From: OMEALY Mikell
To: Chip Humphrey/R10/USEPA/US@EPA; Eric Blischke/R10/USEPA/US@EPA
Cc: PETERSON Jenn L
Subject: heads-up on goal for tomorrow
Date: 04/10/2006 02:44 PM

Chip and Eric,

I don't know whether you've had a chance to read much of LWG's response yet, but Jennifer and I were just discussing the opening pages in relation to what LWG hopes to achieve in tomorrow's ERA Framework meeting. Page 3 of the response states that LWG believes that the data collection needs EPA identified should be narrowed/streamlined by focusing on what's needed to make remedy decisions, and notes that our framework discussions will be a vehicle for resolving issues between EPA/partners and LWG. (I think some government team members may be unclear about the genesis/purpose of these framework meetings, and clarifying this, or asking Jim, Bob or Rick to clarify it could be helpful.)

Jim stated today that tomorrow, he hopes to gain agreement from the group that the general concepts proposed in the ERA Framework document represent how we want to move forward as a group with the ERA, knowing that many important details of how the framework will be implemented are yet to be determined. After talking with Jennifer, I think some members of our team (or all?) may not be comfortable agreeing with the general approach in the framework document before issues are resolved about what lines of evidence (or measurement endpoints) will be used, as well as other issues. LWG's ERA Framework document relied heavily on sediment-related LOEs, which makes sense given that LWG is trying to narrow R3 data collection needs to only those related to making remedy decisions (as stated in their response document below). I think our team may be hesitant to agree in concept with any parts of the Framework document -- the weighting scheme, scale levels, and proposed LOE -- knowing that before we talk about *how* we'll weight LOEs, we've got to agree on *what* LOEs/measurement endpoints we'll analyze and collect data on for the ERA.

I think the Eco Team folks are planning to meet here at DEQ before tomorrow's meeting to talk about this more. I just wanted to give you a heads-up on why our team may not be comfortable agreeing with the approach proposed in the Framework document. Feel free to give me a ring if you'd like to discuss.

Thanks,
Mikell

> -----Original Message-----
> **From:** Lora Boehlke [mailto:lboehlke@integral-corp.com]
> **Sent:** Friday, April 07, 2006 5:23 PM
> **To:** Humphrey.Chip@epamail.epa.gov; Blischke.Eric@epamail.epa.gov
> **Cc:** ANDERSON Jim M; tomd@ctsi.nsn.us; rose@yakama.com; cunninghame@gorge.net; erin.madden@gmail.com; valerie.lee@eiltd.net; jean.lee@eiltd.net; audiehuber@ctuir.com; jeff.baker@grandronde.org; MCCLINCY Matt; davoli.dana@epa.gov; ted_buerger@fws.gov; howp@critfc.org; KEPLER Rick J; humphrey.chip@epa.gov; blischke.eric@epa.gov; preston_sleeger@ios.doi.gov; ron.gouguet@noaa.gov; OMEALY Mikell; Keith Pine; Bill Locke; Valerie Oster
> **Subject:** 2006-04-07_R3DataGaps-SOW_LWGResponse
>
> Chip and Eric:
>
> LWG's detailed responses to EPA's December 2, 2005 *Identification of Round 3 Data Gaps* and February 17, 2006 *Proposed Round 3 Scope of Work* are attached. Hard copy will be provided early next week. Please contact Bob Wyatt or Jim McKenna if you have any questions. Thank you