

To: "david cabiness" <dmcabiness@efdsouth.navfac.navy.mil>
"scott glass" <saglass@efdsouth.navfac.navy.mil>
Cc: "betcher, john [gwsrs]" <jbetcher@gw.pca.state.mn.us>
"ferrey, mark [gwsrs]" <mferrey@gw.pca.state.mn.us>
"tom bloom" <bloom.thomas@epamail.epa.gov>
Bcc:
From: david.douglas@pca.state.mn.us
Subject: NIROP
Date: Monday, February 5, 1996 5:25:00 EST
Attach: Headers.822
Certify: N
Forwarded by:

Dave and Scott, I am sending this e-mail to summarize the major points regarding our conversations last Friday.

DQO Briefing

Dave, you wanted to bring in a Navy group to the MPCA to train us in DQO guidance pursuant to the last sentence of the first paragraph of the Introduction to Attachment A to the FFA (on February 13th) : "If guidance documents discussed in this Attachment are revised after this Agreement becomes final, the most recent revision of that document should be used."

Before we respond to this request, please answer the following questions:

1. What guidance documents in Attachment A are you referring to?
2. How is this DQO guidance related to the FFA?
3. Why isn't the FFA sufficient to complete the investigation and cleanup of NIROP?

Please call me and Tom when you have answers to these questions so we can determine how to proceed.

East and West Plating Room Investigation

Scott, as we discussed on Friday, the MPCA staff is postponing further review of the plating room work plan we received on January 2nd until you answer the following questions:

1. How is the east and west plating room investigation related to the OU2/OU3 RI? As we discussed on Friday approximately 1/4 of the number of subsites presently identified for the OU2/OU3 Site Evaluation Report are in this area. Also approximately 1/2 of the degreasers were/are located in this area. Therefore, this area constitutes far more than a small chunk of the whole. As Mark Ferrey and I reiterated, it was our understanding that the reason for this work related to difficulties in getting into to certain areas because of consolidating plating equipment in one area.
2. Is the Navy prepared to proceed at its own risk (risk of having the data rejected and the work redone because it does not meet the QAPjP requirements for the OU2/OU3 RI? As you know the Navy is currently working on the OU2/OU3 RI QAPjP and its final approval date by EPA and MPCA is currently unknown, but presumably we can get this done soon.

Please answer these questions and then we can arrange a conference call with you and Tom to discuss how to proceed.

Please give me a call if I need to clarify anything in this e-mail message.
Thanks, Dave