Message

From: d'Almeida, Carolyn K. [/O=EXCHANGELABS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=9EC4401AFA1846DD93D52A0DDA973581-CDALMEID]
Sent: 3/16/2016 7:45:37 PM
To: Davis, Eva [Davis.Eva@epa.gov]; Dan Pope [DPope@css-dynamac.com]
CC: Wayne Miller [Miller.Wayne@azdeq.gov]; Henning, Loren [Henning.Loren@epa.gov]; Butler, Thomas [Butler.Thomas@epa.gov]
Subject: RE: March 2016 BCT meeting

EPA has never written a letter "approving" the workplans. Weve only submitted comments, and our comments all along have been on record

-----Original Message-----
From: Davis, Eva
Sent: Wednesday, March 16, 2016 11:09 AM
To: d'Almeida, Carolyn K. <dAlmeida.Carolyn@epa.gov>; Dan Pope <DPope@css-dynamac.com>
Cc: Wayne Miller <Miller.Wayne@azdeq.gov>; Henning, Loren <Henning.Loren@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: March 2016 BCT meeting

If I heard them right, our next chance for influence is 3 years from now when they write their escape plan for the EBR and try to turn it all over to MNA -

-----Original Message-----
From: d'Almeida, Carolyn K.
Sent: Wednesday, March 16, 2016 12:41 PM
To: Davis, Eva <Davis.Eva@epa.gov>; Dan Pope <DPope@css-dynamac.com>
Cc: Wayne Miller <Miller.Wayne@azdeq.gov>; Henning, Loren <Henning.Loren@epa.gov>
Subject: FW: March 2016 BCT meeting

I got the message after lunch yesterday that they had already "steamed the hell out of the treatment zone", that it wasn't going to get any hotter and there was no point to continuing. I also got the message that the only real opportunity we have to influence what they do under the PBR is at the workplan stage and when they give us the exit strategy report at the end of the contract. And I also got the message that they are free to interpret the approved workplan however they see fit. They do not have an approved workplan for EBR yet, but that doesn't necessarily preclude shutdown of steam. It does seem to be out of our hands at this point. If EBR doesn't work in the next 15 years, then we go back to the AF to do steam again. Its not efficient but that's capitalism for you.

-----Original Message-----
From: Davis, Eva
Sent: Wednesday, March 16, 2016 10:04 AM
To: d'Almeida, Carolyn K. <dAlmeida.Carolyn@epa.gov>; Dan Pope <DPope@css-dynamac.com>
Subject: RE: March 2016 BCT meeting

Yeah, Dan - did you get out of the tree safely? Next time you are at the lab, I have a CD for you of the revised ERB WP. Attached are the latest from their website.

Other things I talked to Gorm about yesterday over breakfast - the AMEC/AF contract clearly makes all the contamination AMEC's responsibility, would seem to eliminate AF supplying more $$ for additional steam injection at ST-12. Gorm said that TetraTech and Arcadia have had similar performance based contracts and lost a considerable amount of $$. The AF stopped writing that kind of contract after this one was signed. I wonder if AMEC could challenge that in court, but of course would hate for it to take that - Gorm said my comment was the first he had heard with empathy for AMEC's situation.

Gorm said he told them they haven't presented all the details to us on the EBR, haven't provided supporting information on the design as was done for the SEE - and after yesterday's presentation they still haven't - wonder if its in the revised document. I'm dying to find out how they came up with the 400,000 lbs degraded in a year using EBR -

After I left there yesterday, I realized they really had not told us if they are going to turn the steam back on or not, but I guess we can assume they are not?? Do you think they had a clue what I meant when I said 'we have to respond to the characterization data appropriately' ? ?