RE: Stormwater list

McKenna, James (Jim) to: TARNOW Karen E, Eric Blischke 12/18/2006 08:22 AM
Cc: Valerie Oster, ANDERSON Jim M, JOHNSON Keith, Kristine Koch

Thanks Karen, your summary of events helps greatly. I understand the experience and knowledge certain DEQ people can bring to the table (i.e., Tom), and appreciate their input. My main concern was more process-oriented: I want to make sure the established tech group is familiar with changes/inputs that effect the list of sites in real time so that we don't have to waste a lot of time during the Monday morning meeting explaining how/why each change was made. Since the Monday morning meeting will likely be the last chance to gain consensus for this group, we will want to make it as productive a meeting as possible.

Again thanks, Jim. (and I know how hard you have been working on this, so please don't take my comments as criticism of your efforts!).

-----Original Message-----
From: TARNOW Karen E [mailto:TARNOW.Karen@deq.state.or.us]
Sent: Sunday, December 17, 2006 9:43 PM
To: McKenna, James (Jim); Blischke.Eric@epamail.epa.gov
Cc: Valerie Oster; ANDERSON Jim M; JOHNSON Keith; Koch.Kristine@epamail.epa.gov
Subject: RE: Stormwater list

I regret the consternation caused by the list I sent out last Wednesday. I will ensure that we are working off Eric's list when the tech team meets Monday AM.

I think the tech team has pretty clear direction for moving forward given Jim and Eric's recent emails, so I'm fairly confident that we won't continue to experience these cross wires. But in case it helps, here is a brief explanation for a couple of the issues Jim raises.

At the managers' meeting on Nov 30, in addition to giving direction to the tech team to flesh out the methodology, I came away from the meeting thinking that the managers also wanted some feedback on questions that came up in the discussion in order to put them to rest. From my recollection, those questions included:

What was different/similar about operations at the various Chevron sites and BP Arco, and based upon that, which one(s) should we sample to get the land use data we were interested in?
Should we stick with the proposed Forest Park sampling site, or consider the opportunity to locate a sample site in one of the other basins we discussed?
Should we sample an additional outfall on the river side of Schnitzer?

I also thought the managers wanted some ground truthing of the specific outfalls that were on the list. Dawn and I both captured some additional questions in our notes from that meeting, but I can't recall those right now and don't have access to my notes.

I interpreted that request for feedback as being directed toward DEQ and the City, given their familiarity with sites throughout the harbor or

access to sources of information, and not to the tech team. I asked Tom Roick to assist with that effort because he is much better informed about site-specific issues than I, and because my time was being consumed by the tech team's methodology discussions and I didn't have time to get informed since these two tasks were happening simultaneously. The list that Dawn and Tom put together, and that I forwarded to Eric before he finalized his list, was organized in a manner we felt would make it easier to discern how many sampling sites we had for each land use type, in order to facilitate the discussion about whether we have the right mix. There were only a few differences between Dawn/Tom's list and Eric's final list. With regards to the list I sent out last Wednesday, I thought I had updated it to reflect the key components of Eric's list, but I understand how that would be hard to assess and how the additional columns and comments could create confusion. As I mentioned above, this alternative list does not need to be part of our deliberation as we move forward.

For better or for worse, it seems as though that's all behind us now. I believe that Jim's and Eric's emails will help ensure that we are all clear about what the assignments and expectations are as we move forward.

Karen

-----Original Message-----
From: McKenna, James (Jim)
[mailto:Jim.McKenna@portofportland.com]
Sent: Fri 12/15/2006 3:51 PM
To: Blischke.Eric@epamail.epa.gov; TARNOW Karen E
Cc: Valerie Oster; ANDERSON Jim M; JOHNSON Keith;
Koch.Kristine@epamail.epa.gov
Subject: Stormwater list

Eric and Karen,

It has come to my attention that a significantly modified list of sites was circulated late Wednesday afternoon for the tech team to review. I am quite concerned on two fronts: a) procedurally how this revised list was generated, and b) this may impede the tech team's chances of coming to consensus Monday morning. I am not being a stickler here and I am not trying to throw a wrench in the works. Rather, we all recognized the importance of controlling this collaborative process in order to optimize the chances of achieving a consensus approach. This is critical when considering the tight time constraint we are under. Here are my concerns and recommendations for moving forward:

a) Procedural. The revised list was generated by Dawn and Tom Roick last week. I'm not sure how Tom got involved with the tech group, especially when we tried to keep enrollment to a minimum. If his input was deemed necessary, we should have formally appointed him to the tech group and cc'd him on all communications. The revised list was not circulated to the broader tech group until late Wednesday, so the assertions made by some at Wednesday's Management Team meeting that the tech group was in agreement with the list were false. In fact, the tech team, prior to Wednesday's Management Team meeting, was asked to focus on the sampling methodologies and not on the list. Therefore, it is troubling that a small sub-group of the tech team was given the

opportunity to modify Eric's list without accommodating input from other members. This is especially troubling in that the revisions are not presented in "red-line", making it quite difficult to determine what has been changed, deleted, or added. (For example, the headers and columns are significantly different, there are many changes to the "comments" in the far right column, the outfalls at the BP terminal and Schnitzer riverside sites have been dropped). In order to adequately manage this process, I recommend we stick with the established tech group attendees and make sure all are cc'd on emails. In addition, circulated comments should be presented in red-line format.

b) Monday Tech Meeting. I recommend the tech team stick to reviewing Eric's list. This will help avoid the confusion of having to compare Eric's list with the newly revised list. Those parties that provided suggested changes to Eric's list last week can restate their suggestions Monday for the entire group to vet.

Thanks,

Jim McKenna
Port of Portland
Phone (503) 944-7325
Fax (503) 944-7353