Message

From: Chesnutt, John [/O=EXCHANGELABS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=E1CD369E94474C2C8A876FB16943320A-JCHESNUT]
Sent: 4/11/2018 6:28:29 PM
To: Naito, Janet@DTSC [Janet.Naito@dtsc.ca.gov]
Subject: FW: EPA response to SF Curbed
Attachments: EPA comments on draft Rad Data Eval Parcels B G Text 12-29-2019.pdf; EPA comments on draft Rad Data Eval Parcels D-2 UC-123 Text 3-30-2018.pdf; Rad Scanner Van Survey Rpt Sept 2002 09-156344.pdf

I forgot to cc you. I sent to Nina

From: Chesnutt, John
Sent: Wednesday, April 11, 2018 10:13 AM
To: Robinson, Derek J CIV NAVFAC HQ, BRAC PMO <derek.j.robinson1@navy.mil>; 'Brooks, George P CIV' <george.brooks@navy.mil>; thomas macchiarella (thomas.macchiarella@navy.mil) <thomas.macchiarella@navy.mil>; william.d.franklin@navy.mil; Singh, Sheetal (CDPH-EMB) <sheetal.singh@cdph.ca.gov>; juanita.bacey (Juanita.Bacey@dtsc.ca.gov) <Juanita.Bacey@dtsc.ca.gov>
Subject: FW: EPA response to SF Curbed

FYI – Here is what EPA provided to Chris Roberts of SF Curbed this morning.

SF Curbed Questions:

- Wanted to see what the best way to discuss with EPA the findings from the most recent radiological findings report from the Hunters Point shipyard -- these, related to buildings -- might be. As the report says, the cleanup data from buildings appears to have been falsified--but the report also says that a building on Parcel A, building 322, was scanned and declared clear by Tetra Tech back in 2004. Based on what we know now, can that declaration be trusted? And in any event, how can we be certain that that building is in fact clean and poses no danger to the environment or the public--and what, if any, actions will be taken as a result? [Also, paraphrased from reporter's voicemail: Whistleblowers have declared that Parcel A had contamination; how are those concerns being addressed?]

- Also, it looks like the EPA is also reviewing Tetra Tech's data. Has EPA produced comments on all of the Navy's draft radiological findings reports? Will EPA provide copies of all comments on the draft radiological findings reports produced to date?

- Today, an organization called PEER put out a release in which the EPA's comments on the US Navy's draft radiological findings reports from the former Navy shipyard at Hunters Point in San Francisco, an EPA Superfund site, were published. But only the EPA comments on Parcels B and G were obtained. Has the EPA commented on the draft radiological findings reports from the other parcels? If so, can EPA provide those documents?

- I understand that prior to the transfer, EPA ran a "scan van" over Parcel A and collected its own cleanup data to verify the Navy's. Is that accurate? Can you provide those findings? And was the "scan van" run over other parts of the base after other Navy cleanup?

EPA Response:
We have no reason to question any cleanup work performed on Parcel A. Historically, the majority of Parcel A was used for residences and administrative offices, not industrial activities.
The only radiological materials found at Parcel A were sandblast grit and firebricks, these have since been removed. Former Buildings 322, 816, and 821 had potential for radiological contamination. The Navy scanned all three buildings and did not find radiological contamination above required cleanup levels. Buildings 322 and 816 were demolished and

removed. Building 821 is located on Crisp Road, not in the developed portion of Parcel A. No other sources of radiological contamination were identified during the investigation or cleanup of Parcel A. In 2002, EPA conducted a radiological scanner van survey of Parcel A and navigable roads on other parts of the Shipyard (please see attached report). All of the anomalies detected during the scan were attributable to natural occurring sources at levels consistent with what would normally be found in the environment.

Please see attached for copies of EPA's independent review of Parcels B and G (attachment #1) and Parcels D-2, UC-1, UC-2, and UC-3 (attachment #2). Please note, for the report on Parcels D-2, UC-1, UC-2, and UC-3 (attachment #2), there is a small typo in Table 2. Where it says "71%" in the last row of Table 2, it should actually say "85%". Please let us know if you have any specific questions about these reports.

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.