15 MS. PETERSON: At the open house public -- the
16 public open house meeting, can we get more detailed
17 information on these questions and in par- -- in
18 particular the --?

19 MS. L. LOWMAN: When we do the open house, it's
20 my understanding we are going to have --

21 MR. MACH: Well, assuming the open house is
22 done in lieu of the September RAB meeting, which would
23 then be the 27th of September, with the HRA being in
24 draft form being due October 1st, we should have, you
25 know, a good amount of information that the subcommittee

1 can focus us or, I guess, between the subcommittee for
2 putting the whole thing together and the Radiological
3 Subcommittee --

4 MS. PETERSON: And risk assessment.

5 MR. MACH: Right. If you guys can focus what
6 you want to see, we can make sure that that is provided
7 and available.

8 MS. AGUIRRE: Have the questions been finished
9 yet?

10 MS. ATTENDEE: No.

11 MR. TOMPKINS: No.

12 MR. MACH: No.

13 MR. TOMPKINS: No. Oh, no.

14 MS. AGUIRRE: Then --

15 MR. MACH: We're on --

16 MS. AGUIRRE: Then what's this?

17 MS. ATTENDEE: No.

18 MS. AGUIRRE: I'm confused.

19 MS. L. LOWMAN: Yes.

20 MS. PETERSON: Because everybody wants to ask
21 more questions.

22 MS. L. LOWMAN: Question No. 10: "Have there
23 been any intentional releases of hazardous substances?"
24 If so, please list dates, places, and times of these
25 releases along with the substances enumerated, also for

1 accidental releases.

2 Answer was -- is: Controlled releases of
3 radioactive materials were conducted at NRDL in
4 accordance with the regulatory guidance in
5 effect at the time of release. An accounting
6 of each release is not available at this time.
7 Archival research is continuing This
8 will be put in the HRA.

9 Now, one of the things that they did, we talked
10 about the release -- Dick did -- about the release with
11 the ships associated with OPERATION CROSSROADS.

12 The Atomic Energy Commission, when they issued
13 the licenses, did authorize certain releases into the
14 sanitary sewer system. It's authorized on licenses
15 today. It depends on what the isotope is.

16 We may have it and decay it in storage until
17 it's at a certain strength and then dilute it and
18 release it into sanitary sewer systems. There is some
19 indication of that in the license records.

20 Those are the types of things when I answered
21 this question and I said "controlled releases" was there
22 were purposeful releases of radioactive material per the
23 license authority at the time or per the guidance at the
24 time from the Atomic Energy Commission or whatever
25 regulatory agency was overseeing the experiment.

1 Yes.

2 MR. TOMPKINS: Now --

3 MS. L. LOWMAN: There's no pen in your hand.

4 MR. TOMPKINS: Yes, no. It's on the table.

5 MS. L. LOWMAN: Okay.

6 MR. TOMPKINS: But concisely, as you very
7 close -- very closely word it -- and that was a question
8 I wanted to ask previously -- given the standards at
9 that time of the release, would you be allowed to
10 release that today, given the standards that are in
11 place today?

12 MS. L. LOWMAN: I --

13 MR. TOMPKINS: Given historical data what
14 wasn't known and what is known now, would you be allowed
15 to do that today?

16 MS. L. LOWMAN: It would depend on the isotope.
17 It would depend on the experiment. It would depend on a
18 whole lot of different things. NRDL we use so many
19 different radioisotopes that there is no one specific
20 standard.

21 MR. R. LOWMAN: Only certain ones were allowed
22 to be --

23 MS. L. LOWMAN: Only --

24 MR. R. LOWMAN: -- released.

25 MS. L. LOWMAN: Only certain ones were allowed

1 to be released. That program and that science was in
2 its infancy --

3 MR. TOMPKINS: That's what I'm --

4 MS. L. LOWMAN: -- back then.

5 MR. TOMPKINS: That's what I'm understanding.

6 MS. L. LOWMAN: It's very possible --

7 MR. TOMPKINS: Understand the limited -- but
8 what I'm going from --

9 MS. L. LOWMAN: Right.

10 MR. TOMPKINS: -- a risk assessment, given the
11 limited knowledge of then and understanding what we know
12 today in terms of human effect or disease or low-level
13 accumulative effects in terms of exposure, not
14 high-dose --

15 MS. L. LOWMAN: Right.

16 MR. TOMPKINS: -- but that -- is there a
17 possibility of risk? Would we be allowed to do
18 something like that today, given the knowledge that we
19 know today?

20 Just like if I was -- if I could turn back the
21 hands of time when I was a kid; and if I could keep what
22 I know now, I wouldn't have done a lot of things. Is
23 this the same situation?

24 MR. R. LOWMAN: You may be right.

25 MS. L. LOWMAN: You may be right. Absolutely.

1 MR. FONG: Can I try to answer your question?
2 In a non-Navy way, this is what I know of NRDL. NRDL
3 has two great big hole-up tanks for water. I'm going to
4 be concentrating on water here.

5 They have two big tanks in the back of the
6 building, of Building 815, and what they do is that this
7 line is separated from the sewage. This is not the
8 sanitary sewage line but -- but the lines that comes out
9 of all the laboratories in that building. It is -- it
10 is put into this tank.

11 And the tank fills up in about two days. And
12 then they would have to switch to the other tank and
13 fill up that in two days. It was part of the health
14 physics division every day to run analysis on one of the
15 tanks, the one that is being filled. And that has to be
16 analyzed for the amount of radioactivity and the
17 concentration.

18 And if it's permissible, under the guidance of
19 10 CFR 20 -- 10 CFR 20 is the Code of Federal
20 Regulations that was authorized by the Nuclear
21 Regulatory Commission and now at that time was the
22 Atomic Energy Commission.

23 Anyway, it has to be under a certain
24 concentration; and if it does meet the requirement, then
25 it is released into the sanitary sewer to be released

1 out to the city of San Francisco for disposal. Okay?

2 MR. TOMPKINS: Was that --? That wasn't a
3 line -- You dropped your pen.

4 MR. FONG: Yeah, I can't talk without the pen,
5 yes.

6 MR. TOMPKINS: Then is that the line --? For
7 example, that when we have the accidental spill into the
8 bay, was that the same line?

9 MR. MACH: No.

10 MR. FONG: No. You're talking about --

11 MR. TOMPKINS: Okay.

12 MR. FONG: -- before NRDL was even built.

13 MR. MACH: That was a storm line.

14 MS. L. LOWMAN: No. I'm talking about some
15 other facilities besides --

16 MR. FONG: You -- you asked about the risk
17 analysis. The concentration that's shown in 10 CFR 20
18 has hardly changed. It went from one or two or three
19 different isotopes that went up or down as the -- as the
20 evaluation of the hazard. But if you look at that list,
21 that's essentially the list that we went by.

22 MS. L. LOWMAN: Mr. Fong --

23 MR. FONG: And that's essentially back at that
24 time.

25 MS. L. LOWMAN: -- thank you, but we got to

1 keep going.

2 MS. OLIVA: I just want to know --

3 MS. L. LOWMAN: Okay.

4 MS. OLIVA: -- if the City of San Francisco was
5 alerted to the fact that this was being released into
6 the sewer system.

7 MR. FONG: Yes, and it's permissible. It's
8 allowable.

9 MS. OLIVA: It is documented somewhere that the
10 city --

11 MS. L. LOWMAN: Yes.

12 MS. OLIVA: -- was --?

13 About how much records available?

14 MR. FONG: I don't know was there a particular
15 letter necessarily written to the City of San Francisco,
16 but the City of San Francisco started analyzing their
17 sewage as part of their interest in finding out what's
18 being released.

19 MS. OLIVA: Well, how would I find out that
20 information?

21 MR. FONG: You can check with the City of San
22 Francisco. I can't answer that.

23 MR. MACH: Department of Public Works.

24 MR. FONG: And remember, hospital released a
25 lot more things out of their sewer than we do.

1 MS. L. LOWMAN: Yeah, but we're not -- we're
2 not talking about hospitals.

3 MR. MACH: Okay.

4 DR. SUMCHAI: I just want to make a quick
5 comment that you all have stated in print that there --
6 an accounting of each release is not available at this
7 time. So I don't think that you probably have the
8 expertise or the license at this point to say with
9 assuredness, you know, make some of the comments that
10 you're making.

11 MS. L. LOWMAN: Okay.

12 MR. MACH: Thank you.

13 Okay. Next.

14 MS. L. LOWMAN: Okay. Question 11: "Were
15 there any releases of radiation into the air, water,
16 sewage septum, soil?"

17 And the answer we provided was: "Yes, see the
18 above answer." It's the same answer as we gave
19 previously.

20 Yes?

21 MR. TOMPKINS: Point of clarification. If it
22 went into the line, okay, and -- to the San Francisco
23 sewer line and it was, like -- have you ever been out
24 here?

25 MS. L. LOWMAN: Mm-hmm.

1 MR. TOMPKINS: You could definitely smell when
2 they release. Is it a possibility with the gas being
3 released from the sewer plant that radioactive material
4 at acceptable levels were released?

5 MS. L. LOWMAN: At the sewage plant?

6 MR. TOMPKINS: Right, San Francisco. If the
7 sewage -- please -- clar- -- make -- clarify. As I
8 understand it --

9 MS. L. LOWMAN: Wait, wait, wait.

10 MR. MACH: I can -- I can -- I can answer that.

11 MR. TOMPKINS: -- radioactive material was
12 released into the sewage --

13 MR. JOB: And maybe even I would be the --

14 MR. MACH: I can answer that.

15 MR. JOB: -- I'm a sewage kind of guy.

16 MS. ATTENDEE: Everybody has --

17 MR. JOB: The -- the smelly stuff -- the smelly
18 stuff is --

19 MR. TOMPKINS: Methane.

20 MR. JOB: -- is methane --

21 MR. TOMPKINS: Right.

22 MR. JOB: -- and hydrogen sulfide. And the
23 radioactive materials are going to be much heavier in
24 general, things like -- you know, like cesium, like they
25 were talking about, things like that.

1 So, you know, I think that, you know, I still
2 feel like if there was a -- an impact, that it is --
3 it's probably being -- you know, it was probably felt
4 baywide by people consuming fish.

5 You know, I -- you know, I consistently, you
6 know, hear a lot of people very concerned about --
7 about, you know, ongoing impacts from the Shipyard.
8 I'll tell you, my opinion is that the majority of the
9 risk posed by this site is posed by bioaccumulation of
10 contaminants from offshore sediments, things like PCB
11 and things like that. And, you know, that's a real
12 ongoing impact.

13 I'm not saying the Navy doesn't need to clean
14 up; but, you know, if you're worried about your health,
15 I mean, it's the fish that are really the deal.

16 MR. MASON: And that was one of the points that
17 I -- that -- that was one of the points that I wanted to
18 make, because with those releases and -- and the
19 analysis of the fish during that time, I'm pretty sure
20 they were probably just as contaminated as they are
21 today, probably even more so. So there should have been
22 some kind of --

23 MS. FOX: We can't talk about "shoulds."

24 MR. MACH: Okay. Wait. I can actually answer
25 the question --

1 MS. PETERSON: Okay.

2 MR. MACH: -- that -- that was asked -- that
3 was asked. And that is, the city actually was
4 concerned.

5 And those of you who are on the emergency
6 response community notification distribution list got an
7 e-mail from me a couple of days ago that talked about
8 the ground-water sampling and the -- and the sanitary
9 sewer sampling that was done for radiation within our
10 sanitary sewer system right now because we do extract
11 ground water from behind the sea wall by the landfill
12 where there is -- which is in close proximity to where
13 the radium dial disposal area is.

14 So the City Department of Public Works, who
15 accepts our water that we pump out of the ground because
16 we have a permit to discharge it into the sanitary
17 sewer, took samples of the water within the lines. And
18 they ran their analysis, and they provided that
19 information to the EPA.

20 And EPA reviewed it, and they said that they
21 were not concerned about the levels. It does meet the
22 discharge requirements and that what the -- the low
23 levels that are being detected look like they are
24 naturally occurring from potassium, which comes from
25 seawater, 'cause half of our seawater is -- half of our

1 ground water is from seawater intrusion.

2 And I believe if we double-check where these
3 samples were taken, one of them that run along Crisp
4 Ave., I think, is down gradient of where the
5 815 building is. So we can verify that, and then you'll
6 know what -- what was the worst case, which was right at
7 the source that came out of 815. So let us look into
8 that.

9 MR. TOMPKINS: Rich, I just understood we were
10 chitchatting a comment that requirement for monitoring
11 the radiation wasn't required; the city didn't practice
12 it until '74. So therefore, prior the NRDL was act --
13 didn't cease activity until '63. Therefore, there was
14 no monitoring for that.

15 MR. MACH: Well, Ray, if it's not there now,
16 what's your concern?

17 MR. TOMPKINS: Pardon?

18 MR. MACH: If it's not there now, what's your
19 concern?

20 MR. RATCLIFF: Says who?

21 MR. MACH: Says --

22 MR. TOMPKINS: No, no, no, no, no, no. Please,
23 don't go with me there on it. It's just that
24 historical -- If it was released; if it wasn't
25 monitored for, the possibility is there? That's what

1 I'm putting forth onto.

2 MR. MACH: And we've already said that we have
3 a permit to discharge. So if we monitor now and it's
4 not there, what's your concern?

5 MS. L. LOWMAN: Okay. We need to go on.

6 MS. MORET: No. I'm -- I'd like to make a
7 correction.

8 MS. L. LOWMAN: We need to go on.

9 MS. MORET: One tenth micron-size particles of
10 any material are airborne until they are rained out.
11 Any radiation that was ever here and that is still in
12 the environment and it's still here is still exposing
13 this community.

14 MS. L. LOWMAN: Thank you.

15 MR. MACH: Thanks.

16 MR. R. LOWMAN: Thank you very much.

17 MS. L. LOWMAN: We need to go on.

18 Question No. 12: Were any animals used at
19 various atomic sites brought back to NRDL at Hunters
20 Point Naval Shipyard?

21 Answer: One of the NRDL main missions was
22 to investigate the effect of radiation on
23 animals. Animals were used in research
24 projects at various locations and brought back
25 to NRDL for further analysis and we'll provide

1 additional information in the HRA.

2 There were animals on the ships at CROSSROADS
3 that were left on the ships, and the ships were brought
4 back. There were other animals that were used in
5 various research activities, and they were brought here
6 to study the effects of radiation on those animals.

7 Are there any questions to do with that?

8 Yes?

9 MS. ATTENDEE: Where was the disposal of these
10 animals?

11 MS. L. LOWMAN: That's the next question.
12 You're rolling -- You're right on target.

13 "What happened to the animals that were used in
14 the NRDL radiation experiments?" Were they buried at
15 Hunters Point Naval Shipyard?

16 Everything we had found indicates -- and the
17 answer is: "Documentation indicates animals were
18 packaged in either drums or large casks and disposed of
19 at sea or packaged and sent to a commercial licensed
20 radioactive disposal facility."

21 Yes?

22 MS. ASHER: You -- But Parcel E has never been
23 investigated. We have no idea if there are any of those
24 animal remains in Parcel E. So I don't see how you can
25 answer that question in that way.

1 MR. R. LOWMAN: Could I -- could I answer?

2 MS. L. LOWMAN: No.

3 MR. R. LOWMAN: Real quick?

4 MS. L. LOWMAN: Okay.

5 MR. R. LOWMAN: I'll make it quick.

6 She always tells me I'm supposed to only answer

7 yes-or-no questions.

8 MS. L. LOWMAN: He talks too much.

9 MR. R. LOWMAN: I'm sorry. But this is a

10 really --

11 You have a very good question, and --

12 MS. ASHER: Yes, I do.

13 MR. R. LOWMAN: -- and -- and you deserve an

14 answer.

15 And the answer is: The NRC license that

16 allowed them to do these things told them how they would

17 dispose of stuff. And there are volumes of records.

18 You don't have them in your hands. They will be made

19 available to you on these disks and on these Web sites.

20 You don't have it yet. But there are volumes that --

21 that discuss how the animals and how all of the waste

22 went out of there and that it did go to the Farallones.

23 And you can either believe me or not, and I

24 know a lot of people won't believe me. But this is the

25 truth. This is documented.

1 MS. L. LOWMAN: There are --

2 MR. R. LOWMAN: It is documented.

3 MS. L. LOWMAN: There are actual --

4 MR. R. LOWMAN: Mr. Fong could tell you the
5 same thing.

6 MS. L. LOWMAN: -- procedures in the manuals
7 that show how the animals were packaged, what the casks
8 looked like, how they were loaded onto the ships,
9 everything. So --

10 MR. RATCLIFF: Not in the landfill?

11 MS. L. LOWMAN: They -- I have found no
12 indication, and I would tell you if I have, but I have
13 no indication they were put in the Parcel E landfill.

14 I need to move on.

15 MR. MACH: Okay. As the facilitator, it is
16 three minutes to 8:00. I'm going to let her finish for
17 three more minutes, because I started five minutes late.
18 The last five minutes we're going to talk about setting
19 the agenda for next month's meeting.

20 MS. ASHER: No. You have to finish this,
21 Richard.

22 MR. MACH: No, we're not.

23 MS. ASHER: We don't have --

24 MR. MACH: No, we're not.

25 MS. ASHER: -- a facilitator here.

1 MR. MACH: You need to know --

2 MS. ASHER: No, Richard.

3 MR. MACH: You are not a RAB member, and the
4 RAB has said --

5 MS. ASHER: I am a concerned community member,
6 and I want you to finish answering these questions. We
7 deserve that. You are not being fair. You don't have
8 another moderator here. You are running the meeting.
9 You're not letting us ask the questions. You deserve --
10 We deserve an answer to the rest of those questions.

11 MR. RATCLIFF: PR job going on.

12 MR. MACH: Okay. You got three minutes.

13 MS. L. LOWMAN: Question 14: --

14 MS. ASHER: Are you just ignoring what I just
15 said? I'm going to take up the next three minutes if
16 that's what it takes. I think we deserve an answer.

17 MS. PETERSON: If you take up the next three
18 minutes, how will we get the questions answered?

19 MS. ASHER: Well, it just --

20 MR. ATTENDEE: I think the rest of us in this
21 room have a choice --

22 MS. ASHER: -- shows your total disrespect for
23 our process.

24 MR. MASON: I think as a RAB member I think
25 that we deserve to get those ans- -- those questions

1 answered. So --

2 MR. R. LOWMAN: I'm happy to stay here and
3 answer those questions.

4 MR. MACH: No, no. Wait.

5 MR. MASON: I think we deserve to get those
6 questions answered.

7 MR. MACH: Go ahead, Dorothy.

8 MS. PETERSON: Okay. We need some order. The
9 RAB has said we want to stick to the agenda. He's only
10 doing what we have said.

11 Now, we need to let her finish.

12 MS. ASHER: Yeah, let's let her finish.

13 MR. ATTENDEE: Hear, hear.

14 MR. RATCLIFF: Well, the RAB can vote -- do
15 what they want.

16 MS. ATTENDEE: No, no, no, no.

17 MR. RATCLIFF: And I mean, it's simple.

18 MS. PETERSON: We've already --

19 MR. RATCLIFF: Do it again.

20 MS. PETERSON: -- said we want to stick to the
21 agenda.

22 MR. MASON: We're not going --

23 MR. TOMPKINS: I'd like to --

24 MR. MANUEL: Richard, you're the moderator.

25 MR. TOMPKINS: -- ask a question.

1 MR. MANUEL: You control the proceedings.

2 MR. RATCLIFF: You want to stay, then, you have
3 to stay.

4 MR. MANUEL: Have it your way. I think that's
5 the only right thing to is -- This meeting is being
6 disrupted --

7 MS. ATTENDEE: The RAB controls this meeting.

8 MR. MANUEL: -- and I think that, you know,
9 it's -- if you don't like what's going on here -- I
10 mean, he's only filling in for a guy --

11 MR. MASON: Wait a minute.

12 MR. MANUEL: -- who's had an accident.

13 MR. MASON: This is --

14 MR. MANUEL: It's not fair to Richard to keep
15 dogging him.

16 MR. MASON: We're RAB members, and we'd like to
17 have those questions answered. So --

18 MR. TOMPKINS: Time at this meeting.

19 MR. DACUS: Do we have agenda?

20 MR. MANUEL: Keep moving, Richard.

21 MR. MASON: Do I make a motion to get those
22 questions answered?

23 DR. SUMCHAI: Second, third.

24 MR. MASON: Could I make a motion?

25 MS. WASHINGTON: Second.

1 ATTENDEE: We have a third.

2 MR. DACUS: Eight o'clock is our adjourning,
3 okay?

4 MR. MACH: Exactly.

5 MR. DACUS: Let's stick to the agenda, please.

6 MR. MACH: Okay. Okay. You have one more
7 minute.

8 MR. BROWN: But he was late.

9 DR. SUMCHAI: There was a motion.

10 MS. PETERSON: But he said he would compensate
11 for it.

12 MR. RATCLIFF: Need a second.

13 MS. PETERSON: He said he was going to
14 compensate for being late.

15 DR. SUMCHAI: Miss Washington had seconded it.

16 MR. TOMPKINS: Point of order.

17 DR. SUMCHAI: There was a motion.

18 MR. TOMPKINS: Can we entertain a motion --
19 point of order here -- for an extension of the meeting
20 so that we can address these issues? Because people
21 have been almost two or three months --

22 MR. TOMASZKIEWICZ: There's only five
23 questions.

24 MR. TOMPKINS: That's what I'm asking.

25 MR. TOMASZKIEWICZ: The original list --

1 MR. TOMPKINS: Will you please extend --?

2 MR. MACH: There's a whole -- there's a whole
3 'nother fourth page.

4 MR. RATCLIFF: I'm saying -- guys can vote --
5 you don't have to ask him. You know he's been running
6 this thing too long anyway.

7 MR. TOMPKINS: I vote to the board member to
8 consider extension of the meeting.

9 MR. MASON: I second it. I second it.

10 MR. ATTENDEE: Disrupted.

11 MS. ATTENDEE: There's a RAB mee- -- member
12 motion on the table.

13 MR. MASON: And I second it. And I second it.

14 MS. PETERSON: No. You made it. Caroline
15 seconded it.

16 MR. MASON: Well, yes, she did.

17 MS. PETERSON: Okay.

18 MR. MASON: There's another motion.

19 MR. TOMPKINS: Yeah. I want extension of
20 the -- We also may have some answers --

21 MR. MACH: You have -- You made a motion.

22 MS. PETERSON: Call for the question.

23 MS. AGUIRRE: What question?

24 MR. MACH: Okay. There's a motion to extend
25 the meeting.

1 MR. RATCLIFF: How long?

2 MS. AGUIRE: After when?

3 MR. MACH: There's a second.

4 MR. TOMPKINS: Two answers.

5 MR. MACH: Is there a discussion from the RAB
6 members? RAB members, please.

7 Ray?

8 MR. TOMPKINS: I'd like for clarity on the
9 motion that we extend the period of this meeting so that
10 we can address the questions, knowing that the members
11 here, our guests, have -- second time around, there are
12 concerns of the community that needs to be addressed,
13 and people sort of antagonistic because they have been
14 waiting for the answers. Could we please take time to
15 address the questions and extend this meeting so that
16 people could at least feel like --

17 MR. MACH: That -- that's what --

18 MR. TOMPKINS: -- feel good.

19 MR. MACH: That's what --

20 ATTENDEE: How long?

21 MR. MACH: For how long?

22 MR. TOMPKINS: Maybe for half an hour.

23 MR. ATTENDEE: Till we complete.

24 MS. ATTENDEE: Till we finish --

25 MS. AGUIRE: One --

1 MR. MASON: Until we finish.

2 MR. MACH: Okay.

3 MS. ATTENDEE: We have another --

4 MR. MACH: Ray, okay. Jill --

5 MR. TOMPKINS: What's --

6 MR. MACH: Jill was next. Jill was next.

7 MS. FOX: I just thought I would ask our guests

8 if they would be available -- just an idea -- if they

9 would be available next month to extend --

10 MS. PETERSON: She has a right to ask that

11 question.

12 MR. MASON: Well, let her ask it.

13 MR. RATCLIFF: Fifteen minutes.

14 MS. L. LOWMAN: I already have it on my

15 schedule to be here next month.

16 MR. ATTENDEE: Thank you.

17 MS. FOX: So that's another option.

18 MR. MACH: Okay. Jesse. I'm sorry. J. R. was

19 next.

20 J. R.

21 MR. MANUEL: First off, I think that if we are

22 going to be conducting these meetings, there has to be

23 respect in this room to allow these questions. People

24 are making these outbursts and everything.

25 There's five questions that we talked about

1 could have been answered by now.

2 MS. ATTENDEE: Yeah.

3 MR. MANUEL: And I think there -- there needs
4 to be some respect in here for not only the guest but
5 the members and people who moderate these meetings. All
6 of this unruliness is unreasonable to everybody in the
7 room.

8 Now, if you want to vote on this, let's vote on
9 it, but I think that there should be some order in here,
10 and people should stop doing the things they are doing.

11 There's research available. People are trying
12 their best to answer questions. This is very
13 antagonistic, and it's not helping anybody.

14 MR. MACH: Jesse?

15 MR. MASON: My concern is that, you know, I
16 appreciate those that have come to answer the questions.
17 I was brought up in this community. I've lived here all
18 my life. Lot of these questions are very concerning to
19 me. I think that we deserve an answer.

20 So I'm asking you to extend it for
21 approximately fifteen to twenty minutes to finish the
22 questions and the answers.

23 MR. MACH: Okay.

24 MS. ATTENDEE: Good, Jesse.

25 MR. MACH: Is there any other discussion from

1 the RAB members?

2 MR. TOMPKINS: Call for a question.

3 MR. MACH: Okay. All those in favor?

4 THE BOARD: Aye.

5 MR. MACH: All those opposed?

6 THE BOARD: No.

7 MR. MACH: Okay. Now I need a show of hands.

8 Let's do this again. All those in favor --

9 MR. RATCLIFF: Somebody will need more --

10 MR. MACH: -- please raise your hands. One,

11 two, three, four, five, six.

12 All those opposed? One, two, three, four,

13 five, six, seven.

14 MR. MASON: Those are not RAB members --

15 MR. MACH: Okay.

16 MR. MASON: -- over there.

17 MR. RATCLIFF: Are those RAB members over

18 there?

19 MR. MACH: Those are RAB members. You guys

20 voted them in.

21 Okay.

22 ATTENDEE: Now --

23 MR. MACH: Now, there's five minutes left on

24 the agenda, and we're going to set next month's

25 agenda --

1 MS. FOX: Right.

2 MR. MACH: -- and then we're out of here.

3 MS. AGUIRRE: All right.

4 MR. MACH: So what would you like on the
5 agenda?

6 MS. AGUIRRE: The question.

7 MR. MACH: Jill.

8 MS. FOX: I propose that we have the answers to
9 these questions start at 6 o'clock next RAB meeting.

10 MS. AGUIRRE: Not --

11 MS. FOX: We get it done, and then we take care
12 of RAB business or --

13 MR. DeMARS: Absolutely.

14 MS. FOX: -- and so that we can ha- -- if we
15 extend, you know. So that definitely very high up on
16 the agenda.

17 MR. MACH: Okay.

18 MS. FOX: Plus, we have not completed for the
19 last two months other items on the agenda --

20 MR. DACUS: Correct.

21 MS. FOX: -- community concerns.
22 So let's get this over with next month first
23 thing.

24 MR. MACH: Mitsuyo?

25 MS. HASEGAWA: Also, you know, I'm hearing what

1 she has to say, and I know the time is limited. Is
2 there any way to where they can have an on line or we
3 can get the e-mail address where we have on-line
4 conversations back and forth? If anybody else has any
5 more questions, they can ask, as well as everybody else
6 can see them, or if they can put these answers and
7 questions on paper, pass them out to everybody.

8 MR. MACH: I'm leery to start providing answers
9 when we -- when half these questions we -- we're not
10 sure we understand what the question is.

11 And I would rather funnel it through the
12 subcommittee, which has been set up for the RAB, to look
13 at radiation; and let us start getting into more of the
14 details with them, and then hopefully bring back what
15 the true concerns are about this process.

16 So -- But, you know, you do have my e-mail
17 address and all of my contact information. And stuff
18 that comes to me I work with, you know, the experts to
19 get the answers as best I can.

20 MS. AGUIRRE: For the meeting next month --?

21 MR. MACH: Wait, wait. Can I -- can I just
22 stick with the RAB members, please?

23 Dorothy.

24 MS. PETERSON: Okay. I'm asking that we amend
25 that 6 o'clock to at least 6:30 or 6:45 because we do

1 have -- have --

2 MR. MACH: We do have to get the elections in.

3 MS. PETERSON: Yeah.

4 MR. MACH: I don't know if you guys are going

5 to want -- I'll put the subcommittee reports at the

6 end --

7 MS. PETERSON: Yeah.

8 MR. MACH: -- requested.

9 MS. PETERSON: And then at 6:30 we can --

10 MR. MACH: Okay.

11 MS. PETERSON: -- if it's okay.

12 MR. MACH: Okay. That would be fine.

13 Okay. With that, meeting adjourned.

14 (Whereupon, said meeting ceases at

15 8:07 p.m., 7/26/01.)

16 ----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