Message

From: Bacey, Juanita@DTSC [Juanita.Bacey@dtsc.ca.gov]
Sent: 12/20/2016 4:51:53 PM
To: LEE, LILY (LEE.LILY@EPA.GOV) [LEE.LILY@EPA.GOV]
Subject: FW: DTSC/Cal-EPA/US EPA Conference Call
Attachments: USEPA Greenaction meeting Hunters Pt talking pts QandA draft 12-19-16.docx

FYI. Let me know if you had a different take on anything.

From: Naito, Janet@DTSC
Sent: Monday, December 19, 2016 5:21 PM
To: Alasti, Isabella@DTSC
Cc: Bacey, Juanita@DTSC; Pettijohn, Julie@DTSC; Lofstrom, Dot@DTSC; Setty, Asha@DTSC; Nazemi, Mohsen@DTSC; Lopez Mendoza, Jerilyn@DTSC
Subject: DTSC/Cal-EPA/US EPA Conference Call

Hi, just wanted to give you a heads up. DTSC/Cal-EPA/US EPA had a conference call among Senior Managers (Mohsen, Grant, Enrique, Jerilyn) today. EPA provided an outline of talking points for the discussion. The discussion jumped around a little with respect to topics, so here's a summary.

1) US EPA has stated that they do not have money for a TAG Grant at this site to fund a community advisor. They believe the easiest way to fund this would be for the Navy to give DTSC the funding under our existing agreement to fund the community advisor. Lily has talked to Derek and there are challenges to finding someone with the right nexus of skills.
    a. The EJ Grant is not a mechanism to fund GreenAction or a technical advisor.
    b. Navy is open to the idea of a technical advisor based upon discussions between US EPA and the Navy.
    c. US EPA has sent the Navy names of some people to consider.
    d. Dan Hirsch is not in the list of names forwarded to the Navy since EPA believes he deliberately misled the community regarding radiological issues at this site.
    e. There would be a process for selecting the technical advisor that included community input.
2) Mohsen suggested revising the response to GreenAction's request for the community to provide oversight so that it does not focus solely on US EPA's inability to grant access since this could impact US EPA at other sites.
3) Jerilyn raised the potential for a Title 6 Complaint. US EPA indicated that Greenaction has said that they may file a Title 6 complaint against the State since they have been successful at negotiating favorable settlements. It was agreed that we would address this if/when a complaint is filed.
4) Tetra Tech is currently writing up reports based upon previous work done. The Navy is in discussions with several companies (not Tetra Tech) to do any future radiological work.
    a. As part of NRC settlement, if Tetra Tech does radiological work on a site, they must have third party oversight.
5) CDPH and DTSC will work with US EPA to oversee field activities and analyze split samples.
6) Navy's will submit its Communications Plan on January 25, 2017 to the regulatory agencies which is coincidentally the same day as the next meeting with Mayor Lee and Supervisor Cohen.
7) The response to GreenActions Question #6 will be modified to state that the State is prepared to look into these issues and has asked the Navy to identify if soil was removed offsite from areas where anomalous readings are identified. I'm sorry Nina, when you first broached the question, I didn't interpret this as applying to areas where radiological clearance may have been given and then soil being removed and disposed offsite to address other chemicals of concern. Could you followup with Derek about this?
8) CalEPA and DTSC will be sending out a joint letter of support for US EPA's comments. Grant Cope will draft and run this by Mohsen.
9) Nina, after tomorrow's meeting and once we receive the CalEPA/DTSC letter of support, US EPA's comments and the CalEPA/DTSC letter of support should be uploaded into EnviroStor.