Message

From: Young, Dianna [/O=EXCHANGELABS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=1F40B43CB3DA4607B17140C42CA12A12-YOUNG, DIANNA]
Sent: 6/20/2018 4:21:13 PM
To: Leonard, Paul [leonard.paul@epa.gov]; Gervais, Gregory [Gervais.Gregory@epa.gov]
Subject: FW: SF Chronicle op-ed, HPNS

From: LEE, LILY
Sent: Wednesday, June 20, 2018 9:55 AM
To: Chesnutt, John <Chesnutt.John@epa.gov>; Huitric, Michele <Huitric.Michele@epa.gov>; Yogi, David <Yogi.David@epa.gov>; Fairbanks, Brianna <Fairbanks.Brianna@epa.gov>; Lane, Jackie <Lane.Jackie@epa.gov>; Maier, Brent <Maier.Brent@epa.gov>; Harris-Bishop, Rusty <Harris-Bishop.Rusty@epa.gov>; Calvino, Maria Soledad <Calvino.Maria@epa.gov>; Young, Dianna <Young.Dianna@epa.gov>; Azad, Ava <Azad.Ava@epa.gov>; Walker, Stuart <Walker.Stuart@epa.gov>
Subject: Fwd: SF Chronicle op-ed, HPNS

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

> **From:** "Franklin, William D CIV NAVFAC HQ, BRAC PMO" <william.d.franklin@navy.mil>
> **Date:** June 20, 2018 at 6:24:39 AM PDT
> **To:** "Koenig, Kellie/SDO" <Kellie.Koenig@jacobs.com>, "Brownell, Amy (DPH)" <amy.brownell@sfdph.org>, "Janda, Danielle L CIV" <danielle.janda@navy.mil>, "Tanouye, David@Waterboards" <David.Tanouye@Waterboards.ca.gov>, "Yogi, David" <Yogi.David@epa.gov>, "Robinson, Derek J CIV NAVFAC HQ, BRAC PMO" <derek.j.robinson1@navy.mil>, Elizabeth Basinet <elizabeth@barrettresourcegroup.com>, "Rehoreg, Elizabeth/SDO" <Elizabeth.Rehoreg@jacobs.com>, "Myall, Hilde (CII)" <hilde.myall@sfgov.org>, Jackie Lane <Lane.Jackie@epamail.epa.gov>, "Cohn, Karen (DPH)" <Karen.Cohn@sfdph.org>, "McKinney, Kasheica (CII) (kasheica.mckinney@sfgov.org)" <kasheica.mckinney@sfgov.org>, "Higley, Kathryn Ann" <Kathryn.Higley@oregonstate.edu>, "Henderson, Kim/SDO" <Kimberly.Henderson@jacobs.com>, "Ostrowski, Kimberly A CIV NAVFAC HQ, BRAC PMO" <kimberly.ostrowski@navy.mil>, "LEE, LILY" <LEE.LILY@EPA.GOV>, "Slack, Matthew L CIV SEA 04 04N" <matthew.slack@navy.mil>, "Bacey, Juanita@DTSC" <Juanita.Bacey@dtsc.ca.gov>, "Brooks, George P CIV" <george.brooks@navy.mil>, "Macchiarella, Thomas L JR CIV NAVFAC HQ, BRAC PMO" <thomas.macchiarella@navy.mil>, "tina.low@waterboards.ca.gov" <tina.low@waterboards.ca.gov>, "Edwards, Zachary L CIV SEA 04 04N" <zachary.edwards@navy.mil>, "Huitric, Michele (Huitric.Michele@epa.gov)" <Huitric.Michele@epa.gov>, "harris-bishop.rusty@epa.gov" <harris-bishop.rusty@epa.gov>, "Singh, Sheetal@CDPH" <Sheetal.Singh@cdph.ca.gov>, "Schornack, Dale@CDPH" <Dale.Schornack@cdph.ca.gov>, "Russ.edmondson@dtsc.ca.gov" <Russ.edmondson@dtsc.ca.gov>
> **Cc:** "Ostrowski, Kimberly A CIV NAVFAC HQ, BRAC PMO" <kimberly.ostrowski@navy.mil>
> **Subject: SF Chronicle op-ed, HPNS**
>
> All, the subject op-ed telling our side of the rad cleanup story at HPNS ran this morning and is available at:
>
> https://www.sfchronicle.com/opinion/openforum/article/Navy-agrees-re-testing-of-Hunters-Point-parcels-13008618.php.

Full text version below. R, Bill

==========

By Kimberly Ostrowski June 19, 2018 Updated: June 19, 2018 4:26 p.m.

Navy agrees re-testing of Hunters Point parcels is needed

The former Hunters Point Naval Shipyard is an important part of the city of San Francisco, having played a vital national defense role during World War II and afterward. Today, the priority for the site reflects that space to live and work in the city is both scarce and expensive.

That is where the Navy Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) process comes in. Since 1990, it has transferred and repurposed dozens of closed U.S. military installations for commercial and public use. The Shipyard project will follow in these footsteps.

Since entering the BRAC program in 1991, the vast majority of shipyard project cleanup work has been successfully completed. Over the past several years, however, there has been radiological assessment work at the site that does not measure up.

Radiological cleanup at the shipyard project is challenging under any circumstances, due to low levels of radiation that are near the "background levels" naturally occurring in the environment. Adding to that challenge is that the radiological analysis and cleanup work performed by a Navy contractor is in question.

The Navy originally discovered irregularities in the radiological data provided by Tetra Tech EC through its ongoing internal quality control procedures in 2012. The Navy worked with Tetra Tech EC and regulatory agencies to address those issues and others from 2012 to 2016.

Subsequently, the Navy identified additional problems with Tetra Tech EC. Then-former Tetra Tech EC employees came forward with specific claims of deliberate falsification of tests, improper work and fraudulent record keeping. In 2016, the Navy paused the radiological program at the shipyard development for a comprehensive review. And while there have been multiple reports, articles and much speculation since, it is important that the community understands three things.

1) The shipyard project and nearby areas are safe. The levels of radiation there are low; exposure to these levels would not result in an immediate risk to human health or the environment. In addition, the radiological remedial work performed there has proper controls in place to ensure that workers and the public remain safe.

Regulators have repeatedly verified the safety of Parcel A, which was investigated, cleared and removed from the Superfund program in 1999. The Environmental Protection Agency surveyed Parcel A before transfer to the city in 2004. The Navy also supports the California Department of Public Health's decision to scan areas of Parcel A to provide residents with additional peace of mind.

2) The Navy understands the concerns raised by local stakeholders. Credible, reliable data is crucial to establish the property readiness for transfer and use by the local community. That is why the Navy stopped all remaining transfers of property at the shipyard development. The city and developers have also agreed to pause work on parcels UC1, UC2 and D2, which were transferred to the city in 2015.

3) The Navy agrees with community leaders and its regulatory partners that all of Tetra Tech EC radiological work areas must be re-evaluated. Last week, the Navy released its proposed work plan for retesting Parcel G, identified by the city as its top-priority parcel for development. Once final, this work

plan will serve as a model for other parcel work plans that follow.

To ensure that retesting is performed properly, the Navy has hired independent contractors to oversee the work and verify testing results. The EPA and the California Department of Public Health also will conduct independent sampling to confirm results.

The public has until Aug. 14 to offer suggestions on the approach the Navy will use to retest Parcel G. This doubles the typical 30-day comment period in order to give stakeholders additional time to review and provide feedback. The work plan, a fact sheet and an explanation of the comment process are all available to the public at bracpmo.navy.mil/hpnsrc. Community members are encouraged to participate.

It's time to get the radiological cleanup work at Hunters Point back on track. Retesting at Parcel G is the start. The shipyard project has a long history of proud service to the country, and an important future ahead to the city of San Francisco and its residents. The Navy is determined that our legacy here will be positive and that we will be here until the work is done.

Kimberly Ostrowski is director of the Navy Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC), West.