
Independent Review Panel

DEPARTMENT OF TOXIC SUBSTANCES CONTROL

Gideon Kracov, J.D., *Chair*
Mike Vizzier, *Vice Chair*
Dr. Arezoo Campbell, *Member*



Edmund G. Brown Jr.
Governor

Independent Review Panel Meeting Minutes May 12, 2016

1. Call to Order

Vice Chair Mike Vizzier called the meeting to order at 10:01 a.m. in the Byron Sher Room of the CalEPA Building, 1001 I Street, Sacramento, CA.

Panel members present: Vice Chair Vizzier and Member Arezoo Campbell. A quorum was declared.

2. Welcome and Introductions

Vice Chair Vizzier introduced himself, announced that Chair Gideon Kracov's flight was delayed, and said he would be chairing meeting until the chair arrived. He asked the Panel members and Deputy Attorney General Deborah Barnes to introduce themselves. Vice Chair Vizzier then led the Panel in the Pledge of Allegiance.

3. Announcements

Vice Chair Vizzier announced that there would be no translation service for this meeting because no member of the public requested the service in advance of the meeting. Vice Chair Vizzier noted that there would be public comment under the General Public Comment agenda item and all other agenda items. He also announced that the meeting was webcast on the CalEPA website.

4. Agenda Review

Vice Chair Vizzier suggested moving the Closed Session agenda item to the period immediately following lunch. He also suggested that the Chair's Report agenda item be taken up after Closed Session.

5. Minutes of March 9, 2016 and April 6-7, 2016 Meetings

Motion: Approve the minutes of the March 9, 2016 and April 6-7, 2016 meetings. Panel Member Campbell moved. Vice Chair Vizzier seconded. The motion carried unanimously.

6. General Public Comment

IRP Program Analyst Larry Rohlfes mentioned that Denise Duffield of Physicians for Social Responsibility-Los Angeles had submitted a public comment at the April 7, 2016 meeting, but it was not read into the record of that meeting because of time constraints. Legal counsel advised that the comment be summarized in the minutes of the April 7, 2016 meeting and read at this meeting. It was included in the minutes of the April 7, 2016 meeting. However, Ms. Duffield subsequently indicated to IRP Office Technician Erik Erreca that she did not feel it would be necessary to read the comment at this meeting.

The following comments were submitted via email:

McKee Palms requested the IRP's support in stopping the renewal of Quemetco/RSR Inc.'s 2005 hazardous waste facility permit on behalf of the residents and business owners in Avocado Heights, Bassett, City of Industry, Hacienda Heights, La Puente, and North Whittier.

Ms. Duffield stated that Alec Uzameck's comments at the April 7, 2016 meeting do not represent the views of the Santa Susana Field Lab (SSFL) community. She asserted that the IRP should have questioned Mr. Uzameck about the SSFL Community Advisory Group's (CAG) ties to Boeing, its deviance from CAG statute requirements, its \$32,000 funding source, and the veracity of his statements about the cleanup arrangements. She also stated that Mr. Uzameck's assertion that health studies have found no correlation between the SSFL and cancer is false.

Cindy Gortner said she is a mother of three children and a member of the People's Senate who lives near the SSFL. Addressing comments that Mr. Uzameck made on behalf of the SSFL CAG at the April 7, 2016 IRP meeting, she asserted that the CAG is led by individuals who are former employees of Boeing, its predecessors, and contractors. She also stated that the CAG does not seek diverse perspectives and opposes the cleanup agreement. She added that the 2007 consent orders did not "raise the ante" on required cleanup, but rather required cleanup to longstanding DTSC and US EPA guidance.

William Preston Bowling said he lives in the SSFL community and is a member of the People's Senate. He said the 2010 cleanup agreement was prepared by distinguished scientists, contrary to Mr. Uzameck's assertions. He stated that the agreement does not require removing uncontaminated soil, contrary to Mr. Uzameck's claims. He said the rocket test stand, which Mr. Uzameck wants to preserve, is where some of the worst contamination is located. He said Native American artifacts and endangered plants are protected by the cleanup agreement. Instead of working to protect nearby communities, he said DTSC is dedicating considerable resources to helping the responsible parties evade their cleanup commitments. Finally, he asserted that the failure of the IRP to ask critical questions of Mr. Uzameck diminishes public confidence in the Panel.

Liza Tucker of Consumer Watchdog asked why DTSC didn't use the approach developed in its enforcement actions against SA Recycling and Sims Metals with other large metal shredders and facilities, such as Exide and Quemetco, that she said emit hazardous waste particulate matter into the atmosphere. She also asked the IRP to explain why DTSC concluded in the information it submitted to the Panel on May 5, 2016 that AB 1075 would not apply to any hazardous waste facility with a current operating permit. She said DTSC has fined Phibro-Tech Inc. numerous times for violations.

Christina Walsh of cleanuprocketdyne.org, savesantasusana.org, childrenofexide.org, and environmentalmonsters.com said she lives at the two-mile mark from the SSFL. She said the cleanup still hasn't begun and that one community group is providing radiological fear mongering while the CAG has become a surrogate for the polluter. She also asserted that the IRP is not sufficiently independent of DTSC and requested an investigation into why the IRP's previous office technician, Mr. Erreca, left the IRP to work for DTSC's executive leadership team and was still helping out with IRP business. She requested a meeting with the IRP to discuss issues involving other members of the SSFL community and herself. She also criticized the slow process of lead paint testing near the former Exide facility and procedural matters regarding DTSC community meetings on the facility.

Chair Kracov joined the meeting at about 10:30 a.m. Vice Chair Vizzier turned the meeting over to the chair at 10:38 a.m.

Chair Kracov introduced himself.

Panel Member Campbell pointed out that the IRP is dedicated to respecting diverse opinions. Members of the public also should be respectful of other opinions and avoid personal attacks. The IRP's wants to listen to all stakeholders and do the best it can possibly do. Let's be respectful and objective, she asked.

8. Staff Report

Mr. Rohlfs reported that he had caught up on generating minutes of past meetings. He said he created tracking documents for IRP information requests of DTSC, recommendations for DTSC, and recommendations for the Governor and Legislature. He said he submitted the IRP's second report to the Governor and the Legislature pursuant to Health & Safety Code Section 57014(f) on April 21, 2016, a few days before the statutory deadline. The report, which includes recommendations on the DTSC's Permitting Program as well as preliminary recommendations on DTSC's site mitigation Brownfields and Environmental Restoration Program, is available on the IRP's website. On that same day, Panel Chair Kracov provided testimony in support of DTSC's budget change proposals at a Senate Budget and Fiscal Review Subcommittee 2 hearing. Senate President Pro Tempore Kevin De Leon came to that hearing to express his support for the Panel's work to date. Mr. Rohlfs reported that he has been working with panel Vice Chair Mike Vizzier on a survey intended to be sent to individuals interested in the panel's work. He also noted that Mr. Erreca has been gathering contact information on those individuals. Finally, he announced that Mr. Erreca was promoted, but was still working for the IRP on a part-time basis. A job announcement went out for an office technician to replace him. The deadline to send applications was May 3, 2016.

9. Presentations on Blood Lead Levels in the Area around Exide Technologies Site

Dr. Gina Solomon, CalEPA deputy secretary for science and health, made a presentation to the IRP on Blood Levels in Young Children: Cumulative Impacts. A Power Point version of Dr. Solomon's presentation, which summarized a recent Department of Public Health (DPH) report entitled "An Analysis of Children's Blood Lead Levels in the Area around the Exide Site," is available at <http://dtsc.ca.gov/GetInvolved/ReviewPanel/upload/Blood-Lead-in-Young-Children-Cumulative-Impacts-Gina-Solomon.pdf>.

Dr. Solomon said that CalEPA asked DPH, which collects blood lead data in children, to provide an analysis of blood lead levels in the facility area. DPH used data from 2012 because that was the first year the department had fully quality controlled data and because Exide was still operating that year. Univariate analysis showed a relationship between blood lead levels and distance from the site. Univariate analysis also showed a relationship between blood lead levels and age of housing. However, multivariate analysis of distance and age of housing found only a very slight, non-statistically significant increase in the probability of high blood lead levels and proximity to the site. This is because housing closer to the site tends to be older. The report concluded that lead comes from many sources and that housing is an important source. Dr. Solomon suggested the following potential actions for DTSC: (1) when families self-identify with higher blood lead levels, prioritize their homes for testing and cleanup; (2) coordinate work to increase resources for lead-based paint hazard controls; and (3) work with a university to convene a group to identify better ways to report, track, and reduce blood lead levels in Los Angeles County.

In response to a question from Panel Member Campbell, Dr. Solomon said that older homes may have been exposed to lead from the Exide facility for a longer period of time and therefore may have been more likely to accumulate ambient contamination. The issue is complicated, she emphasized.

Chair Kracov asked if there is evidence that Exide caused blood lead levels over 15 micrograms of lead per deciliter of blood. Dr. Solomon responded that Los Angeles County did investigations of nine children with elevated blood levels, but it was determined that other factors played a role in those cases.

Chair Kracov asked if it would be helpful to map soil lead levels. Dr. Solomon responded in the affirmative, if there is significant variability in the levels.

Chair Kracov noted that there are several homes in the area that have high lead concentrations in the soil and asked if the Exide facility could be the cause. Dr. Solomon said high concentrations can be caused by gasoline, especially if the properties are near highways, or lead paints.

Chair Kracov asked if DTSC already is prioritizing homes for testing and cleanup when families self-identify with higher blood lead levels. Dr. Solomon responded in the affirmative.

Chair Kracov asked Dr. Solomon if she would be willing to work with the IRP's support staff to suggest recommendations on how DTSC could collaborate more closely with other agencies. Dr. Solomon responded in the affirmative.

Public comment via email:

Ms. Walsh said that spending even one dollar on lead paint testing is to defend Exide, that Dr. Solomon should explain why they never issue a nontechnical version of technical reports, and that the advisory group meeting was held when parents were picking their children up from school. She also asked why they only have 10 access agreements and are only sampling two homes a week. In addition, she complained that her earlier comments were not read in their entirety and requested a meeting with the IRP to discuss personal allegations made against her by members of the public.

Dr. Jill Johnston and Andrea Hricko from the University of Southern California Keck School of Medicine gave a presentation on Moving Beyond “Silos”: Using Data and Collaboration to Protect Public Health. A Power Point version of their presentation is available at: <http://dtsc.ca.gov/GetInvolved/ReviewPanel/upload/Moving-Beyond-Silos-Using-Data-Collaboration-to-Protect-Public-Health-Jill-Johnson-and-Andrea-Hricko-pdf.pdf>.

Dr. Johnston pointed out that several different agencies regulate lead and do not coordinate very well. She then discussed what she believes are limitations of the DPH analysis. DPH only looked at blood lead levels above five micrograms of lead per deciliter. If DPH had included all blood levels, it would have more data to look at, which would allow for more nuance. Labs often have the technology to do better than that, but the convention is to report only blood lead levels above five micrograms of lead per deciliter. It does not appear that blood lead levels are routinely geocoded or reported spatially. Not all children are examined for blood lead levels. For example, children with private health insurance may not be examined. They don't have the actual blood levels of children who have blood lead levels above or below five micrograms of lead per deciliter; they only have the percentage of children with blood levels above or below five micrograms of lead per deciliter. 2012 is only one year of data. Because older homes are closer to the Exide facility, it is hard to make conclusions about how distance from the site and age of home affect one another, especially since it isn't exactly known how the data were modeled. Also, the DPH analysis doesn't take into account wind patterns. She recommended the following: (1) increase the years in the DPH analysis, (2) use three micrograms of lead per deciliter as the cut off point for comparison, (3) consider wind direction and risk isopleths, (4) restrict sample to children most at risk (under three years old), and (5) use block-level rather than census-track resolution. She also suggested that spatial soil lead data be used, in part because of the limitations of blood-lead data.

Ms. Hricko recommended a state lead taskforce. California should review best practices in other states and improve methods to share information between departments. Currently there are problems even within departments, such as databases that don't talk to one another. The state also should be monitoring workers, who she said were largely ignored when it came to the Exide facility experience. Cal OSHA does test for blood levels, but there are problems with the way it collects that information. Worker blood lead levels should be used to identify potential community “hot spots” for exposure. All labs should be reporting the names and addresses of employers of workers' blood lead data to DPH. DPH should inform county health departments about problem companies and ensure that counties examine all children of workers with high blood lead levels. The Cal OSHA lead standard is outdated. DTSC needs to make sure it isn't impacting the inside of homes when doing exterior cleanup. Ms. Hricko also expressed concern about the health of cleanup workers.

Vice Chair Vizzier commented that lead is ubiquitous and there is a lot of data on it. Ms. Hricko agreed, but said the big problem is that different agencies are not pooling that data.

Panel Member Campbell said the top priority should be mapping, especially in areas where lead is or was used for production. This would allow state agencies to be more proactive.

Panel Member Campbell asked if there is a need for one central lab. Dr. Johnston said that protocols could address the need for standardization.

Panel Member Campbell asked about testing adults. Dr. Johnston said blood lead levels in adults aren't routinely tested, except occupationally. Ms. Hricko said one of the fears DPH has about

revealing the names of employers is that it doesn't want them to fear the testing. Legislative solutions may be needed to test more children, change lab reporting regulations, and allow the state's two blood lead level databases, one of which is for children, and the other of which is for workers, to talk to one another. She also pointed out that lead won't show up in the blood of an adult if the person was exposed to it as a child. The lead would be in the person's bones, but no longer in the blood. She added that the vehicles and homes of Exide cleanup workers should be checked.

Chair Kracov asked Dr. Johnston and Ms. Hricko if they would support a recommendation to consider blood lead levels above five micrograms per deciliter to be elevated in children. Dr. Johnston responded in the affirmative.

Chair Kracov asked Dr. Johnston and Ms. Hricko if they would support a recommendation to report blood lead levels above one microgram per deciliter. Dr. Johnston responded in the affirmative.

Vice Chair Vizzier questioned whether the IRP should be making public health recommendations.

Chair Kracov asked Dr. Johnston and Ms. Hricko if they would support a recommendation to test all children, not just those on Medi-Cal. Ms. Johnston responded in the affirmative.

Chair Kracov asked Dr. Johnston and Ms. Hricko if they would support a recommendation to strengthen employer reporting of blood lead levels. Ms. Johnston responded in the affirmative.

Chair Kracov asked Dr. Johnston and Ms. Hricko if they would be willing to submit written recommendations to IPR support staff. Dr. Johnston responded in the affirmative.

Chair Kracov asked Dr. Johnston and Ms. Hricko if extremely high lead levels in soil can be caused only by paint and gasoline. Ms. Hricko responded that it is important to take separate samples rather than composite samples from a front yard. Neighboring properties also should be looked at to see if there is a similar pattern. Dr. Johnston added that if you find elevated levels throughout a front yard, then the cause likely is not from paint or gasoline alone, except near freeways in the case of gasoline.

In response to a question from Vice Chair Vizzier, Dr. Johnson said she has not seen the soil lead data. Ms. Hricko said the data has not been released.

Ms. Hricko suggested that DPH partner with a university to analyze the data in a more rapid fashion. She said it took six months for DPH to produce the analysis of children's blood lead levels in the area around the Exide site for DTSC.

Public comments via email:

Ms. Walsh said the 50 years of discharging lead into the air should be focus.

Jane Williams of California's Communities Against Toxics asked what plans CalEPA has to map the soil lead concentrations in the area surrounding the Exide facility.

Ms. Walsh said that if the area surrounding Exide were a rich community like Porter Ranch, pregnant women would be relocated.

Ms. Tucker said DTSC failed to use a particulate sampling technology with Exide that it successfully used to help prosecute a metal shredder: SA Recycling. She asked about DTSC's policy on the use of this lead fingerprinting technology.

Chris Romanini, a resident of Buttonwillow, asked why Clean Harbors is operating with an expired permit. She said trucks going to the facility are passing by the school in the town fairly often, even though they are supposed to use other roads, and nobody is monitoring this traffic. A new permit for the facility should require Clean Harbors to monitor trucks. The required tree windbreak is insufficient.

Chair Kracov thanked Dr. Johnston and Ms. Hricko and asked them to tailor their recommendations for DTSC and not DPH.

Chair Kracov adjourned the meeting for lunch at 12:45 p.m. and reconvened it at 1:20 p.m.

14. Closed Session

Chair Kracov adjourned the meeting for closed session at 1:22 p.m. to discuss personnel and litigation matters.

15. Reconvene and Report Out on Closed Session

Chair Kracov reconvened the meeting at approximately 1:37 p.m.

Ms. Barnes announced that there were no reports out of Closed Session.

12. IRP Reporting Requirements

Chair Kracov asked Ms. Barnes if it would be appropriate for the IRP to make a supplemental recommendation to the Legislature on the DTSC Spring Finance Letters. Ms. Barnes responded that the IRP has the ability to send a supplemental submission for budgetary purposes.

Chair Kracov asked DTSC Director Barbara Lee to discuss the department's Spring Finance Letters.

Director Lee summarized the five budget change proposals.

The Panel agreed to formally recommend support for all five proposals.

Chair Kracov instructed Mr. Rohlfs to submit a letter of IRP support for the five proposals. The letter should mention that the Panel already has submitted recommendations to the Governor and the Legislature to: (1) fund necessary permanent positions to achieve the goal of making 16 permit decisions a year and processing 90 percent of permit decisions in a two-year period or less; and (2) provide position authority and funding to strengthen the role of the DTSC assistant director of environmental justice and tribal affairs. In the context of expressing support for the request to convert five positions from limited-term to permanent positions for ongoing strategic program

development, the letter should mention that the Legislature should ensure that DTSC's strategic program development process is transparent, with a role for external DTSC stakeholders, and done in collaboration with a defined role for the IRP.

Director Lee suggested a DTSC presentation to the IRP in August or September on the department labs that would include a lab tour for the Panel and public in either Berkeley or Pasadena.

7. Chair Report

Chair Kracov acknowledged that Mr. Erreca had accepted another job in the department and thanked him for his IRP service.

Chair Kracov noted that DTSC's deputy director of the Hazardous Waste Management Program, Elise Rothschild, will be leaving the department.

Chair Kracov reported that he had some good discussions recently with DTSC Chief Deputy Director Francesca Negri and other department staff members.

Chair Kracov said he would like to give the DTSC director the opportunity on a regular basis to report to the IRP on the department's many accomplishments.

Panel Member Campbell added that she would like IRP meetings to be a place for the director to tell the public about all of the positive things that are happening with the DTSC.

Chair Kracov mentioned that the DTSC is planning a survey of department staff and asked Director Lee to discuss it.

Director Lee said that an employee task force, the DTSC Organizational Culture Task Group, would be working on the survey and hiring a contractor by the end of the summer to develop it. She said she would be happy to have this contractor hear Panel concerns and try to address those concerns in the survey.

Chair Kracov responded that the IRP has been talking about conducting its own survey of DTSC staff members, but that it may make sense to work with the DTSC project instead.

Public comment via email:

Ms. Walsh congratulated Mr. Erreca on his promotion, but questioned why emails intended for the IRP were still going to him and said the IRP is supposed to be independent of the DTSC. She said the IRP is not independent and therefore has no believability.

10. DTSC Presentation on Enforcement Program

Ms. Rothschild introduced the presentation on DTSC's Enforcement Program, a Power Point version of which can be found on the IRP website at: https://www.dtsc.ca.gov/GetInvolved/ReviewPanel/upload/IRP_Enforcement_Presentation.pdf.

Keith Kihara, chief of the DTSC Enforcement and Emergency Response Division (EERD), then gave an overview of the division and its work.

Chair Kracov asked Mr. Kihara if he is satisfied with sending operators the inspection reports within 65 days of an inspection about 90 percent of the time. Mr. Kihara said DTSC could always do better, but 90 percent is a pretty good percentage to hit. Director Lee pointed out that there are reasons why some reports take longer than 65 days, as some are very complicated. DTSC is currently going through a process of identifying the legitimate reasons for reports that take longer.

Chair Kracov noted that there were only 10 referrals to a district attorney or attorney general from January 1, 2014 to April 1, 2016. Director Lee responded that not all inspections uncover a violation and not all violations result in a referral. The system is set up to make the best use of time in the courts.

Vice Chair Vizzier asked if there is informal enforcement. Mr. Kihara said the only situation where a violation would not be written up would be if it could be corrected immediately during the inspection. He said he encourages his staff to cite all violations because then a record exists of the violation.

Chair Kracov said that based on EERD inspection enforcement data for permitted facilities between January 1, 2014 and April 1, 2016 that DTSC submitted to the IRP in response to an information request, there were only about \$5,000 in fines.

Chair Kracov asked a clarifying question about a statement pertaining to the time taken for return to compliance in a document entitled Enforcement and Emergency Response Division Compliance CY 2014-April 1, 2016 that DTSC submitted to the IRP in response to an information request. Mr. Kihara said he would have to look at the document to properly answer the question.

Mr. Kihara said DTSC has a 240-day metric for return to compliance because US EPA has guidance requiring formal enforcement at that point. However, in California these facilities would already be in the queue for formal enforcement, and therefore this metric is not very important. He added that some metrics were used historically, but may not measure actual performance. Director Lee added that if formal enforcement doesn't begin because DTSC is still building a case, then it makes sense to wait more than 240 days. DTSC's Enforcement Performance Management Branch (EPMB) is just beginning its in-depth examination of what can be improved, much like DTSC previously looked at the Permitting Program. This is a data-driven exercise that will take some time to complete and find out what is really going on.

Panel Member Campbell agreed that the numbers in the presentation are not really descriptive of the process.

Ms. Rothschild added that the numbers are especially misleading because of the timeframes.

Mr. Kihara commented that DTSC isn't even at the point of performing analysis yet.

Chair Kracov asked if the CalEPA response to the most recent deficiency progress update report from the Los Angeles City Certified Unified Program Agency (CUPA) has been completed yet. The

DTSC presenters responded that they did not know. Ms. Rothschild said the report would be posted on the CalEPA website.

Chair Kracov asked what percentage of inspections are devoted to the permitted hazardous waste facilities versus inspections of other operations. Mr. Kihara estimated that the ratio is about 50-50.

Ms. Barnes left the meeting at 4 p.m.

Chair Kracov adjourned the meeting at 4:12 p.m. and reconvened it at 4:26 p.m.

DTSC chief investigator for the Office of Criminal Investigations (OCI) Hansen Pang next discussed OCI and its work.

DTSC Environmental Program Manager Antonia Becker next discussed the Metal Recyclers Enforcement Initiative.

Chair Kracov mentioned that the IRP has received letters from State of California Auto Dismantlers Association that say the organization wants to create a level playing field in the auto dismantling industry by getting rid of unlicensed and otherwise bad actor competitors.

Ms. Rothschild responded that DTSC has had preliminary meetings with association representatives, heard their concerns, and asked for more information. Director Lee clarified that DTSC doesn't coordinate with industry when it comes to inspections. Inspections are done on a surprise basis.

Vice Chair Vizzier said auto dismantling inspections are largely a CUPA responsibility.

Mr. Pang then continued the presentation on the OCI.

Taryn Stokell Buck, DTSC senior environmental scientist, next discussed the Lean Six Sigma Program Referral Improvement Process Initiative.

Chair Kracov asked why only five criminal cases were referred between January 1, 2016 and April 1, 2016, when DTSC has funding for 33 OCI employees. Vice Chair Vizzier added that DTSC's performance metrics on ongoing cases could be read to imply that the department is taking a lot of cases and not doing anything with them. Director Lee responded that DTSC may suspect a criminal case, but a crime may not have occurred or the department may not be able to prove it. A case may start out as a criminal investigation, but not end up that way. She also said that DTSC cleared out a number of cases at one point, partly because the statute of limitations ran out. Vice Chair Vizzier added that no enforcement action by DTSC could be viewed as a failure to act or, conversely, DTSC should be congratulated on cleaning up and closing cases that should have been closed earlier. Ms. Rothschild replied that the latter is exactly what happened.

Chair Kracov said the Panel had to leave the rest of the Enforcement Program presentation for another day because of time constraints at this meeting.

Chair Kracov suggested that the IRP devote most of the next meeting to this topic and try to get to a better understanding of the metrics.

Chair Kracov asked Panel members to forward questions to Mr. Rohlfes in advance of the next meeting and for Mr. Rohlfes to aggregate and forward them to DTSC.

Director Lee agreed that it would be helpful for her staff to hear from the Panel what questions they have about the Enforcement Program and what they would like to measure.

11. Organizational, Operational, and Administrative Matters

The Panel discussed the support staff's tracking documents on information requests and recommendations.

Chair Kracov and Panel Member Campbell suggested color coding the documents.

Vice Chair Vizzier suggested prioritizing the items at some point.

Chair Kracov agreed that there were so many recommendations in the April 21, 2016 report that at some point they become less meaningful.

The Panel discussed the support staff's contact list.

Mr. Erreca reported that gathering the contact information on about 60 individuals was nearly completed.

The Panel discussed the draft survey intended for the individuals on the contact list.

Panel Member Campbell said the survey should be more focused and that the Panel should discuss how to accomplish that at a future meeting.

Chair Kracov suggested that asking about the second biggest challenge for DTSC could be deleted from the survey draft.

Chair Kracov suggested that the survey mention the six topics in the IRP work plan and ask the survey respondents what they think of each topic.

Panel Member Campbell suggested that the respondents be asked to indicate how DTSC is doing on each of these topics on a scale of 1 to 10.

Chair Kracov asked Vice Chair Vizzier to continue working with Mr. Rohlfes on the survey.

13. Future Meeting Schedule and Agenda Items

The Panel decided to hold its next meeting on June 8, 2016 in Sacramento.

The Panel agreed to devote most of the meeting to a continuation of discussions on the Enforcement Program. The Panel also agreed to invite a community group to make a presentation on the Kettleman Hills facility and Kettleman City and to discuss the IRP budget and the survey intended for individuals on the IRP contact list.

The Panel decided to hold its July 2016 meeting on July 13.

Chair Kracov asked Mr. Erreca to find meeting rooms for both meetings.

16. Adjournment

Motion: Adjourn meeting. Vice Chair Vizzier moved. Panel Member Campbell seconded. The motion carried unanimously.

Chair Kracov adjourned the meeting at 5:30 p.m.