

COMMUNITY MEETING

NAVAL STATION TREASURE ISLAND

HUNTERS POINT ANNEX

December 9, 1987

1:30 p.m.

Taken Before Karen A. Crangle, Notary Public

In and for the County of Alameda

State of California

C.S.R. License No. 3816

138
26

ATTENDANCE LIST

Naval Station Treasure Island
Hunters Point Annex

December 9, 1987

<u>Name</u>	<u>Affiliation</u>
Captain Pete Roder	U. S. Navy
Captain Ted Krumm	U.S. Navy
Alex Dong	U.S. Navy
Commander Chris Guild	U.S. Navy
Lisa Teague	Harding Lawson
Rick Notini	California DHS
Alan Ramo	Citizen For A Better Environment
Carol Lee	WESTDIV
Greg Brown	WESTDIV
Steve Castleman	S.F.D.A.
Olivia Perreault	S.F.D.A.
John Shackleton	NASMFT - N.A.S. Moffett Field
C.L. Swain	NASMFT - N.A.S. Moffett Field
David Wells	SFDPH
Peter Strauss	MHB/WSLF
Andrew Lichterman	Western States Legal Foundation
Michael Veilurea	Western States Legal Foundation
Jackie Cabasso	Western States Legal Foundation
Dorothy Legarreta	Nat'l Assn of Radiation Survivors
Patrick Sheehan	ATT
Ellyn Gallagher	WESTDIV PAO
Karen Topakian	Greenpeace
Rev. Daniel Buford	Allen Temple

---o0o---

PROCEEDINGS

1
2
3 CAPTAIN RODER: Good afternoon, ladies and
4 gentlemen. If we could get on with the program here.

5 I'm Captain Pete Roder and I'm the commanding
6 officer of Naval Station Treasure Island and also since 1
7 October the commanding officer of what we call the Naval
8 Station Treasure Island, Hunters Point Annex, which is the
9 property down on the waterfront that used to be the Hunters
10 Point Naval Ship Yard.

11 It's a pleasure for me to be able to be here today
12 and greet you and also good to see a relatively decent
13 turnout for this important first step in the process of
14 cleaning up my addition to my empire down there, as it
15 were.

16 There has been hazardous waste identified down at
17 the Hunters Point Annex. That's incontrovertible. But
18 there's one central point to bear in mind, more than one
19 here. The Navy is going to clean up that property of
20 hazardous waste and we're also going to clean it up of
21 trash and debris that's not hazardous. We're doing that
22 already.

23 The Navy is going to clean up Hunters Point Annex.
24 We're going to clean up the hazardous waste materials down
25 there.

1 We're going to do it regardless of who was
2 responsible for it being there in the first place, whether
3 or not it was defined as hazardous waste when it was put
4 there.

5 The Navy is going to clean it up regardless of
6 whether any Navy ship or any other ship is ever homeported
7 down there. The Navy is committed to cleaning up the
8 hazardous waste and materials that are down there at the
9 Hunters Point Annex.

10 We might, if we find out that somebody else put it
11 there, it's possible that we could try to recover costs
12 from whoever we felt is responsible for it being there.
13 But the Navy is going to clean it up and we are committed
14 to that.

15 A lot of the hazardous material down there predates
16 its definition as hazardous material. Predates the laws
17 regulating that kind of material. We're still going to
18 clean it up.

19 We're not waiting. There's a number of surveys in
20 progress down there to define the extent and types of
21 hazardous materials that might be present on the property.

22 And we are also in the process of cleaning up the
23 non-hazardous material down there because if you've been
24 down there and looked around the property, you'll observe
25 that it's fairly well trashed. We have made quite a bit of

1 progress in cleaning up just the debris and junk and scrap
2 metal that's been left laying around recently.

3 The Navy intends to follow all the applicable
4 federal and state regulations during our cleanup effort.
5 And this hearing we're having here today is part of that.

6 The Navy plans that the public be kept informed
7 during this process, and as I said, that part of the
8 process is one of the reasons that we are gathered here
9 today; to review our intentions for the required Community
10 Relations Plan that is a required first part of the cleanup
11 effort down there, the plan, the Community Relations Plan,
12 and the methods by which we're going to keep the local
13 area, population, and everybody informed. That's about all
14 I have to say. I'd like to introduce Captain Ted Krumm.

15 CAPTAIN KRUMM: Thank you, Pete. Again, let me add
16 to Captain Roder's welcome, my welcome. We certainly
17 appreciate you coming here.

18 The real purpose of today's meeting is to solicit
19 your inputs regarding our Community Relations Plan and
20 environmental cleanup of Hunters Point Annex.

21 We hope to accomplish this by two ways today:
22 Providing an albeit brief but an overview of the Navy
23 Installation and Restoration Program and other
24 environmental cleanup projects we have ongoing that we're
25 looking at for Hunters Point, and also, briefing you on the

1 key features as we see it at this time.

2 We are soliciting your input on the Community
3 Relations Plan itself that goes hand and hand with the
4 environmental cleanup of Hunters Point.

5 The presentation will be followed by an opportunity
6 for questions and answers. And I might add I have a lot of
7 high powered help to help answer those questions as best we
8 can today.

9 Starting at my far left here, Mr. Alex Dong, who is
10 the Environmental Engineering and Project Manager for the
11 Navy's Facility Engineering Command at San Bruno.

12 We have Commander Chris Guild, who heads that
13 division which includes all the environmental support
14 section for the Navy in this particular area.

15 Miss Lisa Teague, who is our Project Manager,
16 particularly with respect to the Community Relations Plan,
17 from Harding Lawson, our primary consultant on the cleanup
18 at Hunters Point.

19 And Mr. Rick Notini, representing the Department of
20 Health Services, and who is also an environmental engineer
21 and one of the project managers assigned to work with the
22 Navy on environmental cleanup.

23 I might point out that immediately following this
24 session, and the sessions have typically lasted an hour and
25 a half to two hours, but if anyone here is interested, we

1 will have a bus here to take you on a tour of Hunters
2 Point. So you can see firsthand some of the sites we're
3 talking about.

4 It's nice to talk about paper, read reports, but I
5 think it might be helpful if you could see some of the
6 areas. I will also ask, so I can save the taxpayers any
7 money, how many would be interested in going on a tour of
8 Hunters Point?

9 Okay. Fine. If there wasn't anybody interested I
10 was going to send the bus off and save a few bucks.

11 We're happy to do it. So right after this we'll
12 load up on the bus, run over to Hunters Point and take a
13 drive around and show you the sites we'll be talking about
14 today.

15 We are also maintaining a verbatim record or a
16 stenographer's record of what goes on at this particular
17 meeting and the purpose of that is to make sure that we get
18 your concerns down on paper, so we don't overlook anything
19 that might be expressed at this particular meeting.

20 Hopefully it won't inhibit anybody with respect to their
21 comments. Just say what you think on particular points.

22 As a way of introduction to the formal presentation,
23 I'd like to highlight a few key points. Some of them will
24 be redundant with Captain Roder's remarks.

25 First, number one, the Navy is fully committed to

1 remediating the hazardous waste at Hunters Point Annex.

2 Not only are we more real committed to this from our
3 own interests, but we are committed to this by federal law
4 and certainly by an extension by state law. So we are
5 going to clean it up.

6 And as you're all aware, CERCLA, SARA and the
7 National Contingency Plan are those primary laws that
8 govern how we go about cleaning up sites such as this and
9 leads us to a lengthy process but under law we are
10 committed to cleaning up Hunters Point.

11 Number two, we have conducted extensive
12 investigation into the site already. In answer to some
13 people's questions, they say you don't know all the detail
14 parameters; that may be so. Some of that will be resolved
15 during the Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study process
16 which will be on this afternoon.

17 We did do the assessment phase of our initial Navy
18 Assessment and Control of Installation Pollutants Program;
19 started that a while ago. We have done some assessment and
20 developed information related to the San Francisco District
21 Attorney's ongoing pursuit of Triple A Machine Shop; we did
22 have our asbestos, our so-called Areas A and B Studies.
23 We've developed other data which will be all rolled into
24 our cleanup program.

25 And I might add, should we discover in the course of

1 these and some of the other ongoing or other planned
2 activities at Hunters Point, anything of concern that would
3 indicate another potential installation restoration type
4 site, something appropriate for the Remedial Investigation/
5 Feasibility Study process, it will be wrapped into that
6 program. Hopefully that point will be clear after the
7 presentation.

8 The third point I'd like to make is we are in the
9 process of cleaning up past practices, practices that were
10 acceptable in their day. With the exception of those more
11 recent contributions by Triple A Machine Shop.

12 And I only draw a similarity to the current asbestos
13 problem which I know you're all aware of. Wasn't that many
14 years ago when we thought asbestos was somewhat of a boon
15 to mankind; today it's something we've got to remove from
16 our environment.

17 But irrespective of how it got there, when it got
18 there, we will clean it up.

19 The fourth point I'd like to make is we are involved
20 in a lengthy process based on the current environmental
21 laws, and there's probably some here more familiar with
22 that process than I am, albeit the Department of Health
23 Services, EPA and other agencies are giving me a rather
24 rapid education of what the process involves, we are
25 looking at a rather lengthy process.

1 We are looking at a process that probably extends
2 over a year to two years in further investigation and study
3 before we can actually do any actual cleanup.

4 Now that's not all bad because part of that process
5 is to make sure that all the planning that is necessary
6 takes place. And all the planning and addressing all the
7 concerns, everything from Community Relations Plan to
8 public health and evaluations to make sure the cleanup
9 process itself does not represent a hazard.

10 However, just to give you an idea of the total scope
11 of the cleanup effort that we're looking at for Hunters
12 Point, we have some nine different studies or activities,
13 either ongoing in the planning stage or implementation
14 stage.

15 One, the Installation Restoration Program, the
16 Navy's Installation and Restoration Program, which is the
17 program that carries us through this investigation study
18 that we're required to do under CERCLA.

19 We have the preliminary assessments of those areas
20 that are alleged and hopefully I can ask the representative
21 that are -- I'm using alleged at this point -- are alleged
22 to have contributed to this site by Triple A Machine Shop.

23 So that's the scope of the so-called scoping
24 document at this particular time and our initial plans.
25 It's the place that we have chosen to start with the

1 cleanup of Hunters Point.

2 Some of the other things that are going on at
3 Hunters Point with respect to the environment, I'll cite
4 specific investigations of the fiscal year '88/'89
5 construction sites connected to the home port. This will
6 be the last time I'll mention anything about homeporting in
7 this whole presentation.

8 Our purpose today here is to address the Community
9 Relations Plan and environmental cleanup. But in order to
10 do any construction at Hunters Point, we must assure
11 ourselves as well as the environmental agencies that those
12 places we plan to build won't interfere with cleanup of any
13 hazardous waste site and, two, won't present a hazard to
14 the future occupants of that building nor the personnel
15 during construction.

16 So we will be doing studies on both sites we hope to
17 construct buildings on and expanding the facility.

18 We also have an ongoing PCB removal at the building
19 503 site which is about two-thirds complete. We're waiting
20 for test results on that. This was a site where about
21 three transformers got spilled and amounted to removing the
22 earth that the PCB-contaminated transformers got into.

23 We're also in the process of removing all the
24 PCB-containing transformers at Hunters Point. There's
25 some -- a total of approximately 75 identified PCB

1 transformers and those that are not going to be used in the
2 foreseeable future are being removed now.

3 Those others that are in use will be programmed for
4 replacement as soon as money is available.

5 We're doing a fence-to-fence inventory. This means
6 literally walking the facility from one fence to the other
7 fence, looking in buildings, looking in corners, trying to
8 identify anything that is suspected hazardous materials.
9 The first phase of this is almost complete and that's where
10 we are looking at the hazardous materials in that part
11 currently controlled by the United States Navy directly.

12 And we're looking to identify the hidden barrel of
13 whatever that may have to be identified and removed. And
14 we'll be in the process of, once we get the inventory
15 complete, of developing a program to move that stuff off
16 the facility. Or dispose of it as the appropriate
17 regulation.

18 The next step in that particular process, we will be
19 looking into the operation of the commercial tenants that
20 we now have at Hunters Point. And ensuring ourselves that
21 if there's any hazardous waste or hazardous materials being
22 utilized or generated, that we're well aware of it and of
23 course any of the commercial tenants will be asked to
24 resolve, remove or what have you on that particular problem
25 based on their current operation.

1 We are developing a plan for what we call the
2 surface asbestos removal. And this is, as others will
3 attest, because of high usage of asbestos in the past,
4 insulant, ship operation, ship repair type of work, there
5 are asbestos at several locations around the facility.
6 Basically asbestos is laying at the surface.

7 In addition there are some spots that we -- where
8 use of lagging on the facility itself or in the boiler
9 plants, that type of stuff, and we will go into a process
10 to remove that with all of the appropriate provisions in
11 accordance with all the regulations.

12 We also have an ongoing winterization effort in
13 coordination with the Regional Water Quality Control Board.
14 And this is to make sure that those sites that we have
15 identified at Hunters Point don't contribute to additional
16 pollution in the bay. And this amounts to covering them
17 with tarps, sandbagging them; those types of action to make
18 sure that during the winter rains that we do not have
19 occasion to add to the contamination.

20 There is also a Navy program which is starting out
21 again in the planning process to identify and remove, or
22 appropriately close out in accordance with laws and
23 regulations, underground storage tanks.

24 We've identified -- I'll let them correct me -- but
25 approximately 20 underground storage tanks that we'll be

1 closing out and removing --

2 DR. LEGARRETA: What's stored in them?

3 CAPTAIN KRUMM: Diesel oil, lubricants, fuel. So
4 those types of things, materials. Of course we will go
5 through that process.

6 DR. LEGARRETA: Are they leaking?

7 CAPTAIN KRUMM: Not that we have any information.
8 That's part of the close-out process to make sure you have
9 appropriate --

10 DR. LEGARRETA: Thank you.

11 CAPTAIN KRUMM: So those are some of the ongoing
12 efforts in the directions we're going. And again, let me
13 lastly point out that the Navy is committed to be fully
14 involved in the community and community at large in its
15 investigation and cleanup processes.

16 Not only do we want to do this, it's required by
17 law. So what you will hear about during the formal
18 presentation will be the Community Relations Plan,
19 hopefully its purpose, some of our current ideas of what we
20 visualize, but again, I solicit your input to tell us how
21 we could enhance this plan so it does the job of keeping
22 the community informed of what we're doing in the area of
23 environmental cleanup in Hunters Point.

24 With that I'd like to introduce Miss Lisa Teague,
25 who will make the formal presentation, and we'll stand by

1 to answer your questions. Thank you.

2 MS. TEAGUE: Good afternoon. I'm going to give you
3 a brief overview on a number of subjects. The first is the
4 background of Hunters Point Annex; the second is the
5 Environmental Plan, the Remedial Investigation/Feasibility
6 Study which we're proceeding on; brief summary of the Navy
7 activities, some of which Captain Krumm talked about; and
8 lastly the community relations activities that are planned.

9 Hunters Point has been operating as a shipyard since
10 1869. In 1939 the Navy purchased the property and in 1941
11 began operating it as a shipyard. In 1974 the shipyard was
12 decommissioned by the Navy and in 1976 was leased to Triple
13 A Machine Shop who operated as a commercial shipyard.

14 In 1987 Triple A's lease expired and the Navy began
15 proceedings to operate Hunters Point as a Navy facility.

16 Hunters Point Annex has been used for over 100 years
17 for industrial activities. As a result, a variety of
18 materials have been used and waste is generated by the Navy
19 as well as other lessees and owners.

20 To address this problem, the Navy initiated an
21 environmental investigation. Initially this program was
22 called the Navy Assessment and Control of Installation
23 Pollutants, or NACIP Program. Recently this program has
24 been renamed the Installation Restoration or IR Program.

25 An attempt has been made to follow EPA's terminology

1 a little more closely. The purpose of that IR Program is
2 to investigate past disposal sites.

3 This slide shows the steps involved in the RI/FS, or
4 in the environmental program, rather. The Preliminary Site
5 Assessment has been accomplished at Hunters Point Annex.
6 And that assessment involved two individual studies which
7 you may have heard of. The initial asbestos study and the
8 verification step of the Confirmation Study.

9 That was under the old NACIP terminology. And as a
10 result of that information, the Remedial Investigation/
11 Feasibility Study has been developed.

12 Right now, we're in the initial stages of the RI/FS.
13 Those initial stages involve preparation to go out into the
14 field and do the work.

15 The purposes of the RI/FS are to characterize the
16 contamination, to obtain data to evaluate remedial or
17 cleanup measures, and to obtain data to evaluate the
18 potential threats to public health and the environment.

19 Once cleanup measures have been decided upon or
20 discussed, those chosen measures will be described in a
21 Remedial Action Plan, or RAP. Following that RAP is period
22 provided for public participation, and then design and
23 implementation.

24 Evaluation of the data obtained previously has shown
25 there are two major sites at Hunters Point. First are

1 NACIP sites; areas where past disposal by the Navy has
2 occurred. And these sites were identified in the Navy's
3 preliminary investigation, the initial asbestos study and
4 the verification step.

5 The Triple A sites are areas where alleged illegal
6 disposal by Triple A has occurred and these sites were
7 identified by the Navy to the San Francisco District
8 Attorney's office.

9 There's a handout in the packet that you received
10 that lists this. These are the 11 IR or Installation
11 Restoration sites that are currently included in the
12 cleanup program and investigation.

13 These sites are shown on a map in your handout and
14 I'll point them out here. The industrial landfill is an
15 area where a variety of wastes were disposed of. These
16 wastes primarily include sandblast wastes. Sandblast waste
17 also has been disposed of in the bay fill area, outlined
18 here.

19 Within the bay fill area, right about here
20 (indicating), are the oil reclamation ponds. These are
21 ponds that were used by the Navy for recycling oil.

22 The scrap yard located here (indicating) and the old
23 transformer yard located here are areas where scrap metal
24 and transformers were stored.

25 The tank farm, located right here (indicating), is

1 an area where there are several above ground tanks for the
2 storage of fuels.

3 Sub-base area, located here, is an area where
4 sandblast waste was also disposed of and where
5 (unintelligible) activities were performed by the Navy.

6 There's a transformer, PCB spill site that Captain
7 Krumm talked about, located right around here. It's not
8 shown on this map but it is in the map in your handout.
9 That's the area currently being excavated.

10 The pickling and plate yard, battery and
11 electroplating shop, and there's a power plant. Those
12 three are buildings that were used by the Navy but are no
13 longer being used.

14 In addition to the excavation being carried out at
15 the PCB spill area, the Navy is proposing or planning to do
16 some interim remediation at a few other sites; tank farm,
17 battery shop, pickling and plate yard, and Building 521 of
18 the power plant. These areas, we feel there are measures
19 that could be taken prior to finalizing a cleanup program.

20 We're right now in the initial planning stages of
21 that. We're discussing them with the regulatory agencies,
22 and we'll go through the process required to implement
23 those.

24 In addition to those 11 IR sites are seven
25 additional sites that are being proposed for preliminary

1 assessment. These are one or more Triple A sites that were
2 identified and are also being investigated by the district
3 attorney's office.

4 These sites are also shown on that map. They're
5 shown on this one. Most of the sites are located along the
6 bay fill area, along the southern end of Hunters Point
7 Annex. The last one is located right north of the main
8 gate.

9 These are areas where Triple A disposed of mostly
10 waste oils, PCB's, asbestos, either at the surface or in
11 trenches.

12 As previously mentioned, we're in the initial stages
13 of the Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study. This
14 phase involves preparation of a number of planning
15 documents listed here.

16 The initial document is a Scoping Document. What we
17 did there was look at the available data, the previous
18 investigations, and came up with an approach. That
19 approach is described in that document. The previous
20 investigations are summarized.

21 Those previous investigations showed that there is
22 not currently an imminent threat to either public health or
23 the environment; that is also the purpose of the RI/FS
24 we'll be looking at that more closely.

25 Health and Safety Plan is for protection of the

1 workers as well as the general public.

2 Quality Assurance Project Plan describes the quality
3 assurance program that is to be carried out. Sampling
4 Plans describe the individual work to be done at each of
5 these sites. Project Management Plan is just to describe
6 the way this project is managed, both within the Navy and
7 within Harding Lawson, consultant.

8 As part of the RI/FS, public health and
9 environmental threats are being evaluated and are described
10 in the Preliminary Public Health and Environmental
11 Evaluation. That's an evaluation based only on data we've
12 developed to date or other consultants have. The Data
13 Management Plan and Feasibility Study Plan describe events
14 that are going to be occurring as we go through the
15 program. And lastly the Community Relations Plan will
16 describe the program to be carried out at Hunters Point.

17 The relationship of the RI/FS activities is shown
18 here. Following the Planning Documents is the Field
19 Investigation, Data Interpretation, Feasibility Study or
20 evaluation of the cleanup measures, the Remedial Action
21 Plan or RAP -- this period is a period for public review
22 and comment -- Design, and Implementation.

23 The asterisks shown here are areas where we
24 anticipate that some method for informing the public would
25 occur, either repositories, placement of draft documents in

1 the repositories, or information releases or newsletters,
2 perhaps public meetings.

3 As Captain Krumm mentioned, the Navy is performing
4 several other investigations at Hunters Point Annex. The
5 IR Program was described previously. The Triple A site
6 Preliminary Assessments. Area A and B Studies is a
7 previous investigation that involved shallow soil samplings
8 over a large portion of Hunters Point Annex and the purpose
9 of that study was to investigate areas that are in the
10 planning stages for construction.

11 The underground storage tanks is an investigation to
12 look at buried fuel storage tanks. MILCON Sites or
13 Military Construction Sites are areas that buildings are
14 proposed, as is the Navy housing studies.

15 The surface inventory is the fence-to-fence survey
16 that Captain Krumm described.

17 Concurrent with these activities is the Navy's
18 Community Relation Program. We're trying to develop that
19 program now. The purpose of the community relations
20 program is to incorporate the community in the project
21 cleanup activities; keep the community informed of the site
22 activities; to address their concerns about the site; and
23 to establish communication between the Navy, the community,
24 and the regulatory agencies.

25 Currently the Community Relations Program, we're in

1 the stages of development. Several activities have been
2 planned. The community meetings such as today's, two
3 others have been held last week. We are planning to do
4 interviews with community members or interested parties.
5 The information gathered from those interviews and the
6 meetings will be used to develop a program to keep the
7 community informed.

8 Implementation of such a program may involve
9 newsletters, information releases; documents have been
10 placed at specific locations. One location is Anna Waden
11 Library which is in this vicinity.

12 The types of documents we're putting in are copies
13 of the previous investigations; copy of the draft Scoping
14 Document that is being reviewed by the regulatory agencies;
15 extra copies of the newsletters; a copy of the Community
16 Relations Program or Plan. And additional community
17 meetings may be held.

18 In conclusion, I'd like to reiterate that the major
19 purpose of today's meeting is to address the Community
20 Relations Program that the Navy is developing for Hunters
21 Point Annex.

22 We'd like to solicit suggestions about the
23 community's needs for obtaining information. These needs
24 will be incorporated in a program or plan.

25 We're interested in hearing from you whether

1 meetings such as this are useful, what times, what places,
2 what kind of information you want and how you want it
3 presented.

4 I'll turn this back over to Captain Krumm.

5 CAPTAIN KRUMM: Thank you, Lisa.

6 I think it's important, we visualize at this time
7 just to give us a basis for talking, that there are going
8 to be a number of events such as when a particular planning
9 process or document has been completed, that would generate
10 an information release.

11 I would visualize that no less than every 60 to 90
12 days we would put out something -- some information at
13 least telling people what has gone on and what we
14 anticipate in the near term for the future.

15 As to public meetings, I think the majority of you
16 are probably aware there is one requirement in law that
17 requires during a remedial action plan that you have a
18 public hearing.

19 Certainly that should be part of the Community
20 Relations Plan and incorporated into that. But I would
21 visualize every three to six months that we should have
22 some general public meeting to give the opportunity to
23 people to ask questions whether they've read our fliers or
24 not.

25 And certainly the repositories -- and I didn't mean

1 to point a finger, Lisa -- but there is one at the Anna
2 Waden Library; there also is a repository with the Officer
3 in Charge at Hunters Point Annex right at the gate. So
4 those are the two that we are maintaining at this point.
5 There may be a desire for additional repositories. Again,
6 types of things which we solicit your input on.

7 Some of the comments we've heard earlier is the
8 community is very interested in information before it
9 happens. And that includes some of these other ongoing
10 cleanups that are not part of the formal RI/FS process.

11 We see no problem with that and we'll move out to
12 include that type of information in the future and in
13 information releases and other documents. So any comments
14 and questions, please? We'll do our best to answer.

15 DR. LEGARRETA: My name is Dr. Dorothy Legarreta.
16 I'm particularly interested in the period of time when
17 Hunters Point was used by the Navy radiological lab and
18 also for the decontamination of Bikini ships and perhaps
19 someone could respond to a couple of questions.

20 I'm particularly interested in the sandblasting
21 because 54 Navy ships had plutonium sandblasted off the
22 decks. Was any of that sandblasting fill in the area you
23 talked about by the industrial areas? Is that Miss Teague?

24 CAPTAIN KRUMM: Go ahead.

25 COMMANDER GUILD: As you know, Hunters Point Annex

1 was used sometime in the past for some radiation lab -- I
2 believe you worked there.

3 DR. LEGARRETA: I didn't work at that lab.

4 COMMANDER GUILD: In the past Hunters Point Annex
5 was apparently used to head a lab there that did some
6 radiation type of work.

7 DR. LEGARRETA: Radiological training and they had
8 the INDEPENDENCE out in the harbor for on-site radiological
9 training for several years from about '46 to '51. It was a
10 very contaminated ship.

11 COMMANDER GUILD: Okay. After that, after the Navy
12 ceased those kinds of activities, the AEC on at least two
13 occasions went through and inspected the facility and found
14 it completely free of contaminants.

15 Nevertheless during our NACIP program, the
16 verification step that both Lisa and Captain Krumm
17 mentioned, we did do radiation testing in the land fill
18 areas where sandblast waste was apparently disposed to
19 determine whether or not we had any kind of a problem.

20 DR. LEGARRETA: Now you checked for alpha as well as
21 gamma?

22 MR. DONG: (Nods head in the affirmative.)

23 COMMANDER GUILD: I believe it was alpha and gamma.
24 They could not distinguish from background and they
25 recommended additional testing which is included in the

1 scope and documents which we'll be doing during the
2 remedial investigation.

3 DR. LEGARRETA: I appreciate this additional
4 information. My question was was any of the sandblasting
5 from any of those 54 hot ships placed in that area? That
6 was my question.

7 COMMANDER GUILD: I don't think we have records that
8 show whether or not it specifically was. The indications
9 we have was that any radioactive material was hauled away
10 from the site and properly disposed of at the time.

11 Nevertheless, as I say, we are testing, wherever
12 there was any kind of sandblast waste we are testing for
13 radioactivity to determine whether or not there is any sign
14 of it at all.

15 DR. LEGARRETA: As you know we just completed a
16 lawsuit against Veterans Administration and we received a
17 great deal of information about this period of time at the
18 Hunters Point Navy Radiological Laboratory and the work
19 that was done on the decontamination and it was very
20 startling to us to see the extent of decontamination
21 activities right in this area.

22 So I really feel that you have to put a lot of time
23 in on this because plutonium lasts for an awfully long
24 time.

25 My second question is where is the site, the former

1 site, of the Navy radiological building on this map?

2 CAPTAIN KRUMM: The building is still there; no
3 longer Navy property.

4 DR. LEGARRETA: Are we going to see that in the --

5 CAPTAIN KRUMM: I can point it out.

6 DR. LEGARRETA: That's old Navy Rad Lab.

7 CAPTAIN KRUMM: Yes.

8 DR. LEGARRETA: And my second question -- okay.
9 That was my second question. Thank you.

10 CAPTAIN KRUMM: Sir?

11 REVEREND BUFORD: My name is Reverend Daniel Buford.

12 It might seem strange that a person from Oakland
13 would be here but we have people in our parish who live in
14 this area.

15 My questions have to do with the health hazards
16 aspect of some of your presentation. First of all, I want
17 to thank you for at least explaining some of the alphabet
18 soup that is on your documents.

19 I, in reading through this thing called the EIS, I
20 wrote down here that it said the contaminated areas could
21 pose hazards to human health and the environment if
22 disturbed by construction activity or if left unremedied
23 for the inadvertent exposure of future occupants or
24 residents.

25 Now, you've stated that the PCB's from the

1 transformers, that there had been spills there, and that's
2 like two-thirds completed, the cleanup process is
3 two-thirds complete?

4 CAPTAIN KRUMM: (Nods head in the affirmative.)

5 REVEREND BUFORD: I'm wondering what kinds of
6 safeguards are being observed as these things are being
7 carted out. How are they being carted out and what kinds
8 of safeguards are being observed to keep them from exposure
9 to the populace? That's my first question.

10 CAPTAIN KRUMM: I'll ask one of two people.
11 Certainly the Department of Health Services is closely
12 monitoring our cleanup.

13 MR. NOTINI: I'm Ric Notini with the Department of
14 Health Services. You're raising a very valid point and
15 that is also a concern of ours when we get involved in
16 cleaning up a site. We don't want to create a hazard when
17 we're cleaning up a site.

18 First of all, one of the first things we did before
19 we started cleanup was we went out to the 500 acre site
20 because there are workers out there now and tried to
21 identify whether or not there were any immediate hazards
22 present at this time.

23 There are some areas out there that were pointed out
24 where there's some contamination on the surface. Those
25 areas have been fenced off and restricted to the public.

1 So we have taken steps to make sure that people
2 don't have access to areas where they could come into
3 direct contact with contaminants.

4 Second part, when we actually go to clean up some of
5 those areas, we require some extensive documentation before
6 that even begins. And Lisa Teague pointed out a lot of
7 those different plans. One I'll focus on is Health and
8 Safety Plan.

9 We require that Health and Safety Plan be prepared
10 and certified by an industrial hygienist which outlines all
11 the health and safety measures that will be taken to
12 protect not only the workers but the public from any
13 exposure during the cleanup.

14 So in other words, they are going to, let's say,
15 take -- there's some soil contamination, they may be doing
16 some excavation, the workers are going to have to don the
17 proper safety equipment, there are going to have to be dust
18 control measurements. So we'll look at all those things
19 and those documents are available for review.

20 So those are the kind of steps we'll take to ensure
21 that there isn't any exposure.

22 REVEREND BUFORD: Thank you. I have more. Somebody
23 else?

24 COMMANDER GUILD: I can add to that if you like.

25 REVEREND BUFORD: Okay.

1 COMMANDER GUILD: I think the thing to note is that
2 particular cleanup activity that's on board now, the
3 contamination was discovered a year ago and the Navy
4 immediately informed the local regulatory agencies, the
5 Department of Health Services, EPA and Regional Water
6 Quality Control Board, sat down with the regulatory
7 agencies and developed a program in order to take care of
8 it and remove it.

9 The contractor who does this is a licensed
10 contractor. Hazardous waste when it gets hauled away is
11 manifested as such; goes to proper disposal area. The
12 regulatory agencies have been involved every step of the
13 way and so I think all precautions that could possibly
14 taken have been taken.

15 REVEREND BUFORD: My other question might be two
16 part but I'll try to be brief.

17 That is, that given the facts that sandblasting
18 apparently was done, of ships that were used during nuclear
19 tests, and the sandblasting was done before there was
20 stringent regulation of radioactive materials, and given
21 the fact that you have so many carcinogenic chemicals that
22 are in the ground and in the water there due to Navy
23 practices and the practices of this mechanic's place, I'm
24 wondering if, in the nine different studies that you were
25 referring to, if there had been any studies regarding the

1 incidence of cancer rates in and around the black community
2 here and also any studies regarding asthma, emphysema, and
3 other respiratory diseases.

4 The reason I ask this is because there's extensive
5 documentation right now, the United Church of Christ has
6 done a national study that looks at the placement of toxic
7 waste sites all around the country around black
8 communities, and black communities percentage-wise have a
9 higher number of people who have emphysema, pleurisy;
10 breathing disorders of this sort and also cancer.

11 So I'm wondering if a similar study has been done
12 and if so, what were the results of that study in this
13 area.

14 COMMANDER GUILD: We, the Navy, have not done any
15 study like that because all of the studies that we have
16 done so far at Hunters Point have come to the conclusion
17 that there is no evidence of any imminent or immediate
18 danger to public health with anything that's been found
19 there so there's been no reason to believe that there would
20 be anything like what you've described.

21 Whether Health Services has done anything like that
22 in the vicinity --

23 MR. NOTINI: I'm not aware of any study that's been
24 done by the department. We do have a group called the
25 Epidemiological Study Section, and they get involved in

1 these studies at hazardous waste sites and in recent years
2 they've had a number of requests from health sites.

3 I can contact them and they have established some
4 criteria for establishing whether or not a site warrants a
5 health study or not.

6 It's very difficult to do one of these health
7 studies in terms of trying to look back many years and
8 determine what population was exposed, to what levels.

9 It's very difficult to track down many of these
10 people and it's very difficult from a statistical
11 standpoint to establish any kind of relationship.

12 But they do attempt to do that from time to time on
13 certain sites and I can -- if you're interested after the
14 meeting we can exchange numbers. I can get you in touch
15 with our epidemiologist and pursue that a little further.

16 REVEREND BUFORD: I'd just like to say in closing --
17 this is not a question but a comment -- that I appreciated
18 what you're doing in terms of the precautions. And even in
19 terms of a fence.

20 But it occurs to me that where a fence might
21 physically keep a child from climbing over it and so on,
22 the fence will not physically keep the sun from evaporating
23 things from within the soil and those things getting into
24 the atmosphere and so on.

25 So if there's been no study, I think that really is

1 something that needs to be looked at. Thank you.

2 MR. RAMO: I have a couple of comments on the
3 Community Relations Program and some of the actions you've
4 taken.

5 It seems that you have a choice, initially, which is
6 whether you're going to do a minimum program that gets by
7 or a program that wins the public confidence.

8 And it seems that you've chosen to do the latter;
9 that you're trying to develop a program that's going to try
10 to win over the public and try to be part of a good cleanup
11 program. That's sort of the spirit in which I'm going to
12 make some of these comments.

13 I think to accomplish that we've got to worry not
14 only about process but you've got to worry about substance,
15 because let's face it, this is a very -- this is a project
16 that's gotten a lot of sensitivity, there's a lot of
17 sophistication that's developed about some of the issues,
18 and I think not only do you have to have a good program in
19 theory, but you're going to have to deliver and implement
20 things. And provide an opportunity not only in getting
21 information out to the public, but getting information
22 back. And let me give you some examples where we have been
23 concerned about.

24 One is your scoping program. I would have liked to
25 have seen it. I've mentioned this informally to Captain

1 Krumm and I understand there's always procedures in terms
2 of getting inter-agency comments, but I think if you want
3 meaningful feedback and people to feel they've had a chance
4 to participate, they've got to be given an opportunity to
5 take a look at this document and get their comments to you
6 before it becomes final.

7 To get a final document and tell them, here it is,
8 take a look at it, is going to increase frustration; going
9 to reduce frustration. So I think that's one thing you
10 have to do here.

11 COMMANDER GUILD: Can I interrupt you just for a
12 minute? The document is in the repository.

13 CAPTAIN KRUMM: I think Alan has got a good point.

14 COMMANDER GUILD: It's available.

15 MR. RAMO: I do understand now it's in the
16 repository. I think if you're serious about getting public
17 comment, before meetings like this, get it afterwards. I
18 had no idea it was in the repository until I walked in here
19 today.

20 Secondly, if you really want to get meaningful
21 feedback, it helps to know when it enters the repository
22 and might just shortcut things to get it to those groups
23 who do want to get into the technical aspects. I don't
24 think judging by your turnout it's going to be that many
25 groups. I think we can shortcut it for you.

1 Your presentation looked very good and I think what
2 you're setting out to do is going to relieve a lot of the
3 concern.

4 One place I am concerned is that when EPA reviewed
5 the entire environmental assessment for homeporting, it
6 made clear that one of the conditions for accepting that
7 review was the initiation of a more comprehensive grid
8 survey. And that's real important to us.

9 We would have trouble having confidence in any
10 program, regardless of what kind of community relations
11 program you have, unless you have that more aggressive
12 comprehensive grid survey with associated sampling so we
13 can be sure that if there's a hot spot out there you're
14 going to find it before you get people in there.

15 A second problem that goes to substance is I
16 understand the Navy's desire to get some construction
17 underway. And not be held back if there's an isolated hot
18 spot that's truly contained in some other part a mile away
19 or ten miles away on the property.

20 On the other hand, when you're dealing with toxics,
21 where if you miss a small little barrel of asbestos, you
22 don't deal with it, could mean the deaths of people in 20
23 years.

24 It's really important to not isolate your
25 investigation. I'm a bit concerned about this notion that

1 we're going to just look at sites, schedule for
2 construction, and if those sites look clean, go ahead and
3 construct and start operations without having done your
4 grid survey, without having done your extensive sampling to
5 make sure, as the Reverend said, there's not going to be
6 stuff blowing in the wind and traveling to where people are
7 working and living.

8 The third area of concern is we're just now starting
9 this program. And you're getting feedback on how this
10 should go. And needless to say, we thought this should
11 have happened a long time ago. Which is, you know, looking
12 back, and I don't want to dwell on the past, but we're
13 getting started now, thank God.

14 I'm glad it is and let's do it right, but meanwhile
15 there's already been some interim actions that nobody in
16 the public has had a chance to comment about and express
17 their concerns.

18 I've heard a rumor that there's currently removal of
19 PCB oil and trucks going through the community with waste
20 oil that's being removed and the community has not been
21 notified about that.

22 I want to know what other interim actions have
23 occurred and are about to occur and urge you that unless
24 there's an immediate health threat and it's totally
25 infeasible to let people know, to give us a chance to

1 comment.

2 I think that's going to win confidence. There's
3 more distrust created when something occurs and you don't
4 tell people about it. And tell them about it.

5 Even if, in fact, it wasn't a problem and you don't
6 tell them about it, it leads to a lot of skepticism.

7 Well, one other substantive thing and a process
8 thing.

9 For months and months we have been urging the Water
10 Board, Department of Health Services, and the Navy to take
11 all steps for weatherization before it rained. And it's
12 rained. And I've heard at least some of the attempts to
13 prevent runoff have not occurred.

14 I'm wondering if any of the sampling that was
15 supposed to take place before it rained has already
16 occurred or not. In any event, let's get that taken care
17 of. We're in the rainy season and that should be a top
18 priority.

19 Finally, in terms of process, I think it's very
20 important for Navy to get feedback -- and this is more
21 directed at both Health Services and through you to other
22 state agencies as opposed to the Navy to other federal
23 agencies which is the Navy -- I think it's very important
24 the Navy get all appropriate input from all other
25 government agencies.

1 There's a number of agencies out there that have the
2 expertise but they may not right now have the budget or
3 staffing to give it to you and they may have it in six
4 months and may have it in a year and either it's going to
5 be too late or you're going to have to do your cleanup all
6 over again and that's a shame.

7 I think whatever you can do within the niceties of
8 your presses, you should be making sure the Water Board has
9 sufficient staffing to do the job of getting the input;
10 that the Department of Health Services has the input and
11 staffing they need now; the EPA have the staffing they need
12 now. And if they don't have the staffing and don't have
13 the budget, those who make the decisions ought to hear
14 about it and not just from the public.

15 Those are sort of the comments and questions implied
16 in that so if there's any response, I'd like to hear about
17 it.

18 CAPTAIN KRUMM: Let me go back to question number
19 one. I notice you all were scribbling notes over there. I
20 was just trying to listen.

21 COMMANDER GUILD: Let me see if I can muddle through
22 some of those things and then anybody chip in, please.

23 Your concern about the scoping document and yes, the
24 scoping document is available, it's in the repository, you
25 weren't notified beforehand, before this meeting, true.

1 However, again, the purpose of this meeting was not
2 to discuss the scoping document; it was to discuss the
3 Community Relations Program and what kind of feedback, give
4 and take between the community and Navy and regulatory
5 agencies, in regard to the presses would there be.

6 The document is available there, the repository is
7 listed in the handouts that were given to you. Certainly
8 any comments you may have on it we would be interested in.
9 And certainly take those into account.

10 CAPTAIN KRUMM: If I can add to that, I think it
11 would be -- I think what we ought to do is take a look at a
12 limited mailing list. I would have to say in terms of the
13 cost to produce and those types of things, to the entire
14 350, 450 people that on at least the draft list at this
15 point, to send everybody a scoping document.

16 I think what we need to do is maybe provide some
17 avenue, either for people to indicate that they would like
18 to see that, or like to be on the distribution, limited
19 distribution. We need to take a look at that and develop
20 this in the Community Relations Plan. I think that would
21 be responsive.

22 MR. NOTINI: I'd like to add something, too. We're
23 developing the Community Relations Plan and it's not
24 actually in place right now but I would envision as part of
25 this plan we are going to develop a system to notify you in

1 the future of such documents and tell you in a newsletter
2 or whatever that the Navy has submitted a document and it's
3 under review by the agencies and it's available for the
4 public to review. That's our intention.

5 We just haven't gotten the whole program in place
6 and you're absolutely right, we should be telling you that
7 these documents are being submitted when they're submitted
8 so that you have an opportunity to review and comment on
9 them.

10 COMMANDER GUILD: The next item I had was your
11 concern regarding grid surveys and any potential future
12 construction that may be done before such grid surveys
13 would be done.

14 The Navy has committed to do additional testing in
15 areas where we plan to do future construction, even though
16 we may have no evidence of any hazardous waste there.

17 We are calling those military construction site
18 studies as was listed in the presentation. The plans for
19 those are being developed and worked with the regulatory
20 agencies and they are, in fact, going to require and are
21 requiring us to do testing outside of the footprint of the
22 particular building to ensure that there is no possibility
23 of offsite contamination onto the site or anything else.
24 In effect it becomes like site or area specific grid survey
25 work tied to that particular site.

1 Also, the sampling plan will have a great deal of
2 additional testing, boring, etcetera, that will be done in
3 regards to remedial investigations.

4 So we feel working with regulatory agencies, that we
5 will be able to ensure that there's just absolutely no
6 problem with construction plans at any place we may have
7 plans to do that.

8 And if we find any problem in an area as a result of
9 that testing, then we won't construct there. We will
10 either re-site the building or do whatever has to be done
11 to that particular site. More than likely re-site any
12 potential planned construction and then take that test
13 result from that particular site study and wrap it into the
14 RI/FS as another RI/FS site.

15 MR. RAMO: That partially answers my concern but you
16 talk about working with the agencies. EPA specifically
17 stated that they approved your review on condition that you
18 do a comprehensive grid survey of the entire site. Are you
19 doing that or not? And if not, why not?

20 COMMANDER GUILD: I think the response is that we
21 have looked at EPA's comments, that was on the EIS, and we
22 are responding to that in a manner which we think is
23 consistent with what they're looking for.

24 We haven't gotten that far yet. We haven't gotten
25 their comments back on what we're planning to do; whether

1 or not they think what we're doing is consistent with that
2 comment on the EIS I can't answer that.

3 MR. RAMO: Maybe I'm not asking the question clearly
4 but I was asking for are you doing a comprehensive grid
5 survey of the entire --

6 COMMANDER GUILD: You'd have to design a
7 comprehensive grid -- you know, the entire Hunters Point
8 peninsula is not being drilled with holes every two feet if
9 that's what you're asking.

10 MR. RAMO: I'm asking -- you did a grid survey of
11 the entire shipyard including areas you're going to do
12 construction; you're familiar with that certainly.

13 COMMANDER GUILD: Yes.

14 MR. RAMO: Are you doing a more intense look at all
15 the areas that were covered by that survey?

16 COMMANDER GUILD: We are doing a more intense look
17 at the areas covered by that survey.

18 MR. RAMO: More holes covering the entire area, more
19 sampling of the entire area?

20 COMMANDER GUILD: We have not developed a plan to do
21 more holes of the entire area at this point in time, no.

22 MR. RAMO: I think that's a mistake and I think
23 that's going to cause a lot of problems.

24 MR. DONG: We are reviewing the data that we got
25 from the Area A and B Survey and we will look at those data

1 and make determination if we have hot spots in those areas,
2 we will do more study in those areas.

3 We are reviewing, evaluating the data of Area A and
4 B grid survey that we have done before.

5 MR. RAMO: Well, I hear you're evaluating data and
6 thinking about what to do. All I'm saying is I think EPA
7 made it clear what they thought you should do and that was
8 real important to the public. And that was one basis that
9 the public had some confidence that EPA review would be
10 helpful.

11 And if there's backtracking of that, all I'm saying
12 is that's going to be causing a problem. And I just want
13 you to consider that when you make those decisions.

14 MR. NOTINI: I'd like to add something to that.
15 Maybe I clarified this document.

16 As you know, Alan, there have been a number of
17 studies done at the site, grid surveys and specific site
18 investigations and so forth.

19 We had a lot of difficulty looking at all these
20 different reports, laying it out over a 500 acre site and
21 trying to decide has enough sampling been done or not.

22 So the objective of this scoping document was we
23 asked the Navy to take all these different studies and look
24 at the entire site and tell us and summarize all this data
25 and identify data gaps, and then based on this scoping

1 document, then identify, develop a work plan to go out and
2 do additional sampling.

3 Now that work plan is going to be based on the
4 scoping document. And it may or may not include a
5 comprehensive grid survey. I'm not sure.

6 But we are going to be looking at that scoping
7 document, EPA is going to be looking at that, and giving
8 them comments. Based on the comments we give them and any
9 comments you give them, we're asking them to develop a work
10 plan to conduct additional sampling. And it's that
11 document that is going to define what additional sampling
12 they're going to do.

13 So it sounds as though no, they haven't defined a
14 definite plan to do a grid survey, but the opportunity for
15 them to do that is going to be in that work plan.

16 So we're going to have to -- you're going to have an
17 opportunity to look at that work plan and decide whether or
18 not they're doing what EPA asked and so is EPA and at that
19 point, if EPA decides that the Navy hasn't done what they
20 asked them to do, I'm sure they're going to tell them and
21 ask them to revise the work plan.

22 MR. RAMO: I think you've heard my concern. I hear
23 what you have to say. I hope we can work it out.

24 MR. CASTLEMAN: Steve Castleman from the D.A.'s
25 office.

1 I said I wasn't going to say anything today but you
2 know you can never trust a lawyer.

3 What is the relationship between the sampling plan
4 and the scoping plan? That is an area that causes me some
5 confusion. And what are the timing relations between
6 those?

7 MR. NOTINI: The scoping plan or the scoping step
8 involves not collecting any new data. It basically says
9 look at all the existing data you already have, the
10 literature, lab results, whatever, evaluate that data and
11 interpret it. And then identify -- basically what does the
12 data tell you and what doesn't it tell you that you need to
13 know about the site.

14 And based on that scoping plan, based on that, the
15 Navy is going to then develop a sampling plan.

16 Now the scoping document may -- based on the scoping
17 document they may say hey, we don't have any samples in
18 this area and there are allegations there was waste
19 deposited in this area. We have identified a data gap. We
20 need to go out and take samples in that area.

21 The sampling plan would describe chemicals, what
22 tests they're going to use, what laboratory to analyze the
23 sample.

24 So I guess we throw out work plan and sampling plan;
25 maybe that's the confusion. We really should be talking

1 about a sampling plan that follows the scope. And a work
2 plan is a very broad term. Does that clarify that?

3 MR. CASTLEMAN: Yes.

4 MR. RAMO: Are you aware that EPA wrote these
5 actions which was the comprehensive grid survey throughout
6 Hunters Point? These actions could be properly initiated
7 as the scoping effort to the upcoming characterization
8 scale.

9 MR. NOTINI: Well, I guess they can also do the grid
10 survey as part of this next step, as part of the sampling
11 plan.

12 COMMANDER GUILD: The next part of your question had
13 to do with any removals that may be happening and public
14 notification of that.

15 This PCB contaminated soil removal that we
16 mentioned, we're two-thirds of the way down; this was a
17 little over a year ago when this was discovered. There was
18 public notice put in the newspaper, a fact sheet
19 circulated, etcetera on that one.

20 You mentioned a PCB contaminated oil. Captain Krumm
21 may want to address that. That's one you're familiar with.

22 CAPTAIN KRUMM: Right. Essentially what we had or
23 are about to do is remove some of the PCB oils that are in
24 tank 505, S505. And we are in the process of providing all
25 the public notices concerning that removal action.

1 We did get a little bit -- I'll have to admit we did
2 get a little bit out of sync between trying to get our
3 community relations process going as a result of this
4 process we're in today and in one of the removal actions we
5 were off process but we are back in sync.

6 COMMANDER GUILD: And no oil has been hauled out of
7 that tank yet.

8 CAPTAIN KRUMM: But we'll get those back in sync.

9 COMMANDER GUILD: I think just as a separate
10 comment, you know, there's the CERCLA related process, past
11 disposal actions that most of this is dealing with. And
12 then also ongoing, everywhere, both in private industry,
13 Navy, everywhere, there's the constant (unintelligible)
14 unrelated disposal of hazardous waste, etcetera, of things
15 that go on every day. Small little bits of this, that and
16 the other thing all done with manifest and proper
17 notifications and licensed contractors and all that kind of
18 thing.

19 What we're talking about here is the CERCLA related
20 process for past disposal kinds of things, although this
21 particular tank, it might span the two laws, if you will,
22 and certainly deserves notification by mere quantity and
23 therefore will be.

24 The other thing you mentioned is winterization or at
25 least what the regional board has called winterization.

1 Notice or letter expressing some concern that any potential
2 contamination on the surface could potentially migrate as a
3 result of winter storms, rains, whatever.

4 They asked us for certain documentation which we
5 provided them, contour maps, things like that. They also
6 asked to come out and take a tour of the facility and then
7 jointly with us wanted to designate some areas for runoff
8 testing.

9 In other words, once the rain came, to take some of
10 the runoff to test to see if there was a problem. We also
11 took some winterization steps in some fairly obvious areas
12 that -- there was a pile of fairly recent sandblast waste;
13 we covered it. We did some sandbagging around the PCB
14 excavation. Then we offered the regional board to come out
15 and take the tour.

16 For their own reasons they were unable to do that
17 until fairly recently. They have, however, recently taken
18 the tour and are in the process of working with us on where
19 they want us to do some runoff testing.

20 Unfortunately they have not designated that with us
21 before this recent storm.

22 MR. RAMO: So it's really their -- they haven't
23 gotten it together yet but that's where it's slowing down?

24 COMMANDER GUILD: I wish they were here. I don't
25 want to make that --

1 MR. RAMO: Maybe I could figure out a more
2 diplomatic way to put it.

3 COMMANDER GUILD: I don't want to say that. We have
4 been working with them and it did take a while before they
5 were able to come out --

6 MR. RAMO: That does go to many of my latter
7 comments about most of this stuff.

8 COMMANDER GUILD: As a matter of fact that was your
9 last comment. I guess what you're alluding to is you feel
10 the Navy should pay the regulatory agencies for oversight
11 of our work. Is that what you're saying?

12 CAPTAIN KRUMM: I think he's saying that we ought to
13 hold regulatory agencies' feet in the fire and make sure
14 they're participating in the process the best they can.

15 MR. RAMO: It could be either on federal and state
16 levels, interagency pooling the funds to get the right
17 people there with the right expertise, or, you know, that's
18 one extreme.

19 And the other extreme is that when there are
20 budgetary decisions made in the administration, and the
21 effect of one agency not having sufficient staffings, that
22 it slows up another agency getting their work done, it
23 might be at least useful internally to get that kind of
24 input out.

25 COMMANDER GUILD: I think first of all I have to say

1 that the regulatory agencies have been very willing
2 participants in this process.

3 And we have gotten a great deal -- certainly the
4 Department of Health Services as evidenced by Mr. Notini's
5 presence here. We meet with them on a regular basis, not
6 less than once a month, with all the major regulatory
7 agencies. The City has also been involved in these
8 meetings, Air Quality Management, Regional Water Quality
9 Control Board, EPA; all these folks.

10 We are getting their attention and their time.
11 Whether we're getting enough of it remains to be seen. I
12 don't think at this point in time that we're in a position
13 to say that we're being held up by regulatory agencies.

14 We're very pleased with the cooperation and interest
15 that they've shown in our program here; the help we've
16 gotten from them in developing our program.

17 MR. RAMO: I think that addresses all my questions.
18 Thank you.

19 MR. STRAUSS: I'm Peter Strauss, with MHB Technical
20 Associates.

21 Just a procedural question. I'm wondering if part
22 of the Community Relations Plan, if you are anticipating
23 answering written questions? Responding to written
24 questions.

25 CAPTAIN KRUMM: We do have a point of contact that's

1 identified in the handout material and we do as part of the
2 Community Relations Plan, do have -- plan to have that
3 point of contact as an intimate part of Community Relations
4 Plan in order to respond to questions by phone or writing.

5 MR. STRAUSS: One of the other of these more -- more
6 substantive question is: It's puzzling to me what the
7 information base you use for the IAS. That original
8 document which is now the preliminary assessment.

9 What was the information base for that?

10 COMMANDER GUILD: Initial assessment studies were
11 done at all major naval activities early in what was called
12 the NACIP Program.

13 The information base was basically consultants were
14 hired to go to each of the activities, take a look at past
15 history of the activity to identify any processes that
16 might have caused any kind of a hazardous waste release; to
17 take a look at the records, any past records that we had,
18 any disposal actions; landfills, any of that kind of thing;
19 to interview both past and present employees, ask them,
20 hey, what did you do with this stuff back in '06 or '45 or
21 whenever; to develop any kind of information source that
22 might be available from record studies, history, obvious
23 things.

24 They would tour the site and look -- you know, if
25 there was a particular area devoid of vegetation without

1 any logical explanation, it might be pinpointed as a site
2 that needs to be looked at.

3 I think I mentioned landfills. Automatic. Any
4 industrial processes that might have resulted in any kind
5 of potential spill; any records of any accidental spills or
6 anything else; all of this was developed to develop these
7 sites.

8 MR. STRAUSS: The question, more specifically, what
9 kinds of information, for instance, Dr. Legarreta asked you
10 a question about where the decontamination waste was buried
11 and you said that you didn't have that -- I believe you
12 said you didn't have that kind of information.

13 COMMANDER GUILD: I think the information is that
14 all of that kind of waste was hauled off and disposed of
15 properly --

16 DR. LEGARRETA: Oh --

17 COMMANDER GUILD: -- but wherever there was any kind
18 of sandblast waste deposited in Hunters Point that was
19 identified as site.

20 DR. LEGARRETA: I beg to differ because some of the
21 documents we got indicated sandblasted material was put in
22 the bay or put on shore; it wasn't hauled off anywhere. It
23 was all kept very secret. My boss was in charge of
24 decontamination of ships and he recommended it be dumped in
25 the bay or put along the shore.

1 COMMANDER GUILD: We would certainly be delighted --

2 DR. LEGARRETA: You must have the same documents we
3 got in discovery. We got them from the U.S. Navy.

4 COMMANDER GUILD: If you have any documents that
5 shows --

6 DR. LEGARRETA: I didn't see maps. There were -- in
7 the -- where things were thrown. Some of it was sold to
8 contractors. You know, it wasn't everywhere.

9 COMMANDER GUILD: This area here (indicating), this
10 area here, and this area here, are the areas where -- all
11 historical records -- are the only areas where we could
12 find where there was sandblast waste used as fill.

13 DR. LEGARRETA: Which is the dry dock next to that?
14 To the furthest left.

15 COMMANDER GUILD: There's a dry dock here, here and
16 here.

17 DR. LEGARRETA: And there's no dry docks near where
18 the green stuff --

19 COMMANDER GUILD: No dry docks over here, no; never
20 have been.

21 DR. LEGARRETA: Okay.

22 COMMANDER GUILD: Those areas, while they are large
23 shaded areas, those are areas to be further investigated in
24 the remedial investigation. That does not mean that this
25 entire area of green is all contaminated. That means that

1 that entire area was a fill area. Including sandblast fill
2 put in parts of that area.

3 DR. LEGARRETA: Just one final comment. One of the
4 documents we did get was an '85 document and one of the men
5 who was in charge of decontamination commented that the
6 target ships were not the problem; it was the non-target
7 vessels that went into the Bikini lagoon immediately after
8 the detonation and picked up the radiation from Bikini.
9 You probably were around then, Dr. Krumm. Probably an
10 Ensign.

11 CAPTAIN KRUMM: No, not quite that along.

12 DR. LEGARRETA: Okay. And this particular gentleman
13 mentioned the evaporator scale which was scaled off there
14 was so contaminated that U.C. Berkeley scientists wanted it
15 as a radiation source so it was very hot and I assume the
16 evaporator -- was sealed off and was dumped -- if you don't
17 have any records I'll certainly -- whatever records we have
18 we'll certainly share with you.

19 CAPTAIN KRUMM: We would appreciate that. The Navy
20 is a big organization. Unless you go to the right office
21 and ask the right question as many of you encounter with
22 bureaucracy, if you don't go to the right office --

23 DR. LEGARRETA: In our discovery we were told if we
24 didn't ask the right questions and have the documents
25 numbered we were going to be told they didn't have it --

1 COMMANDER GUILD: We would be delighted to compare
2 anything you got with our sites and in the sampling --

3 DR. LEGARRETA: I don't know how specific it is. I
4 don't believe there were specific areas designated for
5 dumping the stuff but --

6 CAPTAIN KRUMM: Well, it certainly may give us a
7 clue who to go hunt down.

8 DR. LEGARRETA: There were a lot of ships --

9 COMMANDER GUILD: Nevertheless, the landfill areas,
10 where there's a potential for that, dredging sediment as
11 part of the EIS is all being checked for radioactivity.

12 MR. STRAUSS: Is it correct for me to assume that
13 the information that you are using now is from the IAS, the
14 preliminary assessment; EIS, whatever EIS information you
15 developed; and what other information are you using in the
16 course of this -- of the whole cleanup program?

17 COMMANDER GUILD: Information available thus far is
18 from the Initial Assessment Study followed up by the
19 verification step. Between the Initial Assessment Study
20 and the verification step, there were discussions with the
21 regulatory agencies and additional sites were developed
22 that were included in the verification step.

23 There was the grid survey that was just discussed
24 with Mr. Ramo, Areas A and B where we did grid surveys
25 outside of the NACIP sites; some information from that is

1 being included in the data base.

2 There was the sites that the Navy identified to the
3 district attorney or actually to the Department of Health
4 Services where Triple A was alleged to have improperly
5 disposed of hazardous waste.

6 There was the information from Health Services when
7 they tested those areas as well as other areas in their --
8 I guess it was inspection of Triple A.

9 There was information derived from the district
10 attorney in their investigation of Triple A's activities
11 and from affidavits of former employees and from those
12 affidavits we read and we tried to pinpoint any allegations
13 of improper disposal that they were outside of areas where
14 we planned to investigate and we have pinpointed them.

15 Lisa outlined those as PA sites, Preliminary
16 Assessment sites. We're checking to determine whether or
17 not there is contamination there.

18 There was -- my memory is failing me.

19 MR. DONG: I think you've covered them all.

20 COMMANDER GUILD: When there was some routine
21 maintenance work being done out there when they discovered
22 this PCB site a year ago, that was mentioned. Anything and
23 everything that we've been able to develop is all being fed
24 into the consultant to be addressed in the scoping document
25 for the RI/FS.

1 This fence-to-fence survey, while it's addressing
2 surface kinds of things, if there's a bucket over here or
3 whatever the case may be, if that comes up with any
4 evidence of contamination of the environment, whether it be
5 a stain in the soil or whatever, that will be included,
6 too.

7 CAPTAIN KRUMM: As well as underground storage
8 tanks.

9 MR. STRAUSS: How much of the area, approximately,
10 is being physically sampled?

11 COMMANDER GUILD: Is being physically sampled?

12 MR. STRAUSS: Yes. Or has been physically sampled.

13 COMMANDER GUILD: I would say, and this is
14 approximate, that probably three-fourths of the area, the
15 500 acres, has been addressed in some way, shape or form by
16 some sort of program. Okay?

17 Now that's prior to the sampling plan that Mr.
18 Notini was discussing which will be the next step after the
19 scoping document. That does not mean that every square
20 inch of three-fourths of 500 acres has been tested but
21 three-fourths of the area.

22 Most of that is covered from buildings or paving
23 from long-standing time. There's no evidence or reason to
24 suggest that there might have been a disposal of hazardous
25 waste there.

1 DR. LEGARRETA: How long is the tour going to take,
2 sir?

3 CAPTAIN KRUMM: Probably take about 35 minutes, 40
4 minutes.

5 DR. LEGARRETA: Can we leave after we see the green
6 parts?

7 CAPTAIN KRUMM: Oh, sure.

8 COMMANDER GUILD: You'll be in the bus with us,
9 though.

10 DR. LEGARRETA: Oh, okay.

11 MR. STRAUSS: I guess one of the things that I'm
12 wondering about is whether when you talk about doing very
13 site specific surveys for construction sites, and you want
14 to move these along I guess in a quicker time path than the
15 regular feasibility investigation would take, and I suspect
16 that you would characterize those as those are your own
17 separate feasibility study areas; is that a proper
18 characterization?

19 COMMANDER GUILD: I don't know that I would use that
20 term but -- since that has special meaning in this process,
21 feasibility study meaning a particular process, but it is,
22 in fact, a study, a feasibility study, of a site in the
23 generic use of the term feasibility study, not this
24 specific.

25 And there's no clearly defined process.

1 Essentially, we develop a work plan and study in
2 coordinating with regulatory agencies that agree that this
3 would be a proper examination of that area. We will go out
4 and do whatever testing that plan calls for and compile a
5 report saying what our results are.

6 MR. STRAUSS: I guess what I'm wondering about is do
7 you have enough information? One process is moving at a
8 certain pace and one process is moving very quickly.

9 Do you have enough information to move that process
10 quickly? Because there's a lot of information that still
11 has to be developed in the remedial action feasibility
12 investigation plan. There is an interaction with the
13 sites.

14 MR. NOTINI: That's a very valid concern we have.
15 We have a 500 acre site and typically at a site like this
16 we have 30 areas of investigation and possibly 30 different
17 areas that are going to be remediated somehow. You need
18 some kind of a phased approach to attack the problem.

19 And from our standpoint we're interested in getting
20 the sites that pose the greatest threat dealt with first
21 and we want to make sure that those areas are dealt with as
22 soon as possible.

23 Now the Navy has identified some other areas that
24 they're doing some construction on related to home porting
25 and we don't object to that provided that it does not delay

1 the work that we think is necessary in some of these other
2 areas.

3 The second concern we have is we don't want
4 construction to occur out there that would preclude in any
5 way long term cleanup of the site and that would expose
6 people that might be occupying those buildings to
7 contamination while this investigation and cleanup goes on.

8 So we're concerned about that and one of the things
9 we're doing is a couple of these areas that the Navy is
10 looking at for construction, we've asked them to take
11 additional samples, not only where the building is going to
12 be located under the footprint of the building, but we
13 don't want a building constructed out there on an island of
14 clean soil that is surrounded by contaminants so that
15 people going into the building are exposed.

16 So we're asking them to extend the sampling out a
17 reasonable distance from the building. And we are going to
18 look at, okay, this area is not contaminated, and there's a
19 building built on it; we want to make sure that access
20 roads to that building and so forth aren't going to result
21 in exposure to people.

22 MR. STRAUSS: Given that, what level of cleanup do
23 you propose as an agency, then, do you propose to require
24 the Navy to clean up to given that you don't have all the
25 information on site?

1 For instance, if there is housing to be constructed
2 on the site, and if that housing at that construction site
3 is clean, but there are other parts of Hunters Point that
4 may very well not be -- the Navy might not be able to clean
5 it up for another five or ten years.

6 Is there -- what level of -- I guess I'm getting at
7 what you're requiring in terms of cleanup since you don't
8 know what's going to happen.

9 MR. NOTINI: That is a very difficult question to
10 answer. We don't have any criteria that we apply, a
11 numerical number that we apply for cleanup of a particular
12 contaminant statewide.

13 What we get involved in are risk assessments. Let's
14 take a simple case where you have a contaminated lot. And
15 a company that owns the property wants to clean it up to
16 some level and restore it to some future use. The level we
17 choose for cleanup depends in part on the future use of
18 that lot.

19 As an example, if there's going to be an industrial
20 building built on the site and cement or concrete built
21 over it, we may allow some level of contamination to
22 remain.

23 But if there's going to be a nursery school built on
24 that location, and there's going to be a yard and you
25 aren't going to concrete over or pave over the lot, we may

1 apply a much stricter cleanup level.

2 So that's the kind of thing we need to take into
3 consideration. And if a company wants to leave some kind
4 of contamination behind, provided there's minimal risk, we
5 may require a deed restriction on the property so future
6 use of that lot is limited to certain uses.

7 So that's the kind of thing we take into
8 consideration. I know that probably doesn't entirely
9 answer your question. It's really a site specific
10 determination we make.

11 But we aren't going to put on blinders and look just
12 at that one site; we are looking at the entire site. I
13 want to try and assure you that what we told the Navy is we
14 want a comprehensive investigation of the entire 500 acres
15 but at the same time we recognize that there's going to be
16 a need to focus in on certain areas but we don't want to do
17 that to the detriment of looking at the whole site. Kind
18 of a dual approach. Look at the whole site and at the same
19 time move ahead with certain locations.

20 MR. RAMO: Rick, I think you've hit upon, Peter has
21 hit upon, one of the more sensitive parts of this cleanup
22 which is where I think you really need to adjust your
23 community relations program to it.

24 In other words, I think your basic framework is fine
25 which is occasional meetings like this, formal

1 presentations, interaction, a channel where there's
2 informal exchange of information, repository, but there are
3 going to be periodically difficult decisions that have to
4 be made. Such as declaring a site not to be significantly
5 toxic; declaring an area safe for construction.

6 Whether people ultimately agree or disagree it's
7 very important that they hear why you've come to that
8 decision and at least had a fair shot at convincing you if
9 they do disagree that it's not the right thing.

10 And I think when you get to those points it's
11 important that there be a meeting or at least some real
12 opportunity to have that kind of exchanged input.

13 MR. NOTINI: That's great. I'd be more than willing
14 when we have these kind of decisions to make before we make
15 them is sit down in a work session and look at the data
16 together, put it on a map and actually look at numbers and
17 talk about some of these things. We'd be more than willing
18 to do that.

19 MR. LICHTERMAN: Andrew Lichterman from Western
20 States.

21 An issue that keeps coming up is the interdependence
22 of the cleanup and the plan is to go forward with
23 construction of a very large and complex operation. On
24 this particular site.

25 And I think what you're hearing is a little bit of

1 frustration because we're in a position where the
2 environmental documents that we have so far really tell us
3 nothing at all about the relationship between a whole set
4 of toxic sites that come from a lot of different sources,
5 some of which you have no control over, we recognize that,
6 and all of these various structures that are going to be
7 built and the operations that are going to go on.

8 And in the EPA document, they say: Development in
9 contaminated areas -- this is what they wanted the record
10 decision to commit to -- only after an evaluation of the
11 potential impact of the remediation effort at other sites.
12 All right.

13 And this is what we're really talking about is what
14 does that require? What do you have to know to know
15 whether there's going to be a potential impact on the
16 remediation efforts at the other sites.

17 And we sort of pull back a little bit, we start
18 thinking about whether we have that here. You have all of
19 the sites that were identified through the IAS all right.
20 You have -- and people keep referring to sites identified
21 through the district attorneys' investigations.

22 Now I've looked through those fairly carefully and
23 I've read the declaration that pertain to allegations that
24 we're talking about about the kind of practices.

25 And on the one hand you have sites which are

1 particular areas that were identified, but it's important
2 to recognize that the attorney -- district attorneys'
3 investigation was not an investigation aimed at cleanup; it
4 had a very, very different kind of agenda. There are
5 different reasons they were looking for information.

6 They did not have to, for their particular purposes,
7 study every aspect of the site. And one of the things you
8 have in those allegations are very serious allegations,
9 allegations of widespread apparently somewhat random
10 dumping of large quantities of solvents, waste oils,
11 sandblast waste and so forth.

12 So it makes me very uncomfortable when I hear that
13 the district attorney sites have been added and you're
14 going to concentrate on those because the problem doesn't
15 present itself to me as a question of sites but a question
16 of there being a possibility virtually anywhere you stick a
17 stake into the soil out there and also some places where
18 you stick a spade into asphalt because there are some
19 accounts of places subsequently being paved over so you
20 can't omit the areas paved over unless you know when
21 they're paved over and I assume you then have really
22 reliable histories of what was going on before those areas
23 were paved over.

24 So I think this is one of the reasons Alan was
25 talking about the grid surveys being of such importance and

1 really getting specific because almost anywhere out there
2 could conceivably from the information you already have in
3 your possession have fairly serious contamination.

4 And now getting to the sort of relationship between
5 construction and cleanup, there is a certain amount of
6 concern that the cleanup process is going to end up being
7 construction driven rather than driven by a set of
8 priorities determined by which areas really pose the
9 greatest danger to human health and environment and that's
10 something we really don't think should happen for all of
11 the obvious reasons including --

12 CAPTAIN KRUMM: No, they will not be construction
13 driven. The only thing being construction driven is the
14 MILCON specific studies which, while related, are separate.
15 They have to be tied together to do --

16 MR. LICHTERMAN: Right. But, again, what people
17 have been trying to get at, the questions Peter Strauss was
18 asking about, well, you know, how clean does it have to be
19 in order to permit the construction to go forward, is you
20 have contamination on the surface of various kinds. It can
21 move over the surface by migration.

22 There are allegations of waste being buried, you
23 have ground water movement; all the stuff you don't know
24 yet. You haven't done enough studies to know the extent to
25 which the stuff can or is migrating through or over the

1 soil.

2 If you're going to approve construction at a
3 particular point before you have a remedial action plan for
4 a whole area, how can you have any confidence that you will
5 not be compromising the cleanup of the entire site when you
6 have dug out areas, changed ground water flow for all you
7 know.

8 How do you know that there won't be some
9 contaminants coming from other -- some other area of
10 getting into this general area which is now going to be
11 used possibly as family housing with children and so on and
12 so forth?

13 Another very large concern in this area is the
14 dredging. You're going to have maintenance dredging, first
15 construction dredging then maintenance dredging all along
16 the waterfront in that particular vicinity.

17 Well, you know, you've done testing now, but if you
18 don't know the ability of all these contaminants to migrate
19 into the bay, and you don't know until you have Remedial
20 Action Plan whether you really are going to be able to
21 remove them or cap them, how do you know what level of
22 contamination there's going to be in the future when you're
23 operating a Navy station and dredging it out and taking it
24 away and dumping at Alcatraz or some other location?

25 And there's sort of a set of related specific

1 questions that I'd kind of like to get answered that deal
2 with this sort of broader set of concerns.

3 First is, do we know the location of the underground
4 tanks?

5 MR. DONG: Yes.

6 MR. LICHTERMAN: Because those don't show up on any
7 of these overlays and were not in the material previously
8 released to the public.

9 And other Navy installations have been a major
10 source of contamination. For example, Alameda that has
11 moved great distances and that's a potential cause for
12 concern once again depending on where it is possibly in
13 relation to this question of whether you will compromise
14 cleanup efforts if construction goes forward.

15 The interim cleanups, besides the PCB cleanup you
16 listed some other interim cleanups. Could you give that
17 list a little more slowly?

18 CAPTAIN KRUMM: If you look at the list --

19 MR. LICHTERMAN: That's fine as long as I have it in
20 writing.

21 CAPTAIN KRUMM: Asterisks on that list are the ones
22 we think in preliminary discussions with agencies looks
23 like they might be candidates for interim removal.

24 MR. LICHTERMAN: Could I get an idea for the basis
25 of choosing those locations were? Were they considered to

1 be imminent danger to human health and environment?

2 MS. TEAGUE: No, those are -- if you've got a barrel
3 you can remove it.

4 COMMANDER GUILD: I think, for example, one of them
5 is the power plant. The contamination is asbestos lagging
6 on the piping on the boilers and things like that.

7 It's obvious on the surface and it's just sort of a
8 thing that in any other place would enter into the cleanup.
9 It's part of the IR Program, it's going through the RI/FS.
10 Would have to go through the process for interim removal as
11 outlined recently to us by EPA for those particular sites.

12 MR. LICHTERMAN: So those are sites where the
13 agencies have -- something on the surface, not a problem --

14 CAPTAIN KRUMM: They seem to be a problem we sort of
15 get our arms around.

16 MR. NOTINI: We're investigating those sites now.
17 Some of those surface contamination problems represent a
18 potential threat and they're disturbed in the assessment
19 flow so we would like to deal with some of those problems
20 as soon as possible provided it is consistent with federal
21 and state law.

22 We are still in discussion stage with the Navy in
23 terms of whether these are expedited response actions and
24 they'll be done in accordance with all the laws and
25 regulations.

1 So there hasn't been a final decision, I don't
2 think, made by the agencies definitely so we're still in
3 the discussion stage on that.

4 CAPTAIN KRUMM: Again, when such a work plan or
5 approach is available it will be publicized as well as
6 information releases.

7 MR. NOTINI: But we do want to encourage those kind
8 of actions that can be done to mitigate some of these
9 immediate problems. They don't -- some of those problems
10 may not need to be studied.

11 You raised a point of interim measures done in the
12 past, is that the end of it, and the answer is no. You
13 know, we're going to look at the whole site and look at
14 what's been done in the past but just because there was an
15 interim cleanup done six months ago or two years ago
16 doesn't mean it meets the standards of today. So we are
17 going to be looking at the site based on today's standards.

18 COMMANDER GUILD: I think it also goes hand in hand
19 with the discussion of winterization. These things are
20 surface; while they may not be an immediate problem now,
21 continued exposure to elements could be a potential problem
22 in the future. Why not do something about it? If it's
23 obvious it's not going to be left there.

24 MR. LICHTERMAN: One of the things I wasn't clear on
25 was what -- it's very helpful to get a sense of the

1 criteria for the interim cleanups because again -- and this
2 goes to the whole question of public confidence and why
3 it's really important to make clear what the criteria are
4 for the selection of interim cleanups because there is this
5 question of there's also this somewhat accelerated process
6 for the construction and the possibility of those getting
7 confused in the public mind is --

8 COMMANDER GUILD: I think if you go on the tour that
9 maybe your question would be better answered by that.

10 MR. LICHTERMAN: And I'd like to get a better sense
11 of sort of the relative trajectories of these construction
12 site cleanups and the general cleanup.

13 Is there any intention to actually begin
14 construction at any of these sites before the remedial
15 action plan is complete and has been available for public
16 comment and public comment be taken?

17 COMMANDER GUILD: The response to that would be if
18 the investigation of the site shows that it meets all the
19 criteria that we've agreed with EPA and the Department of
20 Health Services, Regional Water Quality Control Board, that
21 there's no reason why they could not construct there
22 without any potential impact to any potential remediation
23 elsewhere, then quite possibly it would. Right now we
24 don't have any money for construction out there.

25 MR. LICHTERMAN: I understand. But again there

1 seems to be at least some difference of opinion as to what
2 those criteria are. So that's not something intuitively
3 obviously to me at what point the criteria are going to be
4 met for construction to begin and what the relationship
5 between that is and remedial action plan is --

6 COMMANDER GUILD: You need to recognize also these
7 sites for the most part are located in areas where we don't
8 think there is contamination.

9 What we're doing here is establish that there is
10 not, by virtue of the D.A.'s investigation of Triple A,
11 concern expressed by the D.A. and you folks, that, gee,
12 maybe we haven't found all the sites, so we're taking what
13 we consider to be the extra step not required by law, not
14 required from private industry or anything anywhere else,
15 to go ahead and investigate that site to ensure there's not
16 a problem, number one.

17 And number two, to look at around the site as Mr.
18 Notini mentioned to determine whether or not there is any
19 potential migration from a nearby site or whether or not
20 the construction on that site could potentially impact any
21 possible future remedial action on any other nearby site.

22 So we're trying to look at all of that. You know,
23 it's -- nowhere out in industry or anywhere else does the
24 world stop because there are hazardous waste investigations
25 going on elsewhere. Silicon Valley is not shut down, San

2
1 Gabriel Valley is not evacuated or anything else. We don't
2 feel that Hunters Point is any different in terms of as
3 long as no evidence of any imminent danger to public health
4 or environment we can go on with this.

5 REVEREND BUFORD: I wasn't going to say anything but
6 you've forced me. That's why I raised the question about
7 the studies; to see -- regarding the black community. And
8 if I could get even more specific.

9 Particularly regarding births, newborn births that
10 from pregnant women and so on, I'm very concerned that a
11 lot of the stuff is going to be dredged up or is going to
12 be dug up or however you're going to get this mess up that
13 it's going to have an impact on people that you haven't
14 even -- that you at this point you haven't even gotten a
15 yardstick for measuring that particular impact. And it
16 would seem as though that has not really been anticipated
17 that there will be an impact on those people or on the
18 people there in that particular way.

19 So that's something that you won't -- you would not
20 know and so I'm just concerned about the need to rush ahead
21 with the project and I guess this is all a part of our need
22 as a nation to be secure, but good night, how can we be
23 secure, have national security, and I'm talking about the
24 black community, how can we feel confident in national
25 security if in the effort to become a secure nation, our

1 babies are being born deformed because they're born in
2 communities that have these kinds of toxic waste sites and
3 then the cleanup of those things are going on without
4 reference to the hazards that it could pose to them in the
5 future or even while they're being carried.

6 So I just want to raise that caveat about rushing
7 through a project like that.

8 COMMANDER GUILD: If I can refer you to this handout
9 you've got, the RI/FS planning documents, there are three
10 documents there that I think address your concerns at this
11 stage and then I think when you get to the feasibility
12 study where you look at alternatives for remedial action --

13 REVEREND BUFORD: This (indicating).

14 MS. TEAGUE: One right before that.

15 COMMANDER GUILD: Right before. It says RI/FS
16 Planning Documents? The second one there is Health and
17 Safety Plan which deals with the immediate health concerns
18 with actually doing the investigation.

19 Now if you're going to bore a hole, how are we
20 insuring the health of those people doing that work is
21 protected, and secondly, the community and the public, how
22 is that protected that's worked out with those services.

23 Then if you look down about halfway down,
24 Preliminary Public Health and Environmental Evaluation and
25 then the Public Health Evaluation Plan, both of those

1 documents I think would set the current standard of what's
2 known now and how that may or may not affect public health.

3 Then you go through the investigations, you
4 determine what's there and what you're going to do about
5 it, and you have -- that's what the result of the
6 feasibility study is, the discussion of alternatives for
7 the remediation of whatever it is that is there.

8 And the feasibility study looks at the entire range
9 of impacts of a particular remedial action both in regard
10 to the environment, public health, economics, myriad of
11 other things. And all of that is provided for public
12 comment at the time before a plan, remedial action plan
13 decision is made.

14 REVEREND BUFORD: Okay. I thank you for the
15 positive approach and the can-do attitude. I just like to
16 raise that all of what you've presented here in these
17 planning documents and in your scheme of how to move
18 forward through the years is based on the assumption that
19 it can be cleaned up and apparently there's every reason to
20 believe that it can be cleaned up.

21 There's also every reason to believe due to things
22 like Love Canal and other places that perhaps it can't be
23 cleaned up, too.

24 So I just -- that's also what I hear. I mean I hear
25 about petroleum contaminants, I hear about nuclear

1 contaminants and stuff that's been there for years and
2 years and people did not even know about.

3 You've got to be -- this has got to be a lot of
4 digging and how far do you dig until you find out the place
5 is uninhabitable for anybody or anything?

6 COMMANDER GUILD: That's part of the science of the
7 entire process and that's why the process is so cumbersome
8 and there are so many different plans in there. There are
9 other people who are concerned -- why don't you just dig it
10 up and haul it away?

11 REVEREND BUFORD: Yeah, where?

12 COMMANDER GUILD: Yes. That's why this process and
13 all these plans and all of the involvement of other trades
14 and community is so important to try and do this in a
15 manner that is most sensible for the number of avenues.

16 MR. RAMO: Commander Guild, just so you don't feel
17 picked on, Ric, and Alex, correct me if I'm wrong, we've
18 done a lot of work in Silicon Valley so I have some
19 familiarity with issues there.

20 I don't know a single site where there's been
21 evidence of illegal massive routine dumping through a whole
22 site and 30 sites under investigation for hazardous waste
23 cleanup which has not yet been characterized by the
24 Department of Health but where the Department of Health
25 Services has allowed a housing project to be built there.

1 Maybe they know of one, I'd like to know, but I
2 don't know of one. I don't think private enterprise
3 anywhere is getting away with something under those
4 circumstances.

5 So that's the source of our concern. It has nothing
6 to do with Navy versus private industry.

7 Any site that our group is aware of and there have
8 been that kind of evidence and haven't been fully
9 characterized we'd oppose a housing project, period.
10 Whether it's Navy or some developer in San Francisco or
11 whatever. Or IBM.

12 COMMANDER GUILD: I would defer to your knowledge
13 there. I certainly obviously haven't done a study of
14 Silicon Valley. I just know a lot of size there and an
15 awful lot of progress going on in the Silicon Valley.

16 We are saying the same thing. We're not talking
17 about building on the site, we're talking about areas we
18 don't believe are contaminated, but we're taking the extra
19 step, what we feel is the extra step, to ascertain that is
20 the case.

21 MR. RAMO: That's great. I want to make that clear.
22 We're not picking on the Navy. Any situation with that
23 kind of facts we respond that kind of way.

24 CAPTAIN KRUMM: If we can sort of wrap it up, I
25 don't want to curtail comments. There are a number of us

1 who will be available for individual discussions. Don't
2 want to hold up anybody from going off and doing what they
3 want.

4 MR. RAMO: I'll make this my last question. I'm
5 sorry for taking a lot of time but I appreciate the
6 opportunity. I think you sense in my frustration not
7 having had this kind of opportunity before and I really
8 welcome it to get out some of these concerns.

9 In the EIS, on the homeporting, there was an
10 implication in the discussion of asbestos, and this is more
11 directed toward Health Services, that there was a
12 distinction between manmade and natural asbestos.

13 It's my understanding that your department in the
14 ARB has found as part of the tanker process that there's no
15 such distinction and that similar health requirements in
16 terms of construction workers as well as anyone looking at
17 working there afterwards would be entitled to equal
18 protections. Whether it was manmade or natural.

19 Is that any different than what your understanding
20 is?

21 MR. NOTINI: No, it isn't. I would agree that our
22 position is if there's asbestos out there it doesn't matter
23 whether it's manmade or natural. If it presents a hazard
24 it's going to have to be mitigated. I think that's
25 consistent with what Hugh said.

1 Maybe I can throw out one more comment on this.
2 You've really hit a major issue, this construction issue,
3 and it's not something we can resolve today but what's been
4 helpful is to know what these issues are that concern you.

5 And it's helpful for us in terms of developing
6 Community Relations Plan to know this is one of the
7 important things you want to talk more about. And I would
8 suggest we're going to have to have more meetings and
9 discussions on these kinds of things in the future.

10 So I apologize if I'm not responding today giving
11 you the answer. There is no simple answer today. But
12 we're more than willing to discuss it further.

13 CAPTAIN KRUMM: I want to thank everybody for the
14 dialog, the comments and interest, and I think this is a
15 start.

16 And I think at least it's our intention to go the
17 right direction, and I think with your input today, you
18 were a big help in getting that ship steered down the right
19 path and going in the right direction as far as the
20 environmental cleanup.

21 Thank you all very much.

22 (Meeting adjourned at 4:00 p.m.)

23

24

---o0o---

25