

---

# 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 July 13, 2016

### 1. Call to Order

Chair Gideon Kracov called the meeting to order at 9:01 a.m. at the Department of Toxic Substances Control's Sacramento Regional Office at 8800 Cal Center Drive, Sacramento, CA.

Panel members present: Chair Gideon Kracov, Vice Chair Mike Vizzier, and Member Arezoo Campbell. A quorum was declared. Chair Kracov introduced himself and asked Vice Chair Vizzier and Panel Member Campbell to introduce themselves.

Chair Gideon Kracov led the Panel in the Pledge of Allegiance.

### 2. Welcome and Introductions

Chair Kracov asked the following individuals to introduce themselves: IRP Program Analyst Larry Rohlfes, new IRP Office Technician Mike Singh, and the IRP's new legal counsel, Deputy Attorney General Russell Hildreth.

### 3. Announcements

Chair Kracov announced that there would be no translation service for this meeting because no member of the public requested the service in advance. He noted that there would be public comment under the General Public Comment agenda item and all other agenda items. He announced that the meeting was webcast on the CalEPA website and gave out the email address for members of the public to submit comments via email.

### 4. Agenda Review

Chair Kracov reviewed the agenda and said he was not planning on going into Closed Session.

## **5. Minutes of June 8, 2016 Meeting**

Chair Kracov requested one change to the draft minutes for the June 8, 2016 meeting. He suggested that the word “inspections” be changed to the word “actions” in the third line on Page 8.

The Panel agreed to approve the minutes of the June 8, 2016 meeting with the change suggested by Chair Kracov.

## **6. General Public Comment**

Public comment via email:

Lisa Lappin said she works in Paramount, a community impacted by Carlton Forge Works. She stated that 525 individuals requested comprehensive testing and cleanup after Paramount was informed by the Southern California Air Quality Management District that Carlton Forge Works had emitted excessive levels of toxic metals, but the investigation was not as comprehensive as requested. She said Vice Chair Vizzier showed lack of empathy for impacted residents when he stated at the previous meeting that the IRP should not consider their input. She also expressed concern that DTSC declined to comply with an IRP request to respond to the People’s Senate 2015 site-specific concerns.

## **7. Chair Report**

Chair Kracov thanked DTSC for giving the IRP a great deal of information since the previous meeting, all of which was posted on the Panel’s website and available in printed copies at the meeting.

He announced that Antoinette (Tony) Cordero had been appointed DTSC Hazardous Waste Management Program Deputy Director to replace Elise Rothschild.

Chair Kracov reported that he had spoken to DTSC Chief Deputy Director Francesca and DTSC Administrative Services Deputy Director Andrew Collada about staff organizational excellence issues. He commented that the people at the department matter the most when it comes to its performance. He added that he was looking forward to DTSC’s upcoming staff survey and encouraged the department’s staff to reach out to the IRP and himself personally. He invited Ms. Negri to update the IRP on the department’s efforts to achieve organizational excellence.

Ms. Negri reported on the formation of the Cultural Awareness Task Group and the plans for an organizational health diagnostic, including the staff survey. She said she could provide the IRP with a report on those efforts before the end of the year. DTSC may have analytics from the survey in early 2017, she said.

Public comment via email:

Cynthia Babich of the Del Amo Action Committee expressed appreciation for the IRP’s dedication.

## 8. Staff Report

Mr. Rohlfs reported that he is waiting for DTSC to open an account with Survey Monkey to send out the IRP-approved survey questions to its contact list.

He also gave a report on pending legislation pertaining to DTSC.

Vice Chair Vizzier suggested that IRP support staff give the IRP a write-up on future pending legislation.

Chair Kracov recognized Amelia Glickman, DTSC's new chief counsel with its Office of Legal Affairs.

***Chair Kracov adjourned the meeting for a break at 9:56 a.m. and reconvened it at 10:01 a.m.***

## 9. Presentation on CalEPA's New Environmental Compliant System

Nilan Watmore, special assistant at CalEPA, provided an update on the agency's new Environmental Complaint Tracking System. A Power Point version of the presentation is available on the IRP website at [https://www.dtsc.ca.gov/GetInvolved/ReviewPanel/IRP\\_supporting.cfm](https://www.dtsc.ca.gov/GetInvolved/ReviewPanel/IRP_supporting.cfm).

Mr. Watmore said the new system provides better information from complaints, coordinated government investigation and response, better tracking of complaints, and improved communication with the complainants. Among other things, it is mobile-friendly and has GPS location capability, and users can attach photos as well as have the option to turn the entire form into Spanish.

Complainants can file anonymously. However, they are told they may not receive follow-up on the investigation in that case. If complainants opt in for email follow-up, they receive a confirmation email, a 15-day status email, and a closure email.

The system, which was launched about three months prior to the July 13 IRP meeting, had received 502 complaints to date, of which 195 were marked as involving "Toxics." Of the complaints marked "Toxics," 129 were referred to Certified Unified Program Agencies (CUPAs).

In response to a question from Panel Member Campbell, Mr. Watmore said participating agencies do not have the capability to access the internal backend system, but a future phase of the system is expected to provide that capability. He also said CalEPA is considering future upgrades that would allow the public to access information about a specific complaint as well as a map that would illustrate complaint clusters.

In response to a question from Panel Member Vizzier, Mr. Watmore said that the system does not currently interface with Identifying Violations Affecting Neighborhoods (IVAN), but is expected have that capability in a future phase.

In response to a question from Chair Kracov, Mr. Watmore said that CalEPA routes complaints to designated staff at each participating board, department, or other agency entity as appropriate, based on the complaint.

In response to another question from Chair Kracov, Mr. Watmore said that each CalEPA board, department, or other entity has a relationship with the CUPAs and is responsible for making them accountable. It is CalEPA's responsibility to hold DTSC and the other agency entities accountable.

## **10. Presentation on CUPAs**

Jim Bohon, CalEPA assistant secretary for local program coordination and emergency response, provided an overview of the Unified Hazardous Waste and Hazardous Regulatory Management Program, and Maria Soria, DTSC environmental program manager, provided an overview of the department's role in the CUPA evaluations. Power Point versions of their presentations are available on the IRP website at [https://www.dtsc.ca.gov/GetInvolved/ReviewPanel/IRP\\_supporting.cfm](https://www.dtsc.ca.gov/GetInvolved/ReviewPanel/IRP_supporting.cfm).

Mr. Bohon explained that the CUPAs have the responsibility and the authority to implement programs locally. CalEPA has oversight authority. DTSC, the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB), the Office of Emergency Services (OES), and the Office of State Fire Marshal (OSFM) set and interpret program standards in their respective issue areas.

Vice Chair Vizzier asked Mr. Rohlfes to correct a statement in a document that the vice chair submitted for the meeting entitled IRP Questions of DTSC Enforcement Program Related to the Certified Unified Program Agencies (CUPAs) and CalEPA. In addressing the question of whether the CUPAs will enter 90 percent of large quantity generator information into the California Environmental Reporting System (CERS) by September of 2016, the document stated that in May of 2016 there were 179,831 facilities in CERS and that 12,968 facilities made submittals. Vice Chair Vizzier said the document should instead say that in May of 2016 there were 179,831 facilities in CERS, which included several thousand duplicates, and that the actual number was about 164,000. He asked that a revised version of his document be posted on the IRP website.

In response to a question from Chair Kracov, Mr. Bohon said that CUPAs are entering inspection and enforcement information for 90 percent of their large quantity hazardous waste generators into CERS, the web-based, CalEPA system that must now be used to report this information.

Mr. Bohon pointed out that California's serious violation rate has been about the same for the past 10 years and is about half the national average.

Mr. Bohon explained that CalEPA leads a team made up of senior staff from DTSC, OES, SWRCB, and OSFM to evaluate each CUPA triennially. Seventy-one CUPAs are currently rated satisfactory or better and 10 are considered unsatisfactory.

In response to a question from Chair Kracov, Mr. Bohon said that if a CUPA is not making satisfactory progress after an unsatisfactory evaluation, they pull in the political leadership of the jurisdiction and negotiate a Program Improvement Agreement.

Mr. Bohon argued that the program is effective. As evidence he said that the percentage of hazmat spills as a percent of facilities has been dropping since 2008, and the release rate for underground storage tanks has been lower than the national average for approximately the last 10 years.

Mr. Bohon added that CalEPA will be introducing a new tool in the fall, CalEnviroView, which will gather inspection, violation, collection, and facility information from CERS, EnviroStor, and other sources. It is part of CalEPA's long-term program to be transparent.

In response to a question from Vice Chair Vizzier, Mr. Bohon said he would be willing to make a presentation to the IRP on CalEnviroView in the fall.

Ms. Soria covered the resources that DTSC provides to the CUPA evaluation process: technical assistance, document development, participation in committees and regional meetings, and participation in the evaluations.

Public comments via email:

Ms. Babich of the Del Amo Action Committee stated that the Los Angeles CUPAs are not doing proper inspections and that the recent manganese fire in Maywood was the result.

Robina Suwol of California Safe Schools asked if the Los Angeles City Fire Department CUPA's deficiencies mentioned in a February 27, 2015 CalEPA letter to Los Angeles City Council President Herb Wesson have been corrected and, if not, what protocols/timeframes were in place to do so.

Vice Chair Vizzier said it was his opinion that the Unified Program is extremely effective, even though some CUPAs are not meeting standards, and that other states are very envious of California.

Panel Member Campbell asked a clarifying question about overlapping authority to inspect. Mr. Bohon responded that DTSC has the authority to inspect all facilities, even though that authority may be delegated to the CUPAs for certain types of facilities, such as hazardous waste generators.

Panel Member Campbell asked if there is a need to conduct inspections of hazardous waste generators more than every three years. Mr. Bohon responded that the national standard is to inspect the large hazardous waste generators every five years, while in California all hazardous waste generators are inspected every three years.

Chair Kracov asked if there are lessons to be learned from the fire incident in Maywood. Mr. Bohon responded that the fire was a hazardous materials issue, not a hazardous waste issue, and the chemical on the site was not regulated. The fire department initially put water on the fire. Once they realized it was a metal fire, they backed off and sought advice from the CUPA and DTSC. This was the appropriate action. Whether the state should regulate solid metals as a hazardous material is a complex question. It was unfortunate that the fire department didn't initially recognize that it was a metal fire, but it is fully engaged in learning from the experience. Fire departments should participate in determining whether or not solid metals should be regulated.

Chair Kracov asked Mr. Bohon how the CUPAs are doing on their inspection frequencies. Mr. Bohon responded that the CUPAs generally meet inspection requirements. However, they are having trouble doing so and meeting new electronic reporting requirements at the same time. Adding staff to remedy this problem is not easy. To add staff they need to raise fees on businesses, and this is especially difficult to do when the need may be temporary. Where there is some falloff is with the small quantity generators. The City of Los Angeles is operating with a Program Improvement Agreement and turning in quarterly reports very punctually. Oakland, on the other hand, did not

make satisfactory progress, and CalEPA took away its authority in January of 2015, giving it to Alameda County. Long Beach also is rated unsatisfactory and has a problem that essentially is one of internal organization.

Chair Kracov asked Mr. Bohon if he knew whether the CUPAs would be achieving the U.S. EPA Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) Grant 80 percent return to compliance goal by September of 2016. Mr. Bohon responded that he did not have a good sense from current CERS data about whether that goal would be met. He clarified that the job of meeting it is a CUPA-CalEPA responsibility rather than a DTSC job.

***Chair Kracov adjourned the meeting for a break at 12:02 p.m. and reconvened it at 12:07 p.m.***

#### **11. Presentation on DTSC's Border Inspection Team**

Ms. Cordero introduced herself to the IRP at the invitation of the chair. She said she would begin working officially on August 8 and hoped to fully integrate environmental justice into the department's culture.

DTSC Senior Environmental Scientist Alfredo Rios gave the IRP an overview of California/Mexico hazardous waste inspections. A Power Point version of his presentation is available on the IRP website at [https://www.dtsc.ca.gov/GetInvolved/ReviewPanel/IRP\\_supporting.cfm](https://www.dtsc.ca.gov/GetInvolved/ReviewPanel/IRP_supporting.cfm).

Mr. Rios explained that the maquiladoras must send their hazardous waste to the U.S. except for waste that can be recycled in Mexico. He said that northbound trucks are increasingly crossing the Arizona border rather than the California border because Arizona does not inspect that traffic. Mr. Rios also explained that Mexico accepts hazardous waste from the U.S. for recycling, but not for landfilling. DTSC does northbound and southbound inspections.

***Chair Kracov adjourned the meeting for a lunch break at 1 p.m. and reconvened it at 1:45 p.m.***

#### **6. General Public Comment, Continued**

Public comments via email:

Ms. Babich asked if inspection frequency should be based on what the rest of the country is doing.

Rosanna Esperanza said she was a resident of Kern County and that her family, friends, and colleagues were subjected to a daily dose of toxicity and pollution generated by multiple global industries there. She said she disagreed with a statement made by Vice Chair Vizzier at the previous meeting that the Panel should not be looking into specific sites.

Jane Williams of California Communities Against Toxics said she was still unclear about the role that CalEPA and DTSC have in the oversight of the CUPAs. After noting that when the fire department responded to the recent Maywood fire, it did not have knowledge of the presence of magnesium and doused the fire with water, she said the business plans that are required to be submitted to the CUPAs are supposed to include this information. She said it is imperative that the deficiencies in the

Los Angeles CUPA be rectified and that the draft report does not seem to have specific recommendations to improve the performance of CUPAs or their oversight. *(This comment inadvertently was not read into the record during the meeting.)*

Public comments by individuals attending meeting in person:

Ingrid Brostrom of the Center on Race, Poverty, and the Environment (CRPE) said she did not believe the IRP was moving too broadly as far as its authority goes and that she expected the Panel to look into specific sites as it gathers evidence to support its recommendations. Ms. Brostrom also said she did not believe the IRP should view its role as one of supporting the DTSC director. Rather, the emphasis should be on making the DTSC better. Finally, she expressed disappointment that DTSC had not responded in writing to the People's Senate 2015 site-specific concerns as requested by the IRP.

Mr. Rohlfs reported that DTSC informed him the previous day that it will be responding in writing to the People's Senate 2015 site-specific concerns by mid-August of 2016.

DTSC Director Barbara Lee clarified that one of the information requests marked overdue on the status of IRP information requests tracking document as of July 11, 2016 probably should be marked as having been fulfilled. The requested summary of various DTSC reporting mechanisms to other agencies was provided to Vice Chair Vizzier in the form of information for the draft recommendations for the Governor and Legislature due on July 26, 2016.

## **12. IRP Reporting Requirements**

Vice Chair Vizzier summarized the draft 90-day report to the Governor and the Legislature that was due on July 26, 2016. He said his overall perspective was that DTSC is working diligently on its Enforcement Improvement Workplan and had not yet completed its review of the inspection and enforcement program. Once it does that, the department will have recommendations and metrics. Vice Chair Vizzier also said he relied heavily on metrics that DTSC already reports to U.S. EPA.

Public comment via email:

Ms. Babich stated that the IRP should stop studying the situation and make firm and clear recommendations. She also said that if California standards are higher than national standards, they should not be lowered.

Public comment in person:

Ms. Brostrom said that striving to meet national averages is not the right approach. DTSC's targets were already higher than the national averages. However, she said she went through EnviroStor and determined that DTSC had not meet its inspection targets in recent years. She asserted that some of the targets should be increased, particularly those located in environmental justice communities. She pointed out that the RCRA Grant set a target of at least 50 percent of all compliance monitoring activities in high-risk, disproportionately exposed communities, as determined by CalEnviroScreen, but that DTSC had not met this target. In response to a question from a Panel member, she said that

the biggest enforcement problem to address is the long period of time that some facilities take to return to compliance after an enforcement order.

Public comment via email:

Penny J. Newman of the Center for Community Action and Environmental Justice (CCA EJ) expressed support for the comments submitted by CRPE in its July 12, 2016 letter to the IRP. She stated that the draft report read like a regurgitation of the responses CCA EJ previously had seen from DTSC. *(This comment inadvertently was not read into the record during the meeting.)*

DTSC Environmental Program Manager Keith Kihara responded to Ms. Brostrom's comments by noting that DTSC dropped several of the federal facilities mentioned in the CRPE letter from its inspection schedule last year because they were inspected by US EPA Region Nine.

Director Lee responded to Ms. Brostrom's comments by pointing out that DTSC provided the IRP with information for FY 2015-16 only, while the information in the CRPE letter goes back several years. She also pointed out that EnviroStor may not be up to date with activity in all facilities. She said she had asked her staff to review the information submitted by Ms. Brostrom, but this work would take some time.

Mr. Kihara pointed out that the federal law stipulates maximum penalties higher than the maximum penalty suggested in the draft report and also provides for an inflation adjustment. He suggested that any IRP recommendation follow the federal model.

Public comments via email:

An individual with an email address containing the words "mckee palms" said that DTSC enforcement does not respond to formal complaints. The message stated that companies near the Quemetco facility were replacing soils with high lead levels and that DTSC doesn't know where the contaminated soils are being dumped.

Ms. Babich expressed her opinion that the IRP was making a lot of progress at this meeting.

#### Report Narrative

The IRP agreed to change the draft report to mention permitting before site mitigation in the discussion of the April 21, 2016 report in the introduction section.

The IRP agreed to state in the report that the inspection data that DTSC provided the previous day in a document entitled Department of Toxic Substances Control Enforcement Program Performance FY 2015-16 are not clear on what the targets were and do not provide a long-term picture, especially for inspections of permitted hazardous waste facilities. In addition, the IRP agreed to state in the report that this information is not readily accessible or understood by the public.

The IRP agreed to mention in the report that DTSC made a presentation to the IRP on its border inspections at the July 13, 2016 meeting.

The IRP agreed to include a statement in the report indicating that CalEPA made a presentation to the IRP on its Environmental Complaint System at the July 13, 2016 meeting and that the new system appears to be a big improvement over the previous one.

The IRP agreed to clarify in the report that the CalEPA Environmental Complaint system does not yet include complaints from the IVAN network.

The IRP agreed to express concern in the paragraph on the DTSC investigations that the department does not regularly publish Office of Criminal Investigations (OCI) case statistics and that this information should be transparent to the public.

The IRP agreed to add a statement that OCI recently was restructured.

The IRP agreed to mention in the report that CalEPA made a presentation to the Panel on the CUPA evaluation process at this meeting and that the agency expects the CUPAs to have entered inspection and enforcement information for 90 percent of their large quantity generators into CERS by the fall of 2016.

**Motion:** Delete the paragraph in the draft report on toxics in packaging. Panel Member Campbell moved. Chair Kracov seconded. The motion carried unanimously.

The IRP agreed to note in the report that DTSC did not finalize the Improving Enforcement Performance Workplan by the date indicated in the department's 2015 budget change proposal for the work plan because Director Lee subsequently decided to use a different, more comprehensive process than originally envisioned. The report also should communicate that one of the advantages of the modified process is that it allows DTSC to begin making clearly needed improvements while the planning is still underway. Finally, it should state that Director Lee has indicated that she expects to accomplish all of the work plan goals by June of 2017, the original target date.

The IRP agreed that the paragraph on efficiency and effectiveness should be edited to indicate that the goals for managing OCI and Emergency and Enforcement Response Division (EERD) cases should refer to a certain number of days from the dates that the violations were determined.

The IRP agreed to delete the chart illustrations from the U.S. EPA Enforcement and Compliance History Online (ECHO) system dashboard in the draft report and instead characterize the content and significance of the charts in regular text.

The IRP agreed to state in the last paragraph of the narrative that the IRP believes DTSC should strive to lead the nation in enforcement performance.

***Chair Kracov adjourned the meeting for a break at 4:06 p.m. and reconvened it at 4:10 p.m.***

#### Recommendations to the Governor and Legislature to Improve Enforcement

The IRP agreed to change the first recommendation in the draft report to recommend that inspection frequencies be specified in statute for permitted hazardous waste treatment, storage, and disposal facilities as well as hazardous waste generators. The IRP also agreed to add risk of toxicity to the list of factors that should influence statutorily mandated inspection frequencies.

The IRP agreed to support AB 1858 (Santiago).

The IRP agreed to change the recommendation in the draft report to increase the maximum penalty for violations of Health and Safety Code section 25189 from \$25,000 to \$27,500. Instead, the report should recommend an increase to make the maximum penalties equivalent to the federal maximums, with an equivalent inflation allowance.

The IRP agreed to consider recommendations on blood-lead levels in the October 2016 report, which is expected to address the DTSC Public Outreach Program.

#### Recommendations to the DTSC to Improve Enforcement

The IRP agreed to change the recommendation in the draft report on evaluating the number of positions and vacancy levels in OCI and EERD to specify that they should be evaluated to determine if they are sufficient to meet all inspection and enforcement goals.

With respect to the recommendation in the draft report to evaluate the level of participation in state and local task forces that investigate environmental crimes, the IRP agreed to clarify that this should be done to ensure that DTSC is collaborating with those groups when necessary.

The IRP agreed to add a recommendation to the draft report to evaluate whether to include environmental, occupational, and other violations in the VSP.

The IRP agreed to add a recommendation to the draft report to upload all public inspection reports, settlements, and summaries of violation into EnviroStor on a timely basis and evaluate additional technologies to enhance public accessibility.

The IRP agreed to add a recommendation to the draft report to state that, prior to inspection of a permitted hazardous waste facility, the inspection team should communicate with site mitigation staff members to verify that the facility operator has provided any required financial assurances for corrective action.

#### Recommended Goals and Performance Metrics for Enforcement

The IRP agreed to change the following recommended goal and performance metric in the draft report: "Measure the number of reports sent to hazardous waste facility operators within statutory time periods, with a goal of 100 percent of the time each fiscal year." It should instead recommend measuring the percentage of inspection reports sent to hazardous waste facility operators within statutory time periods, with a goal of complying 100 percent of the time each fiscal year.

The IRP agreed to change the following recommended goal and performance metric in the draft report: "Meet or exceed national average in the percentage of permitted hazardous waste treatment, storage, and disposal facilities inspected each fiscal year." The recommendation should instead be divided into two recommended goals and performance metrics. One should recommend meeting or exceeding RCRA Grant commitments for inspection of hazardous waste treatment, storage, and disposal facilities inspected each fiscal year. The other should set a stretch target for

the percentage of permitted hazardous waste treatment, storage, and disposal facilities inspected each fiscal year.

The IRP agreed to change the following recommended goal and performance metric in the draft report: “Measure and evaluate the referral time for OCI cases with a goal of referring 95 percent of the cases within 180 days.” It should clarify that the goal is to refer the cases within 180 days from the date the violation was determined.

The IRP agreed to change the following recommended goal and performance metric in the draft report: “Complete 90 percent of EERD administrative enforcement actions within 180 days when the calculated penalties are less than \$75,000.” It should clarify that the goal is to complete the administrative enforcement actions within 180 days from the date the violation was determined.

#### Data Requests to the DTSC on Enforcement Program

The IRP agreed to ask DTSC to provide the IRP with a report by September 30, 2017 with the following information: (1) measure and evaluate the violations found during comprehensive inspections of hazardous waste treatment, storage, and disposal facilities; (2) measure and evaluate the percentage of hazardous waste treatment, storage, and disposal facilities with comprehensive inspections in which a Summary of Violation was made; (3) measure and evaluate the percentage of formal enforcement actions taken within 360 days of Summary of Violation, with a goal of exceeding the national average; (4) measure and evaluate the number of final formal enforcement actions and associated penalties; (5) measure and evaluate the referral time for OCI cases with a goal of referring 95 percent of the cases within 180 days from the date the violation was determined; (6) measure and evaluate the percentage of EERD administrative enforcement actions completed within 180 days from the date the violations were determined when the calculated penalties are less than \$75,000, with the goal of completing 90 percent within 180 days; (7) provide the number of enforcement actions taken and amount of money collected from fines; (8) provide the number of criminal enforcement proceedings undertaken; (9) provide the amount of enforcement fines diverted to environmental justice SEPs; (10) provide the average length of time for violators to return to compliance or fulfill corrective action; (11) provide the frequency of inspections conducted at each permitted hazardous waste facility; and (12) provide the percentage of enforcement actions and inspections taken in environmental justice communities.

Public comments via email:

Ms. Williams suggested that large quantity generators be inspected on a regular basis, preferably annually, by a competent authority. She said that one of the most common violations she had seen as a member of an inspection team for the past four years is the failure of facilities to properly contain their hazardous waste. She added that a number of the inspected facilities were in close proximity to schools, and in one case the inspection was part of an investigation to find the sources of a serious childhood cancer cluster.

The individual with an email address containing the words “mckeepalms” stated that DTSC enforcement staff does not return calls regarding contaminated soils near the Quemetco facility.

**Motion:** Approve the draft report with the amendments agreed upon at the meeting and assign Vice Chair Vizzier to work with support staff on the wording and submittal of the final draft. Panel Member Campbell moved. Vice Chair Vizzier seconded. The motion carried unanimously.

### **13. Organizational, Operational, and Administrative Matters**

Chair Kracov asked Mr. Hildreth to work with Vice Chair Mike Vizzier and DTSC Special Assistant for Program Review Terri Hardy on the evaluation process for IRP support staff.

### **14. Future Meeting Schedule and Agenda Items**

The IRP decided to hold its next meeting on August 10, 2017 in Sacramento.

Chair Kracov suggested that the Panel hold a two-day meeting in the Los Angeles region in September.

### **17. Adjournment**

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

***Chair Kracov adjourned the meeting at 4:46 p.m.***