Hunters Point Meeting with Navy Laura Duchnak

February 16, 2018

Talking Points – DRAFT v1 2-15-2018

Opening Remarks

- As you may have seen from the extensive press coverage of your community meeting, this issue is highly visible and controversial.

- We have already delayed sampling by over a year to wait for the results of the data evaluation, which showed the problems was worse than you expected. This is not a time to delay more.

- We should err on the side of sampling more up front to gain more technical certainty, restore public trust, and reduce litigation risk. This is not a time to skimp on short term sampling costs when the costs of uncertainty are so great.

- Our team found concerns in 97% of Parcel G survey units vs. the Navy's 44%. The original ROD required excavating and scanning 100% of survey units. That gives the most certainty, regains public trust, and reduces litigation risk.
    - On Nov.1, your team presented a proposal with 0% excavation and scanning.
    - On Nov.7, to keep things moving, we made an extremely generous offered you could start with 25% of trench units. If the results were clean, we would consider a lower level of effort on the remainder. If it were clean, then we would all have real data to make a defensible technical and legal case for reduced effort.
    - On December 19, your team presented a plan excavating 2% of trench units. That is nowhere close.
    - On February 1, I told you we would need 33% for free release.

- I want to offer you one more opportunity to have a face-to-face meeting at our level, with our state counterparts. We want to cut to the bottom line right away. We should all want real data as soon as possible so we can go from there to make better decisions for the whole Parcel.

Fundamental Differences in Perspective

Navy Perspective

- It's unlikely that radiological contamination will be found at the site because the source and all pipe lines have been removed.
- The majority of the excavation work that was done in Parcel G was not necessary but was conducted due to false positives.
- Do not acknowledge the allegations.
- Believe Tetra Tech EC workers were just being "lazy" rather than trying to hide or avoid potential contamination.
- Believe the objective of the soil and building resampling effort is to confirm/demonstrate that all contamination has been remediated.
- Any contamination that may be found will most likely be naturally occurring radioactive material (NORM) and should not require remediation.

Agencies Perspective

- Falsification is widespread and significant. Have identified multiple methods of falsification, some of which have been proven.
- Because of the level of falsification, we are unsure that all contamination has been found and removed.
- Falsification was an attempt to avoid potential contamination and conduct less remediation.
- The objective of the soil and building resampling effort is to redo the work that had previously been done.
- In order to save tax-payer dollars, time and avoid property transfer delays, agencies are willing to consider a "prove-out" and allow for a percent of the survey units to be resampled completely as required by the ROD and work plan. Only if proven to be "clean," allow for reduced effort of resampling work for the remainder of the survey units.