How Does a Regulator Review Your Report?

And Why Do Regulators Want a CSM?

Reviewing Reports

- Start with site history
- Then focus on the data
 - appendices
 - tables and maps
 - graphs help but often not included
- Develop own CSM
- Then Conclusions/Recommendations
 - are they compatible with CSM developed by regulator?

Report Problems

- Data doesn't support conclusions
- Significant data gaps
- Only some data used (and some ignored)
- Lots of data but:
 - it is not analyzed what does it mean?
 - not presented clearly need tables, maps and graphs

Report Problems Continued

- Report doesn't explain WHY things were (and were not) done
 - leaves the regulator with too many questions
- Off-site conditions not addressed
 - need to discuss receptors!
- Difficult to determine how/where consultant and regulator disagree
- Report does not address all the requirements in the state regulations

Benefits of a CSM

- Data gaps managed
- Data is analyzed and presented well
- Reasoning is Explained
 - a key to better reports!
 - many potential questions are answered
- Receptor evaluation is integral
- Conclusions are based on the data

Benefits of a CSM Continued

- If Consultant and Regulator CSMs don't agree - can identify where disagreements are
- Makes correspondence more efficient
- Conversation in plain English easier for everybody (including your client) to understand

Benefits of a CSM Continued

- Improved Quality of Site Characterization
 - Field effort better planned
 - Fewer data gaps
 - Better Decisions
- Improved Quality of Reports
 - Fewer state comments to address
 - Less time and money
 - Overall stakeholder confidence enhanced
 - Less skepticism about quality of work

Conclusion

- States are frustrated by poor report quality
 - significant resources are spent writing lengthy comment letters and other correspondence
 - these resources could be more efficiently used to move other projects
- Use the conceptual site model approach – it benefits all of us!