

Golden Gate University School of Law
GGU Law Digital Commons

Environmental Law and Justice Clinic - Hunters
Point Naval Shipyard Documents

Centers & Programs

6-21-2019

NRC Petition: Supplemental Filing 4 Exhibit 2 - Bowers 2nd NRC Declaration

Golden Gate University School of Law

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.law.ggu.edu/hpns>



Part of the [Environmental Law Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Golden Gate University School of Law, "NRC Petition: Supplemental Filing 4 Exhibit 2 - Bowers 2nd NRC Declaration" (2019). *Environmental Law and Justice Clinic - Hunters Point Naval Shipyard Documents*. 28. <https://digitalcommons.law.ggu.edu/hpns/28>

This Petition Supplemental Filing is brought to you for free and open access by the Centers & Programs at GGU Law Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Environmental Law and Justice Clinic - Hunters Point Naval Shipyard Documents by an authorized administrator of GGU Law Digital Commons. For more information, please contact jfischer@ggu.edu.

1 Steve Castleman, SBN 95764
2 Environmental Law and Justice Clinic
3 Golden Gate University School of Law
4 536 Mission Street
5 San Francisco, California 94105-2968
6 Telephone: (415) 442-6675
7 scastleman@ggu.edu

8 David C. Anton, SBN 94852
9 1717 Redwood Lane
10 Davis, CA 95616
11 Telephone: (530) 759-8421
12 davidantonlaw@gmail.com

13 Attorneys for Petitioner
14 GREENACTION FOR HEALTH
15 AND ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE

16 **UNITED STATES NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION**
17 **Before the Executive Director for Operations**

18 **GREENACTION FOR HEALTH AND**)
19 **ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE,**)
20 **Petitioner,**)
21 **v.**)
22 **TETRA TECH EC, Inc.,**)
23 **Licensee.**)

24 **DECLARATION OF ELBERT**
25 **BOWERS IN SUPPORT OF**
26 **SUPPLEMENTAL FILING NO. 4**
27 **10 C.F.R. § 2.206 PETITION TO**
28 **REVOKE MATERIALS LICENSE**
NO. 29-31396-01

1 I, **ELBERT BOWERS**, state:

2 1. This is my second declaration in support of Greenaction for Health and
3 Environmental Justice's Petition to Revoke Tetra Tech, EC Inc.'s ("Tetra Tech") NRC license.
4 My first declaration was signed on June 19, 2017, and is Exhibit A to the Petition, which was
5 filed on or about June 29, 2017.

6 2. As stated in my previous declaration, I started working on the radiological
7 cleanup at Hunters Point Naval Shipyard ("HPNS") in January 2001, as an employee of New
8 World Environmental ("NWE"), a radiological subcontractor to Tetra Tech. I became NWE's
9 Radiation Safety Officer Representative ("RSOR") in January 2004. On March 30, 2009, after
10 Tetra Tech invoked use of its own NRC materials license for the first time rather than use
11 NWE's, I "rolled over" from working for NWE to working directly for Tetra Tech as its
12 RSOR, with Navy approval.

13 3. On April 15, 2010, in my role as Tetra Tech's RSOR, I was approached by Tetra
14 Tech personnel conducting radiation scanning in Parcel D-1. Expectations were to verify there
15 were only background levels of radiation in the parcel. However, an area with extremely high
16 levels of radioactive contamination had been identified. I went to the area and spoke to the
17 Senior Health Physics ("HP") technician who made the finding, and his supervisor Justin
18 Hubbard. They told me what had taken place. I saw at least one 1-gallon plastic zip lock bag
19 containing a soil sample from the radiation-elevated area that was supposed to undergo
20 laboratory analysis. I do not recall receiving subsequent results of any such lab analysis.

21 4. I took date-stamped pictures of the location of the high radioactivity and its
22 surroundings. The date stamp does not appear on the face of the photos, rather it appears in each
23 photo's "properties file. The pictures are attached as Exhibit 1A-F. The same photos with their
24 date stamps visible are attached as Exhibit 2A-F.

25 5. To the best of my recollection, I notified my Tetra Tech superior, Radiation
26 Safety Officer ("RSO") Erik Abkemeier, about the finding in Parcel D-1 and I believe he notified
27 the Navy Radiological Affairs Support Office ("RASO").

1 scanning by Tetra Tech and before final clearance from RASO. Piles of soil are clearly visible in
2 the designated areas.

3 9. The Petition in this matter describes fraudulent soil scanning by Tetra Tech
4 personnel at RSY-2, directed by Jane Taylor, a woman hired for the position of Senior Health
5 Physics (“HP”) field lead despite having submitted a fraudulent resume indicating significant
6 training and experience as an HP when, in fact, she had none.

7 10. I was informed and believe that the Shaw-excavated soil that was taken to
8 RSY-2 for scanning by Tetra Tech under the direction of Jane Taylor was subject to the same
9 fraudulent scanning as was done on Tetra Tech-excavated soils for projects independent of
10 Shaw.

11 11. Billy Vo was a Shaw Senior HP at the Shipyard. I was familiar with him because
12 he had worked for NWE before moving over to Shaw. Vo, and others who learned of the
13 following events but kept it quiet to protect their jobs, admitted to me later the following
14 incident. Vo was with a Shaw junior HP. The junior HP asked Vo to show him how to operate a
15 radiological scanner in the field, which Mr. Vo possessed and had experience with. Vo showed
16 the junior HP some of the basics in the use of a Ludlum radiological detection field instrument
17 and then let the junior HP give it a try. Vo and the junior HP were in an area of HPNS that had
18 been trenched and remediated by Shaw Environmental. The soil that had been used to fill the
19 trench came from the Tetra Tech-managed RSY-2 pad that Jane Taylor directed. The junior HP,
20 while conducting a walk-over scan of the freshly placed trench backfill, observed that radiation
21 readings on his instrument suddenly jumped off scale (or “pegged out”) due to the area’s
22 radiation levels being so high. When further investigating the source of the high radioactivity, Vo
23 and the junior HP discovered what proved to be an “old generation radium button” of the kind
24 used by the military decades earlier throughout HPNS. Radiation emissions coming from the
25 button were so excessively high, in the milli-Rem-per-hour [mR/hr] range, that the Ludlum
26 sensor being used was inappropriate for accurate measurement. A more appropriate monitoring
27 device was obtained so precise assessment of the highly elevated readings could be made.

1 Finding a highly radioactive button such as the one discovered in this incident in soil that was
2 supposed to have been previously scanned and remediated by Tetra Tech indicates that the soil
3 was not properly scanned or remediated.

4 12. No one from any state or federal agencies, including the NRC, Navy and EPA has
5 ever spoken to me about any of the matters involving Parcel D-1 described above.

6 13. On or about February 2, 2004, I participated in sample collection activities
7 relevant to the assessment of storm water and sanitary sewer systems throughout Hunters Point
8 Shipyard. Sampling began in two interior Parcel A manholes, one brick, and the other concrete
9 lined. Both manhole locations were categorized by the Navy as 1) non-RAD impacted and 2)
10 suitable as a "background reference" area for upcoming RAD impacted storm water and sanitary
11 sewer system assessments.

12 14. One sample was collected from each Parcel A manhole and forwarded to the onsite
13 analytical laboratory for analysis using gamma spectroscopy. (Copies of the laboratory reports
14 are attached hereto as Exhibit 5.) Analytical results indicated elevated radium²²⁶ and were
15 reported to Tetra Tech. Since reports for both samples indicated radioactivity substantially above
16 minimum detectable concentrations, the corresponding sewer systems and soils associated with
17 them should have been investigated further. However, such an investigation never occurred.

18 15. Years later in May 2018, I led a Parcel A walk-through with Navy and regulatory
19 personnel (albeit absent NRC representation). In part, I identified for the group approximate
20 locations where the sampled manholes were previously situated (in relation to the new
21 development and existing landscape). Aside from one EPA person, the walk-through effort with

22 ///

23 ///

24 ///

25 ///

26 ///

27

28

1 remaining oversight entities failed to generate enough concern to suggest an assessment of
2 overarching environmental implications - yet to be explored - would be forthcoming.

3 I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

4
5 Executed on June 21, 2019 in Savannah, South Carolina.

6
7 
8 Elbert Bowers

9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28