

From: [Phil Rutherford](#)
To: ["Berg, Thanne@DTSC"](#); ["Butler, Katherine@DTSC"](#); ["Garcia, Yana@EPA"](#); ["Becker, Steven@DTSC"](#); ["Mathias, Mindy@DTSC"](#); ["Brosnan, Tanya@DTSC"](#); ["Magee, Brian@DTSC"](#); ["Hanley, Valerie@DTSC"](#); ["Lincoln, Julie@DTSC"](#); ["Miller, Elena@DTSC"](#); ["Higginson, E. Paige@DTSC"](#); [Carolina.Szpak-Chamecki@dtsc.ca.gov](#); ["DTSC_SSFLCleanup"](#); ["SSFLPublicComments"](#)
Cc: ["Joshua Mengers"](#); [pamela.hartman@emcbc.doe.gov](#); ["Melissa Simon"](#); [timothy.walsh@hq.doe.gov](#); [wendy@p2-solution.com](#); [etec@emcbc.doe.gov](#)
Subject: September 30 Technical Meeting with DTSC Staff
Date: Thursday, October 8, 2026 3:54:01 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

Dear Thanne,

Thank you for your [August 11, 2026, email](#) in which you confirmed that “*DTSC continues to evaluate your April submission as we committed in our May 1st response.*” I also appreciate your willingness to set up a meeting with DTSC technical staff.

I had the opportunity to meet face-to-face (or via Teams) with some of the DTSC SSFL technical staff at the Chatsworth Offices last Wednesday, September 30. Steve Becker and Mindy Mathias were present via Teams and Tanya Brosnan, Brian Magee and Carolina Szpak-Chamecki were present in person.

The intent of the meeting was to discuss the proposal in the [April 6 letter](#) to renegotiate and/or terminate the 2010 AOCs (specifically the AOC with DOE). Prior to the meeting, I had also forwarded to DTSC, including yourself, a [list of questions](#) that I believed would guide the conversation. The questions were simple, though I acknowledge that the potential answers may not have been simple. Steve replied via [email](#) before the meeting that DTSC would not be able to address these questions in the meeting.

Though the meeting was friendly and cordial, I could not describe it as productive. Steve continually referred to the positions taken in the [April 6 letter](#) as my “opinions.” On the contrary, each “fact” that I listed was backed up by on-line links to third-party reports, communications, and regulatory positions. In contrast, Steve did not address, refute, or debate any of these positions directly and vaguely referred to alternate community “opinions” that DTSC had to consider.

At the end of the meeting, Steve committed to ...

- discuss with yourself, my request for DTSC to respond to the specific technical and regulatory positions in the [April 6 letter](#). (This would hopefully be DTSC’s evaluation report that you referred to in your [August 11 letter](#))
- provide a technical and regulatory response to the inconsistent way DTSC treats Boeing decommissioned material and DOE decommissioned material, as laid out in pages 3-5 of the [list of questions](#)

The [list of questions](#) deserves to be answered. The public needs to know what DTSC’s thoughts and beliefs are surrounding these questions and the AOCs in general. It is no longer acceptable to parrot

the tired old mantra, “*DTSC remains committed to following the 2010 AOCs*” without providing justification and an answer to why the AOCs exist in the first place. Hiding behind bland platitudes is not an answer.

Best wishes,

Phil

Phil Rutherford Consulting

Mobile: +1 818-912-1501

email@philrutherford.com

www.philrutherford.com

