

From: [Phil Rutherford](#)
To: meredith.williams@dtsc.ca.gov; "Becker, Steven@DTSC"; grant.cope@dtsc.ca.gov; marcia.rubin@dtsc.ca.gov; chinh.sheow@dtsc.ca.gov; "Mathias, Mindy@DTSC"
Subject: No Answers to Important Questions
Date: Saturday, June 11, 2022 4:30:25 PM

Dear DTSC,

I have looked through the Settlement Agreement FAQs and do not see any answers that address my questions.

I am therefore still awaiting DTSC's response to my questions at ...

https://www.philrutherford.com/SSFL/Settlement_Agreement/Settlement_Agreement_Email_to_DTSC_2022-05-31.pdf and

https://philrutherford.com/SSFL/Settlement_Agreement/DTSC-Boeing_Settlement_Agreement.pdf

... that were repeated, but ignored, in DTSC's virtual meeting Q&A.

Perhaps the central issue is your responses to your FAQs.

- Is the Settlement Agreement consistent with CEQA?
- Is DTSC making a remedy decision now?

Your responses to both, include the statement that *"DTSC has not agreed to any remedy in the Settlement Agreement."*

This is obviously false in the case of radionuclides. The agreement has selected an "a priori" remedy for radionuclides, in violation of CEQA. DTSC attempts to make an end run around this obvious violation, by repeatedly saying that *"Boeing has agreed to cleanup radionuclides to background."* The logical implication is that DTSC has also agreed to that. That therefore leads to one of my original questions. Why did Boeing do this after refusing to sign the 2010 AOC and successfully challenging SB 990? What did DTSC do or say during the secret mediation meetings that forced Boeing to accept this background goal for radionuclides?

Sincerely,

Phil Rutherford
Mobile: +1 818-912-1501
email@philrutherford.com
www.philrutherford.com