

**RESPONSES TO COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT SAMPLING AND ANALYSIS PLAN
FOR THE J-LINE SECTION EXTERIOR OF INSTALLATION RESTORATION SITE 14, MARE ISLAND NAVAL SHIPYARD,
VALLEJO, CALIFORNIA, DATED: DECEMBER 15, 2009**

The table below contains the responses to regulatory agency comments on the “Draft Sampling and Analysis Plan (SAP) for the J-Line Section Exterior of Installation Restoration (IR) Site 14 (IR14), Mare Island Naval Shipyard (MINS), Vallejo, California.” This document was prepared by ChaduxTt, a joint venture of St. George Chadux Corp. and Tetra Tech EM Inc., and was submitted to the agencies on December 15, 2009. The comments addressed below were received from the California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) on March 11, 2010, the California Regional Water Quality Control Board (Water Board) on March 2, 2010, and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) on March 4, 2010. Throughout this table, *italicized* text represents additions. Also throughout this table, references to page, section, table, and figure numbers pertain to the final version of the document unless indicated otherwise.

No.	Work Sheet	Comment	Response
Responses to Comments from the DTSC (Janet Naito, March 10, 2010)			
1	General	The Final Technical Memorandum Human Health Risk and Ecological Assessment on Greensand, Mare Island, Vallejo, California prepared by Tetra Tech EM Inc. and dated June 2, 1999 is stated as providing the basis why greensands in utility corridors does not pose a risk to public health, or to ecological receptors in the IR 04, or IR 14 area. The Technical Memorandum conclusions are based on greensands only occurring in thin discontinuous lenses. Therefore, if different conditions are encountered while drilling as part of this sampling event, additional characterization and risk evaluation may be required.	The majority of the J-Line has already been sampled. The planned sampling, which is within the IR04 site boundary, is intended to supplement this existing data set and address the specific condition issues (breaks, separations) found along the J-Line during the videolog. A multi-phase RI has been completed for this area, and the revised draft final RI report for IR04 was submitted to the regulatory agencies on January 8, 2010 (ChaduxTt 2010). The results of the IR04 HHRA and ERA are consistent with the 1999 Final Technical Memorandum Human Health Risk and Ecological Assessment on Greensand, Mare Island, Vallejo, California.
2	14	The Sampling and Analysis is confusing at times because it contains procedures for activities beyond the proposed scope of work. For example, section 14.3.2 discusses surveying of groundwater monitoring wells and currently only soil borings are proposed for installation.	All references to groundwater monitoring well installation have been removed from the text.
3	14	Soil borings should be logged in accordance with DTSC’s Drilling, Coring, Sampling and Logging at Hazardous Substance Release Sites Guidance (found at http://www.dtsc.ca.gov/SiteCleanup/upload/SMP_Drilling_Coring_Sampling_Logging.pdf)	The following text in was inserted in Section 14.4.1: <i>Soil borings will be logged in accordance with DTSC’s Drilling, Coring, Sampling and Logging at Hazardous Substance Release Sites Guidance (DTSC 1995).</i>

**RESPONSES TO COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT SAMPLING AND ANALYSIS PLAN
FOR THE J-LINE SECTION EXTERIOR OF INSTALLATION RESTORATION SITE 14, MARE ISLAND NAVAL SHIPYARD,
VALLEJO, CALIFORNIA, DATED: DECEMBER 15, 2009 (CONTINUED)**

No.	Work Sheet	Comment	Response
Responses to Comments from the DTSC (Janet Naito, March 10, 2010) (Continued)			
4	17	<p>Section 17.2.1, Subsurface Sampling.</p> <p>a. Please specify length of the sampling interval proposed for homogenization.</p> <p>b. Please clarify whether intervals containing greensands, if present, should be targeted.</p> <p>c. Please clarify whether soil mixing has the potential to impact SVOC analyses. If so, steps should be taken to minimize the potential for volatilization.</p> <p>d. Paragraph 2.</p> <p>i. Sentence 1. EnCore samplers usually do not sufficiently sample for VOC, SVOC, PCB, and metals analysis as implied in this sentence. It is also not consistent with the discussion in Paragraph 3.</p> <p>ii. Sentence 2. Please describe how the depth of the observed water table will impact the sample interval.</p> <p>e. Paragraph 3. Please describe the decision logic for determining when and where to collect the EnCore samples for VOC analysis.</p>	<p>A response is provided below to the individual comments:</p> <p>a. The sampling interval for homogenization is 1 to 2 feet depending on lithologic characteristics. The following text was added: <i>The sampling interval to be homogenized will be one to two feet depending lithologic characteristics of the boring.</i></p> <p>b. The planned sampling intervals do target greensand. Greensand was used as backfill for the J-Line and the planned sampling depth is immediately below the J-Line. Further, the SAP states: “If backfill material extends beneath the initial sample, then a second soil sample may be collected at a maximum depth of 8-feet bgs.”</p> <p>c. Soil mixing does not have the potential to impact SVOC analysis.</p> <p>d. i. The first sentence has been revised to state: <i>...samples will be collected for analysis of select VOCs, SVOCs, PCBs, and metals.</i> For clarification, the following sentence has been added as the first sentence to the third paragraph: <i>Soil samples for VOC analysis will be collected with EnCore samplers.</i></p> <p>ii. The following sentence was added to paragraph 2: <i>Samples will be collected immediately above the watertable if encountered at depths less than targeted sample intervals.</i></p> <p>e. The following statement was added to paragraph 3: <i>Samples for VOC analysis will be collected from every boring at a depth immediately below the J-Line.</i></p>

**RESPONSES TO COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT SAMPLING AND ANALYSIS PLAN
FOR THE J-LINE SECTION EXTERIOR OF INSTALLATION RESTORATION SITE 14, MARE ISLAND NAVAL SHIPYARD,
VALLEJO, CALIFORNIA, DATED: DECEMBER 15, 2009 (CONTINUED)**

No.	Work Sheet	Comment	Response
Responses to Comments from the DTSC (Janet Naito, March 10, 2010) (Continued)			
4 (Cont'd)	17	f. Figure 2 or 3. Please tie sampling identification numbers to their specific location by labeling the sampling locations.	f. The borings were labeled in the revised Figure 3.
5	App. A	It may be that this is a generic chain-of-custody form. However, the chain-of-custody form should include the container types discussed in the text of the document (i.e., EnCore samplers, 4-ounce glass jars, 8 ounce glass jars).	These container types were added to the chain-of-custody form (Appendix A).
Responses to Comments from the Water Board (Elizabeth Wells, PE, March 2, 2010)			
1	1	Executive Summary: Please state why groundwater is not being evaluated as part of the sampling program.	<p>In September 2009 and in coordination with agency input, the Navy prepared the closure approach technical memorandum to obtain agreement on the investigative approach for closure on the exterior portion of the J-Line before development of the Sampling and Analysis Plan (SAP).</p> <p>The Water Board notified the Navy that it would not be providing comments on the technical memorandum and instead would defer to the Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) and EPA for this document. With agency concurrence, the Navy submitted the final response to comments and technical memorandum on September 14, 2009 (ChaduxTt 2009). This draft SAP reflects the sampling approach that was presented and accepted in the final technical memorandum. The following text will be added to the end of the first paragraph of the executive summary:</p> <p><i>This SAP is based on the sampling approach that was discussed and accepted by the regulatory agencies in the final closure approach technical memorandum (ChaduxTt 2009).</i></p>

**RESPONSES TO COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT SAMPLING AND ANALYSIS PLAN
FOR THE J-LINE SECTION EXTERIOR OF INSTALLATION RESTORATION SITE 14, MARE ISLAND NAVAL SHIPYARD,
VALLEJO, CALIFORNIA, DATED: DECEMBER 15, 2009 (CONTINUED)**

No.	Work Sheet	Comment	Response
Responses to Comments from the Water Board (Elizabeth Wells, PE, March 2, 2010) (Continued)			
1 (Cont'd)	1		<p>The tech memo summarized the existing site data, presented the videolog findings, identified any remaining data gaps, and set forth a sampling approach to address these data gaps (ChaduxTt 2009). As noted in the tech memo, existing soil and groundwater data indicates that the J-Lines have not leaked; however, there are some portions of the J-1 and J-2 lines that were not sampled. Targeted soil sampling was proposed to supplement the existing data along these lines where specific condition issues such as cracks or separations were noted in the videolog of the J-1 and J-2 lines.</p> <p>Per section 4.2 of the final closure approach technical memorandum (ChaduxTt 2009), only chromium exceeded the soil screening levels, and there was no clear correlation between elevated chromium levels in soil and chromium in groundwater. No further sampling or evaluation of groundwater was recommended to support closure of the exterior of the J-Line. The findings are consistent with the greensand technical memorandum, which concluded that groundwater data and the results of the offshore ecological risk assessment (ERA) do not indicate that constituents from greensand are migrating in groundwater along the lines or laterally outside utility corridors at concentrations that would pose significant risk to ecological receptors (Tetra Tech 1999).</p>

**RESPONSES TO COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT SAMPLING AND ANALYSIS PLAN
FOR THE J-LINE SECTION EXTERIOR OF INSTALLATION RESTORATION SITE 14, MARE ISLAND NAVAL SHIPYARD,
VALLEJO, CALIFORNIA, DATED: DECEMBER 15, 2009 (CONTINUED)**

No.	Work Sheet	Comment	Response
Responses to Comments from the Water Board (Elizabeth Wells, PE, March 2, 2010) (Continued)			
1 (Cont'd)	1		<p>Additionally, the J-Line section of IR14, where sampling is planned, is part of IR site 04 (IR04). A multi-phase remedial investigation (RI) has been completed for this area, and the revised draft final RI report for IR04 was submitted to the agencies for comment on January 8, 2010 (ChaduxTt 2010). Area groundwater was characterized and evaluated as part of the revised draft final IR04 RI Report (ChaduxTt 2010). The results of the data analysis for soil and groundwater are that the chemicals in soil have not migrated to groundwater.</p> <p>The following text was added to the executive summary:</p> <p><i>Groundwater sampling will not be a part of this investigation. The results of the data analysis for groundwater are that the chemicals in soil have not migrated to groundwater. Area groundwater was evaluated as part of the IR Site 04 remedial investigation (RI) (ChaduxTt 2010).</i></p>
2	3 and 5	Revise the table to show my correct telephone number, which is (510) 622-2440.	The telephone number was updated to reflect the current correct contact number.
3	10	a. Section 10.2: Revise the discussion to clarify how the closure and removal of pipeline segments and the former pump station caused settlement.	a. The following text was added: <i>Pump station 8 was removed when it was decommissioned.</i> Statements referring to ground settlement were removed from this section. Evidence of ground settlement around the J-Line is presented in Section 10.6.9.

**RESPONSES TO COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT SAMPLING AND ANALYSIS PLAN
FOR THE J-LINE SECTION EXTERIOR OF INSTALLATION RESTORATION SITE 14, MARE ISLAND NAVAL SHIPYARD,
VALLEJO, CALIFORNIA, DATED: DECEMBER 15, 2009 (CONTINUED)**

No.	Work Sheet	Comment	Response
Responses to Comments from the Water Board (Elizabeth Wells, PE, March 2, 2010) (Continued)			
3 (Cont'd)	10	<p>b. Section 10.5.2: Clarify if the greensand layer is 0.2 feet “wide” or thick. If this is the width of the greensand layer, explain how the width of it was determined from the borings drilled.</p> <p>c. Section 10.6.5: This paragraph indicates that a Navy technical memorandum concluded that groundwater at Mare Island is not suitable for domestic, industrial, and agricultural purposes. Either this paragraph should be revised to reference the letter where the regulatory agencies provided concurrence with the beneficial use findings of this technical memorandum or this paragraph should be revised to specifically address IR14/IR04 groundwater. Additionally, a potential beneficial use for groundwater would be for surface water replenishment.</p> <p>d. Sections 10.7.1 and 10.7.2 and Figure 3: Show the referenced boring locations on a Figure 3. The text lists sample locations with the highest chromium concentrations; however, it is unknown where they are located relative to the J-line and proposed sampling locations.</p>	<p>b. The greensand layer description refers to thickness. The following text was added: <i>In eight borings along the J-Line (14GB056, 14VB005, 14VB011, 14VB012, 14VB013, 14VB014, 14VB015, and 14VB016), greensand or sand suspected to contain greensand was used as bedding around the utility line at depths ranging from 0.2 to 2.2 feet.</i></p> <p>c. At the Water Board’s request, the Navy submitted information to the Water Board on beneficial uses of the groundwater at the site (IR04 and IA F1) on January 20, 2010. The submittal consists of an area map that shows groundwater data for total dissolved solids and well information on screening intervals and whether the well purges dry when sampled. If a response from the Water Board is available by March 26, 2010, then this information will be used in the final SAP in lieu of the current information. Additionally, the water balance at Mare Island does not indicate that surface water replenishment is a significant beneficial use of groundwater. This topic is discussed in detail in Section 1.2.4.6 of the Revised Draft Final IR04 RI report (ChaduxTt 2010).</p> <p>d. The borings were labeled as requested in the revised Figure 3. This information was also presented in greater detail in the final technical memorandum (ChaduxTt 2009).</p>

**RESPONSES TO COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT SAMPLING AND ANALYSIS PLAN
FOR THE J-LINE SECTION EXTERIOR OF INSTALLATION RESTORATION SITE 14, MARE ISLAND NAVAL SHIPYARD,
VALLEJO, CALIFORNIA, DATED: DECEMBER 15, 2009 (CONTINUED)**

No.	Work Sheet	Comment	Response
Responses to Comments from the Water Board (Elizabeth Wells, PE, March 2, 2010) (Continued)			
3 (Cont'd)	10	<p>e. Section 10.7.2: Note that construction and/or maintenance workers could be exposed to chemicals in groundwater. Provide justification for why this risk pathway is not being evaluated. Further, explain why only chromium in groundwater is being evaluated as a chemical of concern when other chemicals, if present, could present to a risk to human health.</p> <p>f. Section 10.7.2: Revise the text so that the result for sample IR14GB154 is shown as a numerical value (i.e., <#) rather than “not detected.”</p>	<p>e. No screening levels are available for construction workers; however, these risks were evaluated as part of the IR04 RI human health risk assessment (HHRA) (ChaduxTt 2010). Table II-1.1 in the IR04 RI HHRA shows that the five required pathways, including the construction worker, were evaluated for Subarea 4 (Upland Area around Buildings 900 and 1300), and Table 5-4 in the report shows that the cancer risks were with the EPA risk range and hazard indices were less than 1 for the commercial/ industrial worker and construction worker. This area is planned exclusively for industrial reuse (residential use is specifically excluded).</p> <p>f. The text for the result of sample IR14GB154 has been revised to state: IR14GB154 = not detected (<i>detection limit was 4.2 µg/L</i>).</p>
4	11	<p>a. Step 1: Add total petroleum hydrocarbons (TPH) to the list of primary contaminants carried in the J-Line. TPH is included in the list on page 26 of the Draft SAP but is not listed in this portion of the text. Include a discussion of why TPH was eliminated as a chemical of concern in soil and groundwater.</p>	<p>a. As discussed in detail in the closure approach technical memorandum, TPH as motor oil was detected in one of the 52 samples analyzed for TPH at a concentration above the Mare Island industrial screening value of 1,000 milligrams per kilogram (mg/kg) in soil (Boring IR04GB312 sampled at 1.0 to 2.0 feet below ground surface [bgs]). Four samples were collected from boring IR04GB312, and only the sample collected near the surface (1.0 to 2.0 feet bgs) exceeded the screening criteria, making it likely that the TPH came from a surface spill caused by operations in and around Building 900, rather than from the J-Line found</p>

**RESPONSES TO COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT SAMPLING AND ANALYSIS PLAN
FOR THE J-LINE SECTION EXTERIOR OF INSTALLATION RESTORATION SITE 14, MARE ISLAND NAVAL SHIPYARD,
VALLEJO, CALIFORNIA, DATED: DECEMBER 15, 2009 (CONTINUED)**

No.	Work Sheet	Comment	Response
Responses to Comments from the Water Board (Elizabeth Wells, PE, March 2, 2010) (Continued)			
4 (Cont'd)	11	<p>b. Step 2: Provide justification for why exposure to groundwater by construction and maintenance workers is not included as a goal of the study.</p>	<p>below. Therefore, TPH was not evaluated further because the industrial waste line does not appear to be the source of the TPH. The surficial TPH found at sample location IR04GB312 was addressed in the RI report for IR04.</p> <p>b. See response to Comment No. 3(e).</p>
5	15	<p>Change the project action limit for lead to the September 2009 California Human Health Screening Level (CHHSL). The California Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment recalculated the cleanup number based on a level of lead in soil that could result in up to a 1 microgram per deciliter (µg/dL) increase in blood lead level. The recalculation reduced the CHHSL for lead to 320 milligrams per kilogram for commercial/industrial exposure. If the Navy elects not to make this recommended change, provide justification for the decision. Please review the CHHSLs for the other chemicals of concern to determine if these are more conservative (i.e., lower) than the RSLs; use the lower of the two values as the project action limit.</p>	<p>As described in the closure approach technical memorandum, EPA RSLs will be used for evaluating nature and extent. However, evaluation of risk will incorporate both federal toxicity criteria, and the State of California toxicity criteria.</p> <p>Additionally, lead has been addressed in the risk assessment for IR04, which is presented in the recently issued Revised Draft Final RI (ChaduxTt 2010). The IR04 RI reports an exposure point concentration (EPC) for lead of 65 mg/kg in surface soil and 48 mg/kg in subsurface soil, both of which are significantly below either 800 mg/kg or 320 mg/kg. Side-by-side comparisons of both the EPA and state lead models were performed as part of the IR04 RI report.</p>
6	16	<p>Revise project schedule to correctly reflect agency review of the Draft SAP to be completed on March 3, 2010. Revise the subsequent completion dates as appropriate.</p>	<p>The project schedule has been updated to reflect the current schedule.</p>
7	Figure 2	<p>Label the J-line and Pump Station 8.</p>	<p>The J-Line and pump station 8 were labeled in the revised Figure 2.</p>

**RESPONSES TO COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT SAMPLING AND ANALYSIS PLAN
FOR THE J-LINE SECTION EXTERIOR OF INSTALLATION RESTORATION SITE 14, MARE ISLAND NAVAL SHIPYARD,
VALLEJO, CALIFORNIA, DATED: DECEMBER 15, 2009 (CONTINUED)**

No.	Work Sheet	Comment	Response
Responses to Comments from the Water Board (Elizabeth Wells, PE, March 2, 2010) (Continued)			
8	Figure 3	Label the borings that were previously drilled along the J-line.	The borings were labeled in the revised Figure 3.
Responses to Comments from the U.S. EPA (Carolyn d’Almeida, March 4, 2010)			
1	General	Groundwater Data. – EPA previously requested that all of the groundwater data available for the site be presented. It appears from the Groundwater Summary section 10.7.2 that Navy has made a determination that groundwater has not been impacted by releases from the J lines based upon a very limited regional data set that may not be representative of the entire pipeline area. It appears that the Navy’s basis for not further evaluating impacts to groundwater is based upon only 2 samples collected for VOC’s, 3 samples for TPH, and only 1 sample for SVOCs. We recommend grab groundwater samples be collected from borings along the line that are associated with identified cracks and offsets in the pipeline.	See response Water Board Comment No. 1.
2	Figure 3	Figure 3, showing previous and proposed sample locations, has been improved with the addition of identified presence of greensand in previous borings and locations of cracks and offsets from the video survey of the pipeline. You have identified a one inch offset in the pipeline adjacent to former pump station 8 where both grab groundwater and soil data should be collected, but does not appear to have a sample location currently proposed. Please include characterization of this area.	As described in the final closure approach technical memorandum (ChaduxTt 2009) and Section 10.7.1 of the SAP: “The video logging of the J-Line reported a pipeline offset associated with the J-1 Line, located 15 feet downstream of MH-J-1-1 (Figure 4). There is an existing soil boring at this location (IR14GB056). Review of the soil data from this boring indicated all detected compounds, including chromium and TPH, are below the screening criteria. Based on this information, it does not appear that the J-1 Line leaked through the pipeline offset. Given that the pipeline offset is located next to the former pump station 8, it appears possible that the offset occurred during the removal of the pump station.”

**RESPONSES TO COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT SAMPLING AND ANALYSIS PLAN
FOR THE J-LINE SECTION EXTERIOR OF INSTALLATION RESTORATION SITE 14, MARE ISLAND NAVAL SHIPYARD,
VALLEJO, CALIFORNIA, DATED: DECEMBER 15, 2009 (CONTINUED)**

No.	Work Sheet	Comment	Response
Responses to Comments from the U.S. EPA (Carolyn d’Almeida, March 4, 2010) (Continued)			
3	Figure 3	Figure 3 does not identify sample ID numbers. The locations of specific sample ID numbers and analytical requests are not correlated to specific locations. Please clarify in next version of the SAP.	The borings were labeled in the revised Figure 3.
4	General	Based upon the results of soil and groundwater sampling it may be appropriate to collect soil gas samples as well.	The revised draft final IR04 RI report evaluated the inhalation pathway in this area and found that this pathway contributes only negligible risk (well below the EPA risk range). Results of the evaluation can be found in Table 5-4 of the report, and the full HHRA is presented in Appendix I of the RI report (ChaduxTt 2010).

**RESPONSES TO COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT SAMPLING AND ANALYSIS PLAN
FOR THE J-LINE SECTION EXTERIOR OF INSTALLATION RESTORATION SITE 14, MARE ISLAND NAVAL SHIPYARD,
VALLEJO, CALIFORNIA, DATED: DECEMBER 15, 2009 (CONTINUED)**

REFERENCES

- California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC). 2009. "DTSC Recommended Methodology for Use of U.S. EPA Regional Screening Levels (RSLs) for HHRA Risk Assessment Process at Department of Defense Sites and Facilities." Office of Human and Ecological Risk (HERO). HHRA Note 4. November 18.
- DTSC. 1995. "Drilling, Coring, Sampling and Logging at Hazardous Substance Release Sites, Guidance Manual for Groundwater Investigations". July.
- ChaduxTt. 2009. "Final Closure Approach Technical Memorandum for the J-Line Section of Installation Restoration Site 14, Former Mare Island Naval Shipyard, Vallejo, California." September.
- ChaduxTt. 2010. "Revised Draft Final Installation Restoration Site 04 Remedial Investigation Former Mare Island Naval Shipyard, Vallejo, California." January.
- CH2M Hill. 2008. "Final Closure Certification Report, J-Lines Segment of Installation Restoration Site 14, Former Mare Island Naval Shipyard, Vallejo, California." May 15.
- Tetra Tech EM Inc. (Tetra Tech). 1999. "Final Technical Memorandum, Human Health Risk and Ecological Assessment on Greensand, Mare Island.
- U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). 2009a. EPA Regional Screening Level Table.
- EPA. 2009b. EPA National Recommended Water Quality Criteria.

TRANSMITTAL/DELIVERABLE RECEIPT

Contract No. **N62473-07-D-3213**

Document Control No. CHAD-3213-0063-0008

TO: Contracting Officer
Beatrice Appling
Naval Facilities Engineering Command
Southwest Division
1220 Pacific Highway, Bldg 127
San Diego, CA 92132-5190

DATE: 4/21/10
CTO: 0063
LOCATION:
Mare Island Naval Shipyard, Vallejo, California

FROM: 
Steven Bradley, Contract Manager

DOCUMENT TITLE AND DATE:

Response to Agency Comments on Draft Sampling and Analysis Plan for J-Line Section of Installation Restoration Site 14, Mare Island Naval Shipyard (MINS), Vallejo, California

TYPE: Contractual Deliverable Technical Deliverable (DS) Other (TC)

VERSION: NA (e.g., Draft, Draft Final, Final) REVISION #: NA

ADMIN RECORD: Yes No CATEGORY: Confidential

SCHEDULED DELIVERY DATE: 4/21/10 ACTUAL DELIVERY DATE: 4/21/10

NUMBER OF COPIES SUBMITTED TO NAVY: 0/8C/7E/5D

O = original transmittal form
C = copy of transmittal form
E = enclosure
D = CD

COPIES TO: (Include Name, Navy Mail Code, and Number of Copies)

NAVY:	CHADUXTt:	OTHER:
<u>Michael Bloom (BPMOW.MB)</u>	<u>File/Doc Control</u>	<u>See Letter</u>
<u>O/1E</u>	<u>1C/1D (w/QC)</u>	
	<u>Kelly Ryan</u>	
<u>Heather Wochnick (BPMOW.HW)</u>		
<u>1C/1E</u>	<u>1C/1E</u>	
	<u>Eric Rider</u>	
<u>Diane Silva* (EVR.DS)</u>		
<u>2C/2E/1D</u>	<u>1C/1E</u>	
<u>CSO Office</u>		

Date/Time Received



3C/3E/3D		
Karen Barba (BPMOW.KB)		
1C + 1 letter only		
Nars Ancog (EVR.NA)		
1C/1D		