


To: Project File
From: Merry E Gamper, BLM WSO, Project Lead

Administration Plan Change 1
PAPA Interim Groundwater/Aquifer Pollution Prevention, Mitigation and Monitoring Plan

Interim Plan, Project Administration, Change 1: Section 5.0, page 27:
Sentence "Organizationally, the BLM will assume the lead role in managing the Project to ensure the various work tasks identified herein are completed within the schedule and budget established for the effort"

This will be changed to read: "The BLM has authority to implement the conditions of the PAPA FSEIS, Record of Decision, May 2008 (PAPA SEIS ROD). BLM is responsible for ensuring that the scope of the project remains in compliance with the provisions of the PAPA SEIS ROD. DEQ and EPA, as cooperating agencies, will provide technical review of the study objectives and any subsequent task plans to the BLM. The Operators may provide technical suggestions to plan scope and are responsible for communication with AMEC, and for tracking expenses and budget compliance as the administrator of the third party contract. Communications shall remain between the Operators and the BLM. Any disagreements shall be resolved at the lowest level possible".

Change accepted by BLM on 3/26/2012.


1335

Email Concurrence received by:

Andrew Schmidt, EPA R8, 3/8/2012 (attached)

Kevin Frederick, DEQ, 3/9/2012 (attached)

Gamper, Merry E

From: Kevin Frederick <kevin.frederick@wyo.gov>
Sent: Friday, March 09, 2012 4:19 PM
To: Gamper, Merry E
Cc: Andrew Schmidt; Deborah Harris; Mark Conrad
Subject: Re: Change1.IAMMPPAdministrative Plan.Final03082012.doc

Merry,

I'm OK with the proposed revised language.

I'll ask our NEPA coordinator (Mark Conrad) how to best handle the concurrence questions. Thanks.

Kevin Frederick, P.G.
Manager, Groundwater Section
Water Quality Division
Wyoming Department of Environmental Quality
122 W. 25th St. - 4W
Cheyenne, WY 82002

(307) - 777- 5985

On Thu, Mar 8, 2012 at 9:34 AM, Gamper, Merry E <mgamper@blm.gov> wrote:

> Good morning Kevin and Andrew.

>

>

>

> As we discussed yesterday, here is the proposed final change to the
> administration plan developed in response to an internal meeting the
> Operators had with members of BLM management to discuss the budget overruns.

>

>

>

> Instead of giving this to the Operators to have AMEC format and send
> out, I've decided to send it to you first for concurrence. I do not
> believe that this needs formal signature concurrence, but it does need
> something don't you think? If you can look this over and let me know
> your thoughts, I'd sure appreciate it. I am noting for the record
> that the final posted administration plan doesn't have any type of
> formal acceptance-type document attached to it in the first place so maybe it is unnecessary?

>

>

>

> Speaking of the upcoming final reports, I do think we need to
> formalize their acceptance as meeting the requirements of the Interim
> Plan. Do you concur? Not sure what the easiest way to do this would
> be; it may need to be a formal letter of transmittal to your agency
> with a requested letter of concurrence.

E-Mail to and from me, in connection with the transaction of public business, is subject to the Wyoming Public Records Act and may be disclosed to third parties.

Gamper, Merry E

From: Andrew Schmidt <Schmidt.Andrew@epamail.epa.gov>
Sent: Thursday, March 08, 2012 11:52 AM
To: Gamper, Merry E
Cc: Gregory Oberley
Subject: Re: Change1.IAMMPPAdministrative Plan.Final03082012.doc

Hi Merry,

These changes appear to reflect changes that were discussed yesterday. The EPA's role, nor the communication pathway, appear to be different.

As for whether we need to formalize their acceptance and whether that meets the requirements of the interim plan, I will leave that up to you.

Thanks!

Andrew

Andrew P. Schmidt, P.G.
Regional Superfund Hydrogeologist
US EPA Region 8, 8EPR-PS
1595 Wynkoop Street
Denver, CO 80202-1129
303.312.6283 (office)
303.312.7151 (fax)

Please consider the environment before printing this email.

From: "Gamper, Merry E" <mgamper@blm.gov>
To: Kevin Frederick <kevin.frederick@wyo.gov>, Andrew Schmidt/R8/USEPA/US@EPA
Cc: Deborah Harris <deborah.harris@wyo.gov>
Date: 03/08/2012 09:34 AM
Subject: Change1.IAMMPPAdministrative Plan.Final03082012.doc

Good morning Kevin and Andrew.

As we discussed yesterday, here is the proposed final change to the administration plan developed in response to an internal meeting the Operators had with members of BLM management to discuss the budget overruns.

Instead of giving this to the Operators to have AMEC format and send out, I've decided to send it to you first for concurrence. I do not believe that this needs formal signature concurrence, but it does need something don't you think? If you can look this over and let me know your thoughts, I'd sure appreciate it. I am noting for the record that the final posted administration plan doesn't have any type of formal acceptance-type document attached to it in the first place so maybe it is unnecessary?

Speaking of the upcoming final reports, I do think we need to formalize their acceptance as meeting the requirements of the Interim Plan. Do you concur? Not sure what the easiest way to do this would be; it may need to be a formal letter of transmittal to your agency with a requested letter of concurrence. [attachment "Change1.IAMMPPAdministrative Plan.Final03082012.doc" deleted by Andrew Schmidt/R8/USEPA/US]