From: OMEALY Mikell
To: Eric Blischke/R10/USEPA/US@EPA
Subject: FW: Thursday Lamprey Sturgeon premeeting with LWG/COP
Date: 04/05/2006 10:14 AM

FYI

-----Original Message-----
From: Ron Gouguet [mailto:Ron.Gouguet@noaa.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, April 04, 2006 5:05 PM
To: Erin Madden
Cc: 'Valerie Lee'; 'Aron Borok'; Chris.Thompson@eiltd.net; 'Lisa Bluelake'; jeff.baker@grandronde.org; Brian Cunninghame; 'Billy Barquin'; tomd@ctsi.nsn.us; rose@yakama.com; raygivens@givenslaw.com; Audiehuber@ctuir.com; Ted_Buerger@fws.gov; Jeremy_Buck@fws.gov; 'Katherine Pease'; 'OMEALY Mikell'; KEPLER Rick J; Robert Neely
Subject: Thursday Lamprey Sturgeon premeeting with LWG/COP

Hi y'all:

Looks like a constructive format for Th's meeting will be free disscussion & Q&A with LWG on how to potentially resolve lamprey & sturgeon questions .

Groundrule proposal: 'stipulate' that further discussions and decisions will need to be made in some envisioned future (soon) meeting; we may have a largish parking lot..

If no one 'strenuously' objects let's go forward with a call @ 0900-1200

with LWG, COP, trustees and select EPA observers (aka RPMs & their team).

We'll play it by ear if we want to continue with the remaining 'potential partners' from LWG to continue the discussion, when Jim drops

off, but generally we maybe should shoot for about an hour & a half to discuss the ideas & talk about how to apporoach an upcoming Lamprey Sturgeon (framework?) summit?. Something like a schedule of 0900-1030with LWG & continue from 10-12 with co-trustees, EPA OK, as needed?

06 @ 0900 using the NOAA line nonresponsi Participant Passcode: nonres

Ron

McKenna, James (Jim) wrote: Hi Ron, I'm chiming in from Nevada where I'm

attending a week-long class. I appreciate your concerns about the Thursday meeting. The LWG is responding to an invitation from the Trustees to attend this meeting, so if you feel the Trustees need more time we can be accommodating. However, just to be clear, the LWG is not

coming to this meeting with hardened positions. It was our understanding that the Trustees, EPA and its partners, and the LWG would

come to the meeting with open minds to discuss what we already know about lamprey, what we need to know, and options to get there.
We are very interested to hear each parties views and ideas, and then take that information under consideration over the next few weeks in order to help develop a path forward.
I am comfortable proceeding with your suggested meeting format. I will call in Thursday for the first hour. The logistics (e.g., call-in number) should be coordinated with Valerie Thompson Oster. Thanks, Jim.

-----Original Message-----
From: Ron Gouguet
To: Valerie Oster
CC: Erin Madden; Chip; McKenna, James (Jim); Bob Wyatt
Sent: Tue Apr 04 12:03:55 2006
Subject: Re: Thursday meeting update and question

Valerie:
We really need the extra time. How about this, we schedule ~1 hour with LWG when Jim can call. If he has to drop off, fine. We won't be able to talk a long time, but just touching base is probably useful, as long as everyone realizes we are brainstoring. Is there a number (y'all's?) we can all use? We can do a 30min focussed presentation possibly as a peek at where the ideas are at this point on filling the information holes in our datasets. Y'all may want to drop off too so we caneach chat among ourselves, while ideas are fresh in ouor minds - let's just try not to harden positions but think of possible resolutions for the question raised.

OK?
ROn
Valerie Oster wrote:

>Hi Ron,
>
>I have communicated with Jim McKenna and Bob Wyatt, and the LWG preference would be to keep the meeting as scheduled for April 6. Jim is

comfortable with the Port being represented by others in his absense, and he will be calling in for about 30-60 minutes in the beginning of

the day.
>
>Thanks,
>Valerie
>
>Valerie Thompson Oster
>Anchor Environmental, L.L.C
>6650 SW Redwood Lane, Suite 110
>Portland, OR 97224
>Phone: 503-670-1108 x19
>Fax: 503-670-1128
>
>This electronic message transmission contains information that is a
>confidential and/or privileged work product prepared in anticipation of
>litigation. The information is intended to be for the use of the
individual
>or entity named above. If you are not the intended recipient, please
be >aware that any disclosure, copying, distribution or use of the
contents of >this information is prohibited. If you have received this
electronic >transmission in error, please notify us by electronic mail
at
voster@anchorenv.com.
>
>_____
>
>From: Ron Gouguet [mailto:Ron.Gouguet@noaa.gov]
>Sent: Tue 4/4/2006 9:50 AM
>To: Erin Madden; Chip; Valerie Oster; McKenna, James (Jim)
>Subject: Re: Thursday meeting update and question
>
>
>
>Hi Valerie - Can you stand down for now on the Th date? Spoke to Erin
& >we want to find a time when Jim McKenna can participate in the next
2 >weeks. Can you check on that availability (with other LWG members?)
>I'll check with Rick @ COP. Thanks! Sorry for the confusion
>
>Unfortunately I just sent an email to Valerie Oster and Chip H.
confirming >the meeting on Thursday. I do not have time to attempt to
re-schedule this >today. I understand the concerns, but at this late
date, rescheduling is >going to be difficult. It took me five days to
get calls back from Jim >McKenna and get confirmation from Valerie
Oster that five LWG members
could
>make this meeting on Thursday. If someone is able to do it, I would
start >with Jim and Rick and find out their availability, then run
those dates by >us and EPA. Does someone have time to do that today? >
> > > >
>

Erin Madden wrote:

> I talked to Rick Applegate on Friday. He is comfortable with the
> proposal that Chris put forward last week. Some goals for the mtg from

> his perspective: (1) Force PRPs to say whether there is a problem with

> the study approach, whether it makes sense as laid out; (2) Avoid the
> notion that equipment is a problem for actual sampling; (3) Force
> NRRG/LWG to do something. Although Rick acknowledged that we may not
> reach ultimate agreement on what to do at this meeting, he believes we

> need to have a follow-up meeting quickly to make sure we reach
> agreement in the near future. He also expressed an interest in
> discussing the NRDA vs. CERCLA issues surrounding the studies, but
> agreed that we could discuss the studies as a package first and get to

> the "box" question later. He said he would be surprised if the
> NRRG/LWG has an idea of what fits in which box by the meeting.
>
> I'd like to have an email discussion about the NRDA vs. CERCLA issue
> as it is likely to come up at the meeting. My feeling is that the
> boxes aren't that important except for cost recovery purposes and that

> we should figure out what studies need to be done before putting them
> into boxes. I think a tech memo regarding why the list of studies is
> necessary for a good RI/FS would be helpful.
>
> Based on that info and our conversation last week, here is a proposed
> agenda. I need to get this out to LWG by tomorrow morning, so I need
> your input today.
>
> Agenda:
>
> 1. Introductions
> 2. Discuss goals of meeting (trustees, PRPs)
> 3. Review study proposal (Chris, Ron and Rick?) and answer questions
> about it
> 4. Open discussion re: proceeding with studies (which ones?, when?,
how?)
> 5. Set time for follow up meeting
>
> Also, I need to know if any of you are planning to call-in for the
> meeting. EPA can call out (up to four people) to include in the
> meeting. If we have more than four, then we need a conference call
> line. Two PRPs are planning to be on the phone. Thanks.
>
> erin
>
> Erin Madden
> Attorney At Law

> 503-753-1310
> 503-296-2973 (fax)
> erin.madden@gmail.com <mailto:erin.madden@gmail.com>
>
> The information contained in this e-mail message may be privileged,
> confidential and protected from disclosure. If you are not the
> intended recipient, any dissemination, distribution or copying is
> strictly prohibited. If you think that you have received this e-mail
> message in error, please e-mail the sender at erin.madden@gmail.com.