

What is the purpose of the NPDES permit process if the permit is never revisited when changes are needed to accurately assess the current condition of the site and water quality, despite years of inquiry?

I believe the NPDES permit has failed to gather data needed to insure safety of the surrounding public with regard to the primary discharge area which is not being sampled, as promised under the permit.

Boeing (with regulators in tow), make public presentations about the wells they dug to get a clear “seep and springs” picture, but they didn’t sample the wells and have since refused to provide data though they continue to present the fact that they dug holes to the public, as if it alone can assure our safety. Without water quality data, the holes dug are a pointless waste of money. These funds need to be used wisely, and data needs to be transparently shared upon validation. How can Boeing be held accountable for that data? We know the masses of TCE went somewhere. These seeps are the primary mechanism that makes up the exposure pathway to people of today.

I have been asking about Outfall 2 for several years now and would like to know how you justify not checking on water quality at the outfall where 90% of the water is discharged (according to your own permit)

Why is it never sampled?

If what Boeing says is true, that it never rains at outfall 2, or that water never gathers enough to sample, then don’t you think that proves that the sampling location is NOT in the right location?

We have been asking these questions to no avail for several years now and it is extremely frustrating, especially now, to see the impacts of the worst drought in recorded history and know that it was exacerbated by this process, further damaging this deeply impacted environment.

This is not rocket science. They should be accountable for data. 30 days after validation is the rule.

What happened to all of 2013? and why is that validation and transparency rule not being followed by the RPs or the regulators?

Where are all the quarters?

[Back to SSFL Main Page...](#)

DOCUMENT LIBRARY	CALIFORNIA REGIONAL WATER QUALITY CONTROL BOARD (RWQCB)		
SEARCH THE DOCUMENT LIBRARY	NPDES MONITORING DISCHARGE REPORTS		
Boeing	Monitoring Discharge Reports 2013	Publication Date	File Size
NASA	Second Quarter 2013 NPDES Discharge Monitoring Report Submittal - Santa Susana Site	August 2013	8.6 MB
Public Involvement	Monitoring Discharge Reports 2012	Publication Date	File Size
Public Comment Documents	Second Quarter 2012 NPDES Discharge Monitoring Report	August 2012	22.1 MB
RCRA Facility Investigation - Soils	First Quarter 2012 NPDES Discharge Monitoring Report May 2012	May 2012	35.5 MB
RCRA Facility Investigation - Groundwater	Monitoring Discharge Reports 2011	Publication Date	File Size
Feasibility Study Workplan	Fourth Quarter 2011 NPDES Discharge Monitoring Report	February 2012	11.6 MB
Chemical Background Study	Second Quarter Monitoring Discharge Report	August 2011	5.6 MB
California Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB)	Monitoring Discharge Reports 2010	Publication Date	File Size
Senate Bill 990	Second Quarter Monitoring Discharge Report	August 2010	4.1 MB
Project Technical Meetings and Weekly Activity Reports	First Quarter Monitoring Discharge Report	May 2010	97.9 MB
Quarterly Progress Reports	Monitoring Discharge Reports 2009	Publication Date	File Size
Surface Water	Second Quarter 2009 Monitoring Discharge Report	August 2009	3.6 MB
Interim Measures	First Quarter 2009 Monitoring Discharge Report	May 2009	1.3 MB
Risk Assessment	Fourth Quarter 2009 Monitoring Discharge Report	February 2010	1.1 MB
California Environmental Quality	Fourth Quarter 2009 Monitoring Discharge Report - Figure 1	February 2010	2.1 MB

Can Boeing just decide to withhold a years worth of data from the permit if it makes them feel better doing so?

What then, is the point of regulation?

Please forgive the stark tone, but I have been asking for years now, and there seems to be nothing forthcoming except more overturning of laws to suit Boeing despite the data available to the Regional Board. The very notion that the court opinion is based on the fabricated 50,000 year claim when NOTHING IS TURNED ON so NOTHING can be accomplished. It will take a lot longer than 50,000 years as $0+0=0$. We also know that lots of modern technologies could and should be applied. Arm-folding will get us no where.

I thought the DTSC and RWQCB were supposed to operate under California's Groundwater Non-Degradation policy. That doesn't seem to be the case here and I would like to know why?

At Santa Susana Field Laboratory, Boeing gets to do whatever they want? Why is that? Why does it take years to get a simple answer or to get regulation, as defined within the permit and "correspondence," to occur?

Water flows right below outfall 2 every day...even today and no one is looking because the regulators apparently have their eyes closed. The fact that it is still flowing at the top despite the drought, shows that it's groundwater, and should be sampled. Please explain how it is possible that Boeing has been able to avoid sampling this area even though they have a road to it?

Deeply disappointed.

Please respond.

Christina Walsh

cleanuprocketdyne.org

8189225123

@cwalshCURO

#cleanupSSFL, please!