

Johnson, Bill H (DNR)

From: David Blaha <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Friday, January 06, 2012 7:20 AM
To: Arkley, Stuart (DNR)
Cc: Al Trippel; Carlson, Erik (DNR); Engstrom, Jennifer N (DNR)
Subject: RE: DNR Comments on 12/23/11 Redraft of QA/QC Work Plan

Stuart et al

My apologies that this has taken so much effort on your part, clearly there was a misunderstanding on the level of detail you were looking for with this plan

As I think I mentioned to you, Houston and Fred co-authored the first draft, which in the interest of time I forwarded to you without careful review on my part.

I did coordinate a quick revision to the plan, but clearly that fell short of your expectations.

I will look thru your comments and may give you a call to confirm my understanding of what you are looking for and try to get you a revised version no later than next Friday (I don't want to rush this again as that has clearly been counter-productive)

I will assume "ownership" of this next draft, or if you would prefer to have a fresh body we can ask Al to assign this to someone else – either is fine with me

Take care

From: Arkley, Stuart (DNR) [[mailto:\[REDACTED\]](mailto:[REDACTED])]
Sent: Thursday, January 05, 2012 2:35 PM
To: David Blaha
Cc: Al Trippel; Carlson, Erik (DNR); Engstrom, Jennifer N (DNR)
Subject: DNR Comments on 12/23/11 Redraft of QA/QC Work Plan

Dave,

I have attached DNR's comments on the 12/23 draft of the QA/QC document. There are numerous comments. Much of this stems from a lack of clarity in the first draft that was only partially addressed in the 12/23 draft. The comments generally call for more clarity in the text as well as making substantive suggestions for incorporation into the work plan.

The document still needs an overhaul to address deficiencies carried forward from the original draft, which was not well organized or presented. The current draft does not provide a sufficient basis for the full technical discussion needed to develop a final work plan.

DNR technical reviewers have included comments on this draft based on their best understanding of the proposed work plan. It is possible that some comments are based on a misunderstanding of the text so I encourage the ERM team to contact DNR technical staff to bridge such gaps in understanding while the document is being redrafted. You can contact me or Mike Olson to coordinate conference calls as needed.

Please review the attached comments and let me know how ERM plans to proceed to a revised draft. For example, how long does ERM need to review the comments, and who will ERM select to do the final editing and writing of this document given that the first draft was not well written. Upon receiving your input we can work on defining an appropriate schedule and setting up any necessary meetings.

Thanks,
Stuart

This message contains information which may be confidential, proprietary, privileged, or otherwise protected by law from disclosure or use by a third party. If you have received this message in error, please contact us immediately and take the steps necessary to delete the message completely from your computer system. Thank you.

Please visit ERM's web site: <http://www.erm.com>