From: KISHIDA Koto
To: WIGAL Jennifer;
cc: FOSTER Eugene P;
Subject: RE: RM-NPS: Question about EQC action
Date: Monday, June 17, 2013 10:26:48 AM

Thanks Jennifer

E-mailing them both sounds like the most efficient way. Could I have their e-mail addresses?

Thank you,
Koto

-----Original Message-----
From: WIGAL Jennifer
Sent: Friday, June 14, 2013 2:14 PM
To: KISHIDA Koto
Cc: FOSTER Eugene P
Subject: RE: RM-NPS: Question about EQC action

What Larry & Jane said sounds right to me. They didn't act previously on those provisions and I think not acting was the whole objective.

You can contact Angela Chung, who is my counterpart, (206-553-6511), but I think she'd probably shuttle the question to the regional attorney (Kelly Gable) to confirm. One idea is to send an e-mail to the both of them to ask.

-----Original Message-----
From: KISHIDA Koto
Sent: Friday, June 14, 2013 11:34 AM
To: WIGAL Jennifer
Cc: FOSTER Eugene P
Subject: FW: RM-NPS: Question about EQC action

Hi Jennifer

Greg was asking if EPA would need to formally review and approve the revised Division 41 if EQC decides to take action to remove the NPS provisions. He understands that there would be no NPS provisions to approve or disapprove, but wonders if EPA may still need to review Division 41 as a whole.

Larry suspects that EPA would take the position that it doesn't need to review. Jane suggested that we may want to check in with EPA. Do you think we need

to, and if so, would you let me know EPA contact's information? I don't work with the standards people at EPA, so I am not sure who to ask.

Thanks,
Koto

-----Original Message-----
From: Knudsen Larry [mailto:Larry.Knudsen@doj.state.or.us]
Sent: Friday, June 14, 2013 8:23 AM
To: HICKMAN Jane; KISHIDA Koto
Cc: FOSTER Eugene P
Subject: RE: RM-NPS: Question about EQC action

I have no additional comments on the draft. I suspect that EPA would take the position that it doesn't need to review Division 41 if the only action is to remove provisions that have never been approved by EPA.

_____
From: HICKMAN Jane [HICKMAN.Jane@deq.state.or.us]
Sent: Thursday, June 13, 2013 4:34 PM
To: KISHIDA Koto; Knudsen Larry
Cc: FOSTER Eugene P
Subject: RE: RM-NPS: Question about EQC action

Slide 3, third note: "The process would be unique to Oregon." I would state there is no precedence or guidance for EPA review of rules governing nonpoint source, so it would be difficult to predict what EPA's findings would be and the result of those findings.

Slide 4: First bullet, What is "stipulated order initiating rulemaking"? Do we mean that is when the stipulated order regarding the rulemaking was issued by the judge?

Slide 5, last bullet, not clear what "remain consistent with state and federal regulations" means.

Slide 11, last bullet, I think "depend" is supposed to be "depending"

Regarding whether EPA must review the rule repeal as a standards change, I will defer to Larry on that (though I would think they are supposed to do that). But it might be more germane to ask EPA what its position is on that. Jane

From: KISHIDA Koto
Sent: Thursday, June 13, 2013 2:13 PM
To: HICKMAN Jane; 'Knudsen Larry'

Cc: FOSTER Eugene P
Subject: RE: RM-NPS: Question about EQC action

Jane and Larry

I met with Gene and Greg and went over the presentation for EQC Meeting next week. Greg asked me to send you two the draft presentation as a heads up for the upcoming meeting and also for your review. If you see something in the attached presentation that concerns you, please let me know.

Greg also wants to know if EPA would need to formally review and approve the revised Division 41 if EQC decides to take action to remove the NPS provisions. He understands that there would be no NPS provisions to approve or disapprove, but wonders if EPA may still need to review Division 41 as a whole.

Thank you,
Koto

From: HICKMAN Jane
Sent: Wednesday, June 12, 2013 1:46 PM
To: 'Knudsen Larry'
Cc: KISHIDA Koto
Subject: RE: RM-NPS: Question about EQC action
Importance: High

Larry, Koto has prepared a slide for the EQC to list the options available to the EQC in considering repeal of the NPS provision, along with the anticipated outcome of each option. I think delaying repeal or holding additional hearings would be treated the same as taking no action. Can you please let me know if you have additional or different suggestions for the slide? Thank you. Jane

From: KISHIDA Koto
Sent: Wednesday, June 12, 2013 12:48 PM
To: HICKMAN Jane
Subject: RM-NPS: Question about EQC action

Hi Jane

Thank you for taking a look.

¤ Adopt proposed rule amendments
l No NPS provisions in Division 41 for EPA review ¤ Take no action l EPA may must review NPS provisions in Division 41 and take final action on the rules

within approximately 95 days of the EQC meeting l Outcome of the review unclear ¤ Delay or Modify proposed rules l Outcome of the action unclear, d Dependsing on timeframe and nature of modification, EPA will likely be required to review any rule revisions that affect achievement of water quality standards ¤ Hold additional hearings l Outcome of the action unclear, depends on timeframe and future EQC action

Koto

*****CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE*****

This e-mail may contain information that is privileged, confidential, or otherwise exempt from disclosure under applicable law. If you are not the addressee or it appears from the context or otherwise that you have received this e-mail in error, please advise me immediately by reply e-mail, keep the contents confidential, and immediately delete the message and any attachments from your system.

****