

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Cc:** [REDACTED]; Flohr,  
[Brad\\_VBAVACO](#);  
**Subject:** RE: Louisville: Camp Lejeune issues ~Due 9/21  
**Date:** Thursday, September 20, 2012 2:57:23 PM  
**Attachments:** [Burr Updated Data 2012-09-20.doc](#)  
[CLCW Tracking Plan-Recommendations.doc](#)

---

SAREA,

Please see the attached memo and CLCW data update. Let us know of any questions.

[REDACTED]

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

**From:** VAVBANAS/SAREA  
**Sent:** Tuesday, September 18, 2012 1:02 PM

**To:** [REDACTED]

**Cc:** [REDACTED]

**Subject:** Louisville: Camp Lejeune issues ~Due 9/21

September 18, 2012

Good afternoon,

Please see the email below and the concerns expressed with the Camp Lejeune tracker. Provide a response at to the discrepancy noted. It appears [REDACTED] is already working on the issue.

Please provide a copy of the plan to address the discrepancies to the Southern Area office by 3:00pm EST, Friday, September 21, 2012. If there was another established suspense with Compensation Service, please let us know.

NOTE:

OFO and PA&I are working together to get the estimates the anticipated increase in the CLCW workload. Once those numbers are available, we will provide them to your RO to begin formulate a plan for the increased work. In addition, we shared the information you provided after your staff meeting on the issue at noted below:

Information present to OFO from the Louisville RO:

At this point, receipts of CLCW claims remain relatively constant. While Louisville don't know the answers to the questions that were posed below, their suggestions is to continue the consolidation of the CLCW claims at

Louisville. Since the laws haven't changed for establishing service connection, the initial rationale for centralizing the claims hasn't changed.

That rationale includes several benefits such as control, continuity/consistency, tracking, expertise, etc. Moreover, any future changes involving these claims will only involve training at one location. VHA has begun to train a small staff of experts to provide opinions on the CLCW issues. They have come to Louisville for this training and have met our VSC staff. Louisville also has trained appellate staff for CLCW appeals. As workload increases they have the ability to hire quickly. They have immediate work stations to hire approximately 24 additional staff. As the need increases, there is office space available close to the current RO. They are also in the process of a collocation project with our VA medical center so space needs can be factored into a new building.

While Louisville doesn't know VBA's strategy for workload management in a post transition world. They have heard that our new systems (VRM, VBMS, VLER) could facilitate issue based processing. In that event, ROs could 'specialize' in, and become experts, at rating limited issues. That could mean that multiple ROs would be involved in a veteran's claim, at the same time, thereby possibly reducing overall claim processing timeliness. Louisville has an expertise in CLCW claims makes Louisville a natural for those and all future claims with chemical based issues. If a decision is made to retain consolidation of CLCW at Louisville, any additional resources/staff could be turned towards assisting SAREA, and VBA, meet other goals or emergent situations as required. A versatility that is currently being utilized at stations who had established other special missions (ARC, RRC, DRC, DIBC, Tiger Team, etc.).

[REDACTED]

Thank you,

/s/

[REDACTED]

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

[REDACTED]

Subject: Re: Camp Lejeune issues

Believe that we need to get Louisville engaged in answering.

Without seeing the numbers, not sure where the variance is. If it is a year after the decision was made (appeal period expires) it will go back to ROJ.

If we see an big increase in receipts with new law will need to either give Louisville resources, or disperse the work.

[REDACTED] - would you work with Louisville to put some projections together?

[REDACTED]

-----  
[Redacted]

Subject: FW: Camp Lejeune issues  
Sent: Sep 18, 2012 10:33 AM

[Redacted]

I will discuss with you in person, once you get in the office. But if you got a chance to read emails, while you were there, I wanted you to see the below issue.

I just started to get into the Camp Lejeune issues, but from listening to the last call, I don't believe you were on board with keeping all of the CL claims in Louisville. But, it looks below, like Lois, may have a different opinion. Just wanted to get your thoughts / guidance before proceeding.

[Redacted]

>  
-----  
> [Redacted]  
> [Redacted]

> Subject: RE: Camp Lejeune issues

> OK. Thanks.

>  
-----  
> [Redacted]  
> [Redacted]

> Subject: RE: Camp Lejeune issues

> [Redacted] is going to be taking over as the POC for Camp Lejeune issues/claims. Please make sure to copy her on these emails from this point forward.

>  
-----  
> [Redacted]  
> [Redacted]  
> [Redacted] Flohr, Brad,

> Subject: Camp Lejeune issues

> [Redacted]

> Compensation Service needs OFO assistance to address the Louisville RO  
> Camp Lejeune (CL) claims situation. Since you are the Southern Area  
> liaison, I am initially contacting you. We need OFO oversight on any  
> movement of claims files that may be necessary based on the problem  
> described below.

>

> While attempting to update the CL slide for the upcoming HVAC Hearing  
> on VA Performance and Accountability, we noticed that the numbers  
> (claims completed, claims pending, claims granted, claims denied)  
> presented to Secretary Shinseki in June (following the Louisville case  
> review done for Senator Burr) did not compute with the numbers we  
> obtained from the Louisville RO tracker for August. Despite two  
> additional months of claims processing, the "official" August numbers  
> were lower than the June numbers. We are not sure why this has  
> occurred but have speculated that the August Louisville tracker  
> numbers did not take into account CL cases held at other ROs.

>

> [REDACTED] is concerned about the number discrepancies and has  
> tasked Compensation Service with explaining it and producing accurate  
> numbers in the future. [REDACTED] thinks that all CL cases should be sent to  
> and stored at Louisville, unless there is a good reason why they should  
not.

> And, if not, then Louisville should still be tracking the numbers on  
> these cases for consistent reporting purposes. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] thinks that some CL cases may be held at Winston-Salem or Salt  
> Lake City for BDD/Quick Start processing. [REDACTED] is in the process of  
> creating a plan to address these concerns. We can address the details  
> when his plan is completed.

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>