

-----Original Message-----

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: Thursday, July 15, 2010 1:33 PM

To: [REDACTED]

Cc: [REDACTED]

Subject: RE: NFSS Public Meeting

As always, [REDACTED], thanks for the support from you and your colleagues.  
[REDACTED], FYI.

[REDACTED]

-----Original Message-----

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: Thursday, July 15, 2010 9:49 AM

To: [REDACTED]

Cc: [REDACTED]

Subject: RE: NFSS Public Meeting

Hi [REDACTED]:

Sorry for the delay in response as I was on vacation last week. USACE is currently evaluating a modification to our workshop schedule by eliminating the September and December Meetings and combining into one meeting at the end of October or early November. For your planning purposes, October 20 - November 10 time period is being considered for the next public workshop.

Regarding [REDACTED] report, USACE has not responded to this report and wasn't aware of his report until sent after the March 23rd meeting.

Please let us know if you have any additional questions.

Best Regards,

[REDACTED]

US Army Corps of Engineers  
1776 Niagara Street  
Buffalo, NY 14207

[REDACTED]

-----Original Message-----

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: Tuesday, July 06, 2010 3:57 PM

To: [REDACTED]

Cc: [REDACTED]

Subject: NFSS Public Meeting

[REDACTED],

I hope everyone had a good vacation over the 4th. Just wanted to touch base on a few items as we begin finalizing our report and developing the responsiveness summary. The letter to [REDACTED] addressing the potential for SPRU / KAPL waste on NFSS is with [REDACTED] and he should be submitting this to [REDACTED] e for her review soon if she has not already received it.

As we are finalizing the summary report, just wanted to check in and see if we could get a date for the September meeting to develop our schedule in order to allow sufficient time for public review.

In developing our responsiveness summary, DOE had received the attached 1994 document from [REDACTED] shortly after the March 24th, 2010 meeting and would like to know if the USACE had previously responded to this report and if so how, since this would assist DOE in completing our responsiveness summary.

Thanks for your time and consideration in this and let me know if you have any questions.

Best Regards,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Scientist V  
SM Stoller Corporation  
Grand Junction, Colorado 81503

[REDACTED]