Message

From: TU, LYNDSEY [/O=EXCHANGELABS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=1BBD1651E4434BD78233A6BC426D56F1-TU, LYNDSEY]
Sent: 6/25/2019 9:20:57 PM
To: Grange, Gabrielle Fenix [Gabrielle.Grange@doh.hawaii.gov]; Shalev, Omer [Shalev.Omer@epa.gov]
CC: Ichinotsubo, Lene K [lene.ichinotsubo@doh.hawaii.gov]
Subject: RE: AOC Agenda_7-30- to 8-1_Navy_AOC Parties F2F Mtg Suggested Changes.docx
Attachments: AOC Agenda_7-30 to 7-31_Navy_AOC Parties F2F Mtg 6-25 EPA and DOH edits Final.docx

Hi Fenix,

based on our call just now I updated the agenda to reflect no specific party is in charge of leading the model demonstration session. The email I was working on before you called is below for clarification about some of the tools you eluded to in your email. I think we are on the same page overall about his review of the flow model leading up to the meeting. I will follow up with Matt about potential availability for a meeting on LNAPL *

Given that we may have at best a two week review period I am uncomfortable with committing to Matt having run his own configurations of the model in addition to preforming a cursory review of it. It may be possible but I think time is the major factor. My preference is that Matt focus on getting an understanding of the base model and the assumptions baked into it so we can discuss those assumptions and their impact in the meeting in person.

For clarification the 3-D geologic layer Matt put together is just a visual interpretation of the vadose zone, it is projected somewhat beyond the tanks but it does not extend below the water table and will not have an effect on saturated zone flow model simulations. I believe it was actually Gary who interpreted Matt's work to assign specific values to the basalt and clinker for his LNAPL model.

Matt had in addition provided a recommendation to the Navy of how they should be looking at pared head differences (using TFN) in September of 2018. They have been using his recommendation and spoke to their results in March at our face to face meetings. This is covered in part under "water related CSM issues" in the meeting summaries from that week and starting at slide 42 of the presentation from that day. Matt will need to look at the follow up items from that meeting's discussion in his assessment of the Navy's base model to see if they have incorporated the lessons learned from the TFN analysis and our face to face discussions.

Thanks

Lyndsey Tu
Underground Storage Tanks Program
Land Division, U.S. EPA Pacific Southwest
Tu.Lyndsey@epa.gov | 415-972-3269

From: Grange, Gabrielle Fenix <Gabrielle.Grange@doh.hawaii.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, June 25, 2019 1:36 PM
To: Shalev, Omer <Shalev.Omer@epa.gov>
Cc: Ichinotsubo, Lene K <lene.ichinotsubo@doh.hawaii.gov>; TU, LYNDSEY <Tu.Lyndsey@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: AOC Agenda_7-30- to 8-1_Navy_AOC Parties F2F Mtg Suggested Changes.docx

Yes, the model deliverable is the Navy's, so having them lead is fine, but this is our chance to actively engage and show them alternate visualizations with the data we already have in hand.

Will Matt still be running scenarios in Groundwater desktop or are budget issues further constraining his work? SSPA has the 3-D geologic layer they built last year from the barrel logs, etc. Introducing and using this tool in the F2F meetings allows us to jointly visualize different scenarios (prepared in advance) with the Navy in a collaborative fashion. For example, this would be a great way to show how using the results of the paired head difference analyses could change the outputs. Matt's expertise at this time is critical.

We need to get the agenda to the Navy. I'd prefer you simply take (Navy) off the title line for that section and send it out.

Fenix

From: Shalev, Omer <Shalev.Omer@epa.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, June 25, 2019 9:47 AM
To: Grange, Gabrielle Fenix <Gabrielle.Grange@doh.hawaii.gov>
Cc: Ichinotsubo, Lene K <lene.ichinotsubo@doh.hawaii.gov>; TU, LYNDSEY <Tu.Lyndsey@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: AOC Agenda_7-30- to 8-1_Navy_AOC Parties F2F Mtg Suggested Changes.docx

Hi Fenix, thanks for catching our errors. I changed modeling demos on day 2 to be Navy lead and made that 2 hours. Then there is a break and then agencies discuss model review process for one hour. I think we need Navy to run the demonstration and discussion for the model itself. It's their model and making sure that Navy's model can be described well should be their responsibility and eat up their resources (time and money), not necessarily ours.

See attached, I would like to send this version over to the Navy.

Thanks again,

Omer Shalev
Environmental Engineer
Land, Chemicals and Redevelopment Division (LND-4-3)
EPA Region 9
75 Hawthorne St.
San Francisco, CA 94105
(415) 972-3538

From: Grange, Gabrielle Fenix <Gabrielle.Grange@doh.hawaii.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, June 25, 2019 12:01 PM
To: Shalev, Omer <Shalev.Omer@epa.gov>
Cc: Ichinotsubo, Lene K <lene.ichinotsubo@doh.hawaii.gov>; TU, LYNDSEY <Tu.Lyndsey@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: AOC Agenda_7-30- to 8-1_Navy_AOC Parties F2F Mtg Suggested Changes.docx

Omer and Lyndsey,

Agenda looks good, thanks.

The timeline overlapped on day 2, so I corrected that.

I added some additional language to flesh out the modeling time on day two. We have talked about the importance of showing the groundwater desktop application using Matt's 3-d modeling as a way to share and discuss alternate visualizations of the subsurface and gw flows. The Navy could compare different end member runs and see how they compare to field measurements.

If these are fine, please go ahead and forward to the Navy.

Fenix

From: Shalev, Omer <Shalev.Omer@epa.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, June 25, 2019 5:45 AM
To: Grange, Gabrielle Fenix <Gabrielle.Grange@doh.hawaii.gov>
Cc: Ichinotsubo, Lene K <lene.ichinotsubo@doh.hawaii.gov>; TU, LYNDSEY <Tu.Lyndsey@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: AOC Agenda_7-30- to 8-1_Navy_AOC Parties F2F Mtg Suggested Changes.docx

Sorry there was a small typo. Please use this version.

Omer Shalev
Environmental Engineer
Land, Chemicals and Redevelopment Division (LND-4-3)
EPA Region 9
75 Hawthorne St.
San Francisco, CA 94105
(415) 972-3538

From: TU, LYNDSEY
Sent: Tuesday, June 25, 2019 7:34 AM
To: Grange, Gabrielle Fenix <gabrielle.grange@doh.hawaii.gov>
Cc: Ichinotsubo, Lene K <lene.ichinotsubo@doh.hawaii.gov>; Shalev, Omer <Shalev.Omer@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: AOC Agenda_7-30- to 8-1_Navy_AOC Parties F2F Mtg Suggested Changes.docx

Hi Fenix,

Here is the agenda with changes we discussed yesterday. If this is acceptable to DOH please pass along to the Navy.

Thanks

Lyndsey Tu
Underground Storage Tanks Program
Land Division, U.S. EPA Pacific Southwest
Tu.Lyndsey@epa.gov | 415-972-3269

From: Grange, Gabrielle Fenix <Gabrielle.Grange@doh.hawaii.gov>
Sent: Monday, June 24, 2019 11:07 AM
To: TU, LYNDSEY <Tu.Lyndsey@epa.gov>
Cc: Ichinotsubo, Lene K <lene.ichinotsubo@doh.hawaii.gov>
Subject: FW: AOC Agenda_7-30- to 8-1_Navy_AOC Parties F2F Mtg Suggested Changes.docx
Importance: High

Lyndsey,

Sorry for the delay in responding. I was seeking input from others on our team. Hope you got my voicemail on the subject late last week. We would strongly prefer the approach I laid out of starting with Navy and EPA/DOH perspectives, presenting agency concerns up front so they can be addressed throughout and checking in on the project

objectives and challenges at the halfway point. We will have received their written response on our Top Ten and will have had two weeks with the model to become familiar with it, so our comments will be relevant to what they will be presenting. We often have the format where they present what they want, and we respond on the fly or after the fact. This is a critical meeting, and ensuring that we are talking about and working through the key areas of difference is, to my thinking, essential.

I'd also like to keep in the item where Matt uses his expertise to present on his recommended calibration and model assessment approaches. Per your addition, I added back in the IRR and connected it to the AOC Section 7 objectives discussion. The end of day check in on Tuesday is to see if the AOC parties are coming to closer alignment, and how we can best use Wednesday.

With respect to the groundwater modeling working group meeting, I would like to see the Navy specifically respond to the top 10 list, including an update on their thinking on the LNAPL approach. I would also like to reserve time for DOH to discuss key concerns the Source Water Protection studies we are currently developing are intended to address, and get feedback from the experts in the room on some of the key questions. I suggest this happen right after lunch. Because USGS experts will be there, it would be very helpful to have a short session on thermal profiling - I wonder if we could have a breakout or lunch session on this issue?

Feel free to give me a call.

Fenix

From: TU, LYNDSEY <Tu.Lyndsey@epa.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, June 18, 2019 10:59 AM
To: Grange, Gabrielle Fenix <Gabrielle.Grange@doh.hawaii.gov>
Cc: Whittier, Robert <Robert.Whittier@doh.hawaii.gov>; g.d.beckett <g.d.beckett@aquiver.com>; Myers, Hugh <Hugh.Myers@doh.hawaii.gov>; Matt Tonkin <matt@sspa.com>; Donald Thomas <dthomas@soest.hawaii.edu>; Ichinotsubo, Lene K <lene.ichinotsubo@doh.hawaii.gov>; Shalev, Omer <Shalev.Omer@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: AOC Agenda_7-30- to 8-1_Navy_AOC Parties F2F Mtg Suggested Changes.docx

Hi Fenix,

I primarily made structural changes to the Agenda you provided, largely for clarity and some for organization. As an FYI I moved and consolidated all of the EPA/DOH discussion on the GW flow model to all morning the second day. I thought that consolidating the agency led discussion and letting the Navy explain their model modifications first made a bit more sense for the logical flow of things. I am open to other configurations for the agenda but hearing about the model changes and CSM changes before we begin the agency discussion topics is my general preference. I believe the subjects are generally the same in this version though I did consolidate some that seemed to be the same under the topic of gw flow model.

I am also attaching the version you sent for reference, the track changes got a bit confusing because I deleted from some sections but added the content back into others etc.

Thanks!

Lyndsey Tu
Underground Storage Tanks Program
Land Division, U.S. EPA Pacific Southwest
Tu.Lyndsey@epa.gov | 415-972-3269

From: Grange, Gabrielle Fenix <Gabrielle.Grange@doh.hawaii.gov>
Sent: Monday, June 17, 2019 10:06 PM
To: TU, LYNDSEY <Tu.Lyndsey@epa.gov>
Cc: Whittier, Robert <Robert.Whittier@doh.hawaii.gov>; g.d.beckett <g.d.beckett@aquiver.com>; Myers, Hugh <hugh.myers@doh.hawaii.gov>; Matt Tonkin <matt@sspa.com>; Donald Thomas <dthomas@soest.hawaii.edu>; Ichinotsubo, Lene K <lene.ichinotsubo@doh.hawaii.gov>
Subject: AOC Agenda_7-30- to 8-1_Navy_AOC Parties F2F Mtg Suggested Changes.docx

Lyndsey,

Per our discussion earlier today, see attached revisions to the Navy agenda to create interactive, purpose driven discussions and active collaboration on improving the output to best serve the project. Started with the CSM as the fundamental building block, Top 10 as the checkpoint at the end. I deleted the IRR section as the time seemed too precious to spend two hours on that. Would suggest Navy discuss this at the GWMWG instead. I added your requested language early on Day 1 listing Matt delivering the message - don't know if that is what you had in mind. I included a number of items mentioned by team members - but will need input from them to see if I hit the mark or missed including something key.

I'll send out suggestion for the GWMWG agenda changes as well tomorrow if possible.

Fenix