

From: [Rohlfes, Larry@DTSC](mailto:Rohlfes.Larry@DTSC)
To: [Singh, Mike@DTSC](mailto:Singh.Mike@DTSC)
Subject: FW: Additional Information re outreach
Date: Friday, September 23, 2016 4:36:50 PM
Attachments: [Invitation and correspondence with Marie Mason et al 12 2012.pdf](#)
[Dan Letter to Raphael.pdf](#)

From: Abe Weitzberg [mailto:aweitzberg@att.net]
Sent: Friday, September 23, 2016 3:20 PM
To: Rohlfes, Larry@DTSC <Larry.Rohlfes@dtsc.ca.gov>
Cc: Kracov, Gideon@DTSC <Gideon.Kracov@dtsc.ca.gov>; Campbell, Arezoo@DTSC <Arezoo.Campbell@dtsc.ca.gov>; Vizzier, Mike@DTSC <Mike.Vizzier@dtsc.ca.gov>
Subject: Additional Information re outreach

In my 5 minute presentation at the September 20, 2016 IRP meeting, I emphasized the fact that SSFL cleanup was atypical from the perspective of public participation and DTSC's outreach activities. I would now like to give you my suggestions on what might be the best approach for future outreach activities for SSFL and other sites. At the meeting the CAG, the Public Participation Group(PPG), and the Workgroup were all mentioned and discussed. It should be noted that there was a SSFL Advisory Panel and the SSFL Interagency Workgroup as well as the current SSFL Workgroup. All were run by Dan Hirsch and had the same participation from the general public limited to people who supported Dan Hirsch's viewpoint. As demonstrated in the attached documents, Hirsch vehemently opposed any public group that he could not control. The Hirsch-run workgroups provided him the opportunity to browbeat and threaten representatives of the RPs and the regulatory agencies and denigrate the views of anybody who dared to say anything that deviated from his narrative. Even when he made statements that were patently false and misleading, there was no opportunity to correct the record. I can provide numerous examples but will limit myself to one of the most misleading statements he made in his letter to Debbie Raphael. After leading the effort to get the \$45 million for the EPA radiological study and even having the community participation include the search for uranium daughter products that could not possibly come from nuclear reactor fuel he states "For example, EPA found significant radioactive contamination in the area where the partial meltdown had occurred, with cesium-137 levels as high as a thousand times background."

The truth is that for \$45 million there were only 12 locations found that had radiological contamination above the suburban residential threshold, and there was only one sample location with the 1000 times background value. That contamination was known before the EPA sampling and was located underneath an asphalt road. None of the cesium came from the "meltdown" because they never saw any with their environmental monitoring equipment at the time of the accident. Additionally, that level of contamination was of trivial health risk because if you lay flat on the road for two weeks you would receive the same dose as if you made a round trip plane trip to New York. Hirsch does not want the public to know the truth, he wants to just generate fear so they support his agenda.

Back to the purpose of your meeting, I will tell you what I recommend as possible ways to improve the DTSC public outreach and communication activities. Venues such as the

Workgroups that are dominated by a single group are clearly not the way to go. The CAG which was formed following the DTSC CAG handbook approach would be a much more balanced venue, if it was not boycotted by the Workgroup supporters. Contrary to the accusations of some critics all of the CAG members are volunteers who receive no guidance or control from the RPs or DTSC. We are totally independent. Our views just are not in agreement with those espoused by Hirsch, and we find more factual support for our views than he can offer for his. Independent of the Workgroup and the CAG are lone wolves who have their own worldviews. All groups and individuals are free to submit their comments to DTSC and the RPs. What is needed is a forum for individual members of the public to come together to learn about the cleanup issues and voice their opinions. The PPC had a very diverse group of members but during its limited existence it stayed in the learning mode and never provided feedback as a group back to DTSC. It is doubtful that consensus could have been obtained on any specific issue because of the diversity of opinion. It is questionable whether or not there is need for any consensus from a group because as individuals they are free to express their own views. The apparent polarization of the community and the animosity coming from the Workgroup towards the CAG are totally unnecessary. Everybody in the community wants a cleanup. The only issue is what are the appropriate cleanup levels. The CAG and much of the silent majority want to have a risk-based cleanup such as is done throughout the world and the US. Those members of the public who have been moved by Hirsch's fearmongering want a SSFL cleanup to 'background or detect' even though they live miles away and all of the state and federal agencies have stated there is no off-site health risk.

What is needed is a mechanism for setting up a community group to serve as a focus for educating the public and we found the CAG handbook to be satisfactory. Unfortunately, it has been withdrawn and there is no update. Regular updates from DTSC and the RPs to such a group is necessary, but giving a single individual excessive control over the cleanup as the sole expression of vox populi is clearly a mistake. Perhaps the best solution is for more information to be disseminated by DTSC while leaving any feedback to DTSC at the discretion of the individuals or ad hoc groups.

Thank you.

Abe Weitzberg phone: 818-347-5068
5711 Como Circle mobile: 301-254-9601
Woodland Hills, CA 91367



Ronald Ziman <ronald.ziman@gmail.com>

Invitation to Join the SSFL CAG Membership Selection Panel

8 messages

Marie Mason <mariejmason@roadrunner.com>

Tue, Dec 4, 2012 at 10:24 PM

To: ronald.ziman@gmail.com

We have a few questions regarding the request we received to join the SSFL CAG membership selection panel.

1. How many people are on the Selection Committee?
2. Who is selecting the people to serve on this Selection Committee?
3. Who are the other members of this Selection Committee?
4. How will decisions be made by this Selection Committee?
5. Are you asking us to serve on the Selection Committee, or is what you are asking is for us to agree to be considered for serving on it?
6. Are those of you who are on the Selection Committee barred from serving on the CAG itself?

We look forward to hearing back from you.

Marie Mason
Daniel Hirsch
Holly Huff

From: ronald.ziman@gmail.com [mailto:ronald.ziman@gmail.com] On Behalf Of
Ronald Ziman

Sent: Sunday, December 02, 2012 4:10 PM

To: mariejmason@roadrunner.com

Subject: Invitation to Join the SSFL CAG Membership Selection Panel

December 2, 2012

Dear Ms Mason,

Your name has been recommended as someone who may be willing to serve or as someone who may suggest a colleague or associate to serve on an Ad Hoc Membership Selection Panel to assist in the establishment of a community advisory group (CAG) for the Santa Susana Field Laboratory (SSFL) site.

The SSFL site is located 30 miles northwest of downtown Los Angeles. The location in southeastern Ventura County encompasses the crest of the Simi Hills at the western border of the San Fernando Valley as well as parcels in Los Angeles County. A former rocket engine test and nuclear research facility, the site is currently the focus of a comprehensive environmental investigation and cleanup program conducted by Boeing, the United States Department of Energy (DOE) and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA). This investigation and cleanup is being overseen by the State of CA Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC).

After receiving a petition from communities surrounding the SSFL site, DTSC is assisting the community in forming a CAG. A CAG is a self-governing body composed of volunteers who review documents and provide input to the DTSC. For further information about CAGs please consider reviewing the CAG handbook at: www.dtsc.ca.gov/GetInvolved/upload/PP_Guidance_CAG.pdf.

In order to establish a CAG, there is a need for an Ad Hoc Membership Selection Panel to objectively review applications and identify individuals who represent distinct segments of the stakeholder population surrounding the SSFL site. The CAG should reflect a diversity of interests and opinions which will contribute to a comprehensive discussion on the complex issues at the SSFL site. The Membership Selection panel will dissolve upon completion of the CAG selection process.

As CAG petitioners, we are seeking individuals for the Ad Hoc Membership Selection Panel who can provide:

- . An impartial, objective review of applications identifying community members who represent various segments of the local communities surrounding the SSFL site;
 - . An understanding of group dynamics;
 - . Conflict resolution skills;
 - . An understanding of political and business environments;
 - . An understanding of the need for many diverse voices within the CAG;
- and,
- . Select members with a basic understanding of the complexities of a hazardous waste cleanup site and/or have the willingness to learn.

While we recognize that it is the holiday season and the time frame for this announcement is short, the expedited formation of the CAG is critical to the outreach process for the SSFL project. You will be establishing selection criteria for CAG membership before the end of the year, review CAG membership applications and select members during the first part of 2013.

Please respond via e-mail to: rbziman@gmail.com or by phone to (818) 943-9493 no later than, 12/13/12 in order to move this critical process forward. Feel free to contact me should you have questions or require further clarification. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Ron

Ronald B. Ziman, MD, FACP, FAAN
Chair, SSFL CAG Organizing Committee

Ronald Ziman <ronald.ziman@gmail.com>
To: Marie Mason <mariejmason@roadrunner.com>
Cc: "Perez, Marina@DTSC" <marina.perez@dtsc.ca.gov>

Thu, Dec 6, 2012 at 11:26 AM

Hi Marie,

Thank you for responding to the invitation to serve on the SSFL CAG Membership Selection Panel. Please forward these answers to your questions to the other signatories on your e-mail. Also, please feel free to forward the invitation I sent you as well as these answers to your questions to the other members of the PPG (Barbara Johnson, Sheldon Plotkin and Bonnie Klea) in case they are interested in serving on the Membership Selection Panel.

1. How many people are on the Selection Committee?

There are 7 people on the selection committee including 1 neutral party.

2. Who is selecting the people to serve on this Selection Committee?

The petitioners desire that the CAG be inclusive and broad based, reflecting the diverse opinions of those in the affected community. The Membership Selection Panel will be appointed to insure that this goal is met. The Membership Selection Panel is being chosen by the Organizing Committee of the CAG in consultation with the DTSC and the Udall Foundation. A Udall Foundation representative will be serving as the facilitator of the CAG.

3. Who are the other members of this Selection Committee?

Based upon those responding by 12/13/12 who indicate that they are willing to serve, the Membership Selection Panel will be appointed. As the deadline for response has not been reached, the panel has not yet been appointed. As noted, the Panel will have at least 1 "neutral party" appointed. Neutral party invitations were sent with the same 12/13/12 deadline as the other panel member invitations.

4. How will decisions be made by this Selection Committee?

The Membership Selection Panel will independently decide the CAG admission criteria, what the application screening process will be including whether some or all prospective members would be interviewed, how those not admitted to the CAG may still participate in the CAG (eg: committee members) and ultimately who will be the members of the CAG. I anticipate that DTSC, Udall and 1 or more members of the Organizing Committee will be monitoring the Selection Panel's progress, but the Membership Selection Panel will be autonomous. The time frame for CAG membership selection once the application deadline has passed is anticipated to be about 1 month. As it is expected that some on the Membership Selection Panel will be geographically distant, the meetings will likely be via teleconference or video conference. I have had discussions with DTSC to arrange a tour of the SSFL for those, especially the neutral party, to see the facility and also to have the opportunity for all members of the Selection Panel to meet in person.

5. Are you asking us to serve on the Selection Committee, or is what you are asking is for us to agree to be considered for serving on it?

This invitation is soliciting your interest and willingness to serve on the Membership Selection Panel. Many more invitations were extended than the 7 slots available. Your willingness to serve on the Membership Selection Panel does not guarantee that you will be chosen.

6. Are those of you who are on the Selection Committee barred from serving on the CAG itself?

Participation on the Membership Selection Panel in no way disqualifies anyone interested from serving on the CAG. I would encourage all of you to apply for CAG membership. Obviously the Membership Selection Panel will need to establish a process to evaluate those applicants for CAG membership who are also serving on the Membership Selection Panel.

If you have any further questions, please let me know. I look forward to hearing of your decision.

Sincerely,

Ron

Ronald B. Ziman, MD, FACP, FAAN
Chair, SSFL CAG Organizing Committee

[Quoted text hidden]

Marie Mason <mariejmason@roadrunner.com>
To: Ronald Ziman <ronald.ziman@gmail.com>
Cc: Daniel Hirsch <dhirsch1@cruzio.com>, Hollyhuff1@aol.com

Thu, Dec 13, 2012 at 8:56 PM

Dr. Ziman,

We decline.

We will not be used as window-dressing to try to legitimize an illegitimate process.

The CAG is a creation of Boeing. The CAG effort originated from Boeing and has been pushed aggressively by it. The CAG is widely seen as designed as an "astroturf" body dominated by the tiny minority in the community who have been allied with Boeing in trying to frustrate the cleanup.

Despite the caption of your initial email to us, "Invitation to Join the SSFL CAG Membership Selection Committee," you now indicate, in response to our inquiry, that you were not actually inviting us to join, but merely to have our names considered for being on that Committee.

Despite us asking who would choose the Membership Selection Panel, you decline to answer, merely saying it is being chosen by the "Organizing Committee of the CAG," but you do not disclose who that is.

You indicate that the Panel will consist of 7 or 8 people, so if one, two, or even somehow all three of us were selected by the unnamed members of the Organizing Committee, we would be in the minority and automatically outvoted. The Boeing astroturf people would be selected for the CAG, but its organizers could claim that one or more of us was "involved in the selection," even though we in fact had no say because the panel was stacked against us. We would just be a token to provide a patina of credibility for something that is non-credible.

Boeing is exceedingly happy about the CAG and the shutdown of the Inter-Agency Work Group, outcomes for which it has long worked. We believe it is profoundly unethical for anyone to participate in this effort by the polluter to disrupt and block the cleanup. We won't be party to this unethical activity, and we urge you to withdraw your involvement as well. It can only hurt a community that has long hoped for cleanup of this toxic mess.

We won't allow ourselves to be used to provide cover for the polluter's efforts to block cleanup, something that will contribute to hurting this community.

Marie Mason

Holly Huff

Dan Hirsch

From: Ronald Ziman [mailto:ronald.ziman@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, December 06, 2012 11:27 AM
To: Marie Mason
Cc: Perez, Marina@DTSC
Subject: Re: Invitation to Join the SSFL CAG Membership Selection Panel

[Quoted text hidden]

Ronald Ziman <ronald.ziman@gmail.com>
To: Marie Mason <mariejmason@roadrunner.com>
Cc: Daniel Hirsch <dhirsch1@cruzio.com>, Hollyhuff1@aol.com

Fri, Dec 21, 2012 at 7:36 PM

Dear Marie, Daniel and Holly

I regret that you have decided not to participate in the CAG membership selection process. The CAG is not a creation of Boeing, but rather is a grassroots effort to create an independent, inclusive group where all points of view will be heard and considered. Though you have chosen to decline participation in membership selection, this in no way prevents you from applying for membership in the CAG or otherwise attending and giving input during its meetings, which will be open. Please be aware that the application deadline for CAG membership has been extended 2 weeks due to the Holidays.

I wish you all happy holidays and a healthy, prosperous and joyful New Year.

Sincerely,

Ronald B. Ziman, MD, FACP, FAAN

[Quoted text hidden]

Ronald Ziman <ronald.ziman@gmail.com> Fri, Dec 21, 2012 at 7:47 PM
To: Abe Weitzberg <aweitzberg@att.net>, Alec Uzemeck <alecmu@aol.com>, Christian Kiillkkaa <christiankiillkkaa@gmail.com>, David Karchem <dkarchem@gmail.com>, John Luker <jluker2@yahoo.com>, Mark Osokow <hopebird@lafn.org>

CONFIDENTIAL

**NOT FOR DISTRIBUTION, FORWARDING
OR DISSEMINATION OF ANY OTHER TYPE**

As I mentioned at our recent meeting of 12/18 between the CAG Organizing Committee and DTSC, I had a reply from Marie Mason, Daniel Hirsch and Holly Huff with questions about the invitation. Below is the correspondence that occurred between me and them. As I indicated at our meeting, it appears from their last correspondence that if they would not have control of membership selection, they wanted nothing to do with the CAG. After reviewing their last e-mail, I decided to respond. My last response is also included.

Sincerely,

Ron

P.S. Please honor my request not to distribute this correspondence.

=====

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Ronald Ziman** <ronald.ziman@gmail.com>

Date: Fri, Dec 21, 2012 at 7:36 PM

Subject: Re: Invitation to Join the SSFL CAG Membership Selection Panel

[Quoted text hidden]

David Karchem <dkarchem@gmail.com>

Fri, Dec 21, 2012 at 11:08 PM

To: Ronald Ziman <ronald.ziman@gmail.com>

Cc: Abe Weitzberg <aweitzberg@att.net>, alecmu@aol.com, Christian Kiillkkaa <christiankiillkkaa@gmail.com>, john luker <jcluker2@yahoo.com>, Mark Osokow <hopebird@lafn.org>

Ron:

Your handling of this process has been excellent. Thank you for your time, efforts, discretion and attention to details.

--
--

David Karchem

dkarchem@gmail.com primary

**<http://dkrehab.blogspot.com/> blog*

dkarchem@hotmail.com alternate

818-730-8756 cell

*
*

*Each step is small, even though it may appear very high.

"To everyone else, I look okay, everyone keeps telling me I look "better." I'm not okay. It's like one of those android movies. I'm not me anymore. I'm still in the box I came in, but someone's fing with the wiring inside."***

Jonathan Kellerman, Therapy, 2004

Alec Uzemeck <alecmu@aol.com>

Sat, Dec 22, 2012 at 8:16 AM

To: David Karchem <dkarchem@gmail.com>

Cc: Ronald Ziman <ronald.ziman@gmail.com>, Abe Weitzberg <aweitzberg@att.net>, Christian Kiillkkaa <christiankiillkkaa@gmail.com>, john luker <jcluker2@yahoo.com>, Mark Osokow <hopebird@lafn.org>

I agree with david and I find it humorous that Dan and his folks are uncomfortable with you as the committee head. May the humor continue.

Alec Uzemeck

[Quoted text hidden]

Mark Osokow <hopebird@lafn.org>
To: Ronald Ziman <ronald.ziman@gmail.com>

Sat, Dec 22, 2012 at 4:57 PM

Ron,

Thank you for sharing this. For the record, I have never heard a single Boeing employee use the words "Community Advisory Group." It is a complete mystery to me how the respondents to your invitation arrived at the conclusion that Boeing is somehow orchestrating this effort.

Feel free to share my reply with other members of the Organizing Committee.

[Quoted text hidden]

September 24, 2012

Debbie Raphael
Director
Department of Toxic Substances Control
1001 "I" Street
Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Director Raphael:

We write to regretfully inform you that we, representing the great majority of the community that has worked for so long for a full cleanup of the contaminated Santa Susana Field Laboratory (SSFL), **have lost all confidence in you and your department.** Ever since your appointment as Director, the Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) has reversed course and taken numerous actions to undercut the cleanup and to do what Boeing, the company responsible for the pollution at the site, wishes. **DTSC seems to now be a wholly owned subsidiary of the polluter it is supposed to be regulating. Rather than control toxic material, DTSC appears to be intent only on protecting the polluter.**

SSFL is, as you know, contaminated with radioactive and chemically toxic materials from decades of sloppy operations as a nuclear and rocket testing facility, including a partial reactor meltdown. For years, the Boeing Company, which owns and operates much of the site, has resisted cleaning up SSFL. To this end, Boeing has historically pushed to: remove regulators who were diligent in requiring compliance with cleanup requirements; shut down the longstanding SSFL Inter-Agency Work Group, the primary forum for the public learning what is going on at the site and for pressing for full cleanup; create instead a Community Advisory Group (CAG) that would be dominated by the tiny minority of the community that works with Boeing in opposing the cleanup, part of the long tradition of "astroturfing," polluters creating fake grassroots groups to lobby for the polluter; and take over many of DTSC's regulatory functions, particularly arranging to have Boeing have significant influence over the state's environmental review.

At 5:00 pm Friday—the time when government officials who are doing something disreputable try to bury the news—you issued an announcement saying in essence you were going to give Boeing its wish list, creating precisely the CAG it has long sought, while shutting down the existing community advisory bodies, and

removing as SSFL Project Director the last person at DTSC who was one of the main authors of the cleanup agreements. Earlier in the week it was revealed that, having allowed Boeing to pick and contract with the state's EIR contractor, that contractor was recommending the state take actions that you have conceded would be contrary to the SSFL cleanup agreements.

Boeing is very pleased. The community that wants the cleanup is furious. You have betrayed us.

The Removal of Rick Brausch as SSFL Project Director

In the 1990s, DTSC's Project Director insisted that Boeing install a cap compliant with the regulations over the sodium burn pit, where radioactively and chemically contaminated items had been burned for decades. Boeing didn't want to do it, so it went to DTSC top officials and offered to provide money to DTSC to hire several additional personnel if DTSC would remove the Project Director. DTSC did as Boeing demanded; the Project Director was removed; his replacement immediately approved Boeing's request to not have to appropriately cap the burn pit.

Boeing has long wanted the removal of Rick Brausch, who has been for the last several years the DTSC Project Director. He was instrumental in the negotiation of the Agreements on Consent (AOCs) with NASA and the Department of Energy (DOE). which Boeing opposed, and has been a consistent force pushing for full cleanup of SSFL. With Cal-EPA Secretary Linda Adams and Deputy Secretary Patty Zwarts gone, Brausch is the last person left at DTSC who was deeply involved in accomplishing and trying to implement those cleanup agreements that Boeing wishes to see unravel.

You have now removed Brausch as Project Director, transferring his responsibilities to someone who came to DTSC out of industry and is viewed as far more cozy with polluters. You did not even have the courtesy to announce this directly. DTSC's Friday 5:00 p.m. release buries this at the bottom, where it lists the DTSC SSFL team. Brausch is no longer listed as Project Director, but merely relegated to an "advisory role," and it is indicated that the project is now overseen by Stewart Black.

The Shutdown of the SSFL Inter-Agency Work Group

For twenty-two years, the SSFL Inter-Agency Work Group has been absolutely critical to the community. It has been the primary mechanism

for coordinating cleanup activities across the various agencies, who otherwise can work at times at cross purposes. This is the place the public, news media, and elected officials and their staffs have relied upon for over two decades as their primary source of information, on a quarterly basis, to be updated about the status of the cleanup, the findings of radiation and hazardous materials monitoring, and problems arising in moving the cleanup project forward. And it has been an essential mechanism for holding the agencies' feet to the fire when, as has often happened, there are actions contemplated that might not be in the best interests of the public and the cleanup. It has been a singularly important institution, one that the community and elected officials fought hard to have established and repeatedly defended from efforts by Boeing to have it shut down.

You suspended it a year ago. For the last year, there have been no quarterly meetings. Despite critical developments in the cleanup, there has been no way for the general public to learn about them. For example, EPA found significant radioactive contamination in the area where the partial meltdown had occurred, with cesium-137 levels as high as a thousand times background. Normally, that would be presented at a meeting of the Inter-Agency Work Group. But you have shut down those meetings, so the general public could not learn of it directly. During this period, NASA, as you know, proposed actions regarding its Environmental Impact Statement that DTSC stated would be in violation of the AOC. That clearly should have been disclosed and discussed at a Work Group meeting; yet you had suspended the meetings, so it couldn't be. For a year now there has been this vacuum while you figured out what to do about the Work Group.

More than two hundred people submitted a petition to you, describing its importance and calling for its reinstatement. At 5:00 pm Friday, they finally got their answer: Despite some very misleading language, you have decided to permanently end the SSFL Inter-Agency Work Group, which for two decades was the main venue for the public, elected officials, and the media to learn what is going on at the site. As cover, you say you will meet with members of the now disbanded Work Group to discuss some new forum that you say will be "fundamentally changed" from the long-standing SSFL Inter-Agency Work Group. Indeed, it won't even keep its existing name; you intend to call it a "Community Work Group." You shut it down a year ago, and you refuse to reinstate it as is. Instead, you insist on permanently closing it and creating something new, with a different name, that you say will be fundamentally different.

More than two hundred people sent you a petition calling for reinstating the

SSFL Inter-Agency Work Group as it is and opposing the establishment of a CAG. Instead you have done the opposite, even though this is far more than signed the CAG petition.

For two decades, Boeing and its predecessors have pushed for this outcome, which the community and its elected representatives have strenuously resisted. Boeing has long opposed the Work Group, because it represents the great majority of the community, those that want the cleanup, and has been effective in pushing for the AOCs and for Boeing to be required to clean up the toxic mess for which it is responsible. Once again, under your Directorship, Boeing wins, and the community loses.

The Creation of a CAG, Long Desired by Boeing

It has now become standard practice for polluters to try to set up “Community Advisory Groups” that they dominate; in fact news broke just recently about a controversy involving PG&E’s domination of the CAG for the cleanup of the chromium-6 contamination at Hinkley that was made famous by Erin Brockovich.

Indeed, the idea of a CAG for SSFL arose several years ago when a senior manager for Boeing’s SSFL remediation project left Boeing’s employ and began suggesting he would petition to form a CAG. Resistance was met, however, for a CAG in which the prime visible moving force was a recent Boeing official.

Boeing hired a firm, with the clever name Renewable Resources Group, to identify prospective targets for SSFL astroturfing. They met with one individual in particular to urge her to push for a CAG. Boeing executives subsequently asked to meet with her directly; at that meeting the CAG idea was discussed and Boeing executives offered to fund her CAG if she were to request one. Thereafter she wrote Boeing saying she had done a lot of thinking since the meeting and would request a CAG, that she would need support for the CAG request, and that she accepted their offer to fund the CAG. In the months thereafter she kept Boeing informed of her progress in advancing the CAG. Her initial CAG petition was not accepted by DTSC, but, now that you have become Director, a new petition from the same person has been approved.

This CAG is a long-held Boeing dream, now created with your assistance. No doubt you and Boeing would like some supporters of the AOCs to apply to be on the CAG, so that one or two token representatives can be on a panel otherwise dominated by those working with or parallel to Boeing

to frustrate the full cleanup. We decline to be used to provide a gloss of credibility on a thoroughly non-credible and destructive undertaking.

Three thousand eight hundred comments were received from the public in support of the cleanup agreements signed prior to you coming into office; about 15 commenters were opposed. You have now agreed to set up a sham community advisory group composed largely of opponents of thorough cleanup, working in parallel with Boeing's interests, thus giving Boeing the cover it has long wanted in order to assert that the community doesn't want most of the contamination cleaned up. It is shameful.

You argue that you are required to assist in the formation of a CAG if you receive a petition with fifty signatures. Two years ago your Department took precisely the opposite position, when it rejected a CAG petition from the same individual. All that has changed is that you are now the DTSC Director, and Boeing once again has direct influence. Your argument about being required to act is further undercut by the fact that you not merely approved the CAG, you also shut down the existing community advisory bodies, the SSFL Inter-Agency Work Group and the Public Participation Group, and removed as SSFL Project Director the only person left who had been involved in bringing about the cleanup agreements you are now threatening.

Letting Boeing Have Significant Control Over the State's Environmental Impact Report

You have also allowed Boeing to pick and contract for the state's contractor to produce the state's Environmental Impact Report. Talk about letting the fox run the chicken coop! You may argue that a Memorandum of Agreement with Boeing was entered into prior to you taking office, but the Department under your directorship has repeatedly been urged to revise the MOA and declined to do so. You may argue that the state exercises final say on the selection and direction of the EIR contractor; however, the contractor chosen for this phase was Boeing's top recommendation, hardly coincidental. The contractor was recommended by and is contracted with Boeing, creating clearly conflicted loyalties. And indeed, that contractor has already issued recommendations for the state to take at least one action that you, in writing, have stated would violate the AOCs, undercutting your repeated claims that you remain fully committed to the AOCs. [The Boeing-selected contractor has now recommended that the state not do a joint Environmental Impact Statement/Report with NASA and DOE, even though you wrote NASA, on September 19, 2011, that "the AOC compels ... a joint EIS/EIR document."]

We now face a state EIR being written by a Boeing contractor that will undoubtedly propose weakening the cleanup. We seem to have returned to the “bad old days” when Boeing largely directed the activities of its regulator, rather than the other way around.

We Will Continue to Fight for Full Cleanup

Boeing has purchased very powerful lobbyists and public relations consultants, including Winston Hickox, Peter Weiner, Bob Hoffman, Charlie Stringer, and Gary Polakovic, several of whom are close to the Governor. We recognize that we represent merely the “little people,” everyday folks who live near this polluted facility, whose families face the risk of cancer and other ailments from the decades during which Boeing and its predecessors have succeeded in avoiding cleanup obligations. Your actions indicate to us that in your eyes we don’t count, that it is only the powerful like Boeing that matter, that you will do what they want you to, no matter who among the unpowerful gets hurt by it.

We will continue to fight for cleanup. We fought long before you became Director, and we will keep fighting long after you cease being Director. But, tragically, we now have not merely Boeing as our adversary, but the Director of the Department that should be working to protect us.

Sincerely,

SSFL Inter-Agency Work Group Members

Marie Mason*
Susana Knolls Homeowners Association
involved in SSFL struggle for 23 years

Barbara Johnson*
Rocketdyne Cleanup Coalition
involved in SSFL struggle for 23 years

Sheldon C. Plotkin, Ph.D., P.E.*
Southern California Federation of Scientists
involved in SSFL struggle for 33 years

Bonnie Klea*
former SSFL worker/advocate for

the sick workers
involved in SSFL struggle for 17 years

Daniel Hirsch
Committee to Bridge the Gap
involved in SSFL struggle for 33 years

* also serve on PPG

Public Participation Group Members

William Preston Bowling
Aerospace Contamination Museum of
Education
involved in SSFL struggle for 10 years

Jimmy Hara, M.D.
Physicians for Social Responsibility-LA
involved in SSFL struggle for 33 yrs (PSR's
involvement)

Rev. John Southwick
Radiation Rangers
involved in SSFL struggle for 6 years

Devyn Gortner
Teens Against Toxins
involved in SSFL struggle for 3 years

Holly Huff
involved in SSFL struggle for 23 years

Margery Brown
involved in SSFL struggle for 6 years

Core SSFL Activists

Dawn Kowalski
involved in SSFL struggle for 23 years

Dorri Raskin
involved in SSFL struggle for 23 years

George and Eleanore Rembaum
involved in SSFL struggle for 23 years

Jeanne Londe
involved in SSFL struggle for 23 years

Denise Duffield
involved in SSFL struggle for 8 years

Cindi Gortner
involved in SSFL struggle for 3 years

Eric Estrin
involved in SSFL struggle for 3 years

cc:
Cal-EPA Secretary Matthew Rodriguez
Cal-EPA Deputy Secretary Miriam Ingenito
OPR Director Ken Alex
Congressman Elton Gallegly
Congressman Brad Sherman
Senator Fran Pavley
Assemblymember Julia Brownley
Assemblymember Bob Blumenfield
Assemblymember Betsy Butler
Supervisor Zev Yaroslavsky
Supervisor Michael Antonovich
Supervisor Linda Parks
Supervisor Peter Foy