

**From:** [Pound, Michael J CIV USN NAVFAC WASHINGTON DC \(USA\)](#)  
**To:** [Hussain, Lila \(CII\)](#)  
**Cc:** [Casey, Ryan \(DPH\)](#)  
**Subject:** FW: [Non-DoD Source] Fwd: Plutonium Issue  
**Date:** Thursday, October 2, 2025 5:50:58 PM

---

Lila,

As we discussed, I am forwarding Dr. Hunnicutt's email. I briefly discussed the Pu exceedance before last Monday's CAC meeting. I told I would schedule a follow up meeting to discuss the issue with her and get her recommendations for sharing the information with the public. Secondly, I asked her if she would be interested in scheduling a meeting in the first week of the month that we have CAC meetings to get her input on community concerns to be focus the presentations. She agreed it was a good idea.

I am off tomorrow. We can discuss this further next week.

Michael

-----Original Message-----

From: Veronica Hunnicutt [REDACTED]  
Sent: Thursday, October 2, 2025 11:49 AM  
To: Pound, Michael J CIV USN NAVFAC WASHINGTON DC (USA)  
<[michael.j.pound.civ@us.navy.mil](mailto:michael.j.pound.civ@us.navy.mil)>  
Subject: [Non-DoD Source] Fwd: Plutonium Issue

Hello Michael,  
Thank you for reaching out to me.

I think the public should know about this matter eventually; however, I wanted to ask you some questions and get clarification that would be helpful in comprehending what happened initially to determine the next steps.

>

>>

>> 1. On what Parcel was the Plutonium level increase first detected and when, and what was the exact number or measurements level. This is very important. The exact data information is needed.

>>

>> 2.. You also indicated that a follow up or another test was conducted, and that test did show a 'decrease' in the level that was previously detected that raised the initial alarm.

>>

>> A. Please state the number or measurements level of this other test.

>>

>> B. Was this Test (follow up) performed by an Independent lab or by the same company/lab as the previous test?

>>

>> 3. Simultaneous Testing.

>>

>> A. Can you please verify if the EPA also conducted its own test simultaneously as the Navy initially or after the plutonium level increase detection

>>

>> B. What's the Result?

>>

>> I think it's extremely helpful if the EPA conducts or has already conducted an independent test of its own to determine any or some consistency in the Plutonium level detection, either way.

>>

>> 4. False Negative vs False Positive

>>

>> A. The numbers of testings overall would be helpful.

>> Multiple tests would indicate a pattern and/or point to a direction to validate or rule out any anomalies

>>

>> 5. In such a scenario, such as this case whereas a previous test showed an elevation and a follow up one showed a somewhat 'normal' result, is there any literature for guidance or comparable decision that the Navy and the Regulators can point to, and what was the conclusion or decision that was arrived at?

>>

>> A. Regarding the HPNS, has the Navy encountered such a similar scenario as the current situation, and what was the conclusion?

>>

>> It appears there was a similar situation before, but it was a false positive.

>> That case was botched because it created an unnecessary anxiety in the community, and to this day the stakeholders still talk about it. That's why it's very important to avoid any hasty announcement.

>>

>> 6. Did the Navy enlist Dr. Higley, a Nuclear Scientist, to review the Plutonium testing data for her professional expertise. If not, why not?

>>

>> Michael, the aforementioned questions are very important, and if you can provide me some answers, they could rule out if the plutonium levels elevation is a false positive or not.

>>

>> I will then be able to make some recommendations on the next steps for the public dialogues.

>>

>> Thank you.

>> Dr. Veronica Hunnicutt

>>

>>

>>

>>