HUNTERS POINT SHIPYARD

RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD

REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF MEETING

October 23, 2003

Dago Mary's Restaurant
Hunters Point Shipyard, Building 916
Donahue Street at Hudson 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

P A R T I C I P A N T S

FACILITATOR: MARSHA PENDERGRASS - Pendergrass & Associates

CO-CHAIRS: KEITH FORMAN - United States Navy, SWDIV

LYNNE BROWN - Communities for a Better Environment (CBE), Community First Coalition (CFC)

RAB MEMBERS

LANI ASHER - Communities for a Better Environment (CBE), Community First Coalition (CFC)

AMY BROWNELL - San Francisco Department of Public Health

BARBARA BUSHNELL - R.O.S.E.S., resident

MAURICE CAMPBELL - Business Development, Inc. (BDI); Community First Coalition (CFC); New California Media; NEW BAYVIEW NEWSPAPER

CHARLES L. DACUS, SR. - Hunters Point resident, R.O.S.E.S.

MARIE HARRISON - Communities for a Better Environment (CBE), SAN FRANCISCO BAY VIEW, Greenaction

MITSUYO HASEGAWA - JRM Associates

HELEN JACKSON - All Hallows Gardens Residents Association

RAB MEMBERS [Cont.]:

CHEIN KAO - California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC)
JACQUELINE ANN LANE - U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)
LEA LOIZOS - Arc Ecology
KEVYN D. LUTTON - Resident
J. R. MANUEL - JRM Associates, India Basin resident
JESSE MASON - Community First Coalition (CFC)
JULIE MENACK - San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board
JAMES MORRISON - Environmental Technology
GEORGIA OLIVA - Communities for a Better Environment (CBE), CCA member
KAREN G. PIERCE - Bayview Advocates, BVHP Democratic Club, BVHP Health & Environmental Assessment Program
MELITA RINES - India Basin Neighborhood Association
HARRY SHIN - Associated Builders
AHIMSA PORTER SUMCHAI - Bayview-Hunters Point Health & Environmental Resource Center (HERC)
KEITH TISDELL - Hunters Point resident
RAYMOND TOMPKINS - Bayview-Hunters Point Coalition on the Environment
MICHAEL WORK - U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)

RAB MEMBERS [Cont.]:

LEILANI WRIGHT - JRM Associates

---oOo---

OTHER ATTENDEES

ARVIND ACHARYA - Innovative Technical Solutions, Inc. (I.T.S.I.)
NADINE ANDRAKIN - Katz & Associates
RONALD BATISTE - EEC
DOUG BIELSKIS - Tetra Tech EM Inc.
ANDREW L. BOZEMAN - Southeast Sector Community Development Corporation
PATRICK BROOKS - United States Navy
VICTORIA COKER - Tetra Tech EM Inc.
FRANCISCO DA COSTA - Environmental Justice Advocacy
STEVE DELHOMME - Tetra Tech EM Inc.
REBECCA FOX - Shipyard artist
MIGUEL GALARZA - Yerba Buena Engineering & Construction, Inc.
BOB HOCKER - Lennar/Bayview-Hunters Point Team
CAROLYN HUNTER - Tetra Tech EM Inc.
FENG JIN - Artist, sculptor

OTHER ATTENDEES [Cont.]:

RONALD WM. KEICHLINE - Innovative Technical Solutions, Inc. (I.T.S.I.)
LAFO LAULU - Resident
LISA LAULU - Resident
LAURA L. LOWMAN - United States Navy Radiological Affairs Support Office (RASO)
RICHARD LOWMAN - United States Navy Radiological Affairs Support Office (RASO)
QUIJUAN MALOOF - Pendergrass & Associates
CHARLES R. MAZOWIECKI - United States Navy
DEBRA MOORE - Innovative Technical Solutions, Inc. (I.T.S.I.)
REV JOE NIUMALELEGA
SEALI'IMALIETOA SAM RIPLEY - Samoan American Media Services
DENNIS M. ROBINSON - Shaw Environmental & Infrastructure, Inc.
LEE H. SAUNDERS - United States Navy
IVAN SEPULOVA
MATTHEW L. SHAPS, ESQ. - Paul Hastings LLP for Lennar
CLIFTON J. SMITH - C.J. Smith & Associates, Eagle Environmental Construction
MIYA STANOFF - Hunters Point Shipyard Building 366

OTHER ATTENDEES [Cont.]:

PETER STROGANOFF - United States Navy ROICC Office

DAVID TERZIAN - The Point

ALLISON TURNER - Katz & Associates

RENEE UNDERWOOD - Ideal Day Care

JULIA VETROMILE - Tetra Tech EM Inc.

JASON WEBSTER - Shipyard artist

PETER WILSEY - San Francisco Department of Public Health

---oOo---

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA, THURSDAY, OCTOBER 23, 2003

5:59 P.M.

---oOo---

MS. PENDERGRASS: Welcome, everyone, to the Thursday, the 23rd of October, Hunters Point Shipyard Restoration Advisory Board meeting.

Everybody in the right place?

MR. FORMAN: Let's go.

MR. DACUS: We getting there.

MR. FORMAN: He's right.

MS. PENDERGRASS: All right. Got to remind everybody to turn your cell phones off; remember to remove your pagers. Turn them off as well.

Okay. As is normal and is our custom, tonight let's all introduce ourselves, and let's start with the RAB members, and we're going to start with Ron tonight.

MR. KEICHLINE: Ronald Keichline, I.T.S.I.

MS. PENDERGRASS: Yes, sir.

MR. CAMPBELL: Maurice Campbell, CFC, Community First Coalition.

MS. PENDERGRASS: Thank you.

Yes, sir.

MR. MASON: Jesse Mason, Community First Coalition.

MS. OLIVA: Georgia Oliva, Shipyard artist.

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

MR. BROWN: Lynne Brown, Community First Coalition.

MR. FORMAN: Keith Forman, Navy BRAC Environmental Coordinator.

MR. BROOKS: Pat Brooks, the lead Remedial Project Manager for the Navy.

MS. WRIGHT: Leilani Wright, RAB member.

MR. WORK: Michael Work, U.S. EPA.

MR. DACUS: Charles L. Dacus, Sr., ROSES, and I'm affiliated with RAB.

MS. PENDERGRASS: Thank you.

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

MS. MENACK: Julie Menack, Regional Water Quality Control Board.

MR. TISDELL: Keith Tisdell, resident, RAB member.

MS. RINES: Melita Rines, India Basin Neighborhood Association, RAB member.

MR. MALOOF: Quijuan Maloof, Pendergrass & Associates.

MS. PENDERGRASS: Okay. One other RAB member.

MS. HASEGAWA: Mitsuyo Hasegawa, RAB member.

MS. PENDERGRASS: Did you get that?

(The reporter nods.)

MS. PENDERGRASS: Okay.

Now we're going to introduce everyone else in the room tonight. And what I'm going to do tonight to facilitate a little quicker introductions, I'm going to pass the microphone to each person; and if you can clearly speak your name so that we can record it, would be really great.

So we'll start with you.

MR. ROBINSON: Dennis Robinson, Shaw Environmental.

MS. ANDRAKIN: Nadine Andrakin, Katz & Associates.

MS. TURNER: Allison Turner, Katz & Associates.

MR. WEBSTER: Jason Webster, tenant, 366, resident, Hunters Point.

MR. GALARZA: Miguel Galarza, Yerba Buena Engineering.

MR. STROGANOFF: Peter Stroganoff, ROICC Navy office.

MR. MAZOWIECKI: Charles Mazowiecki, Navy RPM.

MS. HUNTER: Carolyn Hunter, Tetra Tech.

MS. LANE: Jackie Lane, EPA community development.

MS. FOX: Rebecca Fox, tenant, Building 366.

MS. STANOFF: Miya Stanoff, Building 366.

MR. DELHOMME: Steve Delhomme, Tetra Tech.

MS. COKER: Victoria Coker with Tetra Tech.

MS. LOWMAN: Laurie Lowman with the Navy Radiological Affairs Support Office.

MR. LOWMAN: Dick Lowman with the same outfit.

MR. HOCKER: Bob Hocker, Lennar BVHP.

MR. ACHARYA: Arvind Acharya, I.T.S.I.

MS. VETROMILE: Julia Vetromile, Tetra Tech.

MS. PENDERGRASS: Okay. We got a couple of new RAB members join us. Marie?

MS. HARRISON: Marie Harrison.

MS. PENDERGRASS: Okay. And . . .

MS. BUSHNELL: Barbara Bushnell, RAB member.

MS. PENDERGRASS: Very good.

MR. TOMPKINS: Raymond Tompkins, board member.

MS. PENDERGRASS: All right. Thank you. Well, that seemed to go pretty well. All right.

Let's look at the agenda tonight. Any suggestions, changes, comments on the agenda tonight?

We have a pretty tight agenda in that we have a couple of really crucial presentations tonight. So we're going to try to, as always, keep things as succinct as possible.

But before we move any further along, let's review the action items and make sure that all of those have been cleared up and forward on.

The first one I show is the Navy was to report back to the RAB regarding recommendation that air-quality samples be collected for all future Hunters Point Shipyard fires. The person on that was the Navy.

MR. FORMAN: Right.

MS. PENDERGRASS: And the resolution status . . . ?

MR. FORMAN: Okay.

MR. BROOKS: We were discussing that with the Risk & Technical Subcommittee, and we're still evaluating that. So push that item on for next -- report back on the next meeting.

MR. FORMAN: Yeah. I think we made some good progress. We had a good dialogue with Mr. Ray Tompkins and Miss Karen Pierce and with the chief of the federal fire department. But it's going to take some looking into, some more in-depth stuff.

MS. PENDERGRASS: Okay. I need a little bit more concreteness to move this -- to carry this on.

So what's being carried forward? You're going to report back to the RAB at another time on this issue or --?

MR. BROOKS: At the December meeting.

MS. PENDERGRASS: At the December meeting. Thank you so much. So this will carry over to the December meeting.

New items for action are the Navy to ensure 1998 Basewide Environmental Baseline Survey available to the RAB. That was to be done as soon as possible.

And to my knowledge, has that happened?

MR. FORMAN: Mr. Keichline?

MR. KEICHLINE: There is a 1996 version in the library. The 1998 version specifically mentioned during the RAB meeting is not in there. It's been requested from the contractor to make multiple additional copies and get those sent off to the library as soon as possible.

MS. PENDERGRASS: Okay. Will you alert -- alert us on that task when that's in the library?

MR. KEICHLINE: Yeah, I'll do my best as long as I get word from Diane Silva, sure.

MR. BROOKS: In the meantime, Michael Work from U.S. EPA said he has a copy in their office; and if someone is anxious to review that, it's available.

MR. FORMAN: As a footnote to that, I just want to add that Ron Keichline and I and Pat Brooks have been talking, and an additional initiative we're going to do

is: We're doing a top-to-bottom review of what's in the info repository at the Anna Waden Library, and I'm going to be taking out some of the volumes that are there that never get read and some that are old, and then we're going to put in some more.

We are going to beef up the recent document part of that info repository that includes the recent action memos and the recent tech memos, because I think that's going to be a lot more valuable to you. And we're also including -- ensuring that we have a copy of the Parcel B ROD as well and the five-year review.

So look in the next few weeks. Ron and I specifically are going to go over that, and we'll make sure that it's a much -- a more user-friendly info repository.

MS. PENDERGRASS: Is there a possibility to get that on line, all of that on the Web site, or not?

MR. BROOKS: It's prior to actually having those documents electronically available back in --

MS. PENDERGRASS: So they could be scanned in?

MR. BROOKS: They can be, but they are not readily available.

MS. PENDERGRASS: All right.

All right. So that one will be removed. Action Item 2 will be removed. It has been satisfied.

Item 3 is the Navy to replace the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency's lease agreement document -- or to place it -- document in the branch library information repository.

Has that also been done?

MR. KEICHLINE: Yes, it's there.

MS. PENDERGRASS: Okay. Any other comments on that?

Action Item 4, the San Francisco Redevelopment --

What's the "SRFA"?

MR. FORMAN: San Francisco Redevelopment Agency.

MR. KEICHLINE: That was a typo.

MS. PENDERGRASS: Okay. I'm trying to figure that one out.

Okay. The San Francisco Redevelopment Agency to provide Marie Harrison with a copy of the lease agreement document.

Miss Harrison, did you receive that?

MS. HARRISON: No.

MS. PENDERGRASS: Okay. It said it was mailed to you on the 26th of September.

MS. HARRISON: Where did they mail it to?

MR. KEICHLINE: I got word from Mr. Capobres

that it was mailed out, e-mailed me and let me know that it was sent out. So I don't know if there's a problem with the mail or not.

MS. HARRISON: He could have mailed it to the Bayview office at which point I'll stop by and get it, or it should have been mailed to my office downtown.

MS. PENDERGRASS: So Mr. Keichline, will you follow up on that to make sure that she has that?

MS. HARRISON: If it's been mailed to the Bayview office, that's fine. I'll just stop by and pick it up. And that should have been mailed to 4908 Third Street.

MS. PENDERGRASS: Well, at this -- at this point, Miss Harrison, if you have not received it and it has been mailed to you, we're going to leave it on, then, as carryover item until you've received it. All right?

MS. HARRISON: Very good.

MS. PENDERGRASS: Action Item No. 5: Health Department to report back on questions of weed abatement on city property adjacent to the Shipyard.

MS. BROWNELL: I gave some phone numbers to Pat that the Navy can call, and I can also assist them with -- there is an office called the Public Services and Complaint Program at the environmental health

section of the Health Department where I work that deals with these kinds of issues, and they can put pressure on property owners under the nuisance section of the San Francisco Health Code for overgrown weeds and garbage and abandoned vehicles and things like that. So Pat and Keith are going to pursue that.

And I just -- as a follow-up, if anybody else would -- if you'd like to complain, there's a good phone number about any of these kinds of issues: garbage, weeds --

MR. TOMPKINS: I want one.

MS. BROWNELL: -- and all that. I have several of these brochures. I can give it to anybody. I'll leave a couple on the back table.

The phone number is -- There's two phone numbers: 252-3805 is a recorder where if you leave a message, an inspector will get back to you within two to three days; or if you really, really want to talk to a live person, you call 252-3800 and go through all the menus until you get to a live person.

MR. BROWN: May I say something?

MS. BROWNELL: Sure.

MR. BROWN: Why is the Navy doing that when it's on the city property?

MS. BROWNELL: It's not -- it's not a city

property. It's -- There is some private ownership. There's some state property.

And I'm going to work with -- but honestly, if the first initial calls come from the Navy, I think they are going to get a lot better response.

MR. FORMAN: Than we do on other things? Oh, okay.

MS. BROWNELL: We'll definitely work with them. And you're right, if it is city property, we can also enforce just as well. But a lot of the things that they are talking about, especially along that Parcel E fence, it's private property.

MR. BROWN: And a lot -- right there on Griffin [sic] Street is city property. So that's where the fire started.

MS. PENDERGRASS: All right.

MR. FORMAN: Okay. So we'll work -- we'll work --

MS. BROWNELL: We'll work on it.

MR. FORMAN: -- and try and elevate this so that we get some response. But more than getting a response that we get, that we actually get the abatement done. I mean, that's the bottom line.

MS. PENDERGRASS: All right.

MR. FORMAN: Okay.

MS. PENDERGRASS: So with that, Action Item No. 5 will be removed from the list as well.

MR. FORMAN: Can I add one quick thing?

MS. PENDERGRASS: Certainly.

MR. FORMAN: Okay. You'll hear more about this. Don't want to go into too much detail tonight because we've got a lot to talk about.

But what the Navy is very close to doing -- and we'll report on this more next RAB meeting -- is: We have gone to Goats R Us, and we are going to include Hunters Point as one of the bases in the Bay Area that uses goats from Goats R Us, and more details will be provided later. It's going to take a little time to set it up.

But other -- the other BRAC bases use that, and we're looking into it, and it looks like it's going to be a good deal for the community and for the goats, since there's a lot to eat.

MS. PENDERGRASS: Excellent. Excellent. Natural weed abatement approach.

All right. Action Item No. 6 is: The Navy is to contact the San Francisco Department of Public Works about including the perimeter of the Shipyard in their patrol for unauthorized disposal -- disposal of household goods.

Mr. Forman, is that also in your realm of weed abatement?

MR. FORMAN: Yes. And that goes hand in hand --

MS. BROWNELL: I think that's an issue in the same thing.

MR. FORMAN: Yeah. We'll work with Amy Brownell on that.

MS. PENDERGRASS: Very fine. So Action Item No. 6 is also removed from our list. Thank you.

All right. Let's move on with our agenda now.

Right now we need to approve the minutes. Everybody has been in receipt of the September 25th minutes, reviewed them? Any comments about them?

Yes, sir.

MR. CAMPBELL: On page 3 of -- 3 of 10, line No. 18, it states that I said at the previous RAB meeting "Navy responded that they were unaware that SFPD had detonated a device . . . ."

Part of the question that we had, everybody became aware --

MS. PENDERGRASS: A little louder, please.

MR. CAMPBELL: What we want to make sure was the timeliness in the future of the future coordination. There wasn't a question whether somebody was going to

find out about a fire. Eventually everybody would. It was the timeliness. So it should reflect that.

MR. KEICHLINE: How -- how --

MS. PENDERGRASS: I think on --

MR. KEICHLINE: -- is that --?

MS. PENDERGRASS: -- on line 22, Mr. Campbell, where it says it was about some time after the incident occurred, however, before you became aware of it. You restated his request that information be directed to Mr. Forman. Has that not covered that?

MR. CAMPBELL: No, it doesn't.

MS. PENDERGRASS: How would you like that rephrased?

MR. CAMPBELL: Well, I'd like it rephrased so there is a time frame, like if something does take place, within 8 hours or 24 hours maximum.

MS. PENDERGRASS: These are the minutes of what transpired. So what --

MR. CAMPBELL: Right.

MS. PENDERGRASS: -- did you say about that at that time?

MR. CAMPBELL: The question was timeliness, TIME-LI-NESS. Okay?

MS. PENDERGRASS: Mr. Keichline, do you have enough information to --?

MR. KEICHLINE: No. I don't understand how that needs to be revised.

MR. CAMPBELL: Okay. ". . . some time after the incident occurred, however, before he became aware of it." We were discussing timeliness on updates of the information, and that was the main point, and that's not reflected, the timeliness.

We can go back to the transcript and find out. That's one.

Two, it talks about the Economic Committee meeting being on 11/17. I'm sorry. 10/17. The Economic Committee meeting was on 10/7. So that needs to be corrected.

MS. PENDERGRASS: All right.

MR. CAMPBELL: Thank you.

MS. PENDERGRASS: Thank you.

Mr. Keichline, will you follow up to make sure the -- and review the --?

MR. KEICHLINE: Yeah. I'll get with Mr. Campbell during the break --

MS. PENDERGRASS: All right. Very fine.

MR. KEICHLINE: -- and make sure that we agree on the language for that.

MS. PENDERGRASS: All right. Do we have a motion to move the minutes as amended?

MR. BROWN: I make a motion as amended.

MS. PENDERGRASS: As amended.

MR. TISDELL: Second.

MS. PENDERGRASS: Second? All right, Mr. Tisdell.

Any other discussion on the minutes?

All in favor --

THE BOARD: Aye.

MS. PENDERGRASS: -- of accepting these minutes, say, "Aye."

THE BOARD: Aye.

MS. PENDERGRASS: Those opposed?

Any abstentions?

MR. TOMPKINS: One.

MS. PENDERGRASS: One abstention. I'm sorry.

All right. Very fine. We have approved those minutes and the action items. All right.

All right. Mr. Forman, you have some announcements?

MR. FORMAN: Yes. I have some quick Navy announcements so that we can get to our two presentations tonight.

First of all, we're coming up on the community information fair that Lynne Brown and I have talked about, and I want you to please attend. And -- and

equally as important, spread the word out for the information fair. We're putting a lot of work into this, and I think it's going to be the perfect forum for you to come and ask questions of the people who are doing the work at Hunters Point and that are most involved.

The details are this: It's November 15th. We'll write it up later on -- on the paper. It's Saturday, November 15th, at the E. P. Mills facility from 10:00 to 3:00. Okay?

There'll be -- The San Francisco Redevelopment Agency will be there. Regulators and their represe- -- or their representatives will be there, and the Navy will be there with project managers; and we'll be able to discuss each of the programs ongoing at Hunters Point. Parcels E through F will be represented.

Laurie Lowman has graciously agreed to fly across the country and -- to be there for you all day to talk about radiological issues. So it's going to be well worth your time to come and engage with us in discussion and learn a lot more about the nitty-gritty details of what's going on at Hunters Point. Okay.

Second thing --

MR. TOMPKINS: Keith, point of clarification.

MR. FORMAN: Yes.

MR. TOMPKINS: Is this previously the meeting that was scheduled for the 5th has now been moved to the 15th?

MR. FORMAN: This is an information fair.

MR. TOMPKINS: Diff- --? Two different meetings?

MR. FORMAN: Completely different than the --

MR. TOMPKINS: Okay.

MR. FORMAN: -- November 5th meeting that you and I are going to attend, yes.

MR. TOMPKINS: Okay.

MR. FORMAN: Okay.

All right. Second big item: Please, your attention to the back there. As of Tuesday, I have a new e-mail address, and this is one of the few things in the world that's not getting more complex. It's actually getting simpler. You notice that it's Keith.Forman@navy.mil, a lot easier. Now, I also have a new phone number, so copy that down, 415-308-1458.

Okay. Item No. 3, I want everybody to read a copy of that. We put a lot of work into these, and remember, I promised you fact sheets that give you the details and -- of what we're doing.

Fact Sheet No. 4. Radiological Fact Sheet No. 4 is out tonight. You're the first ones to see it,

and it's at the table. I hope that everybody gets a copy and reads it tonight.

Fact Sheet No. 4 focuses on the project that Ryan Ahlersmeyer talked to you about two months ago at Installation Restoration Site No. 2 and the concentrated area where there were radium dials disposed of. That project is highlighted in our next fact sheet.

Okay. That's all I've got.

MS. PENDERGRASS: Very good.

MR. BROWN: I've got a question.

MS. PENDERGRASS: Yes, sir.

MR. BROWN: If I'm not mistaken, the CAC has a workshop on the DDA the same day.

MR. ATTENDEE: That's right.

MR. FORMAN: Same day as what?

MR. BROWN: Same day as our information fair.

MR. FORMAN: Really?

MS. PENDERGRASS: Is it the same time?

MR. BROWN: What time? Ten o'clock?

MR. CAMPBELL: It will probably be from about 10:00 to 11:00.

MR. ATTENDEE: 10:00 to 3:00.

MR. CAMPBELL: 10:00 to 3:00.

MS. PENDERGRASS: That sounds like you got to make some choices.

MR. FORMAN: That's right.

MR. BROWN: Day time -- day time is DDA. But I don't know about that.

MR. FORMAN: Well, it's been well known for quite some time that -- you know?

MR. ATTENDEE: You --

MR. FORMAN: You know?

MR. ATTENDEE: I know.

MS. PENDERGRASS: Mr. Tisdell?

MR. TISDELL: It's -- it's really -- it's really to be like a conflict wherever the RAB has something set up, and the people who we expecting be always off at another meeting, you know. And, like, is it -- it's -- you know, I think the Navy might -- well, it's going to be a problem.

And one of the things that question that maybe, Keith, you can send to -- to Don Capobres about, you know, trying to -- these different committees being set up and trying to, you know, like when you give us something, they are giving something that conflicted that's equally as important --

MR. FORMAN: Well, I --

MR. TISDELL: -- you know, and --

MR. FORMAN: I agree with you, and you know he was here. You know that I've told Mr. Capobres about

the date, and I kept him on track. For several different reasons I kept him in the loop. I'm also asking him for things too --

MR. TISDELL: Yeah.

MR. FORMAN: -- including information, phone boards, a booth, all that kind of thing. So --

MS. PENDERGRASS: All right. So we need to move on from this issue. I mean, at this point, it's done.

Yes, ma'am.

MS. SUMCHAI: Just a quick comment. I think one of the reasons why the bylaws indicate that the membership should include a CAC representative is to cross-pollinate the two organizations and to facilitate communication. But clearly, we shouldn't be having major events that, you know, conflict like this.

MS. PENDERGRASS: Okay.

MR. FORMAN: Our event is one of a kind. Is this a one-of-a-kind event? I understand there's this --

MS. LUTTON: It's a finalizing --

MR. BROWN: They are rushing through the DDA.

MS. PENDERGRASS: Well, I'm sorry, but at this point, we need to end this discussion. And the only option at this point is for Mr. Brown and Mr. Forman, if

you all feel that you can have a conversation with someone at CAC, you all need to take that off line, okay?

MR. FORMAN: Okay.

MS. PENDERGRASS: If you need to have a consult.

MR. FORMAN: Absolutely. I agree with you.

MS. PENDERGRASS: All right. We need to move --

MR. TISDELL: I don't.

MS. PENDERGRASS: I'm sorry?

Mr. Brown, your report?

MR. BROWN: I already made it.

MS. PENDERGRASS: All right. And before we move forward, is there any -- outside of our subcommittee reports, is there anything like that, any announcements that need to be made right now?

All right. Very fine. Let's move on to the landfill gas --

I'm sorry. I didn't -- I didn't see your hand. Mr. Tisdell.

MR. TISDELL: I have a question to Keith Forman.

MS. PENDERGRASS: This is the time for announcements if you have a --

MR. TISDELL: It is -- it . . .

Go ahead and play your game.

MS. PENDERGRASS: Thank you. Thank you.

Mr. Mazowiecki, are you ready to --

MR. MAZOWIECKI: Yes, I am.

MS. PENDERGRASS: -- your report?

MR. MAZOWIECKI: This is going to be an update on the landfill gas removal action that we have been doing for several months now. There's been a lot of questions that have come up, and I think we'd like to clarify the situation, and it's going to involve going through a review of a lot of material that some of you have seen before. It may be new material to some others.

I'm going to cover the landfill gas removal action, discuss briefly the gas control system that was installed, the levels of methane that we found with our monitoring system and some repair work that involved grouting in the barrier wall. Recently we discovered some methane at GMP 24 and discuss that and what we're going to be doing in the future.

Initially back in April of 2002, we discovered the full extent of the methane. That's the whole purple area. You can see that it goes nearly to the edge of the U.C.S.F. property real close to Crisp Avenue. That,

of course, caused some concern on our part because the methane levels on the U.C.S.F. compound were above the lower explosive limit. We wanted to make sure that we could correct that situation, and we want to prevent further migration onto Crisp Avenue.

MR. TOMPKINS: Excuse me. Could you go back to the slide real quick? I'm trying to follow here. I apologize.

On the form, how far -- since the slide cuts off, how far does the plume go, the methane plume, if I understood you --

MR. MAZOWIECKI: Are you --?

MR. TOMPKINS: -- correctly --

MR. MAZOWIECKI: Are you --?

MR. TOMPKINS: -- to the left?

MR. MAZOWIECKI: Are you speaking right there?

MR. TOMPKINS: Yes, sir.

MR. MAZOWIECKI: That's just about at the edge. It doesn't extend out at all. It's just kind of around the edge.

MS. HARRISON: That's not at the edge?

MR. TOMPKINS: Is that -- private property, is that going --?

MR. MAZOWIECKI: That didn't go onto private property. It remained on Parcel E. There's a drainage

swale that runs along the property line right here, and it never made it to the drainage swale.

MR. TOMPKINS: Okay. And how far does it extend to the bottom? Because the slide's cut off there.

MR. MAZOWIECKI: The methane probably was corresponding to -- you can see the cap over here, and it didn't go much beyond the edge of the cap [indicating].

MR. BIELSKIS: There's another map [indicating].

MR. MAZOWIECKI: There's a map on the poster board over there that show the edge of the cap. It doesn't show the methane -- expansion of methane.

MR. TOMPKINS: But the methane does go off beyond the cap?

MR. MAZOWIECKI: It does go beyond the cap, yeah. The cap got it covered, and it started going under the cap to escape.

MR. TOMPKINS: Thank you.

MR. MAZOWIECKI: The removal action that we prepared and then later implemented it had as its goal to remove the methane discovered beneath the University of California-San Francisco, U.C.S.F., compound and to maintain a regulatory limit of less than 5 percent

within the U.C.S.F. compound.

The part of the removal action activities and the determination of success were: We wanted to operate the extraction wells, and we wanted to take the methane down to less than a half a percent at the extraction wells. We have got some gas-monitoring probes, or GMPs, and we want to maintain those at less than 1 percent methane during the active extraction phase.

We then move into weekly monitoring, and we kept the extraction wells in that phase at less than 1 percent, and at U.C.S.F. GMPs less than 2 percent methane.

The reason that we were keeping these levels that low is: We wanted it to extract -- there was a real possibility of what we call rebound where the methane would reappear, and we wanted to make sure that even if we had a rebound, that eventually we would be below the 5 percent methane, which was our -- the goal of the removal action.

And the last bullet says that we describe successful completion and start monitoring if we had four months below 5 percent methane.

This is the system that was constructed. The line shown in purple is our trench with the high-density polyethylene sheathing in it.

And we've got a number of extraction wells. Nine of them are on the U.C.S.F. property. We've got one just off their property on -- within the railroad lease.

We have got some seven GMPs along Crisp Avenue. We have got a number of GMPs along the barrier wall itself, and there are also some GMPs on the U.C.S.F. compound. We have got some GMPs that extend past the barrier over here [indicating].

After we installed the system and operated it, this was the situation that resulted. You can see now that we pulled the methane -- I'm sorry. This is still April of 2002. This was the situation. And then after we operated the system, we pulled it back. So you can see that there's been a significant change.

The methane on this side is such that we still have methane here [indicating], so I can't call that the zero-methane line anymore. There's methane. This is still an active landfill. Because of the barrier, that's where the methane ends.

MS. HARRISON: This is a plastic barrier?

MR. MAZOWIECKI: Yes. It's about -- It's high-density polyethylene. It's plastic. It's about a 16th of an inch thick.

This shows us the results of some monitoring

that we did along the fence line GMPs. These are -- these are the numbers over here [indicating], each one. Sometimes you'll see two sets of numbers, for example, G.O. -- GMP 01 and 01A. When we constructed the barrier, some of those GMPs were destroyed and had to be replaced. The replacement GMP is the one with the "A" suffix on it.

This shows the methane levels [indicating] before we did the extraction. When we went to active extraction, and you can see the dramatic decrease in the methane concentrations. And we had to do a little bit of extraction from our passive vents, but we kept the methane levels down.

And as of May 27th, the removal action was termed completed, and we are in the process of writing our closeout report now. That's going to document all of the activities that were undertaken to get us to that point.

MS. HARRISON: Excuse me. Before you move on, 5 and 6B, those are also replacements?

MR. MAZOWIECKI: Yes. Sometimes the "A" had to be replaced with "B."

MS. HARRISON: So that's a --

MR. MAZOWIECKI: Yes.

MS. HARRISON: -- the third-time-around

replacement?

MR. MAZOWIECKI: I'm sorry?

MS. HARRISON: "B" would be a third time around?

MR. MAZOWIECKI: Yes, which we didn't go up away from. We continued to do some monitoring, and we found out that there was still some methane passing through the barrier, although it seemed to occur at the locations west of GMP 03A. We grouted sections west of GMP 03A to limit communication across the barrier wall.

And we also installed some turbines on the passive vents. We inspected a bentonite cover that we have on the trench. We looked at our pollution-control filters to make sure they were functioning properly, and we measured the gas flow rates throughout our extraction system and throughout the entire control system.

The grouted areas, you can see over here, are shown in a light-blue line. I -- To my eyes, they are a little difficult to read, but there's one section there. There's another section there, there --

MR. TOMPKINS: Not just your eyes.

MR. MAZOWIECKI: -- and another section over there. I'm hoping that it shows up a little better on the handout.

MR. TOMPKINS: No.

MS. BROWNELL: It's worse.

MR. TOMPKINS: So it's not just your eyes.

MR. MAZOWIECKI: After we did the grouting, we continued our monitoring program. The results showed that the grouting and maintenance activities had been effective; but we wanted to tweak the system a little bit more, and we then decided to grout the areas that were left ungrouted all to the west of GMP 03A, and that was done. So we now have grouting across this whole section over here [indicating].

The grouting --

MS. ASHER: What kind of material is the grout?

MR. MAZOWIECKI: I was just going to touch on that.

MS. ASHER: Okay.

MR. MAZOWIECKI: The grout is a mixture of water, clay, and cement; and the exact proportions vary according to what the contractor feels is required at that particular time.

It was pumped to the bottom of the trench, and they would measure their pumping pressure, and they also had some monitoring points that they could visually look down to the bottom of the trench and see if a grout had reached those points; and as the grout did and as pressure would build up, they then raised the injection

pipe a foot at a time.

So they grouted from the bottom of the trench, which is 17 feet deep, down to the bottom of the bentonite, which is roughly 3 to 4 feet below the ground surface.

The slurry mixture is intended to both reinforce the back of the barrier wall, and it would also have a tendency to flow into any crevices, nooks, and crannies that it would cover, and it would tend to fill in any possible punctures in the plastic lining.

MS. HARRISON: I have a question. It might be a dumb question; but these gases, are they pretty much like water? Eventually they find theirselves a way out?

Anything, to me, that's mixed with water in it eventually breaks down, and water will find a way through plastic. I don't care how thick it is. It will find its way through it.

Are these -- these gases more denser than the water, or do they find their way through?

MR. MAZOWIECKI: No. The gas could also permeate through the plastic. The barrier itself and the grout behind it are intended to make the flow of the gas very slow.

I skimmed through a part of the construction; but on the landfill side of the barrier, we have a pipe

that runs the full length of the barrier. That pipe is imbedded in gravel, and it's intended to intercept the methane that may be on that side of the trench and then vent that to the atmosphere through the pollution-control filters again.

The vent is much easier for the methane to flow through than the -- than the plastic and the gravel. So it provides a preferential pathway for the methane. But no, there is no such thing as a totally impermeable membrane and --

MS. HARRISON: Okay. Do you have the same process on the edge of the -- along the -- the water line?

MR. MAZOWIECKI: Well, the plastic extends to approximately 2 feet below the water line in that area. Methane is insoluble in water, and it would not flow down below the barrier. The barrier is 2 feet into the water table.

MS. PENDERGRASS: Can you hold the rest of the questions until the end of your presentation?

MR. MAZOWIECKI: Okay.

If you hold your questions until we get to the end, I guess we will move along a little quicker. If we don't answer any -- any questions that you have now, I'll be here at the end of the meeting, and I'll be

certainly glad to answer any questions. I've got some people from our consulting firm over here, and we should be able to answer the questions that you have.

And now looking here on this slide at GMP 24, and I just want to show you exactly where that is. It's right by the laboratory building on the U.C.S.F. compound.

And what -- why that's significant is: Earlier this month we found at GMP 24 this little spike over here. The methane had increased and gone up to 4.9 percent. That was cause for concern on our part.

We installed a number of temporary monitoring probes, and those are the little green squares that you see all around GMP 24, which is the big green circle.

Conducted significant amount of monitoring, and what you see here is the result. The interior line represents the 4 percent methane concentration, and the outer line is the methane at a 1 percent concentration. You're looking at that.

Our biggest concern, of course, was that the methane might be coming from the trench, and this seems to indicate that it's not, because if it were coming from the trench and going this way, the higher concentration would be here [indicating]. But the highest concentration is in this location [indicating],

and it actually gets less as you approach the trench.

We started extracting from GMP 24 to correct the situation, and this is what we were looking at as of Tuesday's monitoring result. So we have got about a 1 percent concentration in that contour. So you can see that it was effective.

We are continuing to monitor to see if we can get rid of that last little bit of methane and to see if we have got any answers that we can use to explain just where that methane came from.

MS. SUMCHAI: I have to stop you. You said that is by a laboratory. That's a provocative situation, having methane gas, even if it's only 4.9 percent, next to a laboratory.

MR. MASON: Give her a mike.

MR. MAZOWIECKI: It's underground and it's not in the building, and it's been corrected.

MS. SUMCHAI: But you don't know where it's coming from?

MR. MAZOWIECKI: No. I can't answer that question.

MS. SUMCHAI: This is really strange.

MR. MAZOWIECKI: Our intention now is to continue to monitor. We'll use the extraction blowers that we have, if necessary, to assist the passive vents.

In December we are going to install six additional GMPs on Crisp Avenue, and in February we are going to submit a working -- a monitoring work plan to the agencies for their review and approval.

And now if you've got any questions . . .

MS. HARRISON: Yes.

MR. MAZOWIECKI: Okay.

MS. PENDERGRASS: All right. We are going to start over here with Mr. Tompkins and move around the table if that's all right with you.

MR. TOMPKINS: Two problems. Two-part question. One --

MS. PENDERGRASS: Mr. Tompkins, will you take the microphone?

MR. TOMPKINS: Okay.

MS. PENDERGRASS: Thank you.

MR. TOMPKINS: As I understand in talking to some of the technicians and some of the Navy folks, in your experience in handling these type of sites and landfills, normally, as I understand it, that a landfill will quit producing methane gas about in a 30-year range.

As I understand it, some of the anecdotal evidence that this place the site's almost 50 years, and the question is -- like Dr. Ahimsa pointed out earlier,

my concern is: Why is it producing this methane after this long time when normal sites usually quit producing this within a 30-year span? We are going on approaching 50, and it's still producing this methane.

Have any site -- I know the Navy spent billions on site characterization. But we still -- as you kindly pointed out, we still don't know why is this producing.

It should be not focused on the source of production of this methane because in my view this is almost like a Band-Aid. Unless you get rid of the cause, you still have the symptoms, and this is a $13 million approach, and we still haven't resolved issue of where the methane is coming from.

MR. MAZOWIECKI: Well, the first question -- or to answer the first part of that question, the 30 year is probably just a rule of thumb. It does not match anything within my experience. I've been digging in landfills, and I can pick up magazines that are 50 years old, and you can still read them. Obviously, they haven't decomposed, and the trash is still decomposing.

At Hunters Point, of course, it was unregulated. We don't know exactly what's there. But I don't know that it's that important to know how much longer it's going to go. I just think that we have to be prepared to control the gas for however long it

remains to be generating.

MR. TOMPKINS: But in terms of the cost-effectiveness factor, that wouldn't it be in terms of cost effectiveness cheaper for removal of the -- finding the source of removing it rather than putting the pumps and having this constant monitoring over a longer period of time and in terms of safety or risk factor to the community? Because we don't know what's in it, what's coming out --

MR. MAZOWIECKI: When --

MR. TOMPKINS: -- from that.

MR. MAZOWIECKI: When you talk about the removal -- I just want to be clear -- what do you wish to remove? The methane or the trash?

MR. TOMPKINS: The source that's causing the methane. Methane is the by-product of decomposition.

MR. MAZOWIECKI: Correct.

MR. TOMPKINS: Therefore, if we don't remove the source, we are always going to have the by-product. And would it not be for cost effectiveness cheaper to remove the source than to do this -- I could classify it as almost a Band-Aid or -- not Band-Aid, but --

What would be the appropriate word?

MS. SUMCHAI: A Band-Aid.

MR. TOMPKINS: Band-Aid. I mean, in terms of a

stopgap measure.

MR. MAZOWIECKI: Usually --

MR. TOMPKINS: Band-Aid, stopgap measure, so it doesn't blow up.

MR. MAZOWIECKI: The only thing that I can say in that regard is: What you're seeing here in this method of methane control is typical of what you will see at a closed landfill.

Now, if you're talking about a source removal, this is, you know, very preliminary cost estimates, but it has been looked at, but you're looking at probably a half a billion dollars.

Now, you can operate this gas-control system for a very long time with a half-a-billion-dollar budget, and that's the reason that we're looking at a gas-control system rather than trying to go through the landfill and removing any material that might be decomposing.

MR. TOMPKINS: I'll defer question so that other colleagues can ask.

MR. MASON: That -- that brings me to the question that I'd like to ask you, because it seems like we been working with this -- this barrier for a while, because in the beginning we thought that the barrier was going to basically stop the methane. But -- This is one

of the things that you guys assured us of.

But at the same time, my question is: Who's the contractor that's been, you know, doing the -- the extra work outside of I.T.S.I.? I know that was -- that -- that originally that was Barren. Who's the contractor doing this work now?

MR. MAZOWIECKI: I'm not sure which work you mean. Everything that we have been doing has been done with either I.T.S.I. or Tetra Tech, our consultants. I.T.S.I. has brought in a subcontractor to do the grouting.

MR. MASON: Okay.

MR. MAZOWIECKI: I.T.S.I. has been involved with it.

MR. MASON: Okay. Now, my other concern is economics. Now, I'm looking at the opportunity for the community to be involved in it. And one of my biggest concerns is: How many from the community was economically involved?

How many people from the community participated in this -- in this action? Because it seems like there's a lot of -- great deal of money being spent out there, and how much is going into the community?

MR. MAZOWIECKI: I handle the engineering part of it. If you want to discuss the economics, you'll

have to address it to someone else.

MS. PENDERGRASS: Mr. Mason, if you could hold that question, I think that would be appropriate to be addressed to someone else. Yes. And if your question had already been answered, we'll move along. We have five minutes left for this period. So --

MR. TISDELL: That's truly unfair, you know --

MR. CAMPBELL: Thank you very much --

MR. TISDELL: -- stand over there.

MR. CAMPBELL: -- information.

MS. PENDERGRASS: Thank you.

MR. CAMPBELL: Maz, it's my understanding that there is some questions back and forth between the designer of this system, which was Tetra Tech and I.T.S.I., which was to blame. And as a matter of fact, it's costing an awful lot of money.

My -- my question -- My questions are -- one is: When you start using extraction blowers to assist passive vents, it's no longer a passive system. It's an active system at that particular point. So you're saying in so many words that you're going on the other side where it has been passive is now going to be active extraction over there.

The other part of it is: I'm concerned. Where exactly was the shoreline, and could there have been a

runoff pipe of some kind that may have been buried underneath the foundation?

And so methane tends to use pipes, abandoned pipes especially, to move through, not only methane, but the other -- other -- serves as transportation for other gases. Have you guys checked in any sense?

MR. MAZOWIECKI: Okay. Answering the last part first, the trench was dug down to a depth of 17 feet. In that 17 feet, we did not encounter any pipes that were utilities or anything else.

We did encounter one length of pipe. It was way to the west when they installed it. It's beyond the area where we grouted, and that was just one length of pipe. It was not connected to anything else. When we pulled it out, both ends were clean.

The shoreline -- let's see if I can . . . [pause].

The shoreline in 1968 kind of goes up like this and around, and I think that's Yosemite Slough over there, and it came down like this [indicating], and that was in the 1968 shoreline.

There may be something there. When they filled in the bay, they probably didn't remove the vegetation that was on the floor of the bay, and that could be depo -- decomposing right now. That could be a source

of the methane.

But we feel that because we went down to below the water table and the water table cut off any migratory path of the methane, that we isolated that and removed that as a consideration.

MR. CAMPBELL: Okay. So basically, you're saying, then, you're looking at a possible point source of some sort of minor fill that's under there that's generating the methane, or are you saying in fact that the barrier did have breaches and you're not really sure? Because my understanding is: The barrier -- You are getting methane on both sides of the barrier. That's why you went back and grout it. That makes sense.

So what are you saying?

MR. MAZOWIECKI: I'm saying that there's probably a very good possibility that there were punctures in the barrier. We installed this barrier right at the edge of the landfill material. Where possible, we excavated and removed that fill material and hauled it off site.

But in the area where we have got the problems, there was a lot of concrete. There was some very large chunks of concrete that were taken out, and there was one that was perhaps 4 feet by 8 feet by 10 feet. Now,

that's a big piece of concrete. And there was some rebar.

When the barrier was installed, there's a possibility that during the backfill operation, something shifted, either a sharp piece of concrete, a rebar, and it could have landed right against the plastic.

And, I mean, this is a strong piece of plastic, but it is still plastic, and it is only about a 16th of an inch thick. It's not unreasonable to think that there might have been one or two places where a hole was poked -- punched in it, and that was the reason we went for the grouting.

MS. PENDERGRASS: Mr. Tisdell?

MR. TISDELL: Yes.

MS. HARRISON: And then we have questions too.

MR. TISDELL: On that picture right there.

MR. MAZOWIECKI: I'll leave it up.

MR. TISDELL: Okay. Here is Yosemite Slough in here, right?

MR. FORMAN: No.

MR. TISDELL: Where's Yosemite Slough?

MR. FORMAN: Further down.

MR. ATTENDEE: Way over.

MS. ATTENDEE: On the other --

ATTENDEE: Off the page.

MR. TOMPKINS: It's off the page.

MR. TISDELL: Okay. With the fire that was reported in June, Lynne, remember, with different colored smoke was coming up?

MR. BROWN: Yeah.

MR. TISDELL: Would that methane right in here have any effect to do with that fire?

MR. MAZOWIECKI: No. The fire migrated from off site into an area that didn't really get into our methane area, our methane area ends with the drainage swale that runs along the western side of property E. Those fires were beyond the drainage swale.

And what was actually burning there is -- I don't know if you've ever been in that area, but there are blocks of concrete over there, and they have wood bolted to perhaps two sides of those. It looks like it's maybe 4 by 6 or 4 by 8 planks bolted to the concrete.

And what had happened is: The brush fire migrated over to that concrete. That wood caught on fire. Some of it was actually laying down, so the concrete is on top of the wood, and it smoldered.

And with the equipment that the fire department could get in there, they couldn't roll that concrete

over to get to it, so they had to pump a lot of water. They built little coffer dams around it and just pumped a lot of water until they saturated that and flooded it.

MS. PENDERGRASS: All right.

MS. HARRISON: I -- I think I have two questions. And I'm trying to really understand this, because if I have to explain this to anybody in its simplest form, I would simply say it is not working, period.

But this is my problem. All along the outskirts of this -- this area, there's been several fires. And you have increased the density of this plastic, and you put grout in there to stop the gases from flowing. Before you did that, is it possible that though -- the reason we are having fires on private property across the -- that that gas actually extended itself all the way across it into private property?

MR. MAZOWIECKI: No. What you have to have for methane to burn is a 5 percent concentration in air, and we just don't have the methane at those levels in that concentration in the areas where the fire were.

What you're looking at are methane concentrations below ground. Once it makes it to the ground surface, it dissipates very rapidly, and the concentration just drops down to a point where it won't

support combustion.

MS. HARRISON: Okay. So my second question is: I don't know how much that you know about the -- the fire that burned in this area for so very long before we actually were notified.

MR. MAZOWIECKI: All I know is --

MS. HARRISON: Now --

MR. MAZOWIECKI: -- what I heard.

MS. HARRISON: Okay.

MR. MAZOWIECKI: I wasn't here at the time.

MS. HARRISON: But it would have been nice if you were because then you'd understand my questioning.

At that time and up till now, no one has been able to explain to us where the heat source came from that actually started that fire. They didn't put it out. What they did was: They put tons and tons of dirt, clay and plastic over it. They have gone back and cleaned the top area off and re- -- whatever, seeded, rewhatever they did to it on top again.

Now, I'm really concerned that this gas popping up in places that you didn't see it before, all this plastic and grout is there; there is, like you say, a possibility that there was a puncture somewhere. It stands to reason to me just using my limited amount of knowledge on this that if there's a heat source down

there, that no matter how much clay, plastic and dirt you put there and/or concrete --

For some reason, San Francisco thinks that the concrete is a cure-all to everything.

What happens if that heat source heats up enough under the ground?

You didn't -- They didn't find it because they didn't go in there looking for it. Something caused that to start burning, and no one as of yet has been able to give us a solid answer to why that fire occurred, why it burned so long, how long it burned underground before the flames started shooting up out of the ground and was noticed by the community folks.

So, I mean, I just pretty much -- is that fire out? Is that heat source removed?

MR. MAZOWIECKI: Yes, the fire is out. The original source, according to the fire department records, was: It was a brush fire. So it started on the surface. It didn't start within the landfill.

Now, you're concerned about heat building up. To have a fire, you need heat, fuel, and oxygen; and if any one of those elements is missing, you're not going to have a fire.

Part of our --

MS. HARRISON: Parcel E has all those sources.

You got plenty of fuel. You got plenty of air. And the heat source from -- What started the brush fire? Did --?

I mean, I heard several different things. You are the first one to say the brush fire started it. So do they know what started the brush fire?

MR. MAZOWIECKI: I don't think anyone --

(Simultaneous colloquy.)

MS. HARRISON: I just wanted you to understand my -- my point.

MR. MAZOWIECKI: I'm trying to answer it. I'm not trying to put you off.

What I'm concerned about and I think what you're concerned about is the landfill gas itself burning again.

MS. HARRISON: Mm-hmm.

MR. MAZOWIECKI: And when I'm saying that you need heat, you're going to need heat in the landfill itself. Now, you will get some heat over there from the natural decomposition.

Microbial activity will generate some heat. In some cases, that heat by itself would raise the temperature, and you could get a fire. But you also need oxygen, and there don't [sic] have the oxygen required to support combustion within the landfill

itself.

The cap was intended to prevent oxygen from entering it. We monitor the oxygen levels as part of our monitoring program. We have not shared those results with anyone simply because there's been no cause for concern. The oxygen levels are way below what you would need to support combustion. But we are looking at it; and it's part of, if you will, keep our fingers on the pulse of the system.

So that's something that we are looking at. We are -- we are not trying to, you know, make this problem small, or we are aware of the situation, and we are trying to take what we think is appropriate action.

MS. PENDERGRASS: Thank you, Miss Harrison.

MS. HARRISON: Can I finish, please?

MS. PENDERGRASS: He answered your question.

MS. HARRISON: No, he didn't. My question will be answered if he tells me this.

Are you sure that the protective cover that you put -- because water has oxygen in it, okay? Now, that that air is not flowing -- as it goes out, it's not flowing inside there too? There is no source for that air to go inside underneath that cap?

MS. SUMCHAI: But it's partially capped.

MS. PENDERGRASS: Okay. Can we --? We need

t- -- we need to take a break. When we come back from the break, we'll start with Dr. Sumchai and Miss Asher.

And was there anyone else who had a question?

Those -- those are the last two questions. So we need to take a ten-minute break. Come back at ten after 7:00, please.

(Recess 6:58 p.m. to 7:12 p.m.)

MS. PENDERGRASS: The meeting is called back to order. We still have two questions on the floor. We have a question from Dr. Sumchai, and we have a question from Miss Asher.

Dr. Sumchai? Thank you. Yes, ma'am.

MS. SUMCHAI: I'm going to -- I'm going to try and be as concise as -- as possible, and I -- I certainly will make every effort to refrain from being argumentative.

But I do need to refute the statement that the landfill can't be considered a source of combustion because oxygen isn't accessible to it. The -- the landfill, again, is partially capped; and I have expressed concerns to you that there are portions of the landfill, particularly to the southwest, where the -- the density of the monitoring probes is less and where I -- I do believe, you know, the landfill can -- can be accessed by -- by air. And you can respond to that.

The second thing I want to do is: I want to again advance Ahimsa's theory that on August 16th there was a brush fire on the Parcel E landfill, that it continued to smolder, that it ignited the chemical contents of the landfill.

By August 24th there are at least two credible observers, including Lynne Brown and a fireman, who observed the smoke having color to it consistent with a chemical fire. That chemical fire increased the decomposition and the chemical processes within the landfill, and that's why the landfill is producing methane gas.

If Ahimsa's theory is correct, the landfill could continue to produce methane gas for the next 15 years.

The next thing I want to say with regard to the presence of methane at Gas Monitoring Probe 24, the barrier wall is 17 feet deep. Because we don't have a sense of the characterization of the landfill, we don't know its depth. We don't know if the barrier wall is impeding the lateral migration of gases beneath the depth of the landfill.

We have the landfill is 20 feet deep, and the barrier wall is only 17 feet deep. That means that there is potentially a low pressure area where gases can

migrate, you know, beneath that depth.

So -- so that's another concern that I have, that the landfill was poorly characterized and that there is also going to be potential for the lateral migration of gases.

The other issue that I have concerns about is the Navy's statement of confidence about its control of the migration. If you're saying you're going to install six additional gas-monitoring probes by December 2,003rd -- 2003 along Crisp Avenue at the boundary of Parcel A where someone wants to build 1,600 houses, you know, I think that we -- we have a problem here, that there is a logistical problem here, and -- and we need to deal with it.

So those are some -- some issues that I have.

And I guess a question that I have to you is whether you feel as if there is a potential that the methane you're detecting at Gas Monitoring Probe 24 might represent subsurface lateral migration of gas from the landfill beneath the 17-foot deep barrier wall.

MR. MAZOWIECKI: I guess the -- the statement at the end was the question?

I would like to say that at GMP 24, it extends down to a depth of about 12 feet. There's a permeable layer that goes from about 12 feet to 15 feet. That's

where we detected the methane. It's higher than the 17 feet. That's the bottom of the barrier.

I want to repeat again that the barrier's 2 feet underwater. The methane, or the trash, landfill material -- whatever you choose to call it -- may be deeper than 17 feet, but it's underwater; and the likelihood of the methane traveling horizontally through the water and below the barrier is extremely low.

What we have got is a row of what we are calling fence line GMPs, and they are along here [indicating]. We have monitored those, and we are not finding any methane at those locations.

In addition to GMP 24, there are five other GMPs on the U.C.S.F. compound. Those we did not detect any methane, and they are on both sides of GMP 24. GMP 24 is not at the end, so it's not something where you can say, "Well, we just didn't extend them far enough, and it's going around the end."

Beyond that we have got seven GMPs on Crisp Avenue, and we haven't detected any methane in those GMPs either.

The additional GMPs are something that was put in at the regulatory request. We installed those GMPs, and we encountered groundwater at the time that they were installed, and right now the bottoms of those GMPs

are in water.

The Waste Management Board wanted them to go deeper to the point where we could assure that they would never -- the bottom of the GMPs would never be out of groundwater, and that's the reason we are installing the additional GMPs.

So I don't think it's a fair statement to say that the barrier wall is not working. It's keeping the methane below the levels along the fence line GMPs and at all but one of the U.C.S.F. GMPs.

One of the theories that you could propose for the methane that you found at GMP 24 is: There was a little cloud, for want of a better word, of methane that was not extracted during the active extraction system. We don't know very much about the lithology beneath Building 830. Obviously, we didn't go through and put borings down over there. It may have been trapped over there, and all of the activities that we did it kind of pulled it towards GMP 24.

I'm not saying that's what happened. I'm saying it's a possibility.

MS. PENDERGRASS: Thank you.

MR. BROWN: I had one question.

After nine months, after nine months, Maz, of nothing there and Ground Monitoring 24 all of a sudden

you get a -- you get a high strike of methane. So if it was there at the beginning, there would have been a high strike.

MR. MAZOWIECKI: Well, that's what I think too is that we would have seen it earlier. We had it down low, and I just think that it migrated from someplace beneath the building. We did put in a bunch of temporary probes and --

MS. PENDERGRASS: Thank you. Thank you.

MR. MAZOWIECKI: -- that's where it centered.

MS. PENDERGRASS: I'm sorry. Okay. Thank you so much.

All right. Next we have a -- an HRA update, Miss Lowman, and you have about twenty minutes down from your thirty.

MS. WRIGHT: I think you had a question over there.

MS. LOWMAN: I'll go fast.

MS. PENDERGRASS: Okay. If you -- You need to leave questions at the end.

I'm sorry. Did I miss a question?

MS. WRIGHT: Mr. Tisdell had a question.

MR. TISDELL: Yes, I did have a question. It was asked.

MS. PENDERGRASS: We closed that. We closed

that, Mr. Tisdell. Hold on --

MR. TISDELL: But how can you close something when there's a question that concerns the community? How? Would you mind answering me that?

MS. PENDERGRASS: Miss Lowman, can you hold just a moment?

MS. LOWMAN: Sure.

MS. PENDERGRASS: Mr. Tisdell. And Mr. Mazowiecki, where did you go?

Oh, here he is right here.

MR. TISDELL: Okay. Mr. Maz, now, you say if -- if that -- if that wall wasn't working, you wouldn't be getting readings like you are, if I -- if I state you correctly right?

MR. MAZOWIECKI: I'm not sure what the question is. Can --?

MR. TISDELL: Okay. When you say -- okay. You said something in reference if a wall wasn't working, it would be a higher readings, right? If the wall wasn't working, there would be a higher reading?

MR. MAZOWIECKI: What I was saying is that if the wall wasn't working, we would start to see situations like we had back in April of 2002 where the methane was migrating onto the U.C.S.F. compound, and we were receiving extremely high levels of methane. By

"extremely high," I'm talking in 60 to 70 percent range of methane.

We are now seeing 0 percent methane --

MR. TISDELL: Okay.

MR. MAZOWIECKI: -- locations.

MR. TISDELL: Okay. If the wall was working, why are you replacing it?

MR. MAZOWIECKI: I wouldn't choose to classify what we did as "replacing."

MR. TISDELL: Did you bring it up and go back down in it -- with it?

MR. MAZOWIECKI: No. What we did is: We injected some grout behind it.

MS. HARRISON: You reinforced it?

MR. MAZOWIECKI: We reinforced it, but we did not replace it.

MS. HARRISON: Which basically means you put another wall behind it.

MR. MAZOWIECKI: Yes.

MS. HARRISON: Which means the original wall wasn't working, which is what he's asking.

MR. MAZOWIECKI: I don't know that I would word it in that way, but --

MS. HARRISON: I'm going to leave it alone because I'm not the engineer here, okay?

MR. MAZOWIECKI: As I said before, there was a possibility that there was some punctures, and that was the reason that we injected the grout to correct that situation.

MS. PENDERGRASS: All right.

MR. MAZOWIECKI: And we feel that it's been corrected now.

MS. PENDERGRASS: Thank you, sir.

MR. TISDELL: Thank you, Mr. Maz.

MS. PENDERGRASS: All right. Miss Lowman, I'm so sorry.

MS. LOWMAN: It's okay. It's all right.

MS. PENDERGRASS: All right.

MS. LOWMAN: It's nice to be with you this month. We apologize for Hurricane Isabel and her destruction last month that postponed this briefing. So we'll go from where we are today.

HRA status report, Historical Radiological Assessment. I'm sure you are all familiar with that document and the long-heralded HRA.

We have additional archive records that we have researched. We have a second draft that we are preparing. We are working on finalizing the interview process, and all of this has resulted in a delay and a new schedule.

Okay. The additional records we reviewed were at the Naval Sea Systems Command Archives in Washington, D.C. There really wasn't much information on radiological operations out at Hunters Point. However, there was a lot of information on the Triple A contracts that we might be able to extract some building information from.

The other records reviewed were the National Association of Atomic Veterans records. We have reviewed those in August 2003. They have a very, very large volume of records.

However, most of them pertain directly to the exposures that the veterans received when they participated in the atomic test. Very little of it has anything to do with Hunters Point. We were able to pull out, oh, maybe a dozen, 15 documents, but there's really very little information there for us.

MS. HARRISON: Laurie, there was nothing in those records that tells you what they did with the by-products or waste products?

MS. LOWMAN: No, there was not. They talked about the ships and the exposure levels on the ships themselves, but -- and what happened with the personnel, where the personnel worked, but not Shipyard personnel. So there was really very little information we could

use.

MS. OLIVA: Laurie?

MS. LOWMAN: Yeah.

MS. OLIVA: Did they come back with the ships to the Shipyard, the personnel?

MS. LOWMAN: The personnel? Some did. Some did not. The -- the folks that received the higher doses were on the target ships, and many of those were sunk out at Kwajalein. And the target ships that did come back here, the ones with the highest dose rates came back and were towed because the sailors couldn't be on them.

MS. OLIVA: What about the sailors?

MS. LOWMAN: They came back on different ships.

MS. OLIVA: They came back --?

MS. PENDERGRASS: Can we ask the questions at the end and --?

MS. LOWMAN: Let me -- let me keep going so I can get through the information I have, and then you can get me all your questions, okay? That would be better.

We reviewed the NAAV records in August.

Then we found records associated with the Defense Threat Reduction Agency. Now, they used to be called the Defense Nuclear Agency, and they have been renamed. It is a tri-service organization that works on

the effects of atomic -- nuclear or atomic weapons, and they are working with the veterans on any claims they have against the government.

They do have records on Hunters Point. We have reviewed those records in October 2003. A lot of the records were duplicates of what we have already had.

But we did get about, if I'm going to quantify it, I will say 2 inches of new information, 'cause the paper was about 2 inches thick. I have not had a chance to review those. We just finished that last Friday, and I've been traveling since Monday. So I'm not exactly sure everything that's in those.

We are going to have a second internal -- now it's DoD review. We had a first internal Navy review in the document. We received significant comments on it. We have made extensive changes to the document. The document that was 400 pages is now 800 pages. So it's growing by the month. There's a lot of new information that was incorporated.

The reason we are calling it a second DoD review is because DTRA and the Army Corps of Engineers have asked be included in the review process, and the Army Corps of Engineers would be Jerry Vincent, who's managing the FUDS property for the base.

Personnel interviews. Pretty much we have

concluded all the interviews. We have made multiple attempts to reach anyone and everyone we could.

I know that everyone was very interested in us reaching Mr. Tom Olson. I have tried diligently, and we have not been able to contact him. He is no longer in Albuquerque. Maurice Campbell was working with us on that, and he was not able to find him either. It's kind of like he's just disappeared. But should he come up or should he -- he reach us, we would be happy to conclude an interview process with him.

The information has been summarized in an appendix to H. -- to the HRA.

Final contacts are being made with the folks that we did the in-depth interviews with. We cannot publish any interview unless we receive a signed release document from the interviewee agreeing to the information to go in the document.

So -- and what we are finding is: Some of the interviewees, when we type up the interview, they come back and say, "Oh, I don't want to say this, and I want to say that." They are going back and forth with several of them. So we are hoping to get that taken care of.

So we have -- because of all these delays, we have a new HRA time line. Our original August

distribution was delayed. We were going to shoot for a November distribution when we got new information from the DTRA.

Those records were made available to us and -- when Hurricane Isabel hit, which basically Hurricane Isabel by itself slowed us -- took us out two weeks. We couldn't get to work, couldn't -- had no power at the office or at home. So it was -- it was a definite delay.

Now that we have had these delays, we are moving into the holiday period. So we have come up with a new time line.

In November we are going to distribute the internal draft for the DoD review. The comments are due back to us in December 2003 when we're having a meeting out at RASO to discuss all the comments, and we will be distributing the draft final to regulators and the public early in 2004. I do not have an exact date yet. But believe me, it's going to be as soon as I can get it because I'm really getting tired of working on it.

But I -- We have a great team, but it's been over a year now. We are all getting a little punchy. So we'd really like to get it out there for everybody to see.

As I always do, I always try to cover some

upcoming site projects, the different radiological issues that are going on at the base.

Building 366 -- I know that there was some presentations made, and I wasn't here for those. So we're going to talk a little bit about that, and we're going to talk about some new projects on Parcel E.

Building 366, you all know -- you all received the fact sheet in September of '03. We have found some low levels of radium and cesium contamination. They were found in the -- in the inactive ventilation system and in the floor drains.

To access where the contamination is, it's going to require us to remove ventilation systems from a very high ceiling, dig out drains and piping in the flooring; and the type of work and the extent of the work would be impossible to have anyone in the building during that time. So the Navy is working to relocate the artists. We have addressed the relocation sites to make sure they were not radiologically impacted.

And we are also working to address the artists' concerns. I've had numerous phone calls about artists being concerned about any exposure they may have received.

We are doing a dose assessment projection to say that an individual had worked in that building with

those levels of contamination in the ventilation system and in the flooring, that they would have worked in there 12 hours a day, seven days a week, for the ten years that the artists have been working in the building.

I don't have the final information on that yet. Commander Fragoso -- maybe some of you remember him. He had briefed for me one time one month. He is working on the assessment, and hopefully we should have all the information by the end of next week.

The Building 366 findings. I'd like to kind of put them into perspective, because the levels were really very low.

We -- The levels that we found were in samples of material that we took out of the ventilation system and that we took out of the drains. So our -- we are comparing them to outdoor release limits because that would -- normally we would quantify material and soil.

So it comes out in a picocuries-per-gram ratio, and that's how we would make our comparison for the samples out of the ventilation ducting or the drains.

And our release limit for cesium outside is .13 picocuries per gram, and our release limit for radium is 2.0 picocuries per gram. Now, that includes background radiation. So that is not 2.0 above

background. That is 2.0 with the background included. So those are very, very low limits.

Matter of fact, the cesium limit is so low that we cannot really see it with a detection instrument. We have to sample and run it with gamma spectroscopy in the laboratory to be able to see those limits.

These are very conservative limits. We have established these with the EPA. And we are really working to, you know, ensure long-term protection for --

at the site for everyone.

In the inactive ventilation system, we had two samples above the radium limit, and we had four samples above the cesium limit. That does not mean we had six samples. Two of those samples had both cesium and radium in them.

So we had four spots in the ventilation system that -- that we took material from that exceeded those picocurie-per-gram limits. And when it says on the slide there that it's less than "minimal detectable activity," that is less than the gas spectroscopy system in the laboratory could measure. So that is very, very low.

On the floor drain samples, we had four samples above the radium limit and three samples above the cesium limit. Now, that only means that four drains had

contamination in them. It doesn't mean that seven did. Some of these are the same samples that came out, and we found two different isotopes in them.

The building -- When we do -- After we do the -- the decontamination in the building and the remediation, we're going to establish a release limit for the surfaces in the building, and that will be established with the California Department of Health Services. The EPA defaults to Cal. DHS for all the structures and inside the structures out at Hunters Point.

It will be based on surface readings in disintegrations per minute, which is again based on an old NRC reg. guide, 1.86. That is what Cal. DHS is using right now as their standard.

So after we do the remediation, after we do everything and we feel we have cleaned the building, we are going to do what they call a final status survey. It will be done in accordance with the MARSSIM, the Multi-Agency Radiation Survey and Site Investigation Manual. And that final status survey will be used to document that the building is -- we hope, obviously -- ready for free release.

And after we do the final status survey, we will provide all that documentation to the regulators

for their review. But again, that will be based on the standards with Cal. DHS.

One area that I also believe you were briefed on is IR-02 northwest and central. This is moving on to the new activities in Parcel E.

IR-02 northwest and central is an area that is known to contain a certain number of radium devices. It has been referred to as the radium dial disposal area. However, in researching for the HRA, we cannot find any documentation that indicates that it was used as a radium dial disposal area.

They are basically finding a radium device or a radioluminescent device at one every 2 cubic yards, and that is not indicative of a radium dial disposal area, but there is a large concentration of those devices in that area.

The site work plan. I have that. Matter of fact, I brought that with me, but I haven't had a chance to open it.

We are in the second draft now for RASO's review. It will follow previously established remediation protocols that we established for the Phase 5 radiological investigations. And again, the release limit for radium is 2 picocuries per gram because it is an outside area.

We are also going to -- When we do the remediation, we will be testing to identify whether or not there are any other radionuclides present, radioluminescent devices. Most of them used radium-226 as the isotope to mix with the paint for the glow-in-the-dark type of mixture. However, some used strontium-90. Some used promethium-147, and some used tritium or hydrogen 3.

So we will be testing to ensure that we have the isotope radium, and that there isn't another one that we have located. We will also, of course, be testing for cesium-137 and strontium-90 because of the work NRDL did with all of the materials they brought back from the atomic test sites.

We will be taking all prudent safety precautions. We'll be doing air monitoring. We will ensure the workers are wearing the proper PPE. We will do everything possible that we can do.

I understand there was some discussion of having a tent over a certain part of the remediation site. That would be not -- That would not be something that RASO would recommend when working in a bay fill area. We do these all of the time all over the country. We have approximately 20 in process right now. We would not ask for those precautions.

Matter of fact, in some instances, not only is it very, very expensive to get an enclosure big enough for the equipment to operate in, but it can cause some other problems with the tent itself becoming contaminated and not allowing radon from the radium devices to dissipate.

Just a minute. So -- You have to wait till I'm through. I'm hurrying. I'm hurrying. Just bear with me. I promise I'll answer it.

So we are looking at all the safety precautions. We are assessing whether or not --

My understanding is: There was a request to have it over a certain area where the material was going to be taken for screening. And again, as I said, we have -- you know, if RASO felt that we needed one, we would absolutely have one in place. And this is not something that we would normally do. So we are looking at it, but I personally cannot make a recommendation for that at this time.

This action will address both the radiologically contaminated material and the mixed waste, and that is hazardous waste with a radiological contaminant mixed in. So both of those fall under my program. We would remove anything like that and send it for proper disposal.

At the same time, when we do this, we will be testing. We have to test with a TCLP, which is toxicity leaching process, right?

MR. FORMAN: [Inaudible.]

MS. LOWMAN: Potential?

Toxicity characteristic leaching potential.

Thank you. I always get it -- one word wrong.

So we will be using TCLPs. We have to use TCLPs in order to profile the waste to get it into the disposal site. The disposal site has to have that information to know whether or not the radioactive waste has any other hazardous component.

So the material that we are taking out will have full testing both radiologically and for the CERCLA waste or the hazardous constituents.

There's another area we are working in, the sedimentation basin. That is an effort to build up the shoreline to prevent any migration of material off of IR-121. It is not a large effort. However, we have discovered some sandblast grit at the site.

Because of the history of NRDL, we're going to do what we do with all the sandblast grit that we find, and we are going to sample it for potential radiological contamination and just make a decision about the amount of it that is there and whether or not it warrants a

removal process.

Those samples were taken today. We're -- We would have the analysis probably first of next week, and we will be making a decision about that sandblast grit next week.

Parcel E shoreline survey. Now, this was a shoreline survey. The shoreline in Parcel E covers 1 1/2 miles, and this was done in the summer of 2001. We had some money available. We took that time to do a scoping survey for radiological materials along the shoreline in Parcel E.

The survey covered from the low tide mark at the lowest tide we could get in the summer, which is pretty far out there, up to 50 feet above the mean tide mark.

To do this survey we divided the shoreline into 150-foot-wide grids. And these grids were identified alphabetically "A" through "Z" and "AA" through "YY" for a total of 51 grids.

Each grid was divided into 3-foot lanes. And again our readings were taken at 2- to 3-foot intervals. There was just a straight scan. They stopped for three -- six seconds every 2 to 3 feet, took a reading.

Over 90,000 readings were taken, and it's a lot of data to go through. However, only 47 samples were

taken. Those were based on certain 10-foot grids or more than 10-foot grids. Hundred-foot grids we established there where we had found evidence of some radiological contamination.

Focus was on identifying areas of concern for future actions. And elevated levels greater than twice background were identified in 44 of the 51 grids. Now, that is not to say that we had high levels in all 44 of those grids. That is to say that there were readings over twice background in those 44 grids.

We're concentrating on areas where the elevated counts were found. We are using the shoreline survey now to identify our areas of concern along the shoreline, delineate the future actions taken based -- to be taken based on those areas of concern, and this will also allow us to prioritize our future actions by using time-critical removal actions to eliminate these sources of radioactivity.

We will be conducting sampling at areas with the highest count rates, and that will also include -- the TCLP samplings will have to profile for the waste removal, and we will be doing time-critical removal actions for the areas of concentrated elevated counts, in particular a metal reef area, which is down in the southeast portion there on the map near the piers, and a

slag area, which is actually over on the shore by IR-121, as Doug is pointing to.

Thank you very much.

Those will be two of the areas that we'll be concentrating on on the shoreline first.

And that's it. We're ready for questions.

MS. PENDERGRASS: Okay. Miss Oliva, you are the first one.

MS. LOWMAN: I promise, I'll answer your question.

MS. OLIVA: Okay, Laurie.

MS. LOWMAN: Microphone?

MS. PENDERGRASS: Thank you.

MS. OLIVA: Let's talk about dose assessments.

MS. LOWMAN: Okay, let's talk about dose assessments.

MS. OLIVA: We have two issues here. We have the dose -- You're determining those assessments for the 29 in Building 366 outside of their physicalness, correct?

MS. LOWMAN: I'm assessing -- making the dose assessment based on a person working in Building 366 12 hours a day, seven days a week, for ten years.

MS. OLIVA: Okay. I would suggest -- it's a suggestion -- that perhaps you take one of the 29 and do

a medical procedure on them.

MS. LOWMAN: We have not found any evidence so far the need for a medical procedure. That's why we are doing the dose assessment, to see if one would be warranted.

None of the workers in that building have received any dose on their dosimetry. They had -- came out -- All came out with zero.

MS. OLIVA: You tested them?

MS. LOWMAN: Yes.

MS. OLIVA: How did you test them?

MS. LOWMAN: They wore dosimeters. It's a lithium fluoride type device that registers any dose of radiation that they receive when they're working in any particular area. They wear them the entire time they are there.

MS. OLIVA: So the 29 had these -- these devices on?

MS. LOWMAN: Are you talking 29 artists?

MS. OLIVA: Yes.

MS. LOWMAN: No. The workers who did the surveys in the building wore those devices.

MS. OLIVA: Okay. Well, I would suggest that perhaps you would consider -- I believe that some of them are still there -- you have -- you take a sample on

one of them and have them wear one of these devices.

MS. LOWMAN: I can mention that. I can look into that.

MS. OLIVA: That would be great.

MS. LOWMAN: But I think our dose assessment -- we really need to do that first because that will give us a baseline and an idea of if there was a potential for them to have received any dose.

MS. OLIVA: Would you consider any full-body counting?

MS. LOWMAN: We did not -- I do not feel it's really recommended at this point until we do the dose assessment.

MS. OLIVA: And how long will that take?

MS. LOWMAN: We should have the dose assessment done by the end of next week.

MS. OLIVA: Okay. You also mentioned that there were two other isotopes you found in 366?

MS. LOWMAN: I found radium and cesium in 366, and then we found two small spots of the rim on the floor. Those were from the artists using thoriated tungsten welding rods. That is some -- It's a very common welding rod that is sold openly.

MS. OLIVA: I'm aware of that.

MS. LOWMAN: Okay.

MS. OLIVA: And the second one?

MS. LOWMAN: We had radium, cesium, and thorium. Those were --

MS. OLIVA: So --

MS. LOWMAN: -- the only ones we found.

MS. OLIVA: Oh, I thought you said there were two other additional isotopes.

MS. LOWMAN: If I did, I misspoke.

MR. ATTENDEE: Two spots.

MS. OLIVA: Okay.

MS. LOWMAN: Okay?

MS. OLIVA: Now, dose assessment. You had mentioned the gentleman that came out here who was -- is planning at -- on Parcel E to find out the clocks since the Navy was in the Bulova watch business.

MS. LOWMAN: Well, kind of.

MS. OLIVA: Okay. You said that you have --

MS. LOWMAN: Not exactly that, but okay.

MS. OLIVA: You have remediated similar areas?

MS. LOWMAN: All across the country.

MS. OLIVA: Okay. Have there been people in close proximity or on the land when these remediations were taking place?

MS. LOWMAN: Some of them, yes.

MS. OLIVA: How many of, would you consider?

Would you consider maybe 300 people?

MS. LOWMAN: Well, there's not -- I mean, are you saying 300 people on the landfill while the remediation --

MS. OLIVA: Yes.

MS. LOWMAN: -- is going on?

MS. OLIVA: Yes.

MS. LOWMAN: Very few people are on the landfill while the remediation is going on.

MS. OLIVA: We are very close to the landfill, the artists. We are very -- The artists who are really close to it in 366 are very close to other -- other -- all of us. We have a wind factor here around the base.

MS. LOWMAN: Mm-hmm.

MS. OLIVA: And that's why I suggested to that gentleman to have it tented.

If there was an issue of having -- if -- I would like you to consider the amount of people that are sitting here on a Superfund site that need protection, because in example that you've -- you've conducted before, there haven't been that amount of people on it while you were doing remediation. And --

MS. LOWMAN: Okay.

MS. OLIVA: And I realize that the tent can be contaminated. But if the tent could be contaminated, we

can be contaminated upwind; and I would much rather have the tent contaminated than the rest of us here.

And with the same respect to the Building 366, Mr. Forman had mentioned earlier that it's already tented in tin. I don't think that's a real -- real good thing to do. My -- my impression -- I'm not a scientist -- is that cesium-137, a fission product, low levels of that scientifically may be justified, but healthwise it isn't.

MS. LOWMAN: Okay.

MS. OLIVA: That's all.

MS. LOWMAN: Okay.

MS. PENDERGRASS: Mr. Mason and then Mr. Tompkins and --

MS. LOWMAN: Let me --

MS. PENDERGRASS: -- Mr. Tisdell and then Ms. Asher.

MS. LOWMAN: Let me say something quickly.

We would -- If we don't use the tent, we will take all the proper safety precautions, including wetting down everything, dust minimization. There should be absolutely no dust coming from that work site.

MS. OLIVA: Well, how about --

MS. LOWMAN: And --

MS. OLIVA: -- tenting Building 101?

MS. LOWMAN: Tenting Building 101. Is that the one you are in?

MS. OLIVA: Yes.

MS. LOWMAN: Yes, okay.

MS. OLIVA: If you are coming on Saturday -- I hope you are --

MS. LOWMAN: Yes.

MS. OLIVA: -- you'll see us.

MS. LOWMAN: Oh, good. Okay.

MS. PENDERGRASS: Okay, Mr. Mason.

MS. WRIGHT: Mr. Tisdell had his hand up first.

MS. PENDERGRASS: Okay.

MS. LOWMAN: Who do we have?

MS. PENDERGRASS: It's his question. Just one moment.

MS. LOWMAN: Okay.

MS. PENDERGRASS: Go ahead, Mr. Mason.

MR. MASON: Hey, Laurie. How are you? Good to see you.

MS. LOWMAN: Nice to see you.

MR. MASON: One of the questions that -- that I was going to ask Pat is information on certification for the truckers in there to move this low-level radiation. Is there any type of certification they need?

MS. LOWMAN: It depends on the levels of

materials that we are using. In some instances, there are certifications and special licensing required. In addition, some of them require a million-dollar bond on the waste transport; and some of them also, depending on the levels of what we are moving, required the drivers to have dosimetry to wear.

So far we have not moved anything from here that would require that. But I can try to get all that information gathered for you and get it to Pat or -- so he can pass it on to you.

MR. MASON: Most of the drivers that are certified in the community have a million-dollar bond anyway. And so we just wanted to know if there was some further certification that they needed, and if so, what type and --

MS. LOWMAN: Okay.

MR. MASON: -- you know.

MS. LOWMAN: I will get that information for you and get it transmitted to you probably by e-mail to Pat; or if you get me your e-mail address, I'll get it directly to you.

MR. MASON: Thank you very much.

MS. LOWMAN: Okay.

MR. TOMPKINS: I'll go after --

MS. PENDERGRASS: All right.

MR. TOMPKINS: -- then I'll follow.

MS. PENDERGRASS: All right.

Mr. Tisdell and then Mr. Tompkins.

MR. TISDELL: Miss Lowman.

MS. LOWMAN: Yes.

MR. TISDELL: Now, sorry.

MS. LOWMAN: Go ahead.

MR. TISDELL: Ne- -- But anyway, hi, how are you?

MS. LOWMAN: Hi.

MR. TISDELL: Okay. With the people who's living right on that side and every --

MS. LOWMAN: What --? Just a minute. What side? Where?

MR. TISDELL: Behind 830.

MS. LOWMAN: Okay. Up the hill.

MR. TISDELL: Huh?

MS. LOWMAN: Behind 815 up the hill.

MR. TISDELL: That's 815?

MS. LOWMAN: Yeah.

MR. TISDELL: That big building --

MS. LOWMAN: Yeah.

MR. TISDELL: -- no windows. Okay, the people living over there. And everyone here can tell you that -- that that wind comes up that hill off of where

you going to be digging at. And you wouldn't put people before plastic?

MS. LOWMAN: Of course I would put people before plastic.

MR. TISDELL: Okay. Why would you s- --?

MS. LOWMAN: Absolutely.

MR. TISDELL: Why would you say that putting the tent up is -- is really not necessary and when you going to be exposing and stuff, which you can't definitely say what's what's what's what, and it's blowing right up in our face?

MS. LOWMAN: Well, first of all, we would take precautions so it would not blow in your face.

Second of all, we would have air monitoring going all the time. We have done other remediations out there and have not generated any waste or any -- we've had air monitors at every site we have done remediations at, and we have not recorded a single bit of radioactivity from any remediation that we have --

MR. TISDELL: Would you like to come up and get some dust off my cars?

MS. LOWMAN: Sure.

MR. TISDELL: You're more than welcome to.

MS. LOWMAN: Sure.

MS. SUMCHAI: It's the particulates. That's

his point.

MS. LOWMAN: Yeah. I mean, I have to say, you know, I was out there. I was out there today. The wind blows --

MR. TISDELL: They been sitting up there for two years.

MS. PENDERGRASS: Okay. The next questions, Mr. Tompkins?

MS. LOWMAN: Okay.

MR. TOMPKINS: Three part.

MS. LOWMAN: Okay.

MR. TOMPKINS: Mr. Chein Kao, in terms of the removal of the radiation dials, has the State and the Navy come to agreement in terms of first removing the chemical contamination before they address the radio -- radiology -- radioactive material? Has that been resolved?

MR. KAO: No, we have not. We are -- we are arranging to have attorneys to meet to discuss regulations --

MS. ATTENDEE: All right.

MR. KAO: -- regarding that.

MR. TOMPKINS: Okay. So that there is -- set procedures have not passed State's -- has not addressed the State's concerns in this matter?

MR. KAO: No. We have not seen -- You're correct. We have not seen the work plan. But last time we have heard in the presentation, they are still planning on -- to have the hazardous waste redeposit in the ground, which we object. And that needs to be resolved.

MR. TOMPKINS: Okay.

MR. FORMAN: All right.

MR. TOMPKINS: Second question. Dealing with traditional risk assessments that has been utilized in the United States, it's been based on -- medical model's been a 35-year-old healthy white male.

In your assessment to the radiation exposure, do you plan to use the various genetic variance between men and women and since there are men and women working there in terms of their factors as to radiation exposure?

MS. LOWMAN: I believe that we will use probably the standard. But I can talk to Commander Fragoso when I go back and ask him --

MR. TOMPKINS: I know in --

MS. LOWMAN: -- to use multiple standards.

MR. TOMPKINS: Because I know in '96, 1997 we were at EPA in Atlanta, and they had just begin take a look at the difference between men and women exposure

risk factor.

MS. LOWMAN: Okay.

MR. TOMPKINS: Second -- Third part is: How old is the Cal. DHL [sic] standard that you're using? Because some of the stuff on radium that you're using back in '96 was going back to 1940.

MS. LOWMAN: This reg. guide 1.86 has actually been superseded by a less restrictive document, and NRC doesn't use the DPM measurement now. They use a dose-based assessment of 25 millirem. The reg. guide 1.86 is a lower risk factor than that. And D -- Cal. DHS is being more conservative in the standard in applying reg. guide 1.86.

MR. TOMPKINS: And final question, as we had discussion with the manganese and the effect of attaching the manganese to the melanin in people of color: In your assessment or any of the assessments that was talked about in Treasure eye -- not Treasure -- yeah, Treasure Island that genetic variance in the race would be considered in your assessments on risk assessment, is that being taken into account here?

MS. LOWMAN: I can ask Commander Fragoso if he will do that. I haven't seen all the standards he's using yet. I will see those next week. So I can -- I can see what standards are available for us to use on

the dose assessment.

MR. TOMPKINS: 'Cause we are concerned, even though we are giving the argument background and et cetera, about: African-Americans, Filipinos, Samoans are at higher risk than threshold is much lower before ill effects take place, and historically this has been normal also.

MS. LOWMAN: I know I -- I have to base this dose assessment that we are doing right now on the artists that are in the building and have been occupying it. So if I could get --

MR. TOMPKINS: Men and women.

MS. LOWMAN: Yeah -- the various ethnicity of those occupants and the artists that have been in there, I can try to apply that. Okay?

MS. PENDERGRASS: All right. Miss Asher?

MS. ASHER: Yeah. Miss Oliva covered some of the material. But I have specific concerns about health and safety issues for residents of this community and for artists, for people who are on site.

And I -- you know, I guess you haven't come up with a final work plan, and I'm wondering how it interfaces with the emergency removal actions that you're doing at the same time.

I think that -- I mean, I just have to make a

comment that I personally don't have a lot of confidence in the way the Navy has been proceeding with the emergency removal actions.

And you can tell us that you will be doing everything possible to protect our health, but I have not seen that over the last few years with dust abatement. Artists and residents of the community have been exposed to large amounts of dust and particulate matter in the Navy cleanup procedures. And that is true, because I was here. Okay?

So don't say that you're going to do everything possible, because they have not done that in the past. And so that's my comment.

And I'm very concerned about what the work plan is. I want to know what you're doing, when you're doing it, and I want to know -- I know that Arc Ecology has -- has asked the Navy to address the emergency removal actions to at least give more public information about that; and as far as I know, that -- that hasn't been addressed yet. Has it?

MS. LOIZOS: We haven't gotten a formal -- We submitted a formal letter. I haven't gotten a formal letter back, but it's been -- the promise has been made verbally. We haven't -- you know . . .

MS. ASHER: Yeah.

So I -- I would like the Navy to show some good faith by providing that information to Arc Ecology, and I want -- I mean, your first presentation that you did here on the methane, I mean, I was present at a tech meeting for that, you know, where you talked about the solution's in place, that it's safe. You don't know if it's safe or not. So I urge, you know, the precautionary principle here, you know.

That's all. Thank you.

MS. PENDERGRASS: All right.

MS. LOWMAN: Okay.

(Applause.)

MS. PENDERGRASS: Okay. Before you answer that, we need to take a break because we have a live person with fingers that are having no blood at this moment. So we need to stop for ten minutes. We have -- Dr. Sumchai has a question. Miss Harrison has a question, and Mr. Manuel has a question, and we have a question from the audience at this point, and we have a question at the end, and we have Lynne's question.

So at this point, we need take a ten-minute break, and you all by coming back and reconvening will agree to going longer this evening than 8:10 because we are already at 8:10. All right? We'll stop at this time.

(Recess 8:02 p.m. to 8:09 p.m.)

MS. PENDERGRASS: Can we reconvene, please? Otherwise, tomorrow we'll be tired.

MS. ATTENDEE: We're already tired.

(Off-record simultaneous colloquy.)

MS. LOWMAN: Let me -- let me make a comment on -- on --

MS. PENDERGRASS: Okay.

MS. LOWMAN: -- Lani's -- what Lani had to say.

First of all, I haven't finished reviewing the draft work plan; but when I do finish reviewing it, it will go out for comment. It will go out to the public and to the regulators.

And the dates of the actual work will be provided. So everyone will know what's going on, when it's going on, the time frames, the sampling procedures. Everything's going to be out there for everyone to review. Okay? So if that helps you out, yeah. Okay.

MS. PENDERGRASS: Dr. Sumchai?

MS. SUMCHAI: Let's see. What I -- I'd like to do in lieu of the limitations --

MS. PENDERGRASS: You need to turn it on.

MS. SUMCHAI: What I'd do -- like to do --

MR. MASON: The RAB is back in --

MS. SUMCHAI: -- in lieu of --

MR. MASON: -- session.

MS. SUMCHAI: -- in limitations on time if it's okay with you is: I will forgo my subcommittee report and just make a couple of comments.

I did send most of you by e-mail the minutes of last night's meeting. They're very extensive. It was a very productive meeting. I wanted to thank David Terzian and Mr. Webster, one of the artists, for attending. I'm sorry that Georgia and Lani weren't able to attend.

Some of the concerns that you are expressing are shared but are redundant. I think in a more intimate environment, we could have explored some -- some of them in greater depth. But let me just make a couple of statements just to clarify some things that I think that are important.

With regard to the lithium fluoride dosimetry that is -- that the workers are wearing, those do not measure the cumulative additive effects of chronic low-dose radiation of someone staying in that area for ten years, 12 hours a day, seven days a week, might be subjected to. So, you know, that's just an issue I wanted to clarify.

Also, I want to remind everybody that with regard to the Cal. DHS clearance standards for

Building 366 as well as for Parcel A Buildings 3 -- excuse -- yeah, 816 and 821, these are again being legally challenged in the superior court in the state of California and in the legislature. And as of November, we need to revisit what happened in the legislature with regard to passage of bills and the current standards in the state of California.

Mr. Terzian made the important point that the ventilation system may have been operational a year ago. So that means that a year ago people could have breathed in or ingested dust from the overhead vents that had radionuclides on it.

The other thing that I want to emphasize to everyone is that Laurie has made clear the cesium and the radium that's been found in the vents and in the drains is above background. This is not, you know, nuclear fallout. It is not cosmic radiation or an act of God. This is contamination. It is slightly above background. So it is therefore significant.

And then Mr. Terzian also expressed his concerns that the exhaust ventilation system is not contained and that the artists had lingering questions about the risk of inhaling and ingesting the radionuclides detected on the survey.

Now, the final thing that I want to say is that

I had raised the issue of the need for radiation risk assessment for Parcel D because there are other human occupants. There are other artists on Parcel B.

And HRA has generated a radiation risk assessment for Parcel E. and, you know, Laurie and -- and Keith Forman, you know, they, you know, made some -- some explanations for why it hadn't been done. I was impressed to read here under "Parcel D September 2003 Activities" "Continue human health risk assessment data evaluation."

So if they're going to do -- if you're going to do a human health risk assessment for Parcel D, then since there are human occupants on Parcel D, I think that we should have a radiation risk assessment. It just seems to me to be a commonsense measure that we should have some mathematical model for determining, you know, using a computer methodology of what the risks are for people who are on this site.

So that is as much as I am going to say, and you can review the -- you know, the meeting minutes with much more thoroughness.

MS. PENDERGRASS: Okay.

MS. LOWMAN: Okay. I would like to make a couple of statements. Yes, we had a great meeting yesterday. I thought it went really well.

And please, if people have concerns, radiological concerns, that they would like more information on, we'd love to talk to you at the RAB subcommittee meetings. Those kind of have a different atmosphere, and you get more one-on-one questioning. It -- We can answer in a little more detail.

Also, as far as the California bills that are pending, that is also one of my taskings for reviewing those all the time. We are looking at the different levels. The NRC level that they are challenging is a dose-base 25-millirem level. EPA is coming back with a risk-base level of 10 to the minus 6 or even 15 millirem.

There's different ways to look at this. Navy has a certain stance. They do not agree with the 25-millirem rule. The reg. guide 1.86 comes out with a different level that is lower than 25 millirem.

So we are really trying to accommodate what the future bills would be as well as working with Cal. DHS to meet their standards. So there's kind of like a compromise going on. Everybody's trying to do that.

And then in addition to that, all of the readings are compared, as is required by the Multi-Agency Survey and Site Investigation Manual, the MARSSIM. So all buildings are -- and readings are

analyzed for the proper statistical variance and analytical processes that are required by that regulation. So I wanted to let you all know that too.

MS. PENDERGRASS: All right. Miss Harrison has a question, then Mr. Manuel, and then we have an audience question.

MS. LOWMAN: Okay.

MS. HARRISON: Real quickly. Actually, one of my questions Ahimsa actually addressed.

MS. LOWMAN: Okay.

MS. HARRISON: So I can let that go for now.

But what's really important to me is that you had said that the Army Corps of Engineers wanted to be involved in this process now?

MS. LOWMAN: In that HRA review process?

MS. HARRISON: Uh-huh.

MS. LOWMAN: Uh-huh.

MS. HARRISON: Could that possibly be because they know that the Army has actually dumped stuff over there in this Parcel E?

MS. LOWMAN: The gentleman --

MS. HARRISON: Let me finish.

MS. LOWMAN: Okay.

MS. HARRISON: That they have dumped stuff over here, especially stuff after the closure of the -- of

the Presidio and stuff. I'm told that may have come from the hospital, and the Navy doesn't seem to know what it is.

And would they actually have records of what was brought here and dumped and buried in Parcel E that we might be able to review or you may be able to review?

MS. LOWMAN: Okay. That's the first I've heard of the Army dumping anything on Parcel E.

We are looking for radiological records. Gentleman with the Army Corps of Engineers is Mr. Jerry Vincent that's going to be the reviewer. He is the one responsible for Buildings 815, 820 -- 820, I believe it is, 830, and 831. Those areas are FUDS sites, or Formerly Used Defense Sites, which fall under his jurisdiction. And the HRA covers the radiological operations at those sites.

So he is interested in seeing what history we found.

And we also in the document categorized the types of migration of any residual radioactivity that there might be, and we make a recommendation for future actions for each of the sites. So he is very interested in seeing what -- what the history is that we have found for those buildings, what was used in those buildings, and what our recommendation is. That's why he's

involved.

So I -- I'm not aware of any Army dumping of any type of waste over there. That's the first time I've heard of that.

MS. HARRISON: Well, that actually came -- came to my attention a couple years back.

MS. LOWMAN: Okay.

MS. HARRISON: And you have to know that I've been sitting on this RAB for at least -- what, 12 years now?

MR. ATTENDEE: Twelve.

MS. HARRISON: Eleven, twelve years? I'm quite possibly the oldest person sitting here on the table. Well, not being the oldest person in the building.

MS. LOWMAN: The oldest RAB member?

MS. HARRISON: No, that's not right either.

MR. TISDELL: You want to say RAB member --

MS. LOWMAN: The oldest -- the oldest -- The person who has served on the RAB the longest?

MS. ATTENDEE: Yeah.

MS. LOWMAN: Okay.

MS. HARRISON: Quite possibly. I would actually put some money on it.

MS. LOWMAN: Okay.

MS. HARRISON: So when that -- when that

actually came to light, no one ever went back after we requested go back and ask them. I know that the Army keeps records just like the Navy does.

MS. LOWMAN: Okay.

MS. HARRISON: I happened to work with the Department of the Navy as a civilian, and I couldn't get a pencil unless I filled out the form in triplicates. I know that the Navy is very similar. The Army is very similar. Air force is very similar. They just -- They love paperwork.

So somebody has to know, one, if in fact that they did, they dumped stuff over here before the closure of the Presidio or afterwards, and it has to be in writing somewhere.

MS. LOWMAN: Okay. But you are saying that this is in general material that they brought over from there --

MS. HARRISON: Actually --

MS. LOWMAN: -- or do you think it has to do with radiological --

MS. HARRISON: It --

MS. LOWMAN: -- material?

MS. HARRISON: -- possibly would have to do -- If they have used these -- If these radiological materials were used at all, these radium dials or

anything like that that was used at all in the hospital, then it would probably be along those lines, yes.

MS. LOWMAN: So you are talking about Oak Knoll Hospital?

MS. HARRISON: No.

MR. ATTENDEE: Letterman.

MS. LOWMAN: Letterman, okay.

MS. HARRISON: I am talking about Letterman, okay.

MS. PIERCE: The old marine -- the old marine hospital, which was shut down and not cleaned until after transfer.

MS. HARRISON: Exactly.

MS. LOWMAN: Okay.

MS. PENDERGRASS: Okay. So --

MS. LOWMAN: I will -- I will see if there's information out there. I don't -- I can't guarantee it that I'll have it if it's not radiological, you know.

MS. OLIVA: Medical waste.

MS. HARRISON: But it's medical waste.

MS. ATTENDEE: It's medical waste.

MS. LOWMAN: It depends on if they had a nuclear medicine department. So --

MS. HARRISON: I don't know if they give x-rays back -- back then, that tells me -- and they did.

MS. LOWMAN: Well, I know, but that --

MS. HARRISON: What did they do with the waste product from that, the old equipment?

MS. LOWMAN: Right, but that is electric, electrical, and it doesn't leave a residue.

MS. HARRISON: [Unintelligible interruption] -- open the door for you?

MS. PENDERGRASS: One -- one person can speak at a time, please.

MS. HARRISON: To me it doesn't matter. It opens the door for you to ask those questions --

MS. LOWMAN: Okay.

MS. HARRISON: -- and see the documents.

MS. LOWMAN: Okay. I will see what I can do.

MS. HARRISON: Thank you.

MS. LOWMAN: Okay.

MS. PENDERGRASS: Miss Harrison, do you want this as an action item to be --

MS. HARRISON: Yes.

MS. PENDERGRASS: -- followed up on?

MS. HARRISON: Yes.

MS. LOWMAN: Okay.

MS. PENDERGRASS: All rightie, then. Mr. Manual.

MR. MANUEL: Okay. Is it on? Oh, it is on.

First off, I think in all fairness to basically all the participants that come to these meetings, that we should assume that the people that participate, be they people on the RAB board or -- or the public at-large, have -- the people that come here have enough integrity to be interested in helping resolve whatever's going on and raise issues and whatever. And I think in all fairness, every single person here is due that kind of respect.

And I believe unless we go and find a smoking gun of somebody deliberately intentionally lying to us, that we should give everyone the benefit of the doubt rather -- whether they're regulators, whether they're people at-large in the public or et cetera.

Now, one of the issues I wanted to raise is that it was mentioned earlier about the dust particles flying all over the place. Well, I happen to know that Arc Ecology and a lot of the other people in the community know very well that Firma operated an illegal concrete crushing plant here for years. It has asbestos in concrete. It has a whole lot of other airborne problems. And I don't hear anybody complaining about Firma. So let's be fair about this.

They are exposed because they didn't have a federal license. They didn't have a state license to

operate that crushing plant. Okay? Let's -- let's look at the whole picture here and what's right is right, and let's be fair about this.

Secondly, I wanted to refresh Mr. Tompkins' memory, but he may have left early, though, last week -- last month. Excuse me.

What we all agree, at least I thought we all agreed, is that being that the Navy has not put forward their plan, they have not gotten any okays or -- or -- okays to go forward to do anything.

There is a process. We discussed this at the last meeting, that nothing will be agreed to that they will do or process they will do or anything else until the public, this RAB board, and anyone else participates in that process. There's nothing that's just going to come up out of the woods and just say: "Here. Here we are. This is what we're going to do." The law doesn't allow them to do that. We did discuss this at the last meeting.

So they can't just move forward without us participating. Okay?

Now, beyond that, I'd like to ask you on the behalf of the Navy and/or the Redevelopment Agency -- I know that there's disclaimers all over this base about this being a toxic site and there may be problems and et

cetera, et cetera -- pure, right out, is the facilities that the artists occupy -- are those facilities safe for human occupation or not?

If they are not safe for human occupation, why are these people being put in the potential position of harm?

We need to know whether or not it's -- it's safe for people to be in there or not, and -- because a lot of these questions that are coming up basically suggest that people are kind of in there and no one's bothered to check whether or not they are safe being at these places or not.

And I'd like an answer for that, because in all fairness, there's a whole lot of exposure -- legal exposure here if somebody -- I guess agreement with them is with the Redevelopment Agency? That's who sublet the thing out to these people?

So, I mean, somebody needed to take them some kind of notice of this situation and be able to assure them it's safe. If it's not, they shouldn't be in there.

MR. BROWN: That' right.

MR. MANUEL: Simple as that. So I'd like an answer to that.

MS. LOWMAN: Okay. I can -- I can understand

completely what you're saying. And we are -- if you're talking about radiological hazard?

MR. MANUEL: Any kind of hazard.

MS. LOWMAN: Any type of hazard.

MR. MANUEL: Any type of hazard.

MS. LOWMAN: At 366 or any of the artists' buildings?

MR. MANUEL: Any of the occupied territories. Anyplace where anybody's breathing anything or walking around in there or anything else is -- is it safe for these people or not?

MS. LOWMAN: Do you want to take this one? Radiologically I can address this, but --

MR. FORMAN: You do your part first.

MS. LOWMAN: Do my part first?

MR. FORMAN: Yeah.

MS. LOWMAN: Okay. Radiologically we are investigating every site on this base that we feel by virtue of all the research we have done -- and it will be documented in the HRA -- had potential for any residual radioactivity.

We have looked at some of the artists' buildings already, and there are -- we have asked one other individual to move out of the building when we discovered some residual contamination in it. That was

at Building 364. I believe he was a metal processor that was in there, and he has been relocated to another site.

MR. BROWN: Is that 320?

MS. LOWMAN: 364. It was 364. Okay.

As far as any other building that we have done surveys in, we have not yet found any evidence of radiological contamination other than 366 where we had people in the buildings and working in the buildings. We have found it in 364, and we asked that individual to relocate.

And 366, that levels we found in 366, we do not consider them to be harmful at all. However, for us to do the remediation and the decontamination in the building would be absolutely crazy for us to have the people in there, 'cause we are going to have to move their work spaces.

We are going to have to -- The ceiling is 35 feet high with the ventilation in it that we are going to rip holes in the ceiling, rip pipes up out of the concrete floor. It would be very, very difficult for us to do that.

So for -- not only for radiological purposes, but just general safety precautions, we would want them to vacate that building.

I have no other impacted site that I am aware of at this time that has any tenants in it, and we are checking that all the time as we are doing the research that we are doing.

Now, as far as other contaminants, I would have to defer to Mr. Forman.

MR. MANUEL: Well -- well, you know, very briefly --

MS. PENDERGRASS: Mi- --

MR. MANUEL: -- here, well, very briefly --

MS. PENDERGRASS: Mr. Manuel?

MR. MANUEL: -- I -- my -- my question was, basically: Was there consideration prior to allowing the people to occupy these buildings more importantly than what's happening now, they say -- or whatever, but was there a basic consideration prior to allowing the people to occupy the buildings whether or not they were deemed to be safe for human occupation?

That's my basic question, and I may have misstated it. That's why I'm trying to clean it up. I don't mean to interrupt, but that's the question I wanted is that was -- you know, was there consideration before the people were allowed to occupy these buildings whether or not they were safe or not, or this is kind of an after-the-fact thing, horse is galloping down the

valley, and you shut the gate now?

MS. LOWMAN: Well --

MR. MANUEL: I mean, that's what I want to know.

MS. LOWMAN: It's kind of a -- if you're talking about, for example, we use 366 as an example.

336 was used by NRDL for various purposes. When they vacated that building -- well, when they used it, it was No. 351 B. When they vacated that building, they did all the proper surveys for that time. They did everything they were supposed to do with the instrumentation --

MR. MANUEL: Okay.

MS. LOWMAN: -- they had available.

MR. MANUEL: That's what I want to know.

MS. LOWMAN: Okay. And the Shipyard took that building over and used it as a boat and plastic shop. The Shipyard workers were in there working for the rest of the time.

But as far as any regulator was concerned, that -- radiological regulator, the Atomic Energy Commission, that building had been released to the standards at the time. It was free released, and there was no reason anyone couldn't occupy it.

MR. MANUEL: So it was turned over to the

Redevelopment at that time?

MS. LOWMAN: Well, after the Shipyard closed and Triple A was no longer using the building, my understanding is that they were leased to the San Francisco Redevelopment Authority.

MR. MANUEL: When the bui- -- When -- when the property in question was turned over to Redevelopment, there were fresh surveys at the time?

MS. LOWMAN: No.

MR. FORMAN: No.

MS. LOWMAN: They based -- They turned those buildings over based on the historical information.

Since that time, we have new standards and instrumentation. We also have new standards -- new release standards, radiological release standards, for those buildings. That is why we are doing the HRA.

That is why we are going back to address any site that potentially was impacted by radiological operations so that we can revisit all of these old surveys.

And some of these buildings were surveyed multiple times. Some of these buildings were surveyed -- 364, as an example, was surveyed by RASO in 1978 and '79, and we released it.

And now RASO is saying, "Hey, there's -- we have got to go back and look at it again." There was

contamination that was below the new s- -- or above, I should say, the new standards that we did not remove, and we have gone back and worked in that building, and now it meets the current standards.

So --

MS. PENDERGRASS: Okay.

MS. LOWMAN: -- some of what we are doing now is to revisit these sites to make sure.

Ten years ago when 366 was leased, I'm sure that it met the standards of that time.

MR. MANUEL: Yeah, that's what I basically wanted to know.

MS. LOWMAN: Okay.

MS. PENDERGRASS: All right.

MS. LOWMAN: Does that help?

MR. MANUEL: Yeah, thank you.

MS. LOWMAN: Okay.

MS. PENDERGRASS: Okay. Now, now, we have -- we have another question from the audience there, and then --

MR. BROWN: I had a question.

MS. PENDERGRASS: And then we have a question from you. Just a minute.

MS. PIERCE: Tom?

MS. LOWMAN: Okay.

MS. PENDERGRASS: You've been very patient. Yes, sir.

MR. RIPLEY: Talofa, Laurie, thank you for the opportunity and also the RAB committee.

Two question that I have tonight is -- one --

Oh, by the way, my name is Seali'imalietoa Sam Ripley from the Samoan Community here in Bayview-Hunters Point. I been here. I'm originally from Samoa, born and raised in Samoa, but was new here in Hunters Point in the Bayview for quite some time.

The question is: You, the Navy, fail -- f-a-l-e [sic], fail -- to reach to the Samoan community where they 40 percent of the -- you haven't done -- you haven't did your assign- -- your homework. You need to outreach --

How are you doing your outreach to the Pacific Islander Samoan Community?

MS. PENDERGRASS: Excuse me. I have to stop your question at this point because our question period at this point is about the presentation about --

MR. RIPLEY: Okay. Well, it's linked up to this -- can I make my question? I -- I been waiting faithfully.

The question is: How are you translating the material? We are not informed. That's very important.

MS. PENDERGRASS: Okay.

MR. RIPLEY: That the Navy, since 1900, they came to the -- the highest cancer reach. They just left a mess in the South Pacific. You know that. And you're not informing the Samoan community here up in the Hunters Point, which is the -- the highest is African-American. For your information, Laurie --

MR. FORMAN: Sir.

MR. RIPLEY: -- the second is Samoan community.

Thank you very much for your --

MR. FORMAN: Sir --

MR. RIPLEY: -- time, and I am glad I am --

MR. FORMAN: Okay.

MR. RIPLEY: -- here.

MR. FORMAN: Let --

MS. PENDERGRASS: Okay.

MR. FORMAN: Let me give you a quick response to that, sir.

What I recommend -- You sound like a good cons- -- solid, concerned citizen. Talk to me after the RAB.

We have been doing a lot. If you come to the RAB meetings; if you -- if you heard about us before, you know that we're doing a lot in a lot of different communities.

One -- one RAB member -- I don't believe he's here tonight -- his name is Mr. Sulu Palega. Are you familiar with him?

MR. RIPLEY: Very familiar with him. But, you know, this is a first time I -- I -- not the first time. I take that back. But you are not outreaching out in the -- the community.

MR. FORMAN: Okay. So --

MR. RIPLEY: That's all I have to say.

MR. FORMAN: Okay. So my recommendation is that after the meeting adjourns here, if you could stay and talk with me, we can begin that outreach, and I will also talk to you about incorporating the RAB member here who's supposed to be a great facilitator. That's Sulu Palega, and we'll talk about that after the meeting.

MS. PENDERGRASS: Thank you.

All right. Lynne.

MR. BROWN: Yes, thank you.

I like to say, there's a lot of stuff that NRDL was doing out there on the Shipyard, and it's a lot of stuff in 1969 when Atomic Energy Commission came out there and removed strontium-90, cesium 130 -- they removed a lot of stuff out from the NRDL building.

What -- what I would like to ask is: Can we get a inventory of everything that they moved out --

removed from the NRDL building in 1969?

MS. LOWMAN: The reference documents for the HRA, we have right now over 4,000 documents that we are sorting through as to what we are using as reference documents for the HRA. One of those documents is the list of radioactive sources and where they were transferred to that NRDL had when they moved and --

MR. BROWN: Right.

MS. LOWMAN: -- where they transferred those sources to. I will try and make sure that that is included in the reference list.

It would -- The references are going to be so large that they will only be available on CD because there's just so many of them. So we will try to make sure it's included.

MS. PENDERGRASS: Thank you. And thank you for your presentation tonight.

MS. LOWMAN: Okay?

MS. PENDERGRASS: All right. At this point --

Thank you so much.

(Applause.)

MS. PENDERGRASS: Okay. At this point tonight, it is -- I have twenty minutes to 9 o'clock. We are way long. Excuse me.

So at this point, what -- what I'd like to do

is: We have committee reports. Most of those are in writing. What I would like to ask at this point is if we could get up the dates of the next meetings, and we can put that up right now.

We can -- Anybody who has a motion from their committee report that needs to be brought to the full RAB, we will take those now and then adjourn the meeting and any subsequent things.

Is there someone who just deathly opposes that option? Someone who opposes that option?

All right. So who's the first committee that has a moving motion that they need to make as part of tonight's agenda?

Mr. Tisdell?

MR. TISDELL: Yes.

MS. PENDERGRASS: And then Miss Pierce.

MR. TISDELL: Good evening. There's -- I like to place a motion on the floor to accept Mr. Charles Dracus [sic] as a renewal candidate for the RAB. Mr. Charles Dacus.

MS. PENDERGRASS: Is there a motion, sir? Please --

MR. TISDELL: I formed it in a motion.

MR. RAB MEMBER: I second it.

MS. PIERCE: Second.

MR. RAB MEMBER: I second it.

MS. PENDERGRASS: All right. We have a second to that motion.

All in favor of bringing Mr. Charles Duck -- Duckus?

MR. DACUS: Dacus.

MS. PENDERGRASS: -- Dacus back as a RAB member in good standing, all in favor, say, "Aye."

THE BOARD: Aye.

MS. PENDERGRASS: Anyone opposed?

And any abstentions to that?

(No verbal response elicited.)

MS. PENDERGRASS: Okay. We have --

Welcome back --

MR. DACUS: Thank you.

MS. PENDERGRASS: -- Mr. Dacus.

MR. TISDELL: And -- and also this is just to let the RAB know that Miss Caroline Washington and Mr. Sulu Palegra [sic] will be removed from the RAB due to the misses.

MR. ATTENDEE: Yeah.

MS. PENDERGRASS: Okay.

MR. TISDELL: That's just, you know.

MS. PENDERGRASS: Thank you.

MR. TISDELL: And Ron can handle that.

MS. PENDERGRASS: All right. Miss Pierce?

MR. BROWN: May I say this? They allowed to reapply too.

MS. PENDERGRASS: Yes.

MR. TISDELL: They could reapply.

MS. PENDERGRASS: Yes.

Miss Pierce?

MS. PIERCE: This was going to be a request; but if I put it in the form of a motion, then I will --

MS. PENDERGRASS: Can you speak --

MS. PIERCE: Well --

MS. PENDERGRASS: -- up? Or you can use --

MS. PIERCE: Okay.

MS. PENDERGRASS: -- a mike.

MS. PIERCE: This was going to be just a request, but I will put it in the form of a motion.

The Risk Review Committee is recommending that a full participatory process be established to look at the leasing agreements the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency enters into to ensure that there -- there's clear delineation of responsibilities and consequences. And in order to do that, we have identified a number of other city departments that should be included in the discussion.

We'd like to ask if the Outreach Committee,

since it has already started the process for reviewing the lease, the -- the police department lease, to consider expanding that so that we can -- There's -- There is participation and then there's participation. We want a real participatory process. So we'd like to request that that be included as part of what you're already doing.

MS. PENDERGRASS: There's no need to respond to that at this time. You could do that --

MR. TISDELL: Yes --

MS. PENDERGRASS: -- off line.

MR. TISDELL: -- it -- it is --

MS. PENDERGRASS: Is there --?

MR. TISDELL: -- because Mr. Don Capobres will be there November the 5th.

MR. FORMAN: Yes.

MS. PENDERGRASS: Okay. All right. Thank you, sir. Thank you so much.

Do we have all the dates for the Radiological Committee meeting next week, please?

MS. SUMCHAI: When is Thanksgiving in November?

MS. PENDERGRASS: I'm sorry.

MS. SUMCHAI: Is it the 20 -- next --?

MS. PENDERGRASS: Just a moment. I'm sorry.

Mr. Campbell, did you have a moving motion?

MR. CAMPBELL: Yes, I do.

There's Section 2912 of the -- the -- the F -- the fiscal year 1994 Defense Authorization Act establishing the following preference for businesses located in the vicinity of base closure and realignment work.

Now, what my understanding is, the Navy is going to start putting this in their RFPs. The law is here. I believe all the RAB members have it. It was challenged, I believe, in 2000. It was enforced by the GAO, and we would like to see this -- a motion to have this enforced in the future.

MS. PENDERGRASS: Okay. So the RA- -- your -- okay. The -- the way this works is: The RAB can -- you can move -- put a motion together that say -- that gets the RAB in full agreement to make a recommendation to the Navy. But that's about how that works.

MR. CAMPBELL: That's fine.

MS. PENDERGRASS: Okay. Did you want to state that motion?

MR. CAMPBELL: Yeah. I would like to make -- I'm sorry. I would like to make a recommendation that --

MS. PENDERGRASS: It's a motion.

MR. CAMPBELL: -- a motion that this body back

Section 2912 of the FY 1994 Defense Authorization Act, Publication 1.103-116, establishing the following preference of business located in the vicinity of base closure and realignment.

MS. PENDERGRASS: Okay.

Did we have a second to that?

MR. TOMPKINS: Second.

MS. PENDERGRASS: Second.

And all in favor of the motion as -- as read, say, "Aye."

THE BOARD: Aye.

MS. PENDERGRASS: Anyone opposed to that motion?

Any abstentions to that motion?

(No verbal response elicited.)

MS. PENDERGRASS: Okay. So that's a recommendation. Did you --? Did your committee want to put that recommendation in writing, Mr. Campbell?

MR. CAMPBELL: We can.

MS. PENDERGRASS: Okay. That would make sense.

MR. TOMPKINS: I have a copy here.

MS. PENDERGRASS: Okay. That would make sense.

MR. FORMAN: Have you been working with Mr. Chon Son on this?

MR. CAMPBELL: Yes.

MR. FORMAN: Okay.

MS. PENDERGRASS: All right. Did we want to put that as an action item as follow-up --

MR. TOMPKINS: Yes.

MS. PENDERGRASS: -- or how do you want to do that?

MR. CAMPBELL: I'm sorry. I didn't hear.

MS. PENDERGRASS: Did we want to put that as an action item for follow-up?

MR. CAMPBELL: Yes.

MR. TOMPKINS: Yes.

MS. PENDERGRASS: All right. So that would be an action item for next time too to follow up just to see what we are going to do with it. Gives you time to respond.

All right. Barring there's nothing else --

MR. BROWN: I've got announcement.

MR. DA COSTA: Public comment.

MR. BROWN: I got announcement. I have meeting dates. We don't have all the dates yet.

MS. PENDERGRASS: All right. I'm so sorry. I'm in a hurry, as you can see.

All right. Okay. We have Radiological meeting on November 19th. When's the Membership & Bylaws? November 6th. We've got Technical Review November what?

MS. LOIZOS: 18.

MS. PENDERGRASS: 18.

MR. ATTENDEE: Where?

MS. LOIZOS: At the Community Window on the Shipyard, which is 4634 Third Street opening on the 7th. There are invitations for all of you on the -- on the table there with the location address.

MS. PENDERGRASS: Okay. And then the final committee --?

MR. MALOOF: At what time?

MS. LOIZOS: 6:00.

MS. PENDERGRASS: Which committee did I forget?

MR. TOMPKINS: Risk Assessment.

MS. PENDERGRASS: Risk Assessment Committee.

MS. PIERCE: Joint meeting.

MS. PENDERGRASS: Joint meeting.

MS. LOIZOS: And it will be with the Tech Subcommittee.

MS. PENDERGRASS: With the Tech Subcommittee.

MS. PIERCE: With the Tech Subcommittee, and we will be working with the Outreach Committee on the other piece of our --

MS. PENDERGRASS: Very good.

MS. PIERCE: -- proposed activity.

MR. CAMPBELL: One more thing.

MS. PENDERGRASS: Yes.

MR. TOMPKINS: Economic.

MR. CAMPBELL: Economic Committee November 11th at 2:30 at the Anna Waden Library.

MR. ATTENDEE: Veterans Day.

MR. BROOKS: Veterans Day.

MS. PENDERGRASS: November 11th is Veterans Day.

MR. CAMPBELL: Oh.

MS. PENDERGRASS: All right.

MR. ATTENDEE: So --

MS. PENDERGRASS: Will you -- will you get with Mr. Keichline with a new date --

MR. CAMPBELL: Yeah, I will.

MS. PENDERGRASS: -- for that? Okay.

MR. BROWN: I got announcement.

MS. PENDERGRASS: And then we have one announcement.

MR. BROWN: On the 29th at 6 o'clock at the Southeast Community facility, we'll be having Environmental Racism Workshop pertaining to the Southeast Sewage Treatment Plant.

So everybody, if you don't have one, here's an invitation to it.

MS. PENDERGRASS: All right.

Yes, sir?

Okay. I'd like to say thank you for going long tonight. This has been an extremely productive meeting. We got a lot done.

And I would suggest that next month, Mr. Keichline, if -- if we're going to have two big reports like that, then we need to schedule till 8:30.

MR. DA COSTA: And no public comment?

MS. PENDERGRASS: We really don't want to have any public comment because we want to go home. But Mr. Da Costa, you come every meeting, please feel free.

MR. DA COSTA: I think I been listening -- yeah, thank you. I been listening very carefully, and I have a very brief comment.

I have -- There are certain state regulators here, and we'll be monitoring your observations in the future, because we have a lot of discussion here.

One of the reasons the artists were put there were because of political reasons, Nancy Pelosi's legislation. And right now, the community is going to bear adversely due to certain political pressure put to build 1,600 units.

So the city has a precautionary principle, and I'm inviting the state regulators over here to monitor this process very carefully.

Thank you.

MS. PENDERGRASS: Thank you, Mr. Costa.

We are adjourned.

(Off record at 8:45 p.m., 10/23/03.)

---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