LEE, LILY

From: Howard, Leslie A CTR NAVFAC HQ, BRAC PMO <leslie.howard@navy.mil>
Sent: Wednesday, June 08, 2016 11:14 AM
To: LEE, LILY
Subject: RE: FYSA - FW: NBC Bay Area questions 6/6/2016

Thanks Lily...was there supposed to be an attachment?

Leslie

Leslie A. Howard
Contracted RPM
Navy BRAC PMO West
33000 Nixie Way
Bldg 50, 2nd Floor
San Diego CA 92147
Desk Phone: 619-524-5903
Main Office Phone: 619-524-5096

-----Original Message-----
From: LEE, LILY [mailto:LEE.LILY@EPA.GOV]
Sent: Wednesday, June 08, 2016 10:13 AM
To: Howard, Leslie A CTR NAVFAC HQ, BRAC PMO
Subject: [Non-DoD Source] FW: FYSA - FW: NBC Bay Area questions 6/6/2016

Lily Lee
Cleanup Project Manager
Superfund Division
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 9
75 Hawthorne St. (SFD-8-3)
San Francisco, CA 94105
Tel: 415-947-4187, Fax: 415-947-3518
www.epa.gov/region9/superfund

-----Original Message-----
From: Robinson, Derek J CIV NAVFAC HQ, BRAC PMO [mailto:derek.j.robinson1@navy.mil]
Sent: Tuesday, June 07, 2016 7:01 AM
To: LEE, LILY <LEE.LILY@EPA.GOV>
Subject: RE: FYSA - FW: NBC Bay Area questions 6/6/2016

Thank you for sharing. Good answers! ;)

-----Original Message-----
From: LEE, LILY [mailto:LEE.LILY@EPA.GOV]

Sent: Tuesday, June 07, 2016 6:47 AM
To: Robinson, Derek J CIV NAVFAC HQ, BRAC PMO; Franklin, William D CIV NAVFAC HQ, BRAC PMO; Janda, Danielle L CIV; Tina Low (TLow@waterboards.ca.gov); Bacey, Juanita@DTSC
Subject: [Non-DoD Source] FYSA - FW: NBC Bay Area questions 6/6/2016

Keeping you in the loop: We received the message below from a reporter, and we sent the attached response.

Since the EPA will not grant an interview request and has canceled our scheduled phone call, can you please send a statement that we can include in our report? Additionally, we ask that the EPA please answer in writing the questions below for clarification purposes.

We would like to have a conversation with the EPA for clarification purposes, as well. As stated, we are under deadline and a conversation and written material needs to happen by COB today.

We understand that the EPA's position is that the Navy is the lead agency responsible for the cleanup and investigation of Hunters Point.

- As the government entity that is in charge of federal superfund sites and the agency that is overseeing the Navy's cleanup of Hunters Point, why would the EPA defer to the Navy?

- Can't the Navy speak about its own oversight of the Navy?

Dan Hirsch of UCSC said that in a phone call with EPA Region 9 and EPA headquarters, the officials at EPA headquarters said his analysis is correct-the region should not have used a 25 millirem per year standard or the Atomic Energy Commission's 1974 guide, and that averaging contamination across a site should not be used.

- Can the EPA confirm that the EPA headquarters agreed that these standards should not be used?

- Can the EPA confirm that the Navy shouldn't have used the standards referenced above?

We received the EPA's background information below. You said the UCSC presentation had some inaccuracies and left out some relevant information.

- What did the UCSC presentation include that was correct?

- Is the UCSC group correct in that the EPA should not have allowed the Navy to use the cleanup standards referenced above?

- Is the EPA saying that even if the Navy cleaned up to the standards referenced above, the EPA believes the risk that remains after the cleanup is still acceptable from a public health standpoint?

Isn't it true that for the cleanup of buildings and other structures, and equipment and waste, the Navy used a standard of 25 millirem per year and the Atomic Energy Commission's 1974 Regulatory Guide 1.86?

Isn't it true that EPA has repeatedly said that 25 millirem per year is not protective of public health and should not be used as a cleanup standard at Superfund sites?

- If so, why did the EPA allow the Navy to use that standard?

Isn't it true that EPA generally does not approve the use of the 1974 AEC Regulatory Guide at Superfund cleanups?

- If so, why did the EPA allow the Navy to use that standard?

Isn't it EPA's policy that Superfund cleanups at federal facilities are to employ EPA's Preliminary Remediation Goals?

- Why did the EPA allow the Navy to instead employ the non-EPA RESRAD model for estimating risk?

Isn't it true that EPA's guidance prohibits averaging contamination across an area like Hunters Point?

Please explain what the Navy's "protective cover" is.

Please explain what the each of the EPA's risk models are.

LEE, LILY

From: Robinson, Derek J CIV NAVFAC HQ, BRAC PMO <derek.j.robinson1@navy.mil>
Sent: Tuesday, June 07, 2016 7:01 AM
To: LEE, LILY
Subject: RE: FYSA - FW: NBC Bay Area questions 6/6/2016

Thank you for sharing. Good answers! ;)

-----Original Message-----
From: LEE, LILY [mailto:LEE.LILY@EPA.GOV]
Sent: Tuesday, June 07, 2016 6:47 AM
To: Robinson, Derek J CIV NAVFAC HQ, BRAC PMO; Franklin, William D CIV NAVFAC HQ, BRAC PMO; Janda, Danielle L CIV; Tina Low (TLow@waterboards.ca.gov); Bacey, Juanita@DTSC
Subject: [Non-DoD Source] FYSA - FW: NBC Bay Area questions 6/6/2016

Keeping you in the loop: We received the message below from a reporter, and we sent the attached response.

Since the EPA will not grant an interview request and has canceled our scheduled phone call, can you please send a statement that we can include in our report? Additionally, we ask that the EPA please answer in writing the questions below for clarification purposes.

We would like to have a conversation with the EPA for clarification purposes, as well. As stated, we are under deadline and a conversation and written material needs to happen by COB today.

We understand that the EPA's position is that the Navy is the lead agency responsible for the cleanup and investigation of Hunters Point.

- As the government entity that is in charge of federal superfund sites and the agency that is overseeing the Navy's cleanup of Hunters Point, why would the EPA defer to the Navy?

- Can't the Navy speak about its own oversight of the Navy?

Dan Hirsch of UCSC said that in a phone call with EPA Region 9 and EPA headquarters, the officials at EPA headquarters said his analysis is correct-the region should not have used a 25 millirem per year standard or the Atomic Energy Commission's 1974 guide, and that averaging contamination across a site should not be used.

- Can the EPA confirm that the EPA headquarters agreed that these standards should not be used?

- Can the EPA confirm that the Navy shouldn't have used the standards referenced above?

We received the EPA's background information below. You said the UCSC presentation had some inaccuracies and left out some relevant information.

- What did the UCSC presentation include that was correct?

- Is the UCSC group correct in that the EPA should not have allowed the Navy to use the cleanup standards referenced above?

- Is the EPA saying that even if the Navy cleaned up to the standards referenced above, the EPA believes the risk that remains after the cleanup is still acceptable from a public health standpoint?

Isn't it true that for the cleanup of buildings and other structures, and equipment and waste, the Navy used a standard of 25 millirem per year and the Atomic Energy Commission's 1974 Regulatory Guide 1.86?

Isn't it true that EPA has repeatedly said that 25 millirem per year is not protective of public health and should not be used as a cleanup standard at Superfund sites?

- If so, why did the EPA allow the Navy to use that standard?

Isn't it true that EPA generally does not approve the use of the 1974 AEC Regulatory Guide at Superfund cleanups?

- If so, why did the EPA allow the Navy to use that standard?

Isn't it EPA's policy that Superfund cleanups at federal facilities are to employ EPA's Preliminary Remediation Goals?

- Why did the EPA allow the Navy to instead employ the non-EPA RESRAD model for estimating risk?

Isn't it true that EPA's guidance prohibits averaging contamination across an area like Hunters Point?

Please explain what the Navy's "protective cover" is.

Please explain what the each of the EPA's risk models are.

ED_004747_00002059-00005

LEE, LILY

From: LEE, LILY
Sent: Tuesday, June 07, 2016 6:47 AM
To: Robinson, Derek J CIV NAVFAC HQ, BRAC PMO; Bill Franklin (william.d.franklin@navy.mil); Janda, Danielle L CIV NAVFAC SW (danielle.janda@navy.mil); Tina Low (TLow@waterboards.ca.gov); Bacey, Juanita@DTSC
Subject: FYSA - FW: NBC Bay Area questions 6/6/2016
Attachments: Hunters Pt press questions final 6-6-2016.docx

Keeping you in the loop: We received the message below from a reporter, and we sent the attached response.

Since the EPA will not grant an interview request and has canceled our scheduled phone call, can you please send a statement that we can include in our report? Additionally, we ask that the EPA please answer in writing the questions below for clarification purposes.

We would like to have a conversation with the EPA for clarification purposes, as well. As stated, we are under deadline and a conversation and written material needs to happen by COB today.

We understand that the EPA's position is that the Navy is the lead agency responsible for the cleanup and investigation of Hunters Point.

- As the government entity that is in charge of federal superfund sites and the agency that is overseeing the Navy's cleanup of Hunters Point, why would the EPA defer to the Navy?
- Can't the Navy speak about its own oversight of the Navy?

Dan Hirsch of UCSC said that in a phone call with EPA Region 9 and EPA headquarters, the officials at EPA headquarters said his analysis is correct—the region should not have used a 25 millirem per year standard or the Atomic Energy Commission's 1974 guide, and that averaging contamination across a site should not be used.

- Can the EPA confirm that the EPA headquarters agreed that these standards should not be used?
- Can the EPA confirm that the Navy shouldn't have used the standards referenced above?

We received the EPA's background information below. You said the UCSC presentation had some inaccuracies and left out some relevant information.

- What did the UCSC presentation include that was correct?
- Is the UCSC group correct in that the EPA should not have allowed the Navy to use the cleanup standards referenced above?
- Is the EPA saying that even if the Navy cleaned up to the standards referenced above, the EPA believes the risk that remains after the cleanup is still acceptable from a public health standpoint?

Isn't it true that for the cleanup of buildings and other structures, and equipment and waste, the Navy used a standard of 25 millirem per year and the Atomic Energy Commission's 1974 Regulatory Guide 1.86?

Isn't it true that EPA has repeatedly said that 25 millirem per year is not protective of public health and should not be used as a cleanup standard at Superfund sites?

- If so, why did the EPA allow the Navy to use that standard?

Isn't it true that EPA generally does not approve the use of the 1974 AEC Regulatory Guide at Superfund cleanups?

- If so, why did the EPA allow the Navy to use that standard?

Isn't it EPA's policy that Superfund cleanups at federal facilities are to employ EPA's Preliminary Remediation Goals?

- Why did the EPA allow the Navy to instead employ the non-EPA RESRAD model for estimating risk?

Isn't it true that EPA's guidance prohibits averaging contamination across an area like Hunters Point?

Please explain what the Navy's "protective cover" is.

Please explain what the each of the EPA's risk models are.

LEE, LILY

From: Robinson, Derek J CIV NAVFAC HQ, BRAC PMO <derek.j.robinson1@navy.mil>
Sent: Monday, June 06, 2016 2:47 PM
To: LEE, LILY; Bacey, Juanita@DTSC; Tina Low (TLow@waterboards.ca.gov); Brownell, Amy (DPH)
Subject: RE: Hunters Point radiation cleanup statement to reporter

FYSA,

Here are the statements we sent to NBC...

DISPOSAL OF HAZARDOUS MATERIALS:

"The Navy takes its responsibility to complete the environmental cleanup of Hunters Point and ensure the public's safety very seriously. Hazardous materials are sent offsite for disposal, required to meet stringent regulatory requirements, and sent to appropriate certified disposal facilities with regulatory agency oversight."

CLEANUP STANDARDS:

"Cleanup standards are developed based on applicable and relevant regulatory requirements, regulatory agency approved remediation, and an evaluation of naturally occurring levels. The referenced Atomic Energy Commission standard is just one of many that the Navy has to meet. Other standards that are met include the current standards from the U.S. EPA and the State of California. The Navy's final selected clean-up levels meet or exceed human health safety standards, and are reviewed and approved by regulatory agencies, which include the U.S. EPA and California Department of Toxic Substances Control."

-----Original Message-----
From: Robinson, Derek J CIV NAVFAC HQ, BRAC PMO
Sent: Monday, June 06, 2016 1:58 PM
To: 'LEE, LILY'; Janda, Danielle L CIV; Edwards, Zachary L CIV SEA 04 04N; Slack, Matthew L CIV SEA 04 04N; Bacey, Juanita@DTSC; Tina Low (TLow@waterboards.ca.gov); Franklin, William D CIV NAVFAC HQ, BRAC PMO; Brownell, Amy (DPH); Drew, Tamsen (ADM)
Subject: RE: Hunters Point radiation cleanup statement to reporter

Hi Lily,

Thank you for the information.

The Navy is putting together a couple brief paragraphs in response to NBC's request to us. We were not able to make NBC's deadline of Wednesday for phone interview.

I will send over the our statements, once they are ready to go.

I would change this the second paragraph statement "... EPA and its state regulatory agency partners (the California Department of Public Health and the California Department of Toxic Substances Control) oversee and enforce..."

- to -
"... EPA and its state regulatory agency partners (the California Department of Public Health and the California Department of Toxic Substances Control) ensure that Navy selected remedies are protective of human health and the environment and comply with applicable and relevant requirements..."

Derek

-----Original Message-----
From: LEE, LILY [mailto:LEE.LILY@EPA.GOV]
Sent: Friday, June 03, 2016 4:26 PM
To: Robinson, Derek J CIV NAVFAC HQ, BRAC PMO; Janda, Danielle L CIV; Edwards, Zachary L CIV SEA 04 04N; Slack, Matthew L CIV SEA 04 04N; Bacey, Juanita@DTSC; Tina Low (TLow@waterboards.ca.gov); Franklin, William D CIV NAVFAC HQ, BRAC PMO; Brownell, Amy (DPH); Drew, Tamsen (ADM)
Subject: [Non-DoD Source] Hunters Point radiation cleanup statement to reporter

A reporter from NBC news has asked EPA about radiation cleanup at the Hunters Point Naval Shipyard. EPA referred her to the Navy as the lead on the cleanup at Hunters Point. My press officer also sent this statement today to her about EPA's role overseeing Navy cleanup and EPA's process in developing risk based approaches to evaluate cleanup completeness. I wanted to share it with you as well. Our press office offered to talk with her after she reviews it provide any clarification needed.

- Lily

The Hunters Point Naval Shipyard (HPNS) is a former military base in San Francisco, California. It was used by the Navy as a naval submarine and ship repair facility from 1945 until 1974 and was also the site of the Naval Radiological Defense Laboratory from 1948 to 1969. In 1989, U.S. EPA placed the Shipyard on its National Priorities List, which is a list of federal Superfund sites in the United States.

The Navy is the lead agency responsible for the investigation and cleanup of HPNS. As part of the process, EPA and its state regulatory agency partners (the California Department of Public Health and the California Department of Toxic Substances Control) oversee and enforce Navy compliance with the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (commonly called the Superfund law) to ensure the cleanup at HPNS protects human health and the environment. The Navy and regulatory agencies work together to decide how to address the contamination. The Navy also gathers community input through a public process.

EPA uses the best available science to develop guidance for cleaning up sites, such as HPNS, that are contaminated with radioactive materials. EPA's goal for the HPNS cleanup is to ensure that the community is protected from exposure to radiation and that the site can be used for work, recreation, and residential purposes.

EPA assesses the health effects of radiation at a site by calculating the "excess cancer risk" posed by radioactive contamination. Excess cancer risk is the additional probability that a person exposed to contamination will develop cancer over a lifetime. Superfund regulations in the National Contingency Plan have defined the protective range of excess cancer risk as a probability that a person exposed to radioactive and chemical contaminants will have between an additional one in ten thousand and a one in a million chance of developing cancer (technically known as the 10-4 to 10-6 cancer risk range). When calculating this range, EPA uses assumptions about exposure that are higher than people's actual exposure. This means that EPA overestimates risk to make sure that cleanups are sufficiently protective.

EPA reviews the Navy's cleanup report for each survey unit (small area of land or part of a building) of HPNS using the current version of the EPA risk model to make sure that radiation levels are within the protective 10-4 to 10-6 cancer risk range. This ensures that any land that is transferred to the City of San Francisco for new use meets appropriate levels for protectiveness with regard to radiation. To provide additional protection, the Navy is installing a protective cover over the whole site. The Navy is also developing a plan, which EPA will review, that ensures the Navy or City will maintain and inspect the cover indefinitely.

EPA's risk models have changed over time as radiation science continues to improve. EPA has incorporated the latest models into its review process to ensure the HPNS cleanup continues to be protective of human health and the environment. EPA has reviewed the Navy's past HPNS cleanup reports, applying the current EPA risk model, and found that the Navy's earlier work had achieved the cleanup level needed to protect human health and the environment.

University of California at Santa Cruz Presentation

On April 21, 2016, a small group of faculty and students from the University of California at Santa Cruz gave a presentation about the HPNS cleanup at an Environmental Justice Task Force Meeting held in the Bayview-Hunters Point neighborhood. The presentation had some inaccuracies and left out some relevant information, as noted below.

The presentation criticized EPA's reliance on 2006 cleanup standards.

. In fact, EPA uses the latest version of EPA's risk model to review each Navy radiation cleanup report for individual sections of the site as they are drafted. ("Latest version" refers to whichever version is current at the time that EPA reviews each report.)

The presentation suggested that the Navy should be using standards with exposure scenarios that reflected only one end of the range that EPA considers protective.

. In fact, the Navy and EPA assessments of cleanup needs are already based on scenario assumptions of exposure that are higher than would be realistic. In part, this is because the assumptions of exposure do not take into account the protective cover. In addition, EPA considers the protective range to refer to a probability that a person exposed to radioactive and chemical contaminants will have between one in ten thousand and one in a million greater chance of developing cancer. The presentation did not reflect this complete range. Finally, the Navy routinely cleans up radiation to levels within the protective range, even with the current version of worst case scenario assumptions.

The presentation criticized the fact that the Navy's documents reference several different cleanup requirements.

. In fact, Navy cleanup documents showed requirements from multiple agencies that might apply to particular cleanups. The Navy must meet requirements specific to each of those agencies - including the most strict. Some of the standards that the Navy must meet may be less strict than EPA's, but the Navy still referenced them in the documents to show that by complying with stricter standards, they also meet other requirements. The final cleanup requirements were selected in several Records of Decision that were presented in a series of public meetings, allowed at least 30 days for public comment, and then finalized.

ED_004747_00002059-00011

LEE, LILY

From: Robinson, Derek J CIV NAVFAC HQ, BRAC PMO <derek.j.robinson1@navy.mil>
Sent: Monday, June 06, 2016 1:58 PM
To: LEE, LILY; Janda, Danielle L CIV; Edwards, Zachary L CIV SEA 04 04N; Slack, Matthew L CIV SEA 04 04N; Bacey, Juanita@DTSC; Tina Low (TLow@waterboards.ca.gov); Franklin, William D CIV NAVFAC HQ, BRAC PMO; Brownell, Amy (DPH); Drew, Tamsen (ADM)
Subject: RE: Hunters Point radiation cleanup statement to reporter

Hi Lily,

Thank you for the information.

The Navy is putting together a couple brief paragraphs in response to NBC's request to us. We were not able to make NBC's deadline of Wednesday for phone interview.

I will send over the our statements, once they are ready to go.

I would change this the second paragraph statement "... EPA and its state regulatory agency partners (the California Department of Public Health and the California Department of Toxic Substances Control) oversee and enforce..."
- to -
"... EPA and its state regulatory agency partners (the California Department of Public Health and the California Department of Toxic Substances Control) ensure that Navy selected remedies are protective of human health and the environment and comply with applicable and relevant requirements..."

Derek

-----Original Message-----
From: LEE, LILY [mailto:LEE.LILY@EPA.GOV]
Sent: Friday, June 03, 2016 4:26 PM
To: Robinson, Derek J CIV NAVFAC HQ, BRAC PMO; Janda, Danielle L CIV; Edwards, Zachary L CIV SEA 04 04N; Slack, Matthew L CIV SEA 04 04N; Bacey, Juanita@DTSC; Tina Low (TLow@waterboards.ca.gov); Franklin, William D CIV NAVFAC HQ, BRAC PMO; Brownell, Amy (DPH); Drew, Tamsen (ADM)
Subject: [Non-DoD Source] Hunters Point radiation cleanup statement to reporter

A reporter from NBC news has asked EPA about radiation cleanup at the Hunters Point Naval Shipyard. EPA referred her to the Navy as the lead on the cleanup at Hunters Point. My press officer also sent this statement today to her about EPA's role overseeing Navy cleanup and EPA's process in developing risk based approaches to evaluate cleanup completeness. I wanted to share it with you as well. Our press office offered to talk with her after she reviews it provide any clarification needed.

- Lily

The Hunters Point Naval Shipyard (HPNS) is a former military base in San Francisco, California. It was used by the Navy as a naval submarine and ship repair facility from 1945 until 1974 and was also the site of the Naval Radiological Defense Laboratory from 1948 to 1969. In 1989, U.S. EPA placed the Shipyard on its National Priorities List, which is a list of federal Superfund sites in the United States.

The Navy is the lead agency responsible for the investigation and cleanup of HPNS. As part of the process, EPA and its state regulatory agency partners (the California Department of Public Health and the California Department of Toxic Substances Control) oversee and enforce Navy compliance with the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (commonly called the Superfund law) to ensure the cleanup at HPNS protects human health and the environment. The Navy and regulatory agencies work together to decide how to address the contamination. The Navy also gathers community input through a public process.

EPA uses the best available science to develop guidance for cleaning up sites, such as HPNS, that are contaminated with radioactive materials. EPA's goal for the HPNS cleanup is to ensure that the community is protected from exposure to radiation and that the site can be used for work, recreation, and residential purposes.

EPA assesses the health effects of radiation at a site by calculating the "excess cancer risk" posed by radioactive contamination. Excess cancer risk is the additional probability that a person exposed to contamination will develop cancer over a lifetime. Superfund regulations in the National Contingency Plan have defined the protective range of excess cancer risk as a probability that a person exposed to radioactive and chemical contaminants will have between an additional one in ten thousand and a one in a million chance of developing cancer (technically known as the 10-4 to 10-6 cancer risk range). When calculating this range, EPA uses assumptions about exposure that are higher than people's actual exposure. This means that EPA overestimates risk to make sure that cleanups are sufficiently protective.

EPA reviews the Navy's cleanup report for each survey unit (small area of land or part of a building) of HPNS using the current version of the EPA risk model to make sure that radiation levels are within the protective 10-4 to 10-6 cancer risk range. This ensures that any land that is transferred to the City of San Francisco for new use meets appropriate levels for protectiveness with regard to radiation. To provide additional protection, the Navy is installing a protective cover over the whole site. The Navy is also developing a plan, which EPA will review, that ensures the Navy or City will maintain and inspect the cover indefinitely.

EPA's risk models have changed over time as radiation science continues to improve. EPA has incorporated the latest models into its review process to ensure the HPNS cleanup continues to be protective of human health and the environment. EPA has reviewed the Navy's past HPNS cleanup reports, applying the current EPA risk model, and found that the Navy's earlier work had achieved the cleanup level needed to protect human health and the environment.

University of California at Santa Cruz Presentation

ED_004747_00002059-00013

On April 21, 2016, a small group of faculty and students from the University of California at Santa Cruz gave a presentation about the HPNS cleanup at an Environmental Justice Task Force Meeting held in the Bayview-Hunters Point neighborhood. The presentation had some inaccuracies and left out some relevant information, as noted below.

The presentation criticized EPA's reliance on 2006 cleanup standards.

. In fact, EPA uses the latest version of EPA's risk model to review each Navy radiation cleanup report for individual sections of the site as they are drafted. ("Latest version" refers to whichever version is current at the time that EPA reviews each report.)

The presentation suggested that the Navy should be using standards with exposure scenarios that reflected only one end of the range that EPA considers protective.

. In fact, the Navy and EPA assessments of cleanup needs are already based on scenario assumptions of exposure that are higher than would be realistic. In part, this is because the assumptions of exposure do not take into account the protective cover. In addition, EPA considers the protective range to refer to a probability that a person exposed to radioactive and chemical contaminants will have between one in ten thousand and one in a million greater chance of developing cancer. The presentation did not reflect this complete range. Finally, the Navy routinely cleans up radiation to levels within the protective range, even with the current version of worst case scenario assumptions.

The presentation criticized the fact that the Navy's documents reference several different cleanup requirements.

. In fact, Navy cleanup documents showed requirements from multiple agencies that might apply to particular cleanups. The Navy must meet requirements specific to each of those agencies - including the most strict. Some of the standards that the Navy must meet may be less strict than EPA's, but the Navy still referenced them in the documents to show that by complying with stricter standards, they also meet other requirements. The final cleanup requirements were selected in several Records of Decision that were presented in a series of public meetings, allowed at least 30 days for public comment, and then finalized.

ED_004747_00002059-00014

LEE, LILY

From: LEE, LILY
Sent: Thursday, June 02, 2016 7:01 AM
To: Robinson, Derek J CIV NAVFAC HQ, BRAC PMO; Bacey, Juanita@DTSC
Cc: Janda, Danielle L CIV; Edwards, Zachary L CIV SEA 04 04N; Low, Tina@Waterboards; Chesnutt, John; Brownell, Amy (DPH); Lane, Jackie
Subject: RE: Followup from BCT - Questions for Navy regarding Hunters Point radiation issues
Attachments: EPA Technical Questions re Tetra Tech 5-23-2016.docx

Dear Derek,

Thank you for this information. I appreciate it. Other questions in my shortened list still are not covered in the attachments you sent. I have been asking some of these questions since our March 21, 2016, telephone conversation. I followed up with an email list of these questions on March 24, 2016. I have since revised and shortened the list in the attached, which I sent May 23, 2016. Let's find a time to talk about these with the BCT.

Thanks.

Lily Lee
Cleanup Project Manager
Superfund Division
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 9
75 Hawthorne St. (SFD-8-3)
San Francisco, CA 94105
Tel: 415-947-4187, Fax: 415-947-3518
www.epa.gov/region9/superfund

-----Original Message-----
From: Robinson, Derek J CIV NAVFAC HQ, BRAC PMO [mailto:derek.j.robinson1@navy.mil]
Sent: Tuesday, May 31, 2016 3:11 PM
To: Bacey, Juanita@DTSC <Juanita.Bacey@dtsc.ca.gov>
Cc: Janda, Danielle L CIV <danielle.janda@navy.mil>; Edwards, Zachary L CIV SEA 04 04N <zachary.edwards@navy.mil>; Low, Tina@Waterboards <Tina.Low@waterboards.ca.gov>; Chesnutt, John <Chesnutt.John@epa.gov>; Brownell, Amy (DPH) <Amy.Brownell@sfdph.org>; Lane, Jackie <Lane.Jackie@epa.gov>; LEE, LILY <LEE.LILY@EPA.GOV>
Subject: RE: Followup from BCT - Questions for Navy regarding Hunters Point radiation issues

Thank you for the email Nina.

On the topic of Anthony Smith, my office and RASO are planning to be present the next time he is interviewed on the site. The interview date has not been set yet, but we are hopeful for the end of June or beginning of July. I am afraid that we won't have any additional information until after we are able to interview him and determine if his statements bring other areas into question. Lily sent questions that she has regarding his information, please send me any questions you have for Mr. Smith. Otherwise, please let people know that new information is being investigated as we obtain it.

Regarding past investigations and activities, please rely on the anomalous sampling report and materials used in the past. I have attached two resources that we produced. This information hasn't changed. Beyond this, they should be referred to the Navy as the lead agency.

Derek

-----Original Message-----
From: Bacey, Juanita@DTSC [mailto:Juanita.Bacey@dtsc.ca.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, May 31, 2016 2:44 PM
To: Robinson, Derek J CIV NAVFAC HQ, BRAC PMO
Cc: Janda, Danielle L CIV; Edwards, Zachary L CIV SEA 04 04N; Low, Tina@Waterboards; Chesnutt, John; Brownell, Amy (DPH); Lane, Jackie; LEE, LILY
Subject: [Non-DoD Source] RE: Followup from BCT - Questions for Navy regarding Hunters Point radiation issues

Hi Derek,

I'm back from my vacation and I'm going through all my email. I agree with Lily in that a meeting would be helpful so that the Navy could address the questions that Lily sent. I think the sooner we do this, the sooner we can resolve this issue. The Navy's response to us will allow us to respond to the public with confidence that the work done to date at the base acceptable. Also, I'm planning a meeting with our DTSC Environmental Justice staff who regularly attend the Bayview/Hunters Point EJ Task Force meeting. It would be great if we could have the meeting with the Navy prior to my meeting with the EJ staff. This way I can provide them with the information necessary for them to respond to the public at these meetings. If you wish to discuss this further, please feel free to contact me. I'm not at my desk today, but can be reached at (510) 913-0763. Thanks.

Nina

From: LEE, LILY [mailto:LEE.LILY@EPA.GOV]
Sent: Monday, May 23, 2016 3:24 PM
To: Robinson, Derek J CIV NAVFAC HQ, BRAC PMO
Cc: Janda, Danielle L CIV; zachary.edwards@navy.mil; Low, Tina@Waterboards; Chesnutt, John; Bacey, Juanita@DTSC; Brownell, Amy (DPH); Lane, Jackie
Subject: Followup from BCT - Questions for Navy regarding Hunters Point radiation issues

Dear Derek,

As I said in the BCT meeting last Friday, it would be helpful to have a conference call with RASO to help all of us regulators understand more details about the facts of the Tetra Tech issue. Based on further review, and consultation with health physicists in Region 9 and HQ, we have updated and focused the questions I raised at the BCT meeting and that I previously sent about the Tetra Tech issue. Most of the answers could be provided verbally in a conference call with EPA, DTSC, and the Water Board. I understand that DTSC and the Water Board also may have their own additional questions based on their regulatory roles. Since much of this information is likely to be available already from RASO and others, e.g. from the Q&A's you already prepared for the 4/21 meeting, a conference call to give partial answers would be helpful soon. Information that will take longer to prepare can be provided later as it becomes available. In the mean time, I'm also refining my questions f
or the Navy about the USCS presentation.

In addition, at the BCT meeting I also said that the Navy has excellent opportunities at its own July 13 meeting and at the July 21 EJ Task Force meeting to give more thorough explanations of the Navy's work on radiation cleanup and addressing the Tetra Tech issue. The Navy, the public, and the regulatory agencies will all benefit from Navy presentation of the facts. The Navy can make use of the work already done on fact sheets and posters for the April 2015 workshop on radiation and from the Q&A's for the April 21, 2016 EJ Task Force meeting.

By the way, EPA's headquarters Superfund managers visited my office last week for their routine midyear check-in. They specifically requested a presentation about Hunters Point radiation issues. I presented a summary of the main themes. I am also preparing to send HQ the attached draft compilation of public inquiries that we have received thus far from the public and press. I tried to send these along to you along the way as I received them, but in case I missed any, here is my collection so far. If you have others to add, then I'd appreciate it if you could send them to me as well.

Thanks!

Lily

LEE, LILY

From: LEE, LILY
Sent: Monday, May 23, 2016 3:24 PM
To: Robinson, Derek J CIV NAVFAC HQ, BRAC PMO
Cc: Janda, Danielle L CIV; zachary.edwards@navy.mil; Tina Low (TLow@waterboards.ca.gov); Chesnutt, John; Bacey, Juanita@DTSC; Brownell, Amy (DPH); Lane, Jackie
Subject: Followup from BCT - Questions for Navy regarding Hunters Point radiation issues
Attachments: EPA Technical Questions re Tetra Tech 5-23-2016.docx; Hunters Pt Radiation concerns Feb - May 2016.docx; UCSC Community Presentation on Shipyard cleanup.pptx

Dear Derek,

As I said in the BCT meeting last Friday, it would be helpful to have a conference call with RASO to help all of us regulators understand more details about the facts of the Tetra Tech issue. Based on further review, and consultation with health physicists in Region 9 and HQ, we have updated and focused the questions I raised at the BCT meeting and that I previously sent about the Tetra Tech issue. Most of the answers could be provided verbally in a conference call with EPA, DTSC, and the Water Board. I understand that DTSC and the Water Board also may have their own additional questions based on their regulatory roles. Since much of this information is likely to be available already from RASO and others, e.g. from the Q&A's you already prepared for the 4/21 meeting, a conference call to give partial answers would be helpful soon. Information that will take longer to prepare can be provided later as it becomes available. In the mean time, I'm also refining my questions for the Navy about the USCS presentation.

In addition, at the BCT meeting I also said that the Navy has excellent opportunities at its own July 13 meeting and at the July 21 EJ Task Force meeting to give more thorough explanations of the Navy's work on radiation cleanup and addressing the Tetra Tech issue. The Navy, the public, and the regulatory agencies will all benefit from Navy presentation of the facts. The Navy can make use of the work already done on fact sheets and posters for the April 2015 workshop on radiation and from the Q&A's for the April 21, 2016 EJ Task Force meeting.

By the way, EPA's headquarters Superfund managers visited my office last week for their routine midyear check-in. They specifically requested a presentation about Hunters Point radiation issues. I presented a summary of the main themes. I am also preparing to send HQ the attached draft compilation of public inquiries that we have received thus far from the public and press. I tried to send these along to you along the way as I received them, but in case I missed any, here is my collection so far. If you have others to add, then I'd appreciate it if you could send them to me as well.

Thanks!

Lily

LEE, LILY

From: Robinson, Derek J CIV NAVFAC HQ, BRAC PMO <derek.j.robinson1@navy.mil>
Sent: Monday, May 23, 2016 6:51 AM
To: LEE, LILY; Janda, Danielle L CIV; Franklin, William D CIV NAVFAC HQ, BRAC PMO; Tina Low (TLow@waterboards.ca.gov); Bacey, Juanita@DTSC; Brownell, Amy (DPH)
Subject: RE: Hunters Pt radiation concerns from 5/18 EJ Task Force Mtg

Thanks for the summary Lily. Did you let them know that the Navy is having a presentation on July 13? We are coming to their community to answer questions...it would be a good time for them to get answers. Most of the people who attended the Greenaction meeting are on our email list. I'll have Jamie send them an invite now while it is fresh in their minds that they have questions.

-----Original Message-----
From: LEE, LILY [mailto:LEE.LILY@EPA.GOV]
Sent: Thursday, May 19, 2016 3:45 PM
To: Robinson, Derek J CIV NAVFAC HQ, BRAC PMO; Janda, Danielle L CIV; Franklin, William D CIV NAVFAC HQ, BRAC PMO; Tina Low (TLow@waterboards.ca.gov); Bacey, Juanita@DTSC; Brownell, Amy (DPH)
Subject: [Non-DoD Source] Hunters Pt radiation concerns from 5/18 EJ Task Force Mtg

Every EJ Task Force Meeting has a section on the agenda for an open invitation to community members to bring up any concerns not already on the agenda. All of the concerns/questions yesterday in this section were related to Hunters Pt radiation. Below is a summary, and attached are details. Roger Kintz (DTSC EJ program) and Deldi Reyes (EPA EJ program) were also at the mtg because they were on the agenda doing outreach on their own topics, so I asked them to review the attached for accuracy and completeness. In the mean time, I wanted to share this right away, even though it is still in draft form. I was not able to answer all of the questions because audience members often jumped in, and the meeting ran out of time. But some of the most relevant facts came out about public health concerns. Carol Harvey videotaped the whole meeting.

Summary of concerns:

- Because Tetra Tech falsified samples, we don't trust that we are safe.
- EPA and DTSC should do criminal investigations.
- EPA should collect samples independent of Navy, and they should be underground, not just surface
- Radioactive material is going to the landfills in Buttonwillow and Kettleman City, both EJ communities
- The Navy should come back to the EJ Task Force Meetings and answer questions
- Treasure Island is related to Hunters Point and the EJ Task Force should also address Treasure Island problems.
- The Navy should bring back the RAB

Details attached

Lily Lee

Cleanup Project Manager

Superfund Division

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 9

75 Hawthorne St. (SFD-8-3)

San Francisco, CA 94105

Tel: 415-947-4187, Fax: 415-947-3518

www.epa.gov/region9/superfund

ED_004747_00002059-00020

LEE, LILY

From: LEE, LILY
Sent: Thursday, May 19, 2016 3:45 PM
To: Robinson, Derek J CIV NAVFAC HQ, BRAC PMO; Janda, Danielle L CIV; william.d.franklin@navy.mil; Tina Low (TLow@waterboards.ca.gov); Bacey, Juanita@DTSC; Brownell, Amy (DPH)
Subject: Hunters Pt radiation concerns from 5/18 EJ Task Force Mtg
Attachments: EJ Task Force 5-18-2016.docx

Every EJ Task Force Meeting has a section on the agenda for an open invitation to community members to bring up any concerns not already on the agenda. All of the concerns/questions yesterday in this section were related to Hunters Pt radiation. Below is a summary, and attached are details. Roger Kintz (DTSC EJ program) and Deldi Reyes (EPA EJ program) were also at the mtg because they were on the agenda doing outreach on their own topics, so I asked them to review the attached for accuracy and completeness. In the mean time, I wanted to share this right away, even though it is still in draft form. I was not able to answer all of the questions because audience members often jumped in, and the meeting ran out of time. But some of the most relevant facts came out about public health concerns. Carol Harvey videotaped the whole meeting.

Summary of concerns:

- Because Tetra Tech falsified samples, we don't trust that we are safe.
- EPA and DTSC should do criminal investigations.
- EPA should collect samples independent of Navy, and they should be underground, not just surface
- Radioactive material is going to the landfills in Buttonwillow and Kettleman City, both EJ communities
- The Navy should come back to the EJ Task Force Meetings and answer questions
- Treasure Island is related to Hunters Point and the EJ Task Force should also address Treasure Island problems.
- The Navy should bring back the RAB

Details attached

Lily Lee
Cleanup Project Manager
Superfund Division
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 9
75 Hawthorne St. (SFD-8-3)
San Francisco, CA 94105
Tel: 415-947-4187, Fax: 415-947-3518
www.epa.gov/region9/superfund

LEE, LILY

From: Robinson, Derek J CIV NAVFAC HQ, BRAC PMO <derek.j.robinson1@navy.mil>
Sent: Monday, May 16, 2016 7:37 AM
To: LEE, LILY
Subject: RE: His name is Bradley Angel : [Non-DoD Source] Re: UCSC Presentation

Crud...

-----Original Message-----
From: LEE, LILY [mailto:LEE.LILY@EPA.GOV]
Sent: Monday, May 16, 2016 7:33 AM
To: Robinson, Derek J CIV NAVFAC HQ, BRAC PMO
Subject: His name is Bradley Angel : [Non-DoD Source] Re: UCSC Presentation

So you could call him Bradley or Mr. Angel

Lily Lee
USEPA Region 9
Superfund Division
415-947-4187

On May 16, 2016, at 7:29 AM, Robinson, Derek J CIV NAVFAC HQ, BRAC PMO <derek.j.robinson1@navy.mil> wrote:

Thank you Mr. Bradley!

-----Original Message-----
From: Bradley Angel [mailto:bradley@greenaction.org]
Sent: Monday, May 16, 2016 7:10 AM
To: Robinson, Derek J CIV NAVFAC HQ, BRAC PMO; Daniel Hirsch
Cc: Lane, Jackie; Chesnutt, John; Franklin, William D CIV NAVFAC HQ, BRAC PMO; Marie Harrison; Flora Lu; Walker, Stuart; Herrera, Angeles; LEE, LILY
Subject: [Non-DoD Source] Re: UCSC Presentation

Attached is the presentation by UCSC School of Environmental and Nuclear Policy at the Bayview Hunters Point Environmental Justice Response Task Force meeting in April.

> On 5/16/2016 6:58 AM, Robinson, Derek J CIV NAVFAC HQ, BRAC PMO wrote:
> Dear Mr. Bradley/Mr. Hirsch,
>
> I requested the UCSC presentation given at the April 21, 2016 Greenaction meeting, but have not received it. Please send me a copy.
>
> Without a copy of this presentation, it is very difficult/impossible to respond to the allegations presented by UCSC to Greenaction and the community. I assume that everyone wants an informed discussion, which is also not possible without this information.
>

> I recommend discontinuing further discussion of this topic until the presentation has been sent.
>
> Best Regards,
>
> Derek J. Robinson, PE
> BRAC Environmental Coordinator
> Navy BRAC PMO West
> 33000 Nixie Way
> Bldg 50
> San Diego CA 92147
> Desk Phone: 619-524-6026
>
>
>
>

LEE, LILY

From: Robinson, Derek J CIV NAVFAC HQ, BRAC PMO <derek.j.robinson1@navy.mil>
Sent: Thursday, May 05, 2016 6:38 AM
To: LEE, LILY; Janda, Danielle L CIV; Franklin, William D CIV NAVFAC HQ, BRAC PMO; Edwards, Zachary L CIV SEA 04 04N
Cc: Chesnutt, John
Subject: RE: Heads up-request likely coming soon from Bradley: important that we have a follow up call to discuss UCSC findings and get clarity

Thank you for the heads up. I requested Dan Hirsch's presentation over a week ago. Any chance that you have it? I assume that he doesn't want it released.

-----Original Message-----
From: LEE, LILY [mailto:LEE.LILY@EPA.GOV]
Sent: Wednesday, May 04, 2016 8:20 PM
To: Robinson, Derek J CIV NAVFAC HQ, BRAC PMO; Janda, Danielle L CIV; Franklin, William D CIV NAVFAC HQ, BRAC PMO; Edwards, Zachary L CIV SEA 04 04N
Cc: Chesnutt, John
Subject: [Non-DoD Source] Heads up-request likely coming soon from Bradley: important that we have a follow up call to discuss UCSC findings and get clarity

Dear Derek,

I reminded Bradley again that the Navy is the lead on the cleanup, so he should address his requests and questions directly to the Navy. He promised he would directly ask you for this meeting. I wanted to give you a heads up that this is coming to you.
>> On 4/26/2016 4:23 PM, Bradley Angel wrote:
>> HI Lily and Jackie....we should also invite Jared as well as Stuart
>> Walker for the call...
>> On 4/26/2016 9:23 AM, Bradley Angel wrote:
>>> Hi everyone,
>>> Can we set a call to go over the information presented by UCSC folks
>>> at the task force meeting as it would be good to get clarity on the
>>> facts...and next steps.
>>> Lily, Jackie and Dan...when is good for you?
>>> Bradley

LEE, LILY

From: Janda, Danielle L CIV NAVFAC SW <danielle.janda@navy.mil>
Sent: Tuesday, April 19, 2016 4:17 PM
To: LEE, LILY
Cc: Robinson, Derek J CIV NAVFAC HQ, BRAC PMO
Subject: RE: Rad questions & available for call? - 1 of 2 emails
Attachments: NIRIS Export_EPA Author of HP Documents.xls

Hi Lily,

Attached is a list of the documents in our Admin Record that are authored by the EPA. The last column titled "Has PDF" indicates if a pdf is available for download. If there is something that looks interesting, and the pdf is available, I can download and send it to you. If you want it and the pdf is not available, then we have to ask our record keeper for a copy and that will take some time.

V/r,
Danielle Janda
(619)524-6041

-----Original Message-----
From: Robinson, Derek J CIV NAVFAC HQ, BRAC PMO
Sent: Tuesday, April 19, 2016 12:45 PM
To: LEE, LILY
Cc: Edwards, Zachary L CIV SEA 04 04N; Slack, Matthew L CIV SEA 04 04N; Janda, Danielle L CIV NAVFAC SW
Subject: FW: Rad questions & available for call? - 1 of 2 emails

Hi Lily,

The attached includes EPA comments on the removal memo. Page 53-55.

With the presentation planned to be the primary topic, I doubt that we will be able to discuss in detail your questions tomorrow. Hopefully we can give you some general information.

Has Greenaction or Dan Hirsch brought up thorium...or is this something you are researching for yourself? Just trying to figure out how time critical the request is and if we expect questions on this tomorrow.

Derek

From: LEE, LILY

Sent: Tuesday, April 19, 2016 7:25 AM
To: 'zachary.edwards@navy.mil' <zachary.edwards@navy.mil>; 'matthew.slack@navy.mil' <matthew.slack@navy.mil>
Cc: 'Robinson, Derek J CIV NAVFAC HQ, BRAC PMO' <derek.j.robinson1@navy.mil>; 'Janda, Danielle L CIV NAVFAC SW' <danielle.janda@navy.mil>
Subject: Rad questions & available for call?

Dear Zach and Matt,

I look forward to talking to you tomorrow. In the mean time, I wanted to see if you might be available for a quick checkin call today. I'm at 415-947-4187. You many know some of this information off the top of your head, and it would be great to get quick answers to those. I understand that some of these may take more time to address. Would you be available to do a call Monday April 25 from 8:30-11am or 1:30 - 4 pm or Friday April 29 from 8:30 to 4 pm?

In the mean time, I appreciate that Danielle has provided a spreadsheet with the radionuclide concentrations measured in the past.

General questions re past documentation: I am looking in old files to research some questions related to this Thursday's meeting, and in many cases I cannot find information in the EPA's Superfund Records Center and the previous RPM's at the time are now retired. I know the Navy has the full Administrative Record. I tried this link to the Admin Record on the BRAC website several times, but it does not return results to my searches. It seems to just freeze.

1. Do you have any documentation in your records regarding the EPA review of the 2001 or 2006 Basewide Rad Removal Action memo? (I asked this already 4/11, and I never heard back)

2. I found the reference area concentrations for sewer and stormwater removals for post-2012 in the June 2013 SUPR Abstract for San Sewer & Storm Drain Removal Conducted After September 1, 2012. So were the reference levels for previous work in individual SUPRA's as you went along? Karla and Mark remembered that perhaps the Navy had in the past set basewide background levels for at least some radionuclides, but I haven't yet hunted down that documentation. I've ordered some reports from the Superfund Records Center, but they're in off-site storage and will take some time to deliver, and I'm not sure they are the right places to look. Do you have this kind of information more handy to be able to email?

Thorium-232 specific questions. On 4/11, Derek said by phone that RASO said something about Thorium was unusual, but he didn't remember the details. Could you elaborate? On 4/6, I asked Danielle to ask RASO if they remembered significant Thorium-232 found in the past, and I never heard back. Attached are the Th-232 related excerpts from the HRA and the Th-232 related subset of the NED/NIRIS spreadsheet of radionuclide concentrations that Danielle sent me 4/7. For the majority of samples, the column "removed" was left blank, and on 4/15, she said that to find out whether they were actually removed or not would require going back to original reports. So I'm not sure how to tell how many of these points are still left in place. Is it possible to get a spreadsheet that shows only samples for soil that was left behind?

More detailed questions:

1. How was it determined if thorium 232 (Th-232) was a radionuclide of concern (ROC) for a survey unit (SU)?

2. If Th-232 was not an ROC for a SU, was the SU remediated to the Th-232 cleanup goal of 1.69 pCi/g? Is there Th-232 data for those SUs for which it was not an ROC?

3. Was Th-232 data used to calculate the risk for SUs for which it was not an ROC?

4. Was background for Th-232 calculated? Was it done more than once? Where was the background area(s)? Where is this data and can it be provided?

5. For NIIRIS Th-232 data, can we get the data and the associated uncertainty for each data point? (was not in provided table). Is the uncertainty counting uncertainty or total propagated uncertainty?

6. Was the Th-232 data from the spreadsheet that was provided reviewed or validated? What was the outcome?

7. Related to the Th-232 table and data for which no parcel is assigned: Where is 6PBFS? Where is 72-PDT or 72-PBT? Where is Site 00007?

8. When was Thorium-232 first added to the cleanup goals? How was Thorium-232 identified and addressed prior to that date?

9. Why weren't elevated levels of Thorium-232 always excavated if a sample exceeded the cleanup goal of 1.69 pCi/g in a trench?

LEE, LILY

From: Robinson, Derek J CIV NAVFAC HQ, BRAC PMO <derek.j.robinson1@navy.mil>
Sent: Tuesday, April 19, 2016 12:45 PM
To: LEE, LILY
Cc: Edwards, Zachary L CIV SEA 04 04N; Slack, Matthew L CIV SEA 04 04N; Janda, Danielle L CIV NAVFAC SW
Subject: FW: Rad questions & available for call? - 1 of 2 emails
Attachments: 060676%20FnlRevFnlBWRadAction%20Action%20Memo.pdf

Hi Lily,

The attached includes EPA comments on the removal memo. Page 53-55.

With the presentation planned to be the primary topic, I doubt that we will be able to discuss in detail your questions tomorrow. Hopefully we can give you some general information.

Has Greenaction or Dan Hirsch brought up thorium...or is this something you are researching for yourself? Just trying to figure out how time critical the request is and if we expect questions on this tomorrow.

Derek

From: LEE, LILY

Sent: Tuesday, April 19, 2016 7:25 AM
To: 'zachary.edwards@navy.mil' <zachary.edwards@navy.mil>; 'matthew.slack@navy.mil' <matthew.slack@navy.mil>
Cc: 'Robinson, Derek J CIV NAVFAC HQ, BRAC PMO' <derek.j.robinson1@navy.mil>; 'Janda, Danielle L CIV NAVFAC SW' <danielle.janda@navy.mil>
Subject: Rad questions & available for call?

Dear Zach and Matt,

I look forward to talking to you tomorrow. In the mean time, I wanted to see if you might be available for a quick checkin call today. I'm at 415-947-4187. You many know some of this information off the top of your head, and it would be great to get quick answers to those. I understand that some of these may take more time to address. Would you be available to do a call Monday April 25 from 8:30-11am or 1:30 - 4 pm or Friday April 29 from 8:30 to 4 pm?

In the mean time, I appreciate that Danielle has provided a spreadsheet with the radionuclide concentrations measured in the past.

General questions re past documentation: I am looking in old files to research some questions related to this Thursday's meeting, and in many cases I cannot find information in the EPA's Superfund Records Center and the previous RPM's at the time are now retired. I know the Navy has the full Administrative Record. I tried this link to the Admin Record on the BRAC website several times, but it does not return results to my searches. It seems to just freeze.

1. Do you have any documentation in your records regarding the EPA review of the 2001 or 2006 Basewide Rad Removal Action memo? (I asked this already 4/11, and I never heard back)

2. I found the reference area concentrations for sewer and stormwater removals for post-2012 in the June 2013 SUPR Abstract for San Sewer & Storm Drain Removal Conducted After September 1, 2012. So were the reference levels for previous work in individual SUPRA's as you went along? Karla and Mark remembered that perhaps the Navy had in the past set basewide background levels for at least some radionuclides, but I haven't yet hunted down that documentation. I've ordered some reports from the Superfund Records Center, but they're in off-site storage and will take some time to deliver, and I'm not sure they are the right places to look. Do you have this kind of information more handy to be able to email?

Thorium-232 specific questions. On 4/11, Derek said by phone that RASO said something about Thorium was unusual, but he didn't remember the details. Could you elaborate? On 4/6, I asked Danielle to ask RASO if they remembered significant Thorium-232 found in the past, and I never heard back. Attached are the Th-232 related excerpts from the HRA and the Th-232 related subset of the NED/NIRIS spreadsheet of radionuclide concentrations that Danielle sent me 4/7. For the majority of samples, the column "removed" was left blank, and on 4/15, she said that to find out whether they were actually removed or not would require going back to original reports. So I'm not sure how to tell how many of these points are still left in place. Is it possible to get a spreadsheet that shows only samples for soil that was left behind?

More detailed questions:

1. How was it determined if thorium 232 (Th-232) was a radionuclide of concern (ROC) for a survey unit (SU)?

2. If Th-232 was not an ROC for a SU, was the SU remediated to the Th-232 cleanup goal of 1.69 pCi/g? Is there Th-232 data for those SUs for which it was not an ROC?

3. Was Th-232 data used to calculate the risk for SUs for which it was not an ROC?

4. Was background for Th-232 calculated? Was it done more than once? Where was the background area(s)? Where is this data and can it be provided?

5. For NIIRIS Th-232 data, can we get the data and the associated uncertainty for each data point? (was not in provided table). Is the uncertainty counting uncertainty or total propagated uncertainty?

6. Was the Th-232 data from the spreadsheet that was provided reviewed or validated? What was the outcome?

7. Related to the Th-232 table and data for which no parcel is assigned: Where is 6PBFS? Where is 72-PDT or 72-PBT? Where is Site 00007?

8. When was Thorium-232 first added to the cleanup goals? How was Thorium-232 identified and addressed prior to that date?

9. Why weren't elevated levels of Thorium-232 always excavated if a sample exceeded the cleanup goal of 1.69 pCi/g in a trench?

LEE, LILY

From: LEE, LILY
Sent: Tuesday, April 19, 2016 11:59 AM
To: zachary.edwards@navy.mil; matthew.slack@navy.mil
Cc: Robinson, Derek J CIV NAVFAC HQ, BRAC PMO; Janda, Danielle L CIV NAVFAC SW
Subject: 2nd email of 2 with more attachments
Attachments: Hunters Pt HRA Thorium -4.pdf; Hunters Pt Thorium-232 sample.xlsx

Lily Lee
Cleanup Project Manager
Superfund Division
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 9
75 Hawthorne St. (SFD-8-3)
San Francisco, CA 94105
Tel: 415-947-4187, Fax: 415-947-3518
www.epa.gov/region9/superfund

LEE, LILY

From: LEE, LILY
Sent: Tuesday, April 19, 2016 11:58 AM
To: zachary.edwards@navy.mil; matthew.slack@navy.mil
Cc: Robinson, Derek J CIV NAVFAC HQ, BRAC PMO; Janda, Danielle L CIV NAVFAC SW
Subject: FW: Rad questions & available for call? - 1 of 2 emails
Attachments: Hunters Pt HRA Thorium -1.pdf; Hunters Pt HRA Thorium -2.pdf; Hunters Pt HRA Thorium -3.pdf

Sorry the first email bounced. I'm resending with partial attachments

Lily Lee
Cleanup Project Manager
Superfund Division
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 9
75 Hawthorne St. (SFD-8-3)
San Francisco, CA 94105
Tel: 415-947-4187, Fax: 415-947-3518
www.epa.gov/region9/superfund

From: LEE, LILY
Sent: Tuesday, April 19, 2016 7:25 AM
To: 'zachary.edwards@navy.mil' <zachary.edwards@navy.mil>; 'matthew.slack@navy.mil' <matthew.slack@navy.mil>
Cc: 'Robinson, Derek J CIV NAVFAC HQ, BRAC PMO' <derek.j.robinson1@navy.mil>; 'Janda, Danielle L CIV NAVFAC SW' <danielle.janda@navy.mil>
Subject: Rad questions & available for call?

Dear Zach and Matt,

I look forward to talking to you tomorrow. In the mean time, I wanted to see if you might be available for a quick checkin call today. I'm at 415-947-4187. You many know some of this information off the top of your head, and it would be great to get quick answers to those. I understand that some of these may take more time to address. Would you be available to do a call Monday April 25 from 8:30-11am or 1:30 – 4 pm or Friday April 29 from 8:30 to 4 pm?

In the mean time, I appreciate that Danielle has provided a spreadsheet with the radionuclide concentrations measured in the past.

General questions re past documentation: I am looking in old files to research some questions related to this Thursday's meeting, and in many cases I cannot find information in the EPA's Superfund Records Center and the previous RPM's at the time are now retired. I know the Navy has the full Administrative Record. I tried this link to the Admin Record on the BRAC website several times, but it does not return results to my searches. It seems to just freeze.

1. Do you have any documentation in your records regarding the EPA review of the 2001 or 2006 Basewide Rad Removal Action memo? (I asked this already 4/11, and I never heard back)
2. I found the reference area concentrations for sewer and stormwater removals for post-2012 in the June 2013 *SUPR Abstract for San Sewer & Storm Drain Removal Conducted After September 1, 2012*. So were the reference levels for previous work in individual SUPRA's as you went along? Karla and Mark remembered that perhaps the Navy had in the past set basewide background levels for at least some radionuclides, but I haven't yet hunted down that documentation. I've ordered some reports from the Superfund Records Center, but they're in off-site

storage and will take some time to deliver, and I'm not sure they are the right places to look. Do you have this kind of information more handy to be able to email?

Thorium-232 specific questions. On 4/11, Derek said by phone that RASO said something about Thorium was unusual, but he didn't remember the details. Could you elaborate? On 4/6, I asked Danielle to ask RASO if they remembered significant Thorium-232 found in the past, and I never heard back. Attached are the Th-232 related excerpts from the HRA and the Th-232 related subset of the NED/NIRIS spreadsheet of radionuclide concentrations that Danielle sent me 4/7. For the majority of samples, the column "removed" was left blank, and on 4/15, she said that to find out whether they were actually removed or not would require going back to original reports. So I'm not sure how to tell how many of these points are still left in place. Is it possible to get a spreadsheet that shows only samples for soil that was left behind?

More detailed questions:

1. How was it determined if thorium 232 (Th-232) was a radionuclide of concern (ROC) for a survey unit (SU)?
2. If Th-232 was not an ROC for a SU, was the SU remediated to the Th-232 cleanup goal of 1.69 pCi/g? Is there Th-232 data for those SUs for which it was not an ROC?
3. Was Th-232 data used to calculate the risk for SUs for which it was not an ROC?
4. Was background for Th-232 calculated? Was it done more than once? Where was the background area(s)? Where is this data and can it be provided?
5. For NIIRIS Th-232 data, can we get the data and the associated uncertainty for each data point? (was not in provided table). Is the uncertainty counting uncertainty or total propagated uncertainty?
6. Was the Th-232 data from the spreadsheet that was provided reviewed or validated? What was the outcome?
7. Related to the Th-232 table and data for which no parcel is assigned: Where is 6PBFS? Where is 72-PDT or 72-PBT? Where is Site 00007?
8. When was Thorium-232 first added to the cleanup goals? How was Thorium-232 identified and addressed prior to that date?
9. Why weren't elevated levels of Thorium-232 always excavated if a sample exceeded the cleanup goal of 1.69 pCi/g in a trench?

LEE, LILY

From: LEE, LILY
Sent: Tuesday, April 19, 2016 7:29 AM
To: zachary.edwards@navy.mil; matthew.slack@navy.mil
Cc: Robinson, Derek J CIV NAVFAC HQ, BRAC PMO; Janda, Danielle L CIV NAVFAC SW
Subject: Rad questions & available for call?
Attachments: Hunters Pt HRA Thorium -1.pdf; Hunters Pt HRA Thorium -2.pdf; Hunters Pt HRA Thorium -3.pdf; Hunters Pt HRA Thorium -4.pdf; Hunters Pt Thorium-232 sample.xlsx

Dear Zach and Matt,

I look forward to talking to you tomorrow. In the mean time, I wanted to see if you might be available for a quick checkin call today. I'm at 415-947-4187. You many know some of this information off the top of your head, and it would be great to get quick answers to those. I understand that some of these may take more time to address. Would you be available to do a call Monday April 25 from 8:30-11am or 1:30 – 4 pm or Friday April 29 from 8:30 to 4 pm?

In the mean time, I appreciate that Danielle has provided a spreadsheet with the radionuclide concentrations measured in the past.

General questions re past documentation: I am looking in old files to research some questions related to this Thursday's meeting, and in many cases I cannot find information in the EPA's Superfund Records Center and the previous RPM's at the time are now retired. I know the Navy has the full Administrative Record. I tried this link to the Admin Record on the BRAC website several times, but it does not return results to my searches. It seems to just freeze.

1. Do you have any documentation in your records regarding the EPA review of the 2001 or 2006 Basewide Rad Removal Action memo? (I asked this already 4/11, and I never heard back)
2. I found the reference area concentrations for sewer and stormwater removals for post-2012 in the June 2013 *SUPR Abstract for San Sewer & Storm Drain Removal Conducted After September 1, 2012.* So were the reference levels for previous work in individual SUPRA's as you went along? Karla and Mark remembered that perhaps the Navy had in the past set basewide background levels for at least some radionuclides, but I haven't yet hunted down that documentation. I've ordered some reports from the Superfund Records Center, but they're in off-site storage and will take some time to deliver, and I'm not sure they are the right places to look. Do you have this kind of information more handy to be able to email?

Thorium-232 specific questions. On 4/11, Derek said by phone that RASO said something about Thorium was unusual, but he didn't remember the details. Could you elaborate? On 4/6, I asked Danielle to ask RASO if they remembered significant Thorium-232 found in the past, and I never heard back. Attached are the Th-232 related excerpts from the HRA and the Th-232 related subset of the NED/NIRIS spreadsheet of radionuclide concentrations that Danielle sent me 4/7. For the majority of samples, the column "removed" was left blank, and on 4/15, she said that to find out whether they were actually removed or not would require going back to original reports. So I'm not sure how to tell how many of these points are still left in place. Is it possible to get a spreadsheet that shows only samples for soil that was left behind?

More detailed questions:

1. How was it determined if thorium 232 (Th-232) was a radionuclide of concern (ROC) for a survey unit (SU)?
2. If Th-232 was not an ROC for a SU, was the SU remediated to the Th-232 cleanup goal of 1.69 pCi/g? Is there Th-232 data for those SUs for which it was not an ROC?
3. Was Th-232 data used to calculate the risk for SUs for which it was not an ROC?

4. Was background for Th-232 calculated? Was it done more than once? Where was the background area(s)? Where is this data and can it be provided?
5. For NIIRIS Th-232 data, can we get the data and the associated uncertainty for each data point? (was not in provided table). Is the uncertainty counting uncertainty or total propagated uncertainty?
6. Was the Th-232 data from the spreadsheet that was provided reviewed or validated? What was the outcome?
7. Related to the Th-232 table and data for which no parcel is assigned: Where is 6PBFS? Where is 72-PDT or 72-PBT? Where is Site 00007?

LEE, LILY

From: Robinson, Derek J CIV NAVFAC HQ, BRAC PMO <derek.j.robinson1@navy.mil>
Sent: Monday, April 18, 2016 6:20 PM
To: LEE, LILY
Subject: FW: [Non-DoD Source] Hunters Point followup

Hi Lily,

Just keeping you in the loop. Any contracting we do has to be in accordance with federal contracting guidelines. There are rules against NOT hiring someone...and for that matter, hiring someone. I think you can see what Dan is implying.

Derek

-----Original Message-----
From: Daniel Hirsch [mailto:dohirsch@ucsc.edu]
Sent: Monday, April 18, 2016 4:27 PM
To: Robinson, Derek J CIV NAVFAC HQ, BRAC PMO
Subject: Re: [Non-DoD Source] Hunters Point followup

Derek,

My memory is that you were very clear on the conference call that the Navy would not hire Tetra Tech to do further work at Hunters Point once the current contract expires. I'll check with others who were on the call to see if their memory is the same as mine.

Daniel Hirsch
Director
Program on Environmental and Nuclear Policy College Ten University of California at Santa Cruz

> On Apr 18, 2016, at 1:15 PM, Robinson, Derek J CIV NAVFAC HQ, BRAC PMO <derek.j.robinson1@navy.mil> wrote:
>
> I am confirming that Tetra Tech has not been awarded new contracts in 2015 or 2016 at Hunters Point.
>
> Even though the NRC has completed their investigation into Tetra Tech's actions, the Navy's investigations are on-going. It is Navy policy not to comment on on-going investigations.
>
>
> -----Original Message-----
> From: Daniel Hirsch [mailto:dohirsch@ucsc.edu]
> Sent: Monday, April 18, 2016 1:10 PM
> To: Robinson, Derek J CIV NAVFAC HQ, BRAC PMO
> Subject: Re: [Non-DoD Source] Hunters Point followup
>
> Would you please at minimum now confirm what I understood you to say on the call last week that the Navy will not use Tetra Tech again at Hunters Point because of the problems involved with apparent deliberate falsification of radioactivity measurements?

>
>
> Daniel Hirsch
> Director
> Program on Environmental and Nuclear Policy College Ten University of
> California at Santa Cruz
>
>
>
>> On Apr 18, 2016, at 1:07 PM, Robinson, Derek J CIV NAVFAC HQ, BRAC PMO <derek.j.robinson1@navy.mil> wrote:
>>
>> Hello Daniel,
>>
>> Thank you for the request. I am mostly out of the office until the 25th. Expect my response the week of the 25th.
>>
>>
>> Best Regards,
>>
>> Derek J. Robinson, PE
>> BRAC Environmental Coordinator
>> Navy BRAC PMO West
>> 33000 Nixie Way
>> Bldg 50
>> San Diego CA 92147
>> Desk Phone: 619-524-6026
>>
>>
>>
>>
>> -----Original Message-----
>> From: Daniel Hirsch [mailto:dohirsch@ucsc.edu]
>> Sent: Wednesday, April 13, 2016 1:19 PM
>> To: Robinson, Derek J CIV NAVFAC HQ, BRAC PMO
>> Subject: [Non-DoD Source] Hunters Point followup
>>
>> Hi Derek,
>>
>> In our conference call yesterday you kindly offered to provide additional information we may need. I want to therefore ask you to provide me with documents about the Tetra Tech radiation sampling misrepresentation matter. You indicated in our call that because of the question of Tetra Tech falsifying radiation measurements, the Navy has had to go back and redo many of the measurements made by Tetra Tech, and would not hire the firm again. Is that correct?
>>
>> Could you send me documents about the falsification issue and the measurements that the Navy has had to have done again because of that concern? And could you provide ome with any document showing that the Navy will not rehire Tetra Tech at Hunters Point because of the problem?
>>
>> Thanks so much,
>>
>>
>>
>> Daniel Hirsch
>> Director

>> Program on Environmental and Nuclear Policy College Ten University of
>> California at Santa Cruz
>>
>>
>>
>

LEE, LILY

From: Robinson, Derek J CIV NAVFAC HQ, BRAC PMO <derek.j.robinson1@navy.mil>
Sent: Monday, April 18, 2016 1:10 PM
To: LEE, LILY
Subject: RE: Latest email from Dan Hirsch today - FW: Hunters Point info request

Does Daniel not have a 5-year review. If not, here is a link to the 2013 document:

http://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/final_documents2.asp?global_id=38440002&doc_id=60316145

-----Original Message-----
From: LEE, LILY [mailto:LEE.LILY@EPA.GOV]
Sent: Monday, April 18, 2016 12:49 PM
To: Robinson, Derek J CIV NAVFAC HQ, BRAC PMO
Subject: [Non-DoD Source] RE: Latest email from Dan Hirsch today - FW: Hunters Point info request

Dear Derek,

Maybe you could tell him that.

Lily Lee
Cleanup Project Manager
Superfund Division
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 9
75 Hawthorne St. (SFD-8-3)
San Francisco, CA 94105
Tel: 415-947-4187, Fax: 415-947-3518
www.epa.gov/region9/superfund

-----Original Message-----
From: Robinson, Derek J CIV NAVFAC HQ, BRAC PMO [mailto:derek.j.robinson1@navy.mil]
Sent: Monday, April 18, 2016 12:21 PM
To: LEE, LILY <LEE.LILY@EPA.GOV>; Janda, Danielle L CIV NAVFAC SW <danielle.janda@navy.mil>; Franklin, William D CIV NAVFAC HQ, BRAC PMO <william.d.franklin@navy.mil>; Edwards, Zachary L CIV SEA 04 04N <zachary.edwards@navy.mil>; Slack, Matthew L CIV SEA 04 04N <matthew.slack@navy.mil>; Nina Bacey (Juanita.Bacey@dtsc.ca.gov) <Juanita.Bacey@dtsc.ca.gov>
Subject: RE: Latest email from Dan Hirsch today - FW: Hunters Point info request

Thanks for forwarding. Regarding the Navy item, I have his request on my list and will get to it as soon as I can. He can expect a response within 2-3 weeks of his request.

-----Original Message-----
From: LEE, LILY [mailto:LEE.LILY@EPA.GOV]
Sent: Monday, April 18, 2016 12:15 PM

To: Robinson, Derek J CIV NAVFAC HQ, BRAC PMO; Janda, Danielle L CIV NAVFAC SW; Franklin, William D CIV NAVFAC HQ, BRAC PMO; Edwards, Zachary L CIV SEA 04 04N; Slack, Matthew L CIV SEA 04 04N; Nina Bacey (Juanita.Bacey@dtsc.ca.gov)
Subject: [Non-DoD Source] Latest email from Dan Hirsch today - FW: Hunters Point info request

Keeping you in the loop - I just received this.

Lily Lee
Cleanup Project Manager
Superfund Division
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 9
75 Hawthorne St. (SFD-8-3)
San Francisco, CA 94105
Tel: 415-947-4187, Fax: 415-947-3518
www.epa.gov/region9/superfund

-----Original Message-----
From: Daniel Hirsch [mailto:dohirsch@ucsc.edu]
Sent: Monday, April 18, 2016 12:04 PM
To: LEE, LILY <LEE.LILY@EPA.GOV>
Cc: Walker, Stuart <Walker.Stuart@epa.gov>
Subject: Hunters Point info request

Hi Lily,

The Hunters Point documents we have been reviewing indicate a remediation level for radium-226 of 1 pCi/g above background, not to exceed 2 pCi/g, "per agreement with EPA." Could you send me documentation of that EPA agreement and its basis, and any risk assessment that was performed at the time of the risk associated with that level of radium? Also, I am having trouble locating the value being employed for radium background—could you let me know what value is being used and where I can find the source for it?

Additionally, I have not been able to locate anything in the links you sent me for the 5-Year reviews regarding EPA review of those reviews as to compliance with EPA CERCLA guidance for radionuclides, including consideration of changes to EPA PRGs. Could you direct me to such review if it took place?

Lastly, during our call last week Derek Robinson from the Navy offered to provide additional information on request. On the 13th I emailed him regarding questions and documents about the Tetra Tech matter. I haven't heard back. Given the upcoming meeting on Thursday, I very much would like to have that information now. If there is anything you can do to help facilitate getting a response from the Navy, I would appreciate it.

Thank you for your help.

Daniel Hirsch
Director
Program on Environmental and Nuclear Policy College Ten University of California at Santa Cruz

LEE, LILY

From: Robinson, Derek J CIV NAVFAC HQ, BRAC PMO <derek.j.robinson1@navy.mil>
Sent: Monday, April 18, 2016 1:05 PM
To: LEE, LILY
Subject: RE: Latest email from Dan Hirsch today - FW: Hunters Point info request

Will do.

-----Original Message-----
From: LEE, LILY [mailto:LEE.LILY@EPA.GOV]
Sent: Monday, April 18, 2016 12:49 PM
To: Robinson, Derek J CIV NAVFAC HQ, BRAC PMO
Subject: [Non-DoD Source] RE: Latest email from Dan Hirsch today - FW: Hunters Point info request

Dear Derek,

Maybe you could tell him that.

Lily Lee
Cleanup Project Manager
Superfund Division
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 9
75 Hawthorne St. (SFD-8-3)
San Francisco, CA 94105
Tel: 415-947-4187, Fax: 415-947-3518
www.epa.gov/region9/superfund

-----Original Message-----
From: Robinson, Derek J CIV NAVFAC HQ, BRAC PMO [mailto:derek.j.robinson1@navy.mil]
Sent: Monday, April 18, 2016 12:21 PM
To: LEE, LILY <LEE.LILY@EPA.GOV>; Janda, Danielle L CIV NAVFAC SW <danielle.janda@navy.mil>; Franklin, William D CIV NAVFAC HQ, BRAC PMO <william.d.franklin@navy.mil>; Edwards, Zachary L CIV SEA 04 04N <zachary.edwards@navy.mil>; Slack, Matthew L CIV SEA 04 04N <matthew.slack@navy.mil>; Nina Bacey (Juanita.Bacey@dtsc.ca.gov) <Juanita.Bacey@dtsc.ca.gov>
Subject: RE: Latest email from Dan Hirsch today - FW: Hunters Point info request

Thanks for forwarding. Regarding the Navy item, I have his request on my list and will get to it as soon as I can. He can expect a response within 2-3 weeks of his request.

-----Original Message-----
From: LEE, LILY [mailto:LEE.LILY@EPA.GOV]
Sent: Monday, April 18, 2016 12:15 PM
To: Robinson, Derek J CIV NAVFAC HQ, BRAC PMO; Janda, Danielle L CIV NAVFAC SW; Franklin, William D CIV NAVFAC HQ, BRAC PMO; Edwards, Zachary L CIV SEA 04 04N; Slack, Matthew L CIV SEA 04 04N; Nina Bacey (Juanita.Bacey@dtsc.ca.gov)
Subject: [Non-DoD Source] Latest email from Dan Hirsch today - FW: Hunters Point info request

Keeping you in the loop - I just received this.

Lily Lee
Cleanup Project Manager
Superfund Division
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 9
75 Hawthorne St. (SFD-8-3)
San Francisco, CA 94105
Tel: 415-947-4187, Fax: 415-947-3518
www.epa.gov/region9/superfund

-----Original Message-----
From: Daniel Hirsch [mailto:dohirsch@ucsc.edu]
Sent: Monday, April 18, 2016 12:04 PM
To: LEE, LILY <LEE.LILY@EPA.GOV>
Cc: Walker, Stuart <Walker.Stuart@epa.gov>
Subject: Hunters Point info request

Hi Lily,

The Hunters Point documents we have been reviewing indicate a remediation level for radium-226 of 1 pCi/g above background, not to exceed 2 pCi/g, "per agreement with EPA." Could you send me documentation of that EPA agreement and its basis, and any risk assessment that was performed at the time of the risk associated with that level of radium? Also, I am having trouble locating the value being employed for radium background—could you let me know what value is being used and where I can find the source for it?

Additionally, I have not been able to locate anything in the links you sent me for the 5-Year reviews regarding EPA review of those reviews as to compliance with EPA CERCLA guidance for radionuclides, including consideration of changes to EPA PRGs. Could you direct me to such review if it took place?

Lastly, during our call last week Derek Robinson from the Navy offered to provide additional information on request. On the 13th I emailed him regarding questions and documents about the Tetra Tech matter. I haven't heard back. Given the upcoming meeting on Thursday, I very much would like to have that information now. If there is anything you can do to help facilitate getting a response from the Navy, I would appreciate it.

Thank you for your help.

Daniel Hirsch
Director
Program on Environmental and Nuclear Policy College Ten University of California at Santa Cruz

LEE, LILY

From: Robinson, Derek J CIV NAVFAC HQ, BRAC PMO <derek.j.robinson1@navy.mil>
Sent: Monday, April 18, 2016 12:21 PM
To: LEE, LILY; Janda, Danielle L CIV NAVFAC SW; Franklin, William D CIV NAVFAC HQ, BRAC PMO; Edwards, Zachary L CIV SEA 04 04N; Slack, Matthew L CIV SEA 04 04N; Nina Bacey (Juanita.Bacey@dtsc.ca.gov)
Subject: RE: Latest email from Dan Hirsch today - FW: Hunters Point info request

Thanks for forwarding. Regarding the Navy item, I have his request on my list and will get to it as soon as I can. He can expect a response within 2-3 weeks of his request.

-----Original Message-----
From: LEE, LILY [mailto:LEE.LILY@EPA.GOV]
Sent: Monday, April 18, 2016 12:15 PM
To: Robinson, Derek J CIV NAVFAC HQ, BRAC PMO; Janda, Danielle L CIV NAVFAC SW; Franklin, William D CIV NAVFAC HQ, BRAC PMO; Edwards, Zachary L CIV SEA 04 04N; Slack, Matthew L CIV SEA 04 04N; Nina Bacey (Juanita.Bacey@dtsc.ca.gov)
Subject: [Non-DoD Source] Latest email from Dan Hirsch today - FW: Hunters Point info request

Keeping you in the loop - I just received this.

Lily Lee
Cleanup Project Manager
Superfund Division
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 9
75 Hawthorne St. (SFD-8-3)
San Francisco, CA 94105
Tel: 415-947-4187, Fax: 415-947-3518
www.epa.gov/region9/superfund

-----Original Message-----
From: Daniel Hirsch [mailto:dohirsch@ucsc.edu]
Sent: Monday, April 18, 2016 12:04 PM
To: LEE, LILY <LEE.LILY@EPA.GOV>
Cc: Walker, Stuart <Walker.Stuart@epa.gov>
Subject: Hunters Point info request

Hi Lily,

The Hunters Point documents we have been reviewing indicate a remediation level for radium-226 of 1 pCi/g above background, not to exceed 2 pCi/g, "per agreement with EPA." Could you send me documentation of that EPA agreement and its basis, and any risk assessment that was performed at the time of the risk associated with that level of radium? Also, I am having trouble locating the value being employed for radium background—could you let me know what value is being used and where I can find the source for it?

Additionally, I have not been able to locate anything in the links you sent me for the 5-Year reviews regarding EPA review of those reviews as to compliance with EPA CERCLA guidance for radionuclides, including consideration of changes to EPA PRGs. Could you direct me to such review if it took place?

Lastly, during our call last week Derek Robinson from the Navy offered to provide additional information on request. On the 13th I emailed him regarding questions and documents about the Tetra Tech matter. I haven't heard back. Given the upcoming meeting on Thursday, I very much would like to have that information now. If there is anything you can do to help facilitate getting a response from the Navy, I would appreciate it.

Thank you for your help.

Daniel Hirsch
Director
Program on Environmental and Nuclear Policy College Ten University of California at Santa Cruz

LEE, LILY

From: LEE, LILY
Sent: Friday, April 15, 2016 9:20 AM
To: Robinson, Derek J CIV NAVFAC HQ, BRAC PMO; 'Janda, Danielle L CIV NAVFAC SW'; william.d.franklin@navy.mil; zachary.edwards@navy.mil; matthew.slack@navy.mil; Nina Bacey (Juanita.Bacey@dtsc.ca.gov); Lane, Jackie; tlow@waterboards.ca.gov
Cc: Chesnutt, John
Subject: Questions EPA has already received re Hunters Pt radiation issues
Attachments: Hunters Pt Rad Mtg 4-12-2016 - list of issues.docx; Hunters Pt NBC Response Hunters Pt Tetra Tech radiation 3-25-2016.docx

Derek requested yesterday all the questions that we have already received about Hunters Pt & Radiation. That is a great idea. I'm glad you suggested it.

Here are some notes to start with attached and below. I am sure I've received others that I didn't have in writing. I'll think about it some more.

3/16/16 - EJ Task Force Mtg: (Jackie, please help me because I am not sure if my memory is correct

Mr. James: My father and my wife's Uncle worked at the Shipyard. They died of cancer. It must have been from radiation left behind because Tetra Tech falsified samples. Tetra Tech should go to jail.

Carol Harvey – Tetra Tech worked at Treasure Island. Radioactive waste goes between Hunters Pt & Treasure Island. Tetra Tech works at both. They must be falsifying samples at Treasure Island too. The Hunters Pt EJ task force should advocate for Treasure Island because the issues are so related to one another.

Etecia Brown – Former workers whistleblowers and got fired because of it telling the truth about Tetra Tech's problems.

From: Verreos Insurance Agency [mailto:info@verreos.com]
Sent: Monday, April 11, 2016 12:51 PM
To: Lane, Jackie <Lane.Jackie@epa.gov>
Subject: APR 11, 2016 RE: HPNS formal response status

Hi Jackie,

At our last BVHP Task Force for Environmental Justice meeting, I asked when we might get a formal response from EPA on the persistent and new allegations reported by NBC news regarding a conspiracy to falsify required documentation and dumping hot radioactive and/or other toxic dirt on site which was reportedly required to have been removed off site? The news report identified a former independent contractor "whistle blower" who claimed to have firsthand knowledge of all the details except for proof of how far up the management chain of command the source can be tracked. The concern I expressed to everyone present at our last meeting is that without a formal criminal investigation by EPA and/or DOJ, it would seem as though there is no other way to compel those who know the truth about these dealings to testify under oath about it. In essence, it may be possible for the U.S. Navy to be innocent, or at least claim to be, while Lennar blames their subcontractor Tetratech, who in turn attempts to shift all the responsibility to the independent contractors (like this whistle blower) who they hired and directed throughout the projects decades long phases. It's as if the project is so large that whomever is actually responsible for any actual illegal actions, has contrived a means to get away with lying about what they are doing while doing it right under the regulator's combined noses. It suggests to me that the proper level

of oversight on such a major project may not be in place for no other reason than the extreme cost of assuring compliance.

Believing as I do that all of the regulatory personnel we have met are both very much concerned for community safety, and very professional about doing their work properly. The possibility that our government regulatory agencies can be badly fooled, and the public ends up being either exposed to unacceptable levels of health risks, and/or forced to pay to do additional unanticipated remediation work at some time in the future is just unacceptable.

I'm not sure if the EPA has received any written requests for response on these issues, and I'd like you to tell me if this email qualifies as such a formal request, or do I need to physically mail a letter to:
US EPA Region 9
75 Hawthorne Street
San Francisco, CA 94105

Thank you.

Tony

Anthony Verreos
V E R R E O S Insurance Agency 200 Valley Dr. #20, Brisbane, CA 94005
WORKING FOR YOU
Since 1956

CDI #0585599 www.verreos.com See us on Yelp! Please share with your friends

Tel: 415-467-9600

FAX: 415-467-9605

CA only: 800-464-1397

LEGAL NOTICE/PRIVACY: This email, including any attachments, is proprietary, and intended to remain confidential. All information contained herein is intended only for the identified addressee/recipient. In accordance with California and federal privacy laws: if you are not the intended recipient of this message, please advise us by return email or phone, and do not use, retain, copy, forward, disclose or distribute any part of this information by any means in any format.

From: [redacted] [mailto[redacted]]
Sent: Thursday, March 17, 2016 12:59 PM
To: LEE, LILY <LEE.LILY@EPA.GOV>
Subject: Fw: AACHEC members: Please watch video on whistleblower re: Bayview Hunters Point toxics cleanup...

Lily Lee:

Why hasn't the EPA taken action on the radiation exposure and mishandling of the radiation at the Navy's Hunters Point Shipyard National Radiological Research Lab.

I definitely do not look for the San Francisco Public Health Department to take the lead on this matter Amy Brownell over the years when there was a Remediation Advisory Board to the Navy never made any statements that related to the protection of the general public and their well-being. Never was the precautionary measure for protection of the public applied at the shipyard, even though it is a city policy somehow it is never applied to BVHP.

There are at least three staff members of the San Francisco public health department that are subsidized by the developer landlord at a rate of $153.85 per hour for any time spent working on Lennar Development Projects. This is a classic case of the Fox, paying the Guard Dog to watch the chicken coop, and you do not expect chickens to come up missing? In this case is not chickens but human lives we need the human lives to be protected those of the current residence and those potential residents were buying homes in good faith thinking that it is safe to live there.

This gentleman needs to be interviewed by the Federal Government and get the details and do investigation on this matter at once. I personally do not care what federal agency takes charge but this federal government needs to take charge this is a crisis just like Flint Michigan government officials are not doing a damn thing about it.

Thank you
Dr. Raymond Tompkins

I am requesting and I will formally request at the meeting today that EPA take the lead on this investigation of mishandling of radiation products at the Hunters Point Naval Shipyard

On Wednesday, March 16, 2016 5:16 PM, Maxine Tatmon-Gilkerson <maxine@rafikicoalition.org> wrote:

Hi Everyone:

Please follow the link below to view the alarming video that was aired on KRON -TV recently. It provides specific information by the former HP Naval Shipyard employee 'turned whistleblower' on deception around radiation clean-up (including falsification of reports and not removing tainted dirt). He says there are definitely unknown amounts of radiation still present. Rafiki is exploring what can we do, and would like to have a conversation with Council members-- probably at our Health Summit this Saturday.

Here's the link to KRON-4's feature on the above:

http://www.nbcbayarea.com/news/local/Former-Hunters-Point-Worker-Claims-Supervisors-Ordered-Him-to-Hide-Radiation-371723561.html

Thanks much!

Maxine

Maxine Tatmon-Gilkerson, MPH
Health Equity Manager
Rafiki Coalition for Health and Wellness
415-615-9945 ext.104
415-615-9943 (FAX)

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This communication and any of its attachments is intended for the use of the person or entity to whom it is addressed and may contain information that is privileged and confidential or subject to copyright, the disclosure of which is governed by applicable law. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient, or the employee or agent responsible for delivering it to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution, or copying of this information is STRICTLY PROHIBITED. If you received this message in error, please notify the sender immediately and permanently delete originals, copies & printouts of this e-mail.

1st Priority: If Mr. Smith's allegations are confirmed to be true, what would be the potential threats to human health and the environment currently? For example,

- People walking on top of the durable cover?

- People excavating in areas where improper disposal of contaminated soil occurred?

- Groundwater carrying material from trenches into the San Francisco Bay?

- Exposure through dust to the broader community? (John thought of this later after our call)

2nd Priority: What additional work would be needed before Parcels could be verified to be clean enough to be appropriate for transfer?

More specifically:

1. What is the geographic scope of the improper activities that Mr. Smith observed?

2. Which open trenches did Mr. Smith observe hiding of contaminated samples? Only storm drain and sanitary sewer line excavations? Or other areas too? How deep did he observe the contaminated samples were placed?

3. What is the potential volume of individual and total contaminated samples improperly placed into open trenches?

4. Could the area where excavation is planned for the Artist Studio have radionuclide levels above the release criteria due to Tetra Tech EC, Inc., improper activities?

5. Could Navy and contractor workers conducting excavation have been unknowingly exposed to soil at concentrations above release criteria? For example, areas assumed to be already clean would no longer be considered Radiologically Controlled Areas (RCA's), so workers would no longer be required to go through the usual protections, e.g. hand scanning hands and shoes as people exit the RCA, wear dosimeters while inside the RCA, etc.

6. Has the Navy conducted its own independent sampling in addition to the Tetra Tech internal investigation?

7. Has the Navy scanned potentially affected areas after the backfill of trenches?

8. Was the Tetra Tech EC, Inc., contract payments fixed price or time and materials?

9. When and how will the Navy communicate its assessment of potential risks to the regulators? To the public?

Lily Lee
Cleanup Project Manager
Superfund Division
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 9
75 Hawthorne St. (SFD-8-3)
San Francisco, CA 94105
Tel: 415-947-4187, Fax: 415-947-3518
www.epa.gov/region9/superfund

ED_004747_00002059-00048

LEE, LILY

From: LEE, LILY
Sent: Friday, April 15, 2016 9:20 AM
To: Robinson, Derek J CIV NAVFAC HQ, BRAC PMO; 'Janda, Danielle L CIV NAVFAC SW'; william.d.franklin@navy.mil; zachary.edwards@navy.mil; matthew.slack@navy.mil; Nina Bacey (Juanita.Bacey@dtsc.ca.gov); Lane, Jackie; tlow@waterboards.ca.gov
Cc: Chesnutt, John
Subject: Questions EPA has already received re Hunters Pt radiation issues
Attachments: Hunters Pt Rad Mtg 4-12-2016 - list of issues.docx; Hunters Pt NBC Response Hunters Pt Tetra Tech radiation 3-25-2016.docx

Derek requested yesterday all the questions that we have already received about Hunters Pt & Radiation. That is a great idea. I'm glad you suggested it.

Here are some notes to start with attached and below. I am sure I've received others that I didn't have in writing. I'll think about it some more.

3/16/16 - EJ Task Force Mtg: (Jackie, please help me because I am not sure if my memory is correct

Mr. James: My father and my wife's Uncle worked at the Shipyard. They died of cancer. It must have been from radiation left behind because Tetra Tech falsified samples. Tetra Tech should go to jail.

Carol Harvey – Tetra Tech worked at Treasure Island. Radioactive waste goes between Hunters Pt & Treasure Island. Tetra Tech works at both. They must be falsifying samples at Treasure Island too. The Hunters Pt EJ task force should advocate for Treasure Island because the issues are so related to one another.

Etecia Brown – Former workers whistleblowers and got fired because of it telling the truth about Tetra Tech's problems.

From: Verreos Insurance Agency [mailto:info@verreos.com]
Sent: Monday, April 11, 2016 12:51 PM
To: Lane, Jackie <Lane.Jackie@epa.gov>
Subject: APR 11, 2016 RE: HPNS formal response status

Hi Jackie,

At our last BVHP Task Force for Environmental Justice meeting, I asked when we might get a formal response from EPA on the persistent and new allegations reported by NBC news regarding a conspiracy to falsify required documentation and dumping hot radioactive and/or other toxic dirt on site which was reportedly required to have been removed off site? The news report identified a former independent contractor "whistle blower" who claimed to have firsthand knowledge of all the details except for proof of how far up the management chain of command the source can be tracked. The concern I expressed to everyone present at our last meeting is that without a formal criminal investigation by EPA and/or DOJ, it would seem as though there is no other way to compel those who know the truth about these dealings to testify under oath about it. In essence, it may be possible for the U.S. Navy to be innocent, or at least claim to be, while Lennar blames their subcontractor Tetratech, who in turn attempts to shift all the responsibility to the independent contractors (like this whistle blower) who they hired and directed throughout the projects decades long phases. It's as if the project is so large that whomever is actually responsible for any actual illegal actions, has contrived a means to get away with lying about what they are doing while doing it right under the regulator's combined noses. It suggests to me that the proper level

of oversight on such a major project may not be in place for no other reason than the extreme cost of assuring compliance.

Believing as I do that all of the regulatory personnel we have met are both very much concerned for community safety, and very professional about doing their work properly. The possibility that our government regulatory agencies can be badly fooled, and the public ends up being either exposed to unacceptable levels of health risks, and/or forced to pay to do additional unanticipated remediation work at some time in the future is just unacceptable.

I'm not sure if the EPA has received any written requests for response on these issues, and I'd like you to tell me if this email qualifies as such a formal request, or do I need to physically mail a letter to:
US EPA Region 9
75 Hawthorne Street
San Francisco, CA 94105

Thank you.

Tony

Anthony Verreos
V E R R E O S Insurance Agency 200 Valley Dr. #20, Brisbane, CA 94005
WORKING FOR YOU
Since 1956

CDI #0585599 www.verreos.com See us on Yelp! Please share with your friends

Tel: 415-467-9600

FAX: 415-467-9605

CA only: 800-464-1397

LEGAL NOTICE/PRIVACY: This email, including any attachments, is proprietary, and intended to remain confidential. All information contained herein is intended only for the identified addressee/recipient. In accordance with California and federal privacy laws: if you are not the intended recipient of this message, please advise us by return email or phone, and do not use, retain, copy, forward, disclose or distribute any part of this information by any means in any format.

From: [redacted] [mailto[redacted]]
Sent: Thursday, March 17, 2016 12:59 PM
To: LEE, LILY <LEE.LILY@EPA.GOV>
Subject: Fw: AACHEC members: Please watch video on whistleblower re: Bayview Hunters Point toxics cleanup...

Lily Lee:

Why hasn't the EPA taken action on the radiation exposure and mishandling of the radiation at the Navy's Hunters Point Shipyard National Radiological Research Lab.

I definitely do not look for the San Francisco Public Health Department to take the lead on this matter Amy Brownell over the years when there was a Remediation Advisory Board to the Navy never made any statements that related to the protection of the general public and their well-being. Never was the precautionary measure for protection of the public applied at the shipyard, even though it is a city policy somehow it is never applied to BVHP.

There are at least three staff members of the San Francisco public health department that are subsidized by the developer landlord at a rate of $153.85 per hour for any time spent working on Lennar Development Projects. This is a classic case of the Fox, paying the Guard Dog to watch the chicken coop, and you do not expect chickens to come up missing? In this case is not chickens but human lives we need the human lives to be protected those of the current residence and those potential residents were buying homes in good faith thinking that it is safe to live there.

This gentleman needs to be interviewed by the Federal Government and get the details and do investigation on this matter at once. I personally do not care what federal agency takes charge but this federal government needs to take charge this is a crisis just like Flint Michigan government officials are not doing a damn thing about it.

Thank you
Dr. Raymond Tompkins

I am requesting and I will formally request at the meeting today that EPA take the lead on this investigation of mishandling of radiation products at the Hunters Point Naval Shipyard

On Wednesday, March 16, 2016 5:16 PM, Maxine Tatmon-Gilkerson <maxine@rafikicoalition.org> wrote:

Hi Everyone:

Please follow the link below to view the alarming video that was aired on KRON -TV recently. It provides specific information by the former HP Naval Shipyard employee 'turned whistleblower' on deception around radiation clean-up (including falsification of reports and not removing tainted dirt). He says there are definitely unknown amounts of radiation still present. Rafiki is exploring what can we do, and would like to have a conversation with Council members-- probably at our Health Summit this Saturday.

Here's the link to KRON-4's feature on the above:

http://www.nbcbayarea.com/news/local/Former-Hunters-Point-Worker-Claims-Supervisors-Ordered-Him-to-Hide-Radiation-371723561.html

Thanks much!

Maxine

Maxine Tatmon-Gilkerson, MPH
Health Equity Manager
Rafiki Coalition for Health and Wellness
415-615-9945 ext.104
415-615-9943 (FAX)

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This communication and any of its attachments is intended for the use of the person or entity to whom it is addressed and may contain information that is privileged and confidential or subject to copyright, the disclosure of which is governed by applicable law. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient, or the employee or agent responsible for delivering it to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution, or copying of this information is STRICTLY PROHIBITED. If you received this message in error, please notify the sender immediately and permanently delete originals, copies & printouts of this e-mail.

1st Priority: If Mr. Smith's allegations are confirmed to be true, what would be the potential threats to human health and the environment currently? For example,

- People walking on top of the durable cover?

- People excavating in areas where improper disposal of contaminated soil occurred?

- Groundwater carrying material from trenches into the San Francisco Bay?

- Exposure through dust to the broader community? (John thought of this later after our call)

2nd Priority: What additional work would be needed before Parcels could be verified to be clean enough to be appropriate for transfer?

More specifically:

1. What is the geographic scope of the improper activities that Mr. Smith observed?

2. Which open trenches did Mr. Smith observe hiding of contaminated samples? Only storm drain and sanitary sewer line excavations? Or other areas too? How deep did he observe the contaminated samples were placed?

3. What is the potential volume of individual and total contaminated samples improperly placed into open trenches?

4. Could the area where excavation is planned for the Artist Studio have radionuclide levels above the release criteria due to Tetra Tech EC, Inc., improper activities?

5. Could Navy and contractor workers conducting excavation have been unknowingly exposed to soil at concentrations above release criteria? For example, areas assumed to be already clean would no longer be considered Radiologically Controlled Areas (RCA's), so workers would no longer be required to go through the usual protections, e.g. hand scanning hands and shoes as people exit the RCA, wear dosimeters while inside the RCA, etc.

6. Has the Navy conducted its own independent sampling in addition to the Tetra Tech internal investigation?

7. Has the Navy scanned potentially affected areas after the backfill of trenches?

8. Was the Tetra Tech EC, Inc., contract payments fixed price or time and materials?

9. When and how will the Navy communicate its assessment of potential risks to the regulators? To the public?

Lily Lee
Cleanup Project Manager
Superfund Division
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 9
75 Hawthorne St. (SFD-8-3)
San Francisco, CA 94105
Tel: 415-947-4187, Fax: 415-947-3518
www.epa.gov/region9/superfund

ED_004747_00002059-00052

LEE, LILY

From: LEE, LILY
Sent: Friday, April 15, 2016 9:20 AM
To: Robinson, Derek J CIV NAVFAC HQ, BRAC PMO; 'Janda, Danielle L CIV NAVFAC SW'; william.d.franklin@navy.mil; zachary.edwards@navy.mil; matthew.slack@navy.mil; Nina Bacey (Juanita.Bacey@dtsc.ca.gov); Lane, Jackie; tlow@waterboards.ca.gov
Cc: Chesnutt, John
Subject: Questions EPA has already received re Hunters Pt radiation issues
Attachments: Hunters Pt Rad Mtg 4-12-2016 - list of issues.docx; Hunters Pt NBC Response Hunters Pt Tetra Tech radiation 3-25-2016.docx

Derek requested yesterday all the questions that we have already received about Hunters Pt & Radiation. That is a great idea. I'm glad you suggested it.

Here are some notes to start with attached and below. I am sure I've received others that I didn't have in writing. I'll think about it some more.

3/16/16 - EJ Task Force Mtg: (Jackie, please help me because I am not sure if my memory is correct

Mr. James: My father and my wife's Uncle worked at the Shipyard. They died of cancer. It must have been from radiation left behind because Tetra Tech falsified samples. Tetra Tech should go to jail.

Carol Harvey – Tetra Tech worked at Treasure Island. Radioactive waste goes between Hunters Pt & Treasure Island. Tetra Tech works at both. They must be falsifying samples at Treasure Island too. The Hunters Pt EJ task force should advocate for Treasure Island because the issues are so related to one another.

Etecia Brown – Former workers whistleblowers and got fired because of it telling the truth about Tetra Tech's problems.

From: Verreos Insurance Agency [mailto:info@verreos.com]
Sent: Monday, April 11, 2016 12:51 PM
To: Lane, Jackie <Lane.Jackie@epa.gov>
Subject: APR 11, 2016 RE: HPNS formal response status

Hi Jackie,

At our last BVHP Task Force for Environmental Justice meeting, I asked when we might get a formal response from EPA on the persistent and new allegations reported by NBC news regarding a conspiracy to falsify required documentation and dumping hot radioactive and/or other toxic dirt on site which was reportedly required to have been removed off site? The news report identified a former independent contractor "whistle blower" who claimed to have firsthand knowledge of all the details except for proof of how far up the management chain of command the source can be tracked. The concern I expressed to everyone present at our last meeting is that without a formal criminal investigation by EPA and/or DOJ, it would seem as though there is no other way to compel those who know the truth about these dealings to testify under oath about it. In essence, it may be possible for the U.S. Navy to be innocent, or at least claim to be, while Lennar blames their subcontractor Tetratech, who in turn attempts to shift all the responsibility to the independent contractors (like this whistle blower) who they hired and directed throughout the projects decades long phases. It's as if the project is so large that whomever is actually responsible for any actual illegal actions, has contrived a means to get away with lying about what they are doing while doing it right under the regulator's combined noses. It suggests to me that the proper level

of oversight on such a major project may not be in place for no other reason than the extreme cost of assuring compliance.

Believing as I do that all of the regulatory personnel we have met are both very much concerned for community safety, and very professional about doing their work properly. The possibility that our government regulatory agencies can be badly fooled, and the public ends up being either exposed to unacceptable levels of health risks, and/or forced to pay to do additional unanticipated remediation work at some time in the future is just unacceptable.

I'm not sure if the EPA has received any written requests for response on these issues, and I'd like you to tell me if this email qualifies as such a formal request, or do I need to physically mail a letter to:
US EPA Region 9
75 Hawthorne Street
San Francisco, CA 94105

Thank you.

Tony

Anthony Verreos
V E R R E O S Insurance Agency 200 Valley Dr. #20, Brisbane, CA 94005
WORKING FOR YOU
Since 1956

CDI #0585599 www.verreos.com See us on Yelp! Please share with your friends

Tel: 415-467-9600

FAX: 415-467-9605

CA only: 800-464-1397

LEGAL NOTICE/PRIVACY: This email, including any attachments, is proprietary, and intended to remain confidential. All information contained herein is intended only for the identified addressee/recipient. In accordance with California and federal privacy laws: if you are not the intended recipient of this message, please advise us by return email or phone, and do not use, retain, copy, forward, disclose or distribute any part of this information by any means in any format.

From: [redacted] [mailto:[redacted]]
Sent: Thursday, March 17, 2016 12:59 PM
To: LEE, LILY <LEE.LILY@EPA.GOV>
Subject: Fw: AACHEC members: Please watch video on whistleblower re: Bayview Hunters Point toxics cleanup...

Lily Lee:

Why hasn't the EPA taken action on the radiation exposure and mishandling of the radiation at the Navy's Hunters Point Shipyard National Radiological Research Lab.

I definitely do not look for the San Francisco Public Health Department to take the lead on this matter Amy Brownell over the years when there was a Remediation Advisory Board to the Navy never made any statements that related to the protection of the general public and their well-being. Never was the precautionary measure for protection of the public applied at the shipyard, even though it is a city policy somehow it is never applied to BVHP.

There are at least three staff members of the San Francisco public health department that are subsidized by the developer landlord at a rate of $153.85 per hour for any time spent working on Lennar Development Projects. This is a classic case of the Fox, paying the Guard Dog to watch the chicken coop, and you do not expect chickens to come up missing? In this case is not chickens but human lives we need the human lives to be protected those of the current residence and those potential residents were buying homes in good faith thinking that it is safe to live there.

This gentleman needs to be interviewed by the Federal Government and get the details and do investigation on this matter at once. I personally do not care what federal agency takes charge but this federal government needs to take charge this is a crisis just like Flint Michigan government officials are not doing a damn thing about it.

Thank you
Dr. Raymond Tompkins

I am requesting and I will formally request at the meeting today that EPA take the lead on this investigation of mishandling of radiation products at the Hunters Point Naval Shipyard

On Wednesday, March 16, 2016 5:16 PM, Maxine Tatmon-Gilkerson <maxine@rafikicoalition.org> wrote:

Hi Everyone:

Please follow the link below to view the alarming video that was aired on KRON -TV recently. It provides specific information by the former HP Naval Shipyard employee 'turned whistleblower' on deception around radiation clean-up (including falsification of reports and not removing tainted dirt). He says there are definitely unknown amounts of radiation still present. Rafiki is exploring what can we do, and would like to have a conversation with Council members-- probably at our Health Summit this Saturday.

Here's the link to KRON-4's feature on the above:

http://www.nbcbayarea.com/news/local/Former-Hunters-Point-Worker-Claims-Supervisors-Ordered-Him-to-Hide-Radiation-371723561.html

Thanks much!

Maxine

Maxine Tatmon-Gilkerson, MPH
Health Equity Manager
Rafiki Coalition for Health and Wellness
415-615-9945 ext.104
415-615-9943 (FAX)

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This communication and any of its attachments is intended for the use of the person or entity to whom it is addressed and may contain information that is privileged and confidential or subject to copyright, the disclosure of which is governed by applicable law. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient, or the employee or agent responsible for delivering it to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution, or copying of this information is STRICTLY PROHIBITED. If you received this message in error, please notify the sender immediately and permanently delete originals, copies & printouts of this e-mail.

1st Priority: If Mr. Smith's allegations are confirmed to be true, what would be the potential threats to human health and the environment currently? For example,

- People walking on top of the durable cover?

- People excavating in areas where improper disposal of contaminated soil occurred?

- Groundwater carrying material from trenches into the San Francisco Bay?

- Exposure through dust to the broader community? (John thought of this later after our call)

2nd Priority: What additional work would be needed before Parcels could be verified to be clean enough to be appropriate for transfer?

More specifically:

1. What is the geographic scope of the improper activities that Mr. Smith observed?

2. Which open trenches did Mr. Smith observe hiding of contaminated samples? Only storm drain and sanitary sewer line excavations? Or other areas too? How deep did he observe the contaminated samples were placed?

3. What is the potential volume of individual and total contaminated samples improperly placed into open trenches?

4. Could the area where excavation is planned for the Artist Studio have radionuclide levels above the release criteria due to Tetra Tech EC, Inc., improper activities?

5. Could Navy and contractor workers conducting excavation have been unknowingly exposed to soil at concentrations above release criteria? For example, areas assumed to be already clean would no longer be considered Radiologically Controlled Areas (RCA's), so workers would no longer be required to go through the usual protections, e.g. hand scanning hands and shoes as people exit the RCA, wear dosimeters while inside the RCA, etc.

6. Has the Navy conducted its own independent sampling in addition to the Tetra Tech internal investigation?

7. Has the Navy scanned potentially affected areas after the backfill of trenches?

8. Was the Tetra Tech EC, Inc., contract payments fixed price or time and materials?

9. When and how will the Navy communicate its assessment of potential risks to the regulators? To the public?

Lily Lee
Cleanup Project Manager
Superfund Division
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 9
75 Hawthorne St. (SFD-8-3)
San Francisco, CA 94105
Tel: 415-947-4187, Fax: 415-947-3518
www.epa.gov/region9/superfund

ED_004747_00002059-00056

LEE, LILY

From: LEE, LILY
Sent: Friday, April 15, 2016 9:20 AM
To: Robinson, Derek J CIV NAVFAC HQ, BRAC PMO; 'Janda, Danielle L CIV NAVFAC SW'; william.d.franklin@navy.mil; zachary.edwards@navy.mil; matthew.slack@navy.mil; Nina Bacey (Juanita.Bacey@dtsc.ca.gov); Lane, Jackie; tlow@waterboards.ca.gov
Cc: Chesnutt, John
Subject: Questions EPA has already received re Hunters Pt radiation issues
Attachments: Hunters Pt Rad Mtg 4-12-2016 - list of issues.docx; Hunters Pt NBC Response Hunters Pt Tetra Tech radiation 3-25-2016.docx

Derek requested yesterday all the questions that we have already received about Hunters Pt & Radiation. That is a great idea. I'm glad you suggested it.

Here are some notes to start with attached and below. I am sure I've received others that I didn't have in writing. I'll think about it some more.

3/16/16 - EJ Task Force Mtg: (Jackie, please help me because I am not sure if my memory is correct

Mr. James: My father and my wife's Uncle worked at the Shipyard. They died of cancer. It must have been from radiation left behind because Tetra Tech falsified samples. Tetra Tech should go to jail.

Carol Harvey – Tetra Tech worked at Treasure Island. Radioactive waste goes between Hunters Pt & Treasure Island. Tetra Tech works at both. They must be falsifying samples at Treasure Island too. The Hunters Pt EJ task force should advocate for Treasure Island because the issues are so related to one another.

Etecia Brown – Former workers whistleblowers and got fired because of it telling the truth about Tetra Tech's problems.

From: Verreos Insurance Agency [mailto:info@verreos.com]
Sent: Monday, April 11, 2016 12:51 PM
To: Lane, Jackie <Lane.Jackie@epa.gov>
Subject: APR 11, 2016 RE: HPNS formal response status

Hi Jackie,

At our last BVHP Task Force for Environmental Justice meeting, I asked when we might get a formal response from EPA on the persistent and new allegations reported by NBC news regarding a conspiracy to falsify required documentation and dumping hot radioactive and/or other toxic dirt on site which was reportedly required to have been removed off site? The news report identified a former independent contractor "whistle blower" who claimed to have firsthand knowledge of all the details except for proof of how far up the management chain of command the source can be tracked. The concern I expressed to everyone present at our last meeting is that without a formal criminal investigation by EPA and/or DOJ, it would seem as though there is no other way to compel those who know the truth about these dealings to testify under oath about it. In essence, it may be possible for the U.S. Navy to be innocent, or at least claim to be, while Lennar blames their subcontractor Tetratech, who in turn attempts to shift all the responsibility to the independent contractors (like this whistle blower) who they hired and directed throughout the projects decades long phases. It's as if the project is so large that whomever is actually responsible for any actual illegal actions, has contrived a means to get away with lying about what they are doing while doing it right under the regulator's combined noses. It suggests to me that the proper level

of oversight on such a major project may not be in place for no other reason than the extreme cost of assuring compliance.

Believing as I do that all of the regulatory personnel we have met are both very much concerned for community safety, and very professional about doing their work properly. The possibility that our government regulatory agencies can be badly fooled, and the public ends up being either exposed to unacceptable levels of health risks, and/or forced to pay to do additional unanticipated remediation work at some time in the future is just unacceptable.

I'm not sure if the EPA has received any written requests for response on these issues, and I'd like you to tell me if this email qualifies as such a formal request, or do I need to physically mail a letter to:
US EPA Region 9
75 Hawthorne Street
San Francisco, CA 94105

Thank you.

Tony

Anthony Verreos
V E R R E O S Insurance Agency 200 Valley Dr. #20, Brisbane, CA 94005
WORKING FOR YOU
Since 1956

CDI #0585599 www.verreos.com See us on Yelp! Please share with your friends

Tel: 415-467-9600

FAX: 415-467-9605

CA only: 800-464-1397

LEGAL NOTICE/PRIVACY: This email, including any attachments, is proprietary, and intended to remain confidential. All information contained herein is intended only for the identified addressee/recipient. In accordance with California and federal privacy laws: if you are not the intended recipient of this message, please advise us by return email or phone, and do not use, retain, copy, forward, disclose or distribute any part of this information by any means in any format.

From: [redacted] [mailto:[redacted]]
Sent: Thursday, March 17, 2016 12:59 PM
To: LEE, LILY <LEE.LILY@EPA.GOV>
Subject: Fw: AACHEC members: Please watch video on whistleblower re: Bayview Hunters Point toxics cleanup...

Lily Lee:

Why hasn't the EPA taken action on the radiation exposure and mishandling of the radiation at the Navy's Hunters Point Shipyard National Radiological Research Lab.

I definitely do not look for the San Francisco Public Health Department to take the lead on this matter Amy Brownell over the years when there was a Remediation Advisory Board to the Navy never made any statements that related to the protection of the general public and their well-being. Never was the precautionary measure for protection of the public applied at the shipyard, even though it is a city policy somehow it is never applied to BVHP.

There are at least three staff members of the San Francisco public health department that are subsidized by the developer landlord at a rate of $153.85 per hour for any time spent working on Lennar Development Projects. This is a classic case of the Fox, paying the Guard Dog to watch the chicken coop, and you do not expect chickens to come up missing? In this case is not chickens but human lives we need the human lives to be protected those of the current residence and those potential residents were buying homes in good faith thinking that it is safe to live there.

This gentleman needs to be interviewed by the Federal Government and get the details and do investigation on this matter at once. I personally do not care what federal agency takes charge but this federal government needs to take charge this is a crisis just like Flint Michigan government officials are not doing a damn thing about it.

Thank you
Dr. Raymond Tompkins

I am requesting and I will formally request at the meeting today that EPA take the lead on this investigation of mishandling of radiation products at the Hunters Point Naval Shipyard

On Wednesday, March 16, 2016 5:16 PM, Maxine Tatmon-Gilkerson <maxine@rafikicoalition.org> wrote:

Hi Everyone:

Please follow the link below to view the alarming video that was aired on KRON -TV recently. It provides specific information by the former HP Naval Shipyard employee 'turned whistleblower' on deception around radiation clean-up (including falsification of reports and not removing tainted dirt). He says there are definitely unknown amounts of radiation still present. Rafiki is exploring what can we do, and would like to have a conversation with Council members-- probably at our Health Summit this Saturday.

Here's the link to KRON-4's feature on the above:

http://www.nbcbayarea.com/news/local/Former-Hunters-Point-Worker-Claims-Supervisors-Ordered-Him-to-Hide-Radiation-371723561.html

Thanks much!

Maxine

Maxine Tatmon-Gilkerson, MPH
Health Equity Manager
Rafiki Coalition for Health and Wellness
415-615-9945 ext.104
415-615-9943 (FAX)

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This communication and any of its attachments is intended for the use of the person or entity to whom it is addressed and may contain information that is privileged and confidential or subject to copyright, the disclosure of which is governed by applicable law. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient, or the employee or agent responsible for delivering it to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution, or copying of this information is STRICTLY PROHIBITED. If you received this message in error, please notify the sender immediately and permanently delete originals, copies & printouts of this e-mail.

1st Priority: If Mr. Smith's allegations are confirmed to be true, what would be the potential threats to human health and the environment currently? For example,

- People walking on top of the durable cover?

- People excavating in areas where improper disposal of contaminated soil occurred?

- Groundwater carrying material from trenches into the San Francisco Bay?

- Exposure through dust to the broader community? (John thought of this later after our call)

2nd Priority: What additional work would be needed before Parcels could be verified to be clean enough to be appropriate for transfer?

More specifically:

1. What is the geographic scope of the improper activities that Mr. Smith observed?

2. Which open trenches did Mr. Smith observe hiding of contaminated samples? Only storm drain and sanitary sewer line excavations? Or other areas too? How deep did he observe the contaminated samples were placed?

3. What is the potential volume of individual and total contaminated samples improperly placed into open trenches?

4. Could the area where excavation is planned for the Artist Studio have radionuclide levels above the release criteria due to Tetra Tech EC, Inc., improper activities?

5. Could Navy and contractor workers conducting excavation have been unknowingly exposed to soil at concentrations above release criteria? For example, areas assumed to be already clean would no longer be considered Radiologically Controlled Areas (RCA's), so workers would no longer be required to go through the usual protections, e.g. hand scanning hands and shoes as people exit the RCA, wear dosimeters while inside the RCA, etc.

6. Has the Navy conducted its own independent sampling in addition to the Tetra Tech internal investigation?

7. Has the Navy scanned potentially affected areas after the backfill of trenches?

8. Was the Tetra Tech EC, Inc., contract payments fixed price or time and materials?

9. When and how will the Navy communicate its assessment of potential risks to the regulators? To the public?

Lily Lee
Cleanup Project Manager
Superfund Division
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 9
75 Hawthorne St. (SFD-8-3)
San Francisco, CA 94105
Tel: 415-947-4187, Fax: 415-947-3518
www.epa.gov/region9/superfund

ED_004747_00002059-00060

LEE, LILY

From: Janda, Danielle L CIV NAVFAC SW <danielle.janda@navy.mil>
Sent: Thursday, April 07, 2016 2:59 PM
To: LEE, LILY
Cc: Bacey, Juanita@DTSC; Chesnutt, John; Robinson, Derek J CIV NAVFAC HQ, BRAC PMO
Subject: RE: It would be extremely helpful for a RASO rep to join the 4/12 conf call w/Greenaction

Hi Lily,

I said that RASO would not be attending the Navy's community meeting next week. Sorry for the confusion.

V/r,
Danielle Janda

-----Original Message-----
From: Robinson, Derek J CIV NAVFAC HQ, BRAC PMO
Sent: Thursday, April 07, 2016 2:41 PM
To: LEE, LILY; Janda, Danielle L CIV NAVFAC SW
Cc: Bacey, Juanita@DTSC; Chesnutt, John
Subject: RE: It would be extremely helpful for a RASO rep to join the 4/12 conf call w/Greenaction

Hi lily,

I'm not sure what you heard, but RASO is planning on calling into the meeting.

Derek

-----Original Message-----
From: LEE, LILY [mailto:LEE.LILY@EPA.GOV]
Sent: Wednesday, April 06, 2016 11:49 PM
To: Robinson, Derek J CIV NAVFAC HQ, BRAC PMO; Janda, Danielle L CIV NAVFAC SW
Cc: Bacey, Juanita@DTSC; Chesnutt, John
Subject: [Non-DoD Source] It would be extremely helpful for a RASO rep to join the 4/12 conf call w/Greenaction

Dear Derek and Danielle,

I'm glad that both of you will participate in the 4/12 call with Greenaction. I heard from Danielle today that RASO unfortunately will not send a rep to the 4/12 mtg. I respect their expert knowledge and their communication skills a great deal. I understand that they are extremely busy. If there is any way to persuade them to join the call, I think it would be very beneficial. A month ago, you asked us to move the meeting to a morning time slot to accommodate the time difference so RASO could join. I thought that was well worth it because of the value RASO would add. Please consider encouraging their participation.

Thank you for your efforts.

Lily

Lily Lee

Cleanup Project Manager

Superfund Division

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 9

75 Hawthorne St. (SFD-8-3)

San Francisco, CA 94105

Tel: 415-947-4187, Fax: 415-947-3518

www.epa.gov/region9/superfund

ED_004747_00002059-00062

LEE, LILY

From: Robinson, Derek J CIV NAVFAC HQ, BRAC PMO <derek.j.robinson1@navy.mil>
Sent: Thursday, April 07, 2016 2:41 PM
To: LEE, LILY; Janda, Danielle L CIV NAVFAC SW
Cc: Bacey, Juanita@DTSC; Chesnutt, John
Subject: RE: It would be extremely helpful for a RASO rep to join the 4/12 conf call w/Greenaction

Hi lily,

I'm not sure what you heard, but RASO is planning on calling into the meeting.

Derek

-----Original Message-----
From: LEE, LILY [mailto:LEE.LILY@EPA.GOV]
Sent: Wednesday, April 06, 2016 11:49 PM
To: Robinson, Derek J CIV NAVFAC HQ, BRAC PMO; Janda, Danielle L CIV NAVFAC SW
Cc: Bacey, Juanita@DTSC; Chesnutt, John
Subject: [Non-DoD Source] It would be extremely helpful for a RASO rep to join the 4/12 conf call w/Greenaction

Dear Derek and Danielle,

I'm glad that both of you will participate in the 4/12 call with Greenaction. I heard from Danielle today that RASO unfortunately will not send a rep to the 4/12 mtg. I respect their expert knowledge and their communication skills a great deal. I understand that they are extremely busy. If there is any way to persuade them to join the call, I think it would be very beneficial. A month ago, you asked us to move the meeting to a morning time slot to accommodate the time difference so RASO could join. I thought that was well worth it because of the value RASO would add. Please consider encouraging their participation.

Thank you for your efforts.

Lily

Lily Lee

Cleanup Project Manager

Superfund Division

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 9

75 Hawthorne St. (SFD-8-3)

San Francisco, CA 94105

Tel: 415-947-4187, Fax: 415-947-3518

www.epa.gov/region9/superfund

ED_004747_00002059-00064

LEE, LILY

From:	LEE, LILY
Sent:	Monday, April 04, 2016 5:03 PM
To:	Bacey, Juanita@DTSC; derek.j.robinson1@navy.mil; Lane, Jackie; zachary.edwards@navy.mil; Janda, Danielle L CIV NAVFAC SW (danielle.janda@navy.mil)
Subject:	Response to Dan Hirsch questions FW: EPA use of Current PRG Calculator to evaluate Navy cleanups
Attachments:	Work Pkgs 108-111 Storm drain D-1 - EPA Comments 6-29-2015.docx; 2015-1-12 EPA Rad Review multiple Survey Units Oct Nov 2014.docx; EPA Comments Draft Survey Units 344-350-351-355.docx

I wanted to let you know what I sent in response to the latest questions I have gotten (scroll down below).

Lily Lee
Cleanup Project Manager
Superfund Division
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 9
75 Hawthorne St. (SFD-8-3)
San Francisco, CA 94105
Tel: 415-947-4187, Fax: 415-947-3518
www.epa.gov/region9/superfund

From: LEE, LILY
Sent: Monday, April 04, 2016 5:01 PM
To: 'Daniel Hirsch' <dohirsch@ucsc.edu>
Cc: Walker, Stuart <Walker.Stuart@epa.gov>; Janice Davis <jadadavi@ucsc.edu>; Lucien Martin <lumamart@ucsc.edu>; Maria Caine <mcaine@ucsc.edu>; Janie Flores <jalflore@ucsc.edu>; Liora Huebner <lhuebner@ucsc.edu>; Flora Lu <floralu@ucsc.edu>; bradley@greenaction.org
Subject: EPA use of Current PRG Calculator to evaluate Navy cleanups

Dear Dr. Hirsch,

Thank you for asking about EPA reviews of Navy analyses. In summary, the Navy uses the Department of Energy's RESRAD model in place of the EPA Preliminary Remediation Goal (PRG) calculator to evaluate doses and risks from contamination. EPA compares contamination concentrations with its PRG calculator. Generally, EPA's calculations result in a smaller estimate of radiation dose and associated risk, but the results are always nearly the same. EPA advises the Navy of its findings.

More specifically, as the Navy conducts radiological cleanup work, it submits individual reports on progress. When the Navy provides EPA with drafts of its Survey Unit Project Reports (SUPR), EPA's health physicist evaluates these reports to use the most current version of the USEPA's Preliminary Remediation Goal PRG Calculator as an additional line of evidence to evaluate residual risk remaining after completion of the removal actions described in these reports. EPA's submits this evaluation as part of its comments on the draft SUPR reports, and EPA comments become part of the final SUPR reports.

Once the reports are finalized, they become part of the Administrative Record for the site. One place individual reports are available to the public is at DTSC's EnviroStor website (link for Hunters Point Naval

Shipyard files at http://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/search.asp?CMD=search&city=San+Francisco&zip=&county=&case_number=&business_name=&FEDERAL_SUPERFUND=True). As one recent example, which I have pulled out at random, here is a link to the files for the "Final Work Package 110, Survey Unit Project Reports, Zones K, L, M, N, and O, Parcel D-1 Phase II Sanitary Sewer and Storm Drain Removal." http://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/regulators/deliverable_documents/4440022110/Final%20SUPR%20Pkg%20%23110_Zone%20K.pdf For Zone K, USEPA's PRG table for this survey unit appears beginning on p. 2868 of this pdf file. This file is 17 MB, so for your convenience, I have attached the EPA comments for this example. I also attached a few other examples to illustrate the type of evaluation that USEPA Region IX routinely conducts for each draft report from the Navy.

The Navy prepares Five Year Reviews, but those type of documents do not typically go to this level of detail, so I thought the information above and attached would be more relevant to your questions. Please let me know what further information would be useful to you.

Lily

Lily Lee
Cleanup Project Manager
Superfund Division
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 9
75 Hawthorne St. (SFD-8-3)
San Francisco, CA 94105
Tel: 415-947-4187, Fax: 415-947-3518
www.epa.gov/region9/superfund

From: Daniel Hirsch [mailto:dohirsch@ucsc.edu]
Sent: Wednesday, March 30, 2016 4:41 PM
To: LEE, LILY <LEE.LILY@EPA.GOV>
Cc: Walker, Stuart <Walker.Stuart@epa.gov>; Janice Davis <jadadavi@ucsc.edu>; Lucien Martin <lumamart@ucsc.edu>; Maria Caine <mcaine@ucsc.edu>; Janie Flores <jalflore@ucsc.edu>; Liora Huebner <lhuebner@ucsc.edu>; Flora Lu <floralu@ucsc.edu>; bradley@greenaction.org
Subject: Re: Stuart Walker will join RE: request re conference call April 12

Hi Lily,

That's great. Thank you.

May I ask, in preparation for the call, if you could either provide me with copies, or direct me to links if they are posted on a website, for any 5-year reviews performed for portions of Hunters Point to ascertain the potential impact of revised EPA cleanup standards and guidance that may have come into being since cleanup planning and decisions and risk analyses were originally initiated? If the 5 year reviews were done by EPA, it would be helpful to see them. If they were done by the Navy, it would be helpful to be able to obtain them as well as any EPA reviews of the Navy analyses.

Also, if EPA has done any other reviews of how updated EPA guidance and standards and risk assessment methodologies might impact Hunters Point past cleanup actions, decisions, and risk analyses, it would be very helpful to see those as well.

Thanks,

Daniel Hirsch
Director
Program on Environmental and Nuclear Policy
College Ten
University of California at Santa Cruz

On Mar 25, 2016, at 1:58 PM, LEE, LILY <LEE.LILY@EPA.GOV> wrote:

Dear Dr. Hirsch,

Thank you for the questions and the suggestion to bring in Stuart. Region IX has consulted with him over the years about the Hunters Point site. I just talked with him, and he has graciously agreed to participate in the call.

Lily

Lily Lee
Cleanup Project Manager
Superfund Division
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 9
75 Hawthorne St. (SFD-8-3)
San Francisco, CA 94105
Tel: 415-947-4187, Fax: 415-947-3518
www.epa.gov/region9/superfund

From: Daniel Hirsch [mailto:dohirsch@ucsc.edu]
Sent: Sunday, March 20, 2016 7:57 PM
To: LEE, LILY <LEE.LILY@EPA.GOV>
Cc: Walker, Stuart <Walker.Stuart@epa.gov>; Janice Davis <jadadavi@ucsc.edu>; Lucien Martin <lumamart@ucsc.edu>; Maria Caine <mcaine@ucsc.edu>; Janie Flores <jalflore@ucsc.edu>; Liora Huebner <lhuebner@ucsc.edu>; Flora Lu <floralu@ucsc.edu>; bradley@greenaction.org
Subject: request re conference call April 12

Hi Lily,
We would appreciate it if you would arrange for Stuart Walker, the EPA Superfund remedial program's National Radiation Expert, to participate in the conference call on Hunters Point issues scheduled for April 12.
We note that "Radiation Risk Assessment at CERCLA Sites Q&A ," (EPA Office of Superfund Remediation and Technology Innovation Directive 9200.4-40, May 2014) states:
"Q10. For CERCLA risk assessments at remedial sites, is it appropriate to use guidance or approaches developed by other Federal, State or Tribal Agencies or by International or National Organizations?
A. EPA has made the policy decision that risks from radionuclide exposures at remedial sites should be estimated in the same manner as chemical contaminants, which is consistent with EPA's remedial program implementing guidance (e.g., EPA 1997g, 1999d, 2000f). Consequently, approaches that do not follow the remedial program's policies and guidance should not be used at CERCLA remedial sites. Should regional staff have questions, they should consult with the Superfund remedial program's National Radiation Expert (Stuart Walker of

OSRTI at the time this fact sheet was issued, at (703) 603-8748 or walker.stuart@epa.gov), before using guidance from other organizations that is not already incorporated into this and other EPA Superfund remedial program guidance."

Among the issues we wish to explore during the conference call is whether remediation standards, models, and other guidance were used at Hunters Point that are inconsistent with the EPA remedial program's policies and guidance. If so, we would like to understand whether EPA Region IX consulted with Mr. Walker before allowing use of guidance that is not incorporated in EPA Superfund remedial program guidance, and if so, on what basis the approvals were made. If there was no consultation with Mr. Walker, we would like to learn why not.

Thank you.

Daniel Hirsch
Director
Program on Environmental and Nuclear Policy
College Ten
University of California at Santa Cruz