

Allen memorandum to Horvath and Smith, May 12, 1995.

FWS/PRP proposed meeting

I note that RO management appears to be uncomfortable with "bad impressions" resulting from progress on the Green Bay NRDA (ref: email message of May 12, 1995 from John Blankenship to Shelly Hall). I support all efforts to educate any constituency as to how CERCLA, federal regulations, and DOI implementation seek to avoid litigation; how NRDA actions around the U.S. have, in fact, avoided litigation in most instances, and trial in all instances; how the trustees, Federal Government, DOI, and FWS have and will continue to seek coordination with other efforts, including the Fox River Coalition. However, it is unrealistic to expect all constituencies, particularly those who may incur costs, those who may view Federal involvement as intrusive, and those who may view competing programs as unnecessary complications to their own, to accept any of these explanations. The RO should be concerned about "bad impressions," should seek to correct the record when "bad impressions" are founded in unreliable or incorrect information (such as FWS motivation to litigate against volunteers), but should not expect to eliminate "bad impressions." Indeed, it is unlikely that the FWS can avoid "bad impressions" from one quarter or another, relevant to the Green Bay NRDA, regardless of what actions are taken or words are spoken (given the prominence and magnitude of the action and the competing interests which seek to engage the FWS, DOI, Federal Government, and trustees to influence the outcome).

...

Therefore, I submit that a lack of effective coordination and communication is not the cause of any "bad impressions" emanating from the GLNPO, or other entities. Rather, an unsatisfied desire to halt, slow, or control the NRDA may better explain the invocation of "bad impressions" by certain parties...