Message

From: Huitric, Michele [Huitric.Michele@epa.gov]
Sent: 4/12/2018 11:24:26 PM
To: Chesnutt, John [Chesnutt.John@epa.gov]; Fairbanks, Brianna [Fairbanks.Brianna@epa.gov]
CC: Harris-Bishop, Rusty [Harris-Bishop.Rusty@epa.gov]; Huitric, Michele [Huitric.Michele@epa.gov]
Subject: RE: Media query - SF Chronicle - Hunters Point shipyard soil review

Thanks, Brianna.

John – does the revised response look ok to you? Does anyone else in SFD need to see?

- Q1 - What does "97% of survey units" mean in terms of clean-up? (Is that months, years, or just impossible?)
- Q2 - Has the Navy responded to the numbers in the EPA's review?
- Q3 - Did the EPA look at the soil results for areas where people are currently living/working on the property? (e.g. the artists studios in Parcel B, the new homes that were most recently built?)

Response:
Q1 & Q2:
The Navy will be resampling the impacted parcels and will rely on these new data to determine where additional cleanup may be needed. EPA's input, which is based on our independent review of the data, will help inform where the resampling will be done. The final plan for resampling is not yet complete, though the Navy has committed to resampling 100% of the survey units previously sampled by Tetra Tech EC Inc. The resampling results will determine how much additional cleanup may be needed, so at this time we are unable to predict how long that cleanup may take.

Q3:
~~Even though the~~ The Navy transferred Parcels D-2, UC-1, and UC-2 to San Francisco in 2015, and construction on new projects within these parcels is only allowed with a specific work plan approved by the regulatory agencies. As part of the review process for any new construction proposals, EPA and its state regulatory partners assess any potential concern about radiological exposure and any other hazardous contaminants.

For example, EPA reviewed the draft workplan for the new artists' building, part of which is located on Parcel UC-2, before construction started. We researched the locations closest to the artists' building where Tetra Tech EC Inc. had done trench and other radiation cleanup work. None of the radiological work that is in question lies within the boundaries of the artists' building work. Therefore, EPA has no concern about radiological exposure—or any other hazardous contaminants—associated with construction of the artists' building.

EPA also has previously evaluated the potential current exposure to radiation at Parcel A, where the new homes have been built. We have no reason to question any cleanup work performed on Parcel A. Historically, the majority of Parcel A was used for residences and administrative offices, not industrial activities. The only radiological materials found at Parcel A were sandblast grit and firebricks, and these have since been removed. Former Buildings 322, 816, and 821 had potential for radiological contamination. The Navy scanned all three buildings and did not find radiological contamination above required cleanup levels. Buildings 322 and 816 were demolished and removed. Building 821 is located on Crisp Road, not in the developed portion of Parcel A. No other sources of radiological contamination were identified during the investigation or cleanup of Parcel A. In 2002, EPA conducted a radiological scanner van survey of Parcel A and navigable roads on other parts of the Shipyard. All of the anomalies detected during the scan were attributable to natural occurring sources at levels consistent with what would normally be found in the environment.

From: Fairbanks, Brianna
Sent: Thursday, April 12, 2018 4:18 PM
To: Huitric, Michele <Huitric.Michele@epa.gov>; Chesnutt, John <Chesnutt.John@epa.gov>

Cc: Harris-Bishop, Rusty <Harris-Bishop.Rusty@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Media query - SF Chronicle - Hunters Point shipyard soil review

No concerns on the changes.

Brianna Fairbanks
Attorney/Advisor
EPA Region 9
75 Hawthorne Street
San Francisco, CA 94105
(415) 972-3907

From: Huitric, Michele
Sent: Thursday, April 12, 2018 4:17 PM
To: Fairbanks, Brianna <Fairbanks.Brianna@epa.gov>; Chesnutt, John <Chesnutt.John@epa.gov>
Cc: Harris-Bishop, Rusty <Harris-Bishop.Rusty@epa.gov>; Huitric, Michele <Huitric.Michele@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Media query - SF Chronicle - Hunters Point shipyard soil review

Ok. though perhaps it will help if we clarify the timing – so that she doesn't think that the efforts we are describing were part of this recent soil sampling review process? See edits in yellow. (my concern is that she may be new to this topic and we get pretty technical with this answer)

Q3 - Did the EPA look at the soil results for areas where people are currently living/working on the property? (e.g. the artists studios in Parcel B, the new homes that were most recently built?)

Response: ~~Even though the~~ The Navy transferred Parcels D-2, UC-1, and UC-2 to San Francisco in 2015, and construction on new projects within these parcels is only allowed with a specific work plan approved by the regulatory agencies. As part of the review process for any new construction proposals, EPA and its state regulatory partners assess any potential concern about radiological exposure and any other hazardous contaminants.

For example, EPA reviewed the draft workplan for the new artists' building, part of which is located on Parcel UC-2, before construction started. We researched the locations closest to the artists' building where Tetra Tech EC Inc. had done trench and other radiation cleanup work. None of the radiological work that is in question lies within the boundaries of the artists' building work. Therefore, EPA has no concern about radiological exposure—or any other hazardous contaminants—associated with construction of the artists' building.

EPA also has previously evaluated the potential current exposure to radiation at Parcel A, where the new homes have been built. We have no reason to question any cleanup work performed on Parcel A. Historically, the majority of Parcel A was used for residences and administrative offices, not industrial activities. The only radiological materials found at Parcel A were sandblast grit and firebricks, and these have since been removed. Former Buildings 322, 816, and 821 had potential for radiological contamination. The Navy scanned all three buildings and did not find radiological contamination above required cleanup levels. Buildings 322 and 816 were demolished and removed. Building 821 is located on Crisp Road, not in the developed portion of Parcel A. No other sources of radiological contamination were identified during the investigation or cleanup of Parcel A. In 2002, EPA conducted a radiological scanner van survey of Parcel A and navigable roads on other parts of the Shipyard. All of the anomalies detected during the scan were attributable to natural occurring sources at levels consistent with what would normally be found in the environment.

From: Fairbanks, Brianna
Sent: Thursday, April 12, 2018 4:09 PM
To: Huitric, Michele <Huitric.Michele@epa.gov>; Chesnutt, John <Chesnutt.John@epa.gov>
Cc: Harris-Bishop, Rusty <Harris-Bishop.Rusty@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Media query - SF Chronicle - Hunters Point shipyard soil review

I don't believe that any of the reports we've reviewed cover these areas, though I'm not confident on the artist's studio. Regardless, I think our response answers the question.

Brianna Fairbanks
Attorney/Advisor
EPA Region 9
75 Hawthorne Street
San Francisco, CA 94105
(415) 972-3907

From: Huitric, Michele
Sent: Thursday, April 12, 2018 4:02 PM
To: Chesnutt, John <Chesnutt.John@epa.gov>; Fairbanks, Brianna <Fairbanks.Brianna@epa.gov>
Cc: Harris-Bishop, Rusty <Harris-Bishop.Rusty@epa.gov>; Huitric, Michele <Huitric.Michele@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Media query - SF Chronicle - Hunters Point shipyard soil review

Thanks, John. As I look at Q3 , I'm now wondering if she is simply asking if we have reviewed a findings report that deals with where people are living. For example, did either the Parcels B and G report or the Parcels D-2, UC-1, UC-2, and UC-3 report cover areas where people live or the artists studio? Or perhaps the buildings report (which we haven't reviewed yet)?

Thoughts?

Btw, here is the current version with John's edits incorporated:

- Q1 - What does "97% of survey units" mean in terms of clean-up? (Is that months, years, or just impossible?)
- Q2 - Has the Navy responded to the numbers in the EPA's review?
- Q3 - Did the EPA look at the soil results for areas where people are currently living/working on the property? (e.g. the artists studios in Parcel B, the new homes that were most recently built?)

Response:
Q1 & Q2 –

The Navy will be resampling the impacted parcels and will rely on these new data to determine where additional cleanup may be needed. EPA's input, which is based on our independent review of the data, will help inform where the resampling will be done. The final plan for resampling is not yet complete, though the Navy has committed to resampling 100% of the survey units previously sampled by Tetra Tech EC Inc. The resampling results will determine how much additional cleanup may be needed, so at this time we are unable to predict how long that cleanup may take.

Q3 - Even though the Navy transferred Parcels D-2, UC-1, and UC-2 to San Francisco in 2015, construction on new projects within these parcels is only allowed with a specific work plan approved by the regulatory agencies. As part of the review process for any new construction proposals, EPA and its state regulatory partners assess any potential concern about radiological exposure and any other hazardous contaminants.

For example, EPA reviewed the draft workplan for the new artists' building, part of which is located on Parcel UC-2, before construction started. We researched the locations closest to the artists' building where Tetra Tech EC Inc. had done trench and other radiation cleanup work. None of the radiological work that is in question lies within the boundaries of the artists' building work. Therefore, EPA has no concern about radiological exposure—or any other hazardous contaminants—associated with construction of the artists' building.

> EPA also evaluated the potential current exposure to radiation at Parcel A, where the new homes have been built. We have no reason to question any cleanup work performed on Parcel A. Historically, the majority of Parcel A was used for residences and administrative offices, not industrial activities. The only radiological materials found at Parcel A were sandblast grit and firebricks, and these have since been removed. Former Buildings 322, 816, and 821 had potential for radiological contamination. The Navy scanned all three buildings and did not find radiological contamination above required cleanup levels. Buildings 322 and 816 were demolished and removed. Building 821 is located on Crisp Road, not in the developed portion of Parcel A. No other sources of radiological contamination were identified during the investigation or cleanup of Parcel A. In 2002, EPA conducted a radiological scanner van survey of Parcel A and navigable roads on other parts of the Shipyard. All of the anomalies detected during the scan were attributable to natural occurring sources at levels consistent with what would normally be found in the environment.

From: Chesnutt, John
Sent: Thursday, April 12, 2018 3:52 PM
To: Fairbanks, Brianna <Fairbanks.Brianna@epa.gov>; Huitric, Michele <Huitric.Michele@epa.gov>
Cc: Harris-Bishop, Rusty <Harris-Bishop.Rusty@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Media query - SF Chronicle - Hunters Point shipyard soil review

Here's my edits. I added the Parcel A info that Brianna mentioned and that we used previously.

From: Fairbanks, Brianna
Sent: Thursday, April 12, 2018 7:50 AM
To: Huitric, Michele <Huitric.Michele@epa.gov>; Chesnutt, John <Chesnutt.John@epa.gov>
Cc: Harris-Bishop, Rusty <Harris-Bishop.Rusty@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Media query - SF Chronicle - Hunters Point shipyard soil review

This looks good. I think her third question also asked about the new homes, which are on Parcel A. So, we may want to add some language from our previous statements on Parcel A.

Brianna Fairbanks
Attorney/Advisor
EPA Region 9
75 Hawthorne Street
San Francisco, CA 94105
(415) 972-3907

From: Huitric, Michele
Sent: Wednesday, April 11, 2018 5:33 PM
To: Chesnutt, John <Chesnutt.John@epa.gov>; Fairbanks, Brianna <Fairbanks.Brianna@epa.gov>
Cc: Harris-Bishop, Rusty <Harris-Bishop.Rusty@epa.gov>; Huitric, Michele <Huitric.Michele@epa.gov>
Subject: Media query - SF Chronicle - Hunters Point shipyard soil review

SF Chronicle's Caille Millner is working on an editorial about "the expanding need for soil re-evaluations at the Hunters Point Shipyard area." Her deadline is Friday morning at 10 a.m..

Please see below for a start of a draft response; please edit/add to as needed.

Thanks,
Michele

Questions:
As I'm sure you've seen, a Dec. 2017 letter from John Chesnutt of the local EPA was released by PEER. Chesnutt says in the letter that an independent review has found that an additional 76% of survey units had unreliable soil data from the Navy's original numbers – the review found that a total of 97% of survey units are suspect.

- Q1 - What does "97% of survey units" mean in terms of clean-up? (Is that months, years, or just impossible?)
- Q2 - Has the Navy responded to the numbers in the EPA's review?
- Q3 - Did the EPA look at the soil results for areas where people are currently living/working on the property? (e.g. the artists studios in Parcel B, the new homes that were most recently built?)

Response:
Q1 & Q2 - The Navy will be resampling the impacted parcels and will rely~~ing~~ on these new data to determine where additional cleanup may be needed. EPA's input, which is based on our independent review of the data, will help inform where the resampling will be done. The final plan for resampling is not yet complete, though the Navy has committed to resampling 100% of the survey units previously sampled by Tetra Tech EC Inc. The resampling results will determine how much additional cleanup may be needed, so at this time we are unable to predict how long that cleanup may take.

Q3 - ? can we pull something from this previous response:

> Even though the Navy transferred Parcels D-2, UC-1, and UC-2 to San Francisco in 2015, construction on new projects within these parcels is only allowed with a specific work plan approved by the regulatory agencies. As part of the review process for any new construction proposals, EPA and its state regulatory partners assess any potential concern about radiological exposure and any other hazardous contaminants.

For example, EPA reviewed the draft workplan for the new artists' building, part of which is located on Parcel UC-2, before construction started. We researched the locations closest to the artists' building where Tetra Tech EC Inc. had done trench and other radiation cleanup work. None of the radiological work that is in question lies within the boundaries of the artists' building work. Therefore, EPA has no concern about radiological exposure—or any other hazardous contaminants—associated with construction of the artists' building.

> EPA also evaluated the potential current exposure to radiation at Parcel A, where the new homes have been built. We have no reason to question any cleanup work performed on Parcel A. Historically, the majority of Parcel A was used for residences and administrative offices, not industrial activities. The only radiological materials found at Parcel A were sandblast grit and firebricks, and these have since been removed. Former Buildings 322, 816, and 821 had potential for radiological contamination. The Navy scanned all three buildings and did not find radiological contamination above required cleanup levels. Buildings 322 and 816 were demolished and removed. Building 821 is located on Crisp Road, not in the developed portion of Parcel A. No other sources of radiological contamination were identified during the investigation or cleanup of Parcel A. In 2002, EPA conducted a radiological scanner van survey of Parcel A and navigable roads on other parts of the Shipyard. All of the anomalies detected during the scan were attributable to natural occurring sources at levels consistent with what would normally be found in the environment.