To: Juan_Somoano@oxy.com[Juan_Somoano@oxy.com]
From: Yeh, Alice
Sent: Thur 9/1/2016 12:44:52 AM
Subject: RE: Revised SOW

NJDEP asked that the deliverables referred to in Section 7.1 be sent to them in hard copy, because that is an OPRA requirement (NJ State version of FOIA). So I propose adding the word "hard" before "copy" in the 1st sentence of Section 7.1.

NJDEP also asked that the word "initial" be removed from Section 2.1(b). However, since that paragraph is all language from the EPA HQs model SOW, we may not agree to it.

I hope you'll agree that these are minor comments, but if any of them present a problem, please let me know.

-----Original Message-----
From: Yeh, Alice
Sent: Wednesday, August 24, 2016 9:22 AM
To: 'Juan_Somoano@oxy.com' <Juan_Somoano@oxy.com>
Subject: RE: Revised SOW

As we discussed, attached is another draft of the SOW, with a new paragraph 56(e) that attempts to incorporate a comment we received from OCC attorneys on the AOC. Since we talked, I have changed the OCC attorneys' original language more than I had originally planned - the recent change was to address a concern that the original language did not allow for EPA to approve field modifications quickly.

Other than that new paragraph, the only change is that I moved the RDWP from item 5 to item 3 as you suggested below.

Also as we discussed, I will let you know by the end of next week if we get any comments from NJDEP that require changes to the SOW.

I will be out of the office next week, but checking e-mails and voice mails regularly. Please feel free to send me e-mails or call my cell phone (914-912-7293) if you have any questions.

-----Original Message-----
From: Juan_Somoano@oxy.com [mailto:Juan_Somoano@oxy.com]
Sent: Friday, August 19, 2016 1:02 PM
To: Yeh, Alice <Yeh.Alice@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Revised SOW

Hi Alice,

Please see the attached redline. We're good with your edits to our initial comments, and I populated the table with our proposed timetable along the lines of our communications restoring the 30-60-95-100 packages and a VE study. For ease of viewing, I did not try to reorder the table items sequentially (they're pretty close regardless), but it may make sense to move the RDWP from item 5 to item 3 within the table if you agree.

Please note one other new comment from us where I included the more specific language provided by Juan F. in June 27 letter to Section 5.5 Certification for clarity.

Please don't hesitate to contact me with any questions.

Thanks!
Juan

-----Original Message-----
From: Yeh, Alice [mailto:Yeh.Alice@epa.gov]
Sent: Thursday, August 11, 2016 9:32 AM
To: Somoano, Juan P <Juan_Somoano@oxy.com>
Subject: RE: Revised SOW

Attached is the revised draft SOW that should reflect our discussions on Friday 8/5.

I expect to send you (early next week) some thoughts about how the schedule might be re-arranged so that submissions are more staggered and follow more of a critical path. It is my understanding that we are both still exploring how EPA might become more comfortable with a 50%/90%/100% RD submittal structure. However, I also heard during last Friday's meeting that you were willing to accept using EPA's standard 30%/60%/95%/100% RD submittal structure. So our edits to the SOW assume using the traditional structure for now, pending an exchange of information on the schedule next week.

Please let me know if you have any questions or would like to talk about any of these edits (212-637-4427).

(Attached is a PDF and Word version of the draft SOW. I will be sending the PDF to the Partner Agencies shortly.)

-----Original Message-----
From: Juan_Somoano@oxy.com [mailto:Juan_Somoano@oxy.com]
Sent: Wednesday, August 10, 2016 2:49 PM
To: Yeh, Alice <Yeh.Alice@epa.gov>
Subject: Revised SOW

Alice,

Thanks for notice on the revised draft SOW that you expect to send to us and partner Agency's this Friday. We don't have any questions and appreciate the heads-up on the distribution.

Juan