From:	Robinson, Derek J CIV USN NAVFAC SW SAN CA (USA)
To:	Banister, Stephen D CIV USN (USA); Hackett, John/DEN
Cc:	Henderson, Kim/SDO (Kimberly.Henderson@jacobs.com); Stoick, Paul T CIV USN (USA); Janda, Danielle L CIV USN (USA); Daniel.Cohen@jacobs.com
Subject:	RE: EPA comments on technical details in Parcel G draft final Work Plan
Date:	Tuesday, April 30, 2019 13:30:04

Thanks for the input Steve!

I agree with what you are saying, but have a different understanding of how we would move forward.

1. Send RTCs (background RTCs will be ready at the same time.)
2. Navy finalizes the work plan (EPA will send separate concurrence for each portion)
3. Finalize the addendum (normal concurrence)
4. Maybe change pages (or other) will be needed to update sections of the work plan. Maybe not.

This allows us to finalize the document and conduct work in accordance with a finalized document. Changes, if needed, can be completed later. No need to concede anything in the WP. Background proceeds with identical timeline to the other plan.

Unless someone else has comments, please proceed with the plan as I described.

Derek

From: Banister, Stephen D CIV USN (USA) <stephen.banister@navy.mil>
Sent: Tuesday, April 30, 2019 12:07 PM
To: Robinson, Derek J CIV USN NAVFAC SW SAN CA (USA) <derek.j.robinson1@navy.mil>; Hackett, John/DEN <John.Hackett@ch2m.com>
Cc: Henderson, Kim/SDO (Kimberly.Henderson@jacobs.com) <Kimberly.Henderson@jacobs.com>; Stoick, Paul T CIV USN (USA) <paul.stoick@navy.mil>; Janda, Danielle L CIV USN (USA) <danielle.janda@navy.mil>; Daniel.Cohen@jacobs.com
Subject: RE: EPA comments on technical details in Parcel G draft final Work Plan

Derek,

I think the primary reason to respond to EPA's request to address background comments would be to start fieldwork a full month earlier. I don't think we anticipate concurrence on the building or soil portion with full RTCs. I believe procedurally that concurrence would come from follow on documents to the G WP which will evaluate the current RGs.

As we know from the schedules, this would reduce the impacts for ALL other work.

In our pre-S3 meeting with APTIM yesterday, we confirmed that background work has not started. They assumed that we would not have sent the addendum in draft form without also finalizing the

Parcel G WP simultaneously.

I see this as an opportunity to move forward with fieldwork and avoid conceding anything on the WP.

V/r,
Stephen Banister P.G.
619-524-6040

From: Robinson, Derek J CIV USN NAVFAC SW SAN CA (USA) <derek.j.robinson1@navy.mil>
Sent: Tuesday, April 30, 2019 11:26 AM
To: Banister, Stephen D CIV USN (USA) <stephen.banister@navy.mil>; Hackett, John/DEN <John.Hackett@ch2m.com>
Cc: Henderson, Kim/SDO (Kimberly.Henderson@jacobs.com) <Kimberly.Henderson@jacobs.com>; Stoick, Paul T CIV USN (USA) <paul.stoick@navy.mil>; Janda, Danielle L CIV USN (USA) <danielle.janda@navy.mil>; Daniel.Cohen@jacobs.com
Subject: RE: EPA comments on technical details in Parcel G draft final Work Plan

Thanks to everyone for continuing to move these forward.

After a discussion with Lawrence this morning, we do not want to separate out the background RTCs. It is important to have a final work plan before doing anything in the field. This means that we have to complete RTCs for all the comments concurrently and finalize the work plan. EPA can give us their concurrence separately on different components of the work plan, if that is what they want to do.

Please let me know if there are good reasons to do this differently. If so, we would need to talk with LL first.

Derek

From: Banister, Stephen D CIV USN (USA) <stephen.banister@navy.mil>
Sent: Tuesday, April 30, 2019 10:05 AM
To: Hackett, John/DEN <John.Hackett@ch2m.com>
Cc: Henderson, Kim/SDO (Kimberly.Henderson@jacobs.com) <Kimberly.Henderson@jacobs.com>; Stoick, Paul T CIV USN (USA) <paul.stoick@navy.mil>; Robinson, Derek J CIV USN NAVFAC SW SAN CA (USA) <derek.j.robinson1@navy.mil>; Janda, Danielle L CIV USN (USA) <danielle.janda@navy.mil>; Daniel.Cohen@jacobs.com
Subject: FW: EPA comments on technical details in Parcel G draft final Work Plan

John,

I just spoke with Lily on the phone. She said that if we provide clarification on the background issues in the attached letter and provide a description of specific gamma walkover instruments, that EPA would provide concurrence to move forward with background. Will you and Kim please work on responses to number 6,10, 11, 12 and the instrument info request?

I realize much of this may be duplicated effort and information, but I'm hoping that we can use this informal opportunity to move forward on the project.

I will be at the APTIM office for the S3 presentation at 1pm, but will be around otherwise if you would like to discuss more.

V/r,
Stephen Banister P.G.
619-524-6040

From: LEE, LILY <LEE.LILY@EPA.GOV>
Sent: Friday, April 26, 2019 12:00 AM
To: Robinson, Derek J CIV USN NAVFAC SW SAN CA (USA) <derek.j.robinson1@navy.mil>; Stoick, Paul T CIV USN (USA) <paul.stoick@navy.mil>; Banister, Stephen D CIV USN (USA) <stephen.banister@navy.mil>
Cc: juanita.bacey@dtsc.ca.gov; Chesnutt, John <Chesnutt.John@epa.gov>; Sanchez, Yolanda <Sanchez.Yolanda@epa.gov>; Fairbanks, Brianna <Fairbanks.Brianna@epa.gov>; Karla Brasaemle (kbrasaemle@techlawinc.com) <kbrasaemle@techlawinc.com>; Kappelman, David <Kappelman.David@epa.gov>; Nguyen, Lyndsey <Nguyen.Lyndsey@epa.gov>; jdawson@techlawinc.com; Singh, Sheetal (CDPH-EMB) <sheetal.singh@cdph.ca.gov>; Reese, Shane@CDPH <shane.reese@cdph.ca.gov>
Subject: [Non-DoD Source] EPA comments on technical details in Parcel G draft final Work Plan

Dear Derek, Paul, and Steve,

Attached are final comments on technical details related to the draft final Parcel G Work Plan version November 2, 2018. Please contact me if you would like to discuss these further. Thank you.

- Lily

Lily Lee
Cleanup Project Manager, Superfund Division
US Environmental Protection Agency, Region 9
75 Hawthorne St. (SFD-8-3)
San Francisco, CA 94105
415-947-4187