To: Yelensky, Erica[Yelensky.Erica@epa.gov]
From: Bacalan, Vince
Sent: Fri 7/28/2017 3:50:48 PM
Subject: RE: Copy of BRP Revision Timeline v2.xlsx

Hey just to follow-up on the BRP timeline and my 'sigh' of concern for not being able to see a full draft until almost a year from now…..

The CCMP revision guidance came up because there was a lack of standard approach for ensuring what's a completed revision/update is. San Francisco's example (where HQ deliberated and found gaps after their Board signed off on a final draft) exposed a slight hiccup in the process. Nancy has really wanted to avoid repeating this again, which explains why Tampa adopted their own process and we have stressed 'early and often' into the conversation.

I feel like EPA can have the greatest influence on the timeline now because the NEP hasn't officially 'started' yet. Not sure how you can impose on Tom our collective concern that there are no guarantees that the draft BRP -following multiple rounds of reviews and public comment period- will come out unscathed with minor changes to it before work on final revisions begin, which is already a very narrow window.

Other NEPs have been vocal about avoiding the trap of getting so close to the end, only for EPA to 'derail' their progress, which is equivalent to starting over. I can't say with certainty this will happen with SMBNEP but without knowing ahead of time what's in and out at what time, it makes me nervous. If Tom really has it together in his mind, perhaps a skeletal outline or plan of attack would ease my anxiety about this (knowing how busy he is).

Feel free to talk this over with Sam. And I am more than happy to participate on a call with Tom if this needs elevation. And of course I'm around today if you need to chat.

Vince

From: Yelensky, Erica

Sent: Wednesday, July 26, 2017 7:48 PM
To: Bacalan, Vince <Bacalan.Vince@epa.gov>
Subject: Copy of BRP Revision Timeline v2.xlsx

Vince,

Can we find a time tomorrow, Thursday to talk about this schedule for a few minutes, specifically EPA review and concurrence?

Thanks,

Erica