RESPONSE TO QUESTIONS FROM SHELDON PLOTKIN SUBSEQUENT TO THE MARCH 2004 SSFL WORKGROUP MEETING

 It was stated that NPDES surface water discharge monitoring from the Happy Valley area had not detected any perchlorate moving offsite in January, February, and March. It is our understanding there were no measurements made in January or March, and only 1 or 2 made in late February.

We have checked our records for both 2003 and 2004. For 2003, four sampling events took place at both Happy Valley 1 and Happy Valley 2; one on February 12, one on February 25, one on March 15, and one on May 3. Perchlorate was detected in the Happy Valley 1 location at 4.7, 1.2, and 5.3 ppb on February 12, 25, March 15, 2003, respectively. Perchlorate was detected at the Happy Valley 2 location at 4.6 ppb on May 3, 2003.

For 2004, our records show one sampling event on February 26, 2004, in which perchlorate was not detected at Happy Valley locations 1 and 2.

If you need more information on this, please contact Mr. Peter Bailey of my staff at 916-255-3602.

2. It was stated that upon spiking of the Raytheon groundwater sample that had been initially found to contain perchlorate, two peaks appeared, indicating that the original peak thought to be perchlorate had been something else. It is our understanding that after spiking, there was still only 1 peak and that your Hazardous Materials Lab questions the decision by the lab to change the original designation to a "non-detect" and is reviewing the matter.

Fred Seto, of DTSC's Hazardous Materials Laboratory, received data from the Lab used by Raytheon, on April 28. The Lab has been reviewing the matter and is expected to share their conclusions by the middle of June.

3. In response to an inquiry about whether wells in the western part of LA County near the site were being investigated for perchlorate, DTSC said that the LA Regional Water Quality Control Board now has responsibility for offsite perchlorate investigations (with the exception of Brandeis) and the inquiry should be directed to it. However, in a December 10, 2003 letter to Christina Walsh of Cleanuprocketdyne.org and the West Hills Property Owners Association, requesting study of wells in the West Hills area, the Regional Board staff said that investigating perchlorate in the areas surrounding SSFL was outside their jurisdiction and that the requested "study and the oversight of these types of activities would be handled by the lead agency, DTSC. Please coordinate with DTSC staff for split sampling and testing events." So, DTSC tells people to contact the Regional Board and the Regional Board tells people to contact DTSC regarding the offsite wells. This matter needs clarification.

It has been brought to our attention that there is confusion in the community regarding which state agency is responsible for perchlorate investigation. The quote by the Regional Water Board that you refer to is in response to Ms. Walsh's comment, "...we feel that the West Hills side of the property should be tested with more detail." We believe that the Regional Board's response, "The study you are requesting ... would be handled by the lead agency, DTSC." is accurate if it responds to Ms. Walsh's request for further study of the West Hills side of the property, presumably the SSFL property. Ms. Walsh later expresses concern of the "surrounding area" but it is not clear to us if she is requesting further study of the SSFL property or if she is requesting residential properties in West Hills to be studied.

Ms. Walsh did request to DTSC at the last Workgroup meeting to be involved in testing events onsite, and we have been working with her and other people to

PERFORMENT AND FROM FROM SURVICES STORED TO THE PARKET BOOK WESTEN

1. In very scalar draft (20, u.5) surface weight discertige intenditions have being very and real districted and particular meaning officers by Economy, and Mainte, if is our consensationing those were no necessary and east surface and the resonance made on a sequence.

We have elected our records for both 2003 and 2004. For 2003, four sampling events took procedulation integer Valley 1 one on from usery 12 one on field and field are 13, one on the Mappy Valley 1 location at 4.7, March 15, and one on thisy 2. Perchlorate was detected in the Happy Valley 1 location at 4.7, 1.2, and 6.0 ppb on February 12, 25, March 15, 2003, respects by Perchiplatic was detected at the Happy Valley 2 location at 4.6 ppb on May 3, 2003.

For 1994, our records show one manpling event on repressy 161, 2004, in which lour normer were not detected at Mappy Valley locations 1 and 2.

Elyen mate more information on this, please contact felt foler sellay of my stab at 916-235-3602.

2. It was sumal to at upon continued the Raylesia granussatas sample bear and been and primar to or dand partitioned, was partitioned, was present at the continued for the presidence of the presidence of the continued in the other was still and the each unit that was the presidence of the section of th

Fred Scio, of DTSC's Hezerdous **Waterials** Laboratory, received data from the Lab uses by Raytheon, on April 28. The Lab has been reviewing the matter and is expected to share their concretions by the middle of June.

It is a special control in a little to the walls in the vastern part of CA County at a cities allowed being invastigation for a campane being invastigation for a campane being invasion for a campane being in a campane of the action of the a

It has been brough to currefundion that there is confusion in the community regarding which stars agency is responsible for perchlorate investigation. The counts by the Regional Weier Event it at you refer to it is trapposed to its.

Vialsh's communit, "... we feel that the West Hills side of the property should be rested with more detail. We believe that the Regional down a response. The study you are requesting ... would be handled by the had agency, DTSC," is accurate if it recponds to life. Whish request for further study of the West Hills olde of the orderly, presumably the SSFL property. Ms. Weich later expresses added in summariant and clear to us if she is requesting according to a surface in further study of the CSFL property or if she is requesting residential properties in further study of the CSFL property or if she is requesting residential properties in further study of the CSFL property or if she is requesting residential properties in the on studied.

wis. Walsh did request to 0.15G at the last Workgroup meeting to be involved in remind events coolie, and we have been working with her and utiliar people to

coordinate that request. We are the lead agency for characterization activities onsite, including testing for perchlorate, and the Regional Board is the lead agency for perchlorate investigation occurring outside the boundaries of SSFL. (DTSC has taken the lead for testing surrounding the bathtub well on the Brandeis property, as you noted.) We can see that the comment and response were both vague, which can easily lead to misunderstandings. In our presentations to the public (via Workgroups meetings and fact sheets) we will make a point of being clear about the difference in our agencies' roles.

4. Lastly, and most troubling, was Mr. Abrams' attack on Mr. Hirsch near the end of the last meeting. Mr. Hirsch had said that the Regional Board had identified perchlorate in the surface runoff leaving the property at the NDPES discharge points that drain into Dayton Canyon Creek, while DTSC had taken soil samples from the creekbed area for Dayton Canyon Creek and said it had not found detectible perchlorate. Mr. Hirsch's point was that we know perchlorate went down Dayton Canyon Creek in surface water discharges, yet perchlorate was non-detect in sediments in Dayton Canyon Creek, raising questions about the usefulness of sediment measurements in determining whether perchlorate may have previously passed down in surface water.

Mr. Abrams has every right to have a different view of the significance of these two data sets and whether they call into question his presumptions about the implications of non-detects in sediment. However, that is a very different matter than saying, as he said, that DTSC was unaware of any such data existing, implying that Mr. Hirsch was lying about the data. The non-detects in sediment in Dayton Creek referred to by Mr. Hirsch had been samples taken by Mr. Abrahms himself. The audience clearly came away with the impression that Mr. Abrams, on behalf of the Department, was saying no such non-detects in Dayton Creek sediment existed, that Mr. Hirsch was inventing them — when in fact, these were measurements Mr. Abrams himself had made.

It is our understanding that after the meeting concluded, Professor Tabidian came over and spoke to Mr. Abrams and several other Department staff, expressing puzzlement that Mr. Abrams would deny existence of measurements he had personally taken. As we understand it, Mr. Abrams conceded that in fact the data did exist. However, by that time the damage had been done, as he had clearly created the opposite impression with the audience.

If Mr. Abrams did not mean to create such an impression, he should apologize and correct the situation. If he did intend to imply no such measurements existed, when he had taken them himself, the Department needs to apologize and remedy the situation. This really isn't appropriate conduct, and doesn't help. People have every right to disagree about the interpretation or significance of data, but it goes a bit over the edge to deny that data exist and imply that another speaker has invented measurements that in fact one oneself conducted. We think an apology is in order.

I personally asked Gerard Abrams about soil samples from the creek bed area from Dayton Creek. Gerard told me that no soil samples have been taken by DTSC beyond the SSFL property in lower Happy Valley Drainage or from Dayton Creek due to access restrictions. If you or Dan you have any sampling results from that location, I would be interested in giving them to my staff for their review.

The amount of information that exists regarding this site can be overwhelming to the general audience member. Our intention is to be clear to everyone about the data that exists and how we intend to proceed with that data. If we feel there has been a mischaracterization about where or what data has been found, we feel obligated to state clearly where we believe the inaccuracies lie. We do not believe that pointing out these differences implies that another person is necessarily lying or being deceitful.

conditionate and acquisit. We are the lead agency for characterization eclivities onethe, including testing for perchlorate, and the Regional Board is the lead agency for perchlorate investigation occurring outside the boundwies of SSFL. (DTSC has taken the lead for resting surganding the bathfub well on the Branders property, as you noted.) We can see that the comment and response were both vegue, which are easily lead to misurderstandings to our presentations to the public (via Workgroups meetings and fact sheets) we will make a point of bolog clost about the difference in our agencies' roles.

4. Leafly, and most boulding, wester Abrama' attack on the illimon mear the end of the test or edge, the littlets bad seed the Regional Board healthcare in the surface mean the page sky at the 1006S decharge points that main min Coston Canyon Creek, rightly DESC had taken soft carpites from the marked area for Caryon Canyon Coston Canyon Catyon and Catyon the Catyon Catyon and and Catyon the Catyon that are safe in the catyon and the market catyon declarate wait of the Caryon Canyon Canyon Canyon Catyon the surface with declarage, yet pandrous over correct in residents in Dayon Canyon Caryon and the next has not sufficed the parent of the declaration whether perchasis may have previously passed from in surface years.

Voll transchie auch politic house a different vior of the significance of the central and a true they cultimate passent has presentable about the respection of the relative and electron in effective as no said, that this respective or the relative and somethy, imprived that the considerable and the transcription of the chief of

If in our districts ding that after the televishing Profession bears as a considerable to the Aligams and several betweether of movements and several betweether of movements and the Abanass raudd deny creatency of movements the Philaders concentration and the Abanass concentration in fact the data dig exists stowered by their time that the detail of exists the exists the the time and bear done. As not und dealth and control the appropriate implication with the endeather.

If Mr. Province and nection to the cure an improvince, he are identified and an eat the situation of the did map of the Province and an exist masseumments established by the Dipolitic masseumments established by the study of the situation. This really end appropriate construct, and doesn't note. Proprie have excepting to an agree, what the training of a situation of accordance of samples a situation of the despendence of samples and guess and over the despendence of samples that the fact one ones the fact one ones the fact one ones? Consider the lifet on applying a notice of the fact one ones?

I personally asked Gerard Almams about sort samples from the creek bed araa from Dayton Creek. Gerard told me that no soil samples have been taken by DTSO beyond the SSFL property in lower Hoppy Verley Drainage or from Dayton Creek due to access restrictions. If you or Dan you have any sampling results from that location, I would be interested in giving them to my staff for their review.

The amount of information that exists regarding this site can be everyone about the disc general audience member. Our intention is to be clear to everyone about the dast time exists and how we insend to proceed with that data, if we ised there has been a mischaracterization about where or what data has been found, we feel obligated to state clearly where we believe the insecuracies has twice on not believe that pointing out insess differences implies that another person is becausedly lying or being discretiful.