Message

From: Chesnutt, John [/O=EXCHANGELABS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=E1CD369E94474C2C8A876FB16943320A-JCHESNUT]
Sent: 4/10/2018 12:40:54 AM
To: william.d.franklin@navy.mil
Subject: FW: media responses
Attachments: EPA comments on draft Rad Data Eval Parcels B G Text 12-29-2019.pdf

Resending. My outlook pulled up another William Franklin who retired from EPA.

From: Chesnutt, John
Sent: Monday, April 09, 2018 5:31 PM
To: 'Brooks, George P CIV' <george.brooks@navy.mil>; Robinson, Derek J CIV NAVFAC HQ, BRAC PMO <derek.j.robinson1@navy.mil>; Frank, William <Frank.William@epa.gov>; thomas macchiarella (thomas.macchiarella@navy.mil) <thomas.macchiarella@navy.mil>; juanita.bacey (Juanita.Bacey@dtsc.ca.gov) <Juanita.Bacey@dtsc.ca.gov>; Singh, Sheetal (CDPH-EMB) <sheetal.singh@cdph.ca.gov>; 'Naito, Janet@DTSC' <Janet.Naito@dtsc.ca.gov>
Subject: media responses

FYI. EPA received a number of press inquiries today in response to a Public Employees for Environmental Responsibility press release that went out today, which reported on the difference between EPA/State and the Navy's percent data that was in question.

Below are our responses.

John

NBC Bay Area

> **Question:** I was just sent the following press release regarding the EPA's review of soil samples at Hunters Point. The organization "PEER" reviewed EPA records and learned the EPA found between 90 and 97 percent of the samples at Parcels B and G reexamined by the agency are "neither reliable nor defensible." These percentages appear to be much higher than the Navy's percentages for Parcels B and G. Can the EPA please help explain this discrepancy?
>
> **Response:** Please see the attached report for EPA's findings from our independent review of Parcels B and G soil sample data. In regards to the discrepancy in the percentages, EPA's assessment of the data included looking more closely for signs of potential data quality problems in addition to signs of potential falsification. For example, EPA recommended resampling when data were missing or when different data collection methods did not produce consistent results. Please let us know if you have any specific questions about the report.
>
> EPA is pleased that the Navy will be resampling the impacted parcels and relying on these new data to determine where additional cleanup may be needed. EPA's input, which is based on our independent review of the data, will help inform where the resampling will be done.

SF Examiner – Reporter said she had heard that EPA had released a report saying that contamination numbers are higher than what Navy had previously reported.

Response: Please see attached for the report in question, which EPA sent to the Navy on December 29, 2017. The report shows EPA's findings from our independent review of Parcels B and G soil sample data; please let us know if you have any specific questions about the report.

In regards to the discrepancies in the percentages, EPA's assessment of the data included looking more closely for signs of potential data quality problems in addition to signs of potential falsification. For example, EPA recommended resampling when data were missing or when different data collection methods did not produce consistent results.

EPA is pleased that the Navy will be resampling the impacted parcels and relying on these new data to determine where additional cleanup may be needed. EPA's input, which is based on our independent review of the data, will help inform where the resampling will be done.

SF Business Times - Reporter said she had seen the PEER report saying that EPA documents show that soil sample falsification is greater than previously reported. She is asking 1) if the documents in question are official EPA documents, and 2) what happens next (eg, will we ask Navy to re-do all testing?)?

Response: Yes, the report in question is an official EPA document; please see attached for the full report. The report shows EPA's findings from our independent review of Parcels B and G soil sample data; please let us know if you have any specific questions about the report.

In regards to the discrepancies in the percentages, EPA's assessment of the data included looking more closely for signs of potential data quality problems in addition to signs of potential falsification. For example, EPA recommended resampling when data were missing or when different data collection methods did not produce consistent results.

EPA is pleased that the Navy will be resampling the impacted parcels and relying on these new data to determine where additional cleanup may be needed. EPA's input, which is based on our independent review of the data, will help inform where the resampling will be done.