Message

From: Donovan, Betsy [/O=EXCHANGELABS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=1075D24015DB49549A456BC334BD9C25-DONOVAN, BETSY]
Sent: 5/22/2018 9:52:22 PM
To: Sivak, Michael [Sivak.Michael@epa.gov]
Subject: RE: rolling knolls question

Thanks. From the DOI comments and PRP responses, I gather that a passive recreationalist would be an off-trail hiker… The nearest GSNWR walking trails, which are not maintained, are a mile away from the site. So the HHRA trespasser scenario was deemed appropriate. I will check with Tanya regarding the FWS review.

From: Sivak, Michael
Sent: Tuesday, May 22, 2018 5:22 PM
To: Donovan, Betsy <Donovan.Betsy@epa.gov>
Subject: Re: rolling knolls question

Betsy: I have no idea if Tanya shared the HHRA with FWS. You will have to ask her. I believe we did evaluate the hiker scenario. I'm not sure I know what a passive recreationalist is.

Sent from my iPhone

On May 22, 2018, at 4:50 PM, Donovan, Betsy <Donovan.Betsy@epa.gov> wrote:

> Hi Michael, ORC is reviewing the PRPs responses to FWS comments on the FS – attached. Please see Sarah's message below regarding the HHRA… Did DOI/FWS review the HHRA? Did DOI/FWS object to our decision not to include passive recreationalists in the HHRA? Thanks and I will ask Tanya if you don't recall….
>
> ---
>
> **From:** Fajardo, Juan
> **Sent:** Tuesday, May 22, 2018 4:40 PM
> **To:** Flanagan, Sarah <Flanagan.Sarah@epa.gov>; Donovan, Betsy <Donovan.Betsy@epa.gov>
> **Subject:** RE: rolling knolls question
>
> Betsy, what do you say?
>
> ---
>
> **From:** Flanagan, Sarah
> **Sent:** Tuesday, May 22, 2018 4:37 PM
> **To:** Fajardo, Juan <Fajardo.Juan@epa.gov>
> **Subject:** rolling knolls question

Ex. 5 Attorney Work Product (AWP)