

ROB BISHOP, UT
CHAIRMAN
DON YOUNG, AK
LOUIE GOHMERT, TX
DOUG LAMBORN, CO
ROBERT J. WITTMAN, VA
JOHN FLEMING, LA
TOM McCINTOCK, CA
GLENN THOMPSON, PA
CYNTHIA LUMMIS, WY
DAN BENISHEK, MI
JEFF DUNCAN, SC
PAUL A. GOSAR, AZ
RAUL R. LABRADOR, ID
DOUG LAMALFA, CA
JEFF DENHAM, CA
PAUL COOK, CA
BRUCE WESTERMAN, AR
GARRET GRAVES, LA
DAN NEWHOUSE, WA
RYAN ZINKE, MT
JODY HICE, GA
AUMUA AMATA COLEMAN RADEWAGEN, AS
TOM MacARTHUR, NJ
ALEX MOONEY, WV
CRESENT HARDY, NV
DARIN LAHOOD, IL

JASON KNOX
STAFF DIRECTOR

U.S. House of Representatives
Committee on Natural Resources
Washington, DC 20515

RAÚL M. GRIJALVA, AZ
RANKING MEMBER
GRACE F. NAPOLITANO, CA
MADELEINE Z. BORDALLO, GU
JIM COSTA, CA
GREGORIO KILILI CAMACHO SABLAN, CNMI
NIKI TSONGAS, MA
PEDRO R. PIERLUISI, PR
JARED HUFFMAN, CA
RAUL RUIZ, CA
ALAN LOWENTHAL, CA
MATTHEW CARTWRIGHT, PA
DON BEYER, VA
NORMA J. TORRES, CA
DEBBIE DINGELL, MI
RUBEN GALLEGO, AZ
LOIS CAPPS, CA
JARED POLIS, CO
Wm. LACY CLAY, MO

DAVID WATKINS
DEMOCRATIC STAFF DIRECTOR

December 18, 2015

The Honorable Arthur A. Elkins, Jr.
Inspector General
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
1200 Pennsylvania Avenue NW
Washington, DC 20460

Dear Inspector General Elkins:

On August 17, 2015, your office, the Environmental Protection Agency's ("EPA") Office of Inspector General ("OIG"), sent a memorandum to EPA Region 8 Administrator Shaun McGrath and Assistant Administrator for the Office of Solid Waste and Emergency Response Mathy Stanislaus informing them of the OIG's intent to conduct a review of the Gold King Mine Release.¹ The OIG additionally notified Regional Administrator McGrath and Assistant Administrator Stanislaus of related issues the OIG planned to review in a second memorandum on November 4, 2015.²

¹ Memorandum from Carolyn Copper, Assistant Inspector General, Office of Inspector General, Environmental Protection Agency, to Shaun McGrath, Regional Administrator, EPA Region 8, and Mathy Stanislaus, Assistant Administrator, Office of Solid Waste and Emergency Response, Environmental Protection Agency (Aug. 17, 2015) ("The Office of Inspector General (OIG) for the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) plans to begin preliminary research on the cause of, and the EPA's response to, the August 5, 2015, release from the Gold King Mine in Colorado. . . . Due to the scope of the issues involved, the OIG's Office of Program Evaluation, Office of Audit, and Office of Investigations will work collaboratively to conduct parts of this review.").

² Memorandum from Carolyn Copper, Assistant Inspector General, Office of Inspector General, Environmental Protection Agency, to Shaun McGrath, Regional Administrator, EPA Region 8, and Mathy Stanislaus, Assistant Administrator, Office of Solid Waste and Emergency Response, Environmental Protection Agency (Nov. 4, 2015) ("The purpose of this memorandum is to notify you of additional issues we plan to review . . . including issues disclosed in the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation's October 2015 report, Technical Evaluation of the Gold King Mine Incident.").

In light of the OIG's clearly expressed intent to conduct a review of the Gold King Mine spill, the Committee on Natural Resources ("Committee") is troubled by the EPA's disclosure last week that it had recently interviewed two material witnesses to the EPA's activities at Gold King Mine. Specifically, the Committee is concerned that the EPA's interview did not follow best investigative practices and may have interfered with the OIG's ongoing investigation.

EPA Releases an Addendum to its Initial Internal Review

At 6:29 PM on December 8, 2015, the evening before the Committee's oversight hearing on the Interior Department's *Technical Evaluation of the Gold King Mine Incident* ("DOI report")³, EPA notified the Committee of its release of a document entitled, *Addendum to EPA Internal Review of Gold King Mine Incident* ("Addendum").⁴ The unsigned Addendum, which was transmitted to Administrator McCarthy by Administrator Stanislaus, asserts that it:

provides clarity pursuant to additional information that has become available since the initial EPA Internal Review report was issued on August 26, 2015. This includes information presented in the October 2015 Department of the Interior/Bureau of Reclamation (BOR) Technical Review of the Gold King Mine Incident (DOI Report), as well as reservations expressed by the US Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) peer reviewer regarding internal EPA communication and coordination.⁵

The Addendum states that its new narrative is based on "a follow up interview with the two On-Scene Coordinators (OSCs) most closely associated with the event."⁶ However, the circumstances surrounding this interview raise concerns about its timing, appropriateness, and potential to affect the OIG's investigation.

³ U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, BUREAU OF RECLAMATION, TECHNICAL EVALUATION OF THE GOLD KING MINE INCIDENT (2015), <http://www.usbr.gov/docs/goldkingminereport.pdf>.

⁴ ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY, ADDENDUM TO EPA INTERNAL REVIEW OF GOLD KING MINE INCIDENT (2015), <http://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2015-12/documents/gkmaddendumfinal.pdf>.

⁵ *Id.*

⁶ *Id.*

Procedural Problems with EPA's Addendum

One of the most concerning problems with EPA's Addendum is its timing. According to the Addendum, the interview of Hays Griswold and Steven Way⁷ occurred on December 2, 2015 – prior to the release of the OIG's report, which is not expected until early 2016. The timing of the interview calls into question the EPA's respect for the OIG's ongoing investigation and commitment to ensuring the integrity of witness testimony. As you know, the EPA's own guidance states that "managers should not question staff about their interactions with the OIG."⁸ Based on EPA's Addendum, it appears likely that a regional supervisor and two officials from headquarters questioned Mr. Griswold and Mr. Way about matters central to an ongoing OIG investigation, and may have done so following their interactions with the OIG.

Second, the interview was conducted not by independent investigators or technical experts from unaffected regions, but by three EPA employees with close ties to the agency's public response to the Gold King Mine spill. The Addendum identifies the following three interview team members:

- **Laura Williams, Region 8 Supervisor.** Ms. Williams is a colleague of Mr. Griswold and Mr. Way within the Region 8 office and is listed as the contact for Superfund Emergency Response questions.⁹ She describes her role as "EPA's technical lead for development of [Superfund] site remediation and oversight strategy and primary contact to present, explain, or defend the team's project approach to internal and external stakeholders."¹⁰ Additionally, documents obtained by the Committee show that she was kept informed of the discussions between EPA and the Bureau of Reclamation ("BOR") concerning the development of the DOI report.
- **Nancy Grantham, HQ OPA/OA.** Ms. Grantham is a spokeswoman from the Office of Public Affairs within the EPA Administrator's Office in the agency's Washington, DC headquarters. For months, she has served as EPA's spokeswoman for its Gold King

⁷ Although EPA redacted the names of the OSCs, the Committee understands that at the time of the spill Hays Griswold was acting as substitute OSC while Steven Way, the lead OSC for the Gold King Mine project, was on vacation. Both were identified in news reports following the spill, and in videos released by the EPA.

⁸ Memorandum from Lisa P. Jackson, Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, to All EPA Employees, available at <http://nepis.epa.gov/Exe/ZyPDF.cgi/P100734J.PDF?Dockkey=P100734J.PDF>.

⁹ *Region 8 Superfund Contacts*, ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY, <http://www.epa.gov/region8/superfund-contacts>.

¹⁰ *Laura Williams*, LINKEDIN, <https://www.linkedin.com/in/laura-williams-21977632>.

Mine response, including the EPA's plans for the Gold King Mine¹¹, the DOI report¹², and the EPA's recently released Addendum.¹³ Following the Committee's Gold King Mine oversight hearing on December 9, 2015, Ms. Grantham said, "EPA and external entities will be thoroughly investigating the full facts regarding this incident and the response, and the agency will respond based on that information."¹⁴ Despite the fact that neither the EPA Internal Review nor the DOI report made conclusions about culpability, and the OIG report is still forthcoming, Ms. Grantham went on to publicly conclude that "[t]here is no one individual responsible."¹⁵

- **Dana Stalcup, HQ OSWER/OSRTI.** Mr. Stalcup is the Acting Director of the Assessment and Remediation Division within the Office of Land and Emergency Management (formerly the Office of Solid Waste and Emergency Response), which is headed by Assistant Administrator Stanislaus.¹⁶ According to documents obtained by the Committee, Mr. Stalcup was responsible for coordinating with the U.S. Bureau

¹¹ Jesse Paul, *EPA Sought Bids for Treatment Plant at Colorado Mine Spill in August*, DENVER POST, Sept. 15, 2015, http://www.denverpost.com/news/ci_28817990/epa-releases-new-videos-taken-after-colorado-mine ("Nancy Grantham, an EPA spokeswoman, said the agency has received six bids and is evaluating each one. 'The treatment plant is a contingency option,' Grantham said. 'The agency continues to evaluate data to determine the impacts of the Gold King Mine on water quality currently and going into the winter months.' Grantham said the Gold King 'is one of many mines contributing to poor water quality in the Animas' and treating its waste 'may or may not have a measurable impact downstream going forward.'").

¹² Amy Harder & Dan Frosch, *Government Report: Lack of Expertise Caused Colorado Mine Spill*, WALL ST. J., Oct. 22, 2015, <http://www.wsj.com/articles/government-report-lack-of-expertise-caused-colorado-mine-spill-1445543749> ("Nancy Grantham, a spokeswoman for EPA, said the agency will review the [DOI] report. 'This report, in combination with the findings of EPA's internal review of the incident, will help inform EPA's ongoing efforts to work safely and effectively at mine sites,' Ms. Grantham said in an email.").

¹³ Peter Marcus, *Disagreement Between Colorado and EPA over Gold King Mine Spill Lingers*, DURANGO HERALD, Dec. 9, 2015, <http://www.durangoherald.com/article/20151209/NEWS01/151209593/Disagreement-between-state-and-EPA-over-Gold-King-Mine-spill-lingers> ("Despite the discrepancy between the state and federal accounts of the incident, the EPA maintains that the state played a role. 'The documents released in the addendum, as well as documents released previously, reflect the cooperation between our two agencies. EPA was working collaboratively with the Colorado Division of Reclamation and Mining Safety at the Gold King Mine site as well as other sites in the area,' said Nancy Grantham, an EPA spokeswoman. 'EPA was the lead agency on the site but was working closely with the state and with the Animas River Stakeholder Group. We stand by the contents of our internal review and addendum.'").

¹⁴ Michael Coleman, *Interior Department Report on Mine Spill Challenged*, ALBUQUERQUE JOURNAL, Dec. 10, 2015, <http://www.abqjournal.com/688719/news/interior-depts-report-on-mine-spill-challengedexcerpt-house-panel-chairman-calls-for-gao-review-of-agencys-investigation.html>.

¹⁵ *Id.*

¹⁶ *About the Office of Land and Emergency Management (OLEM)*, ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY, <http://www.epa.gov/aboutepa/about-office-land-and-emergency-management-olem>.

of Reclamation (“BOR”) on the Interior Department’s technical evaluation of the Gold King Mine spill.¹⁷

The Addendum does not explain who selected Ms. Williams, Ms. Grantham, and Mr. Stalcup to conduct the interview with Mr. Griswold and Mr. Way, nor does it provide any basis for their selection given their apparent lack of investigative credentials, technical expertise, or objectivity. In fact, the only obvious commonality between the interview team members is their joint interest in preventing damage to the agency’s public image following the spill. Moreover, the composition of the interview team for the Addendum is in stark contrast to the team that prepared the Internal Review released in August. That team, which was composed of members of “a subgroup of [EPA’s] National Mining Team,”¹⁸ included EPA employees from other regional offices and one environmental engineer from EPA headquarters.¹⁹

Additionally, the Addendum implies that the interview of Mr. Griswold and Mr. Way was conducted jointly. With one exception, which is presumably a typographical error, the Addendum repeatedly refers to the interview team’s conversation with Mr. Griswold and Mr. Way as “the interview,” “a follow up interview” and “the meeting.” If EPA in fact conducted a single joint interview, the agency may have succeeded in rendering it impossible to independently verify Mr. Griswold’s and Mr. Way’s individual statements.

Further, the Addendum does not indicate that the interview was transcribed or recorded, possibly obstructing efforts to confirm or deny the Addendum’s new narrative. Instead, the Addendum includes a list of “planned questions” that “were not asked explicitly but were used as a guide to ensure all key issues were addressed.”²⁰ This description of how the Addendum team conducted the interview raises even more concerns about the EPA’s conduct during a pending OIG investigation.

¹⁷ In one email, Mr. Stalcup acknowledged receipt of the proposed scope of the report, sent by the Director of the Bureau of Reclamation’s Technical Services Center, and then wrote: “It looks good to me, and I will share up my management chain.” Email from Dana Stalcup, Acting Director, Assessment and Remediation Division, Office of Solid Waste and Emergency Response, Environmental Protection Agency, to Thomas Luebke, Director, Technical Services Center, Bureau of Reclamation, Department of the Interior (Aug. 18, 2015, 02:17 PM). Mr. Stalcup’s participation in the follow up interview with Mr. Griswold and Mr. Hays, which was intended to provide clarity on a report he helped develop, is curious given the fact that he was clearly well-informed about the scope of the DOI report from its earliest stages.

¹⁸ ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY, SUMMARY REPORT: EPA INTERNAL REVIEW OF THE AUGUST 5, 2015 GOLD KING MINE BLOWOUT 1 (2015), http://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2015-08/documents/new_epa_nmt_gold_king_internal_review_report_aug_24_2015fnldated_redacted.pdf.

¹⁹ *Id.* at 2.

²⁰ ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY, *supra* note 4.

Substantive Problems with EPA's Addendum

The most alarming aspect of the Addendum is that the underlying joint interview of Mr. Griswold and Mr. Way – who have both spoken previously with EPA and BOR review teams – allegedly uncovered new information that conflicts with the initial EPA Internal Review, the DOI report, and the work that was actually performed at the site. The Addendum's discovery – four months after the spill – of new information that goes to the crux of EPA's objectives and activities at the Gold King Mine site on August 5, 2015 is startling.

Specifically, the new narrative of events described in the Addendum claims that Mr. Way gave additional verbal instructions to the EPA crew and that on August 5, 2015, Mr. Griswold was directing the EPA crew in a manner “completely consistent with the direction provided by [Mr. Way].”²¹ The Addendum reiterates: “The work being conducted on August 4 and 5 was completely consistent with the direction provided by the primary OSC [Steven Way] prior to his leaving for vacation, to help plan for the August 14 meeting and potential future work.”²²

The Addendum's claim is demonstrably false and is one of multiple claims that diverge from the facts and conclusions presented in reports issued previously by EPA and the Interior Department.

Neither of the previous review teams that spoke with Mr. Griswold and Mr. Way documented the Addendum's claim that Mr. Way gave verbal instructions to wait to open the mine until his return on August 14, the day the team was to consult with BOR and others. The Addendum states that Mr. Way provided “clear verbal direction” to the EPA crew “not to proceed with any work on actually opening the adit until after his return [from vacation] and the planned consultation on August 14.”²³

The claim that the EPA crew intended to pause work until August 14 is not supported by the DOI report, which states that on August 4 the team “discussed a plan to open the adit,” discussed the plan to reopen the adit again on August 5, and then immediately “the contractor began excavating.”²⁴ Rather, the timeline described in the DOI report corresponds with the peer reviewer's statement that the team was “digging out the

²¹ *Id.*

²² *Id.*

²³ *Id.*

²⁴ U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, *supra* note 3, at 46, 52.

plug.” Indeed, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers peer reviewer’s main criticism of the DOI report is that it did not explain why the EPA team started to “dig[] out the plug rather than wait for BOR technical input as prescribed by the EPA project leader.”²⁵ DOI addressed and dismissed the peer reviewer’s concern, saying the communications of the onsite personnel were not within the DOI report’s scope:

The BOR Evaluation Team (evaluation team) believed that it was hired to perform a technical evaluation of the causes of the incident, and was not asked to look into the internal communications of the onsite personnel, or to determine why decisions were made. The evaluation team did not believe it was requested to perform an investigation into a ‘finding of fault,’ and that those separate investigative efforts would be performed by others more suitable to that undertaking.²⁶

The initial EPA Internal Review, for its part, makes no mention of the meeting Mr. Way scheduled for August 14, 2015, and does not indicate that any further technical expertise was needed before proceeding with the plan to reopen the Gold King Mine.

Moreover, the claim that EPA intended to excavate the adit and then leave it in a disturbed condition for at least nine days before taking further steps is nonsensical. It also does not explain why Mr. Way’s written directions to the crew did not contain any reference to the August 14 meeting. The DOI report claims that Steve Way’s interaction with the BOR was as follows:

On or about July 23, 2015, [Steve Way] made a brief telephone call (about 2 minutes) to Mr. Gobla at BOR to ask if funding of \$4,000 had finally been transferred to BOR for the Red and Bonita Mine. He requested that Mr. Gobla travel to the site. [Mr. Way] explained he was about to leave for vacation and wanted a site visit on August 14, 2015, which would be his first day back from vacation. [Mr. Way] stated that the upstream form for the bulkhead had been placed in the Red and Bonita Mine and they would be placing concrete in a few days. He went on to say that he did not want any more review of the Red and Bonita Mine; the purpose of the site visit on August 14,

²⁵ *Id.* at 3. It is unclear how the peer reviewer became aware of Mr. Way’s instruction to wait for BOR technical input, since the report itself does not address the issue other than to mention that a meeting with BOR was planned for August 14, 2015.

²⁶ *Id.* The issues the DOI report dismisses as outside the scope of the report are the very issues Administrator Gina McCarthy said would be addressed in the DOI report when she testified before the Committees on Natural Resources and Oversight and Government Reform on September 17, 2015.

2015, would be for the Gold King Mine as he was “unsure about the plans for the Gold King Mine” and wanted an outside independent review of the EPA/DRMS plans by BOR. [Mr. Way] scheduled to have DRMS and contractor personnel in Silverton on August 14, 2015, to present the plans to BOR and be available to answer questions. This was the first time that BOR had heard of the Gold King Mine. The plan was for Mr. Gobla to travel on August 13, 2015, and be onsite all day August 14, 2015; this plan was confirmed, and the call ended without any further discussion about the project or what it would involve.²⁷

Six days after Mr. Way’s telephone conversation with Mr. Gobla, Mr. Way sent the following email to the EPA crew:

-----Original Message-----
From: (b) (6)
Sent: Wednesday, July 29, 2015 7:04 AM
To: (b) (6)
Cc: (b) (6)
Subject: Gold King Mine - prep

Matt ,

The following are the priority and strategy discussed onsite with (b) (6) regarding work to prepare for opening the adit:

1. Adit drainage control: leave the existing half pipe to receive flow from the adit until the ground level is lowered. Set a channel or drain pipe arrangement to the right as you look at the adit to divert flow to the half-pipe diverting water from the area that will be excavated.
2. Water management system:
 - A. set up the pipe and filter bags towards the outlet end of the discharge pipe/ dump.
 - B. Before any excavation towards the adit floor between the concrete flume channel and adit, the sump and sump-pump set up to handle adit discharge must be in place.
 - C. Water management system 2: the piping / hose must be in place to allow flow to be directed to the R n B pond before removing any adit blockage at or below 24" pipe in the adit debris. And, the steel stinger pipe ,4" threaded well casing pipe, must be prepared and available.
3. Excavation above adit / hill slope: the option to investigate the slope with the excavator was discussed. If appropriate, this option would require placing enough borrow material on top of the existing berm in front of the adit to allow access above the adit to expose the rock face.
4. Adit face excavation: this will occur only when either the OSC or DRMS (b) (6) or HW mine crew Superintendent and the ERRS RM are present. In addition the ability to treat water must be set up with START present.

²⁷ *Id.* at 44-45. Mr. Gobla, the BOR engineer Mr. Way asked to visit the Gold King Mine, eventually led the BOR Evaluation Team that authored the DOI report. The fact that EPA was allegedly waiting on the man who was later tasked with writing the independent DOI report before proceeding with work at the Gold King Mine is a separate cause for concern.

Noticeably absent from Mr. Way's instructions, which EPA included as an attachment to its Addendum and as evidence of Mr. Way's written instructions to the EPA crew for the week of August 3, is any mention of the BOR, Mr. Gobla, or the need for additional technical input before the team began to excavate the adit face and remove the adit blockage.²⁸ It is unclear why Mr. Way would tell Mr. Gobla that he was unsure about the plans for the Gold King Mine and then – less than a week later and without receiving any further input from BOR – send the detailed, enumerated instructions shown above to the EPA contractor's Response Manager and other members of the EPA crew. While Mr. Way may have been uncertain about future plans for the Gold King Mine when he spoke with Mr. Gobla on July 23, he did not appear at all unsure of the plans for the week of August 3 that he sent to the EPA crew less than a week later.

Additionally, the work the EPA crew was performing on August 4 and 5 was not consistent with the directions Mr. Way sent to the team prior to his departure for vacation. Mr. Way wrote: "Before any excavation towards the adit floor between the concrete flume channel and adit, the sump and sump-pump set up to handle adit discharge must be in place." However, multiple sources who were onsite the day of the spill have confirmed to the Committee that the crew did not have a pump at the Gold King Mine on August 5.

Mr. Way also wrote: "[T]he piping/hose must be in place to allow flow to be directed to the [Red and Bonita Mine] pond before removing any adit blockage at or below 24" pipe in the adit debris. And, the steel stinger pipe, 4" threaded well casing pipe, must be prepared and available." According to the DOI report, "[c]onstruction was [not] begun on ponds at Gladstone and piping of water to the Red and Bonita ponds and the new ponds at Gladstone" until after the blowout. The photographs below illustrate that the EPA crew, under Mr. Griswold's supervision, was excavating at the level of the 24" pipe referenced in Mr. Way's email. If, as the DOI report states, construction was not begun on the piping system to carry the mine water to Red and Bonita until well after the spill, the EPA crew's work on August 5 clearly violated Mr. Way's instructions.

²⁸ Per Mr. Way's email, excavation of the adit face was to "occur only when either the OSC or DRMS (Allen) or [Harrison Western, the expert subcontractor] mine crew Superintendant [sic] and the [Environmental Restoration, an EPA contractor] [Response Manager] are present. In addition the ability to treat water must be set up with [Weston Solutions, another EPA contractor] present." All of the individuals required according to Mr. Way's email were on site the day of the spill, although the water treatment system was not yet completed.



Photographs Showing Upper 24" Corrugated HDPE Observation Pipe



Photograph Showing Lower 24" Turquoise Drainage Pipe



Photographs Showing Further Excavation of 24" Pipe

On August 5, the EPA crew also did not have a steel stinger²⁹, which Mr. Way specified should be “prepared and available.” Mr. Way’s directions regarding the stinger are confusing, since the Addendum claims that “[t]he stinger or well point installation was to be performed by [the expert subcontractor] after they had assessed the area exposed during the initial work on August 4 and 5.”³⁰ Why did the team need a stinger “prepared and available” the week of August 3 when the subcontractor who was supposed to install the stinger was not scheduled to be onsite until August 14?

Although the Addendum claims that Mr. Way gave “clear verbal instructions . . . not to proceed with any work on actually opening the adit until after his return and the planned consultation on August 14,” other photographs indicate that Mr. Griswold and the EPA team were in fact carrying out some of Mr. Way’s written instructions. For example, the photograph below appears to show the channel Mr. Way described in his email. He wrote: “Set a channel or drain pipe arrangement to the right as you look at the adit to divert flow to the half-pipe diverting water from the area that will be excavated.”

²⁹ Multiple sources who were onsite the day of the spill confirmed this fact to the Committee.

³⁰ ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY, *supra* note 4.



Photograph Showing Berm, left, and Drainage Channel, right (also see attachments)

It is unclear why the EPA crew would have followed some of Mr. Way's written directions, such as to construct a channel, while ignoring others, including the directions to have a pump and stinger on hand. Perhaps on August 5 Mr. Griswold and the EPA crew were merely executing other verbal instructions given by Mr. Way. But if so, it would seem that those verbal instructions conflicted with Mr. Way's own written instructions sent on July 29, as well as with multiple EPA planning documents.³¹

In yet another omission, none of the shifting accounts EPA and the Interior Department have provided to date offer any substantive explanation of how and why EPA decided not to test the hydrostatic pressure in the mine before excavating the adit or who made that decision.

EPA has not accounted for these inconsistencies, and its Addendum, rather than providing clarity, has only served to obfuscate efforts to understand the events leading up to the Gold King Mine disaster.

³¹ See, e.g., Task Order Statement of Work for Gold King Mine, June 25, 2014, <http://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2015-09/documents/08-1574701.pdf> ("Water management systems will be set up and operational before any construction work begins."); Action/Work Plan for Gold King Mine, May 2015, <http://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2015-09/documents/08-1574709.pdf>.

Given the concerns outlined above, the Committee expects the OIG to conduct a thorough investigation of the Gold King Mine spill and looks forward to reviewing the OIG's report when it is made available. In advance of the release of the OIG's report, your answers to the following questions are requested:

- 1) Is it the OIG's policy to request the EPA to forego interviewing witnesses who are central to an ongoing OIG investigation?
- 2) Did the OIG ever request that EPA hold its internal review in abeyance?
- 3) Did the EPA notify the OIG of its plans to conduct an interview with Mr. Way and Mr. Griswold on December 2, 2015? If so, when and by whom was such notification provided?
- 4) The EPA Office of General Counsel briefed the original EPA Internal Review team on interview guidelines in August 2015.³² Is the OIG aware of any guidelines or briefings provided to the Addendum team by the EPA's Office of General Counsel concerning the December 2, 2015 interview? If so, did the OIG and/or the OIG's Office of Counsel concur with any such direction?

Thank you for your prompt attention to this serious matter. Please contact Rob Gordon or Jessica Conrad of the Committee staff at (202) 225-7107 with any questions.

Sincerely,



Rob Bishop
Chairman
Natural Resources Committee



Louie Gohmert
Chairman
Subcommittee on Oversight &
Investigations

cc: The Honorable Raúl Grijalva, Ranking Member, Natural Resources Committee
The Honorable Debbie Dingell, Ranking Member, Subcommittee on Oversight &
Investigations

³² ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY, *supra* note 18, at 1 (“Interviews to be conducted using guidelines to be included in a briefing from the Office of the General Counsel.”).

Attachment 1



Attachment 2

