

M00263.AR.000842
MCRD PARRIS ISLAND
5090.3a

EMAIL REGARDING U S NAVY COMMENTS ON REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE TO
MERCURY FROM FISH CONSUMPTION IN TECHNICAL MEMORANDUM FOR SITE 3
CAUSEWAY LANDFILL MCRD PARRIS ISLAND SC
7/14/2010
NAVAL FACILITIES ENGINEERING COMMAND SOUTHEAST

From: [Cook, Charles CIV NAVFAC SE](mailto:Cook.Charles@NAVFAC.SE)
To: AmickMS@dhec.sc.gov; darrel.pittman@usmc.mil; [Annie Gerry](mailto:Annie.Gerry@dhec.sc.gov); bowersjb@dhec.sc.gov; Llmas.Lila@epamail.epa.gov; [Sladic, Mark](mailto:Sladic.Mark@NAVFAC.LANT.PNBC); [Barclift, David J CIV NAVFAC LANT, PNBC](mailto:Barclift.David@NAVFAC.LANT.PNBC); [Reed, Sarah M CIV NAVFAC SE, JAX](mailto:Reed.Sarah@NAVFAC.SE); [Beverly, Stephen A CIV NAVFAC SE](mailto:Beverly.Stephen@NAVFAC.SE); timothy.j.harrington@usmc.mil; frenchsl@dhec.sc.gov
Subject: FW: CONFERENCE CALL 20 TH JULY SITE THREE
Date: Wednesday, July 14, 2010 3:26:09 PM

TEAM

After talking to Dave Barclift, he sent me an email(below) that summaries the Navys' Interpretation and outlines possible outcomes or decisions that need to be made by the team. The tech memo was created to justify the remedy for the ROD. We need to agree as a team what measures assures the remedy is protective. Also we need to agree the risk due to PCBs are substantially anthropogenic.

V/R

Charles Cook

" I'm not sure the exact issue is the definition of the RME. As Lila pointed out, the RME is an EPA risk assessment term and the intent of the RME is to estimate a conservative exposure case that is still within the range of reasonable possible exposures. The question is whether the subsistence fishing individual ("queen angler") falls outside of the reasonable range.

According to the 1995 EPA memo on Risk Characterization, "Agency risk assessments will be expected to address or provide descriptions of (1) individual risk that include the central tendency and high end portions of the risk distribution, (2) population risk, and (3) important subgroups of the population, such as highly exposed or highly susceptible groups."

Using this definition, and in my professional opinion, the subsistence fishing individual identified in the one-person interview, would fall within the third category of highly exposed individual. I use the term "individual" because of the interview was only conducted with one person and not the rest of the population of subsistence fishers. To partly account for the uncertainty associated with the interview, exposure assumptions from EPA's fish advisory guidance were used to calculate risk for the subsistence fishing population.

One of the issues the project team has to answer is whether this specific exposure scenario is still occurring (i.e., is subsistence fishing a viable scenario). Recent discussions during conference calls indicate that it is not still occurring. Regardless, the signs prohibiting subsistence fishing posted as part of the interim ROD should still be deemed protective of this exposure scenario. If the team agrees that this is a viable scenario, then the signs (with perhaps better explanation of catch limit, etc.) should be included as part of the final ROD for the Site 3 pond only (not the reference area). If the project team makes a risk management decision that this is not a viable scenario, then the signs could come down and perhaps a "risk communication" outreach effort could occur for those individuals who continue to use the Site 3 pond for subsistence fishing.

In my mind, the more important issue that the project team needs to resolve is whether the calculated risk to all exposure scenarios is due to site-related chemicals or non-site related (background/reference) chemicals, specifically dioxin-like PCBs. Unacceptable risks have been identified for both Site 3 and the reference area; evaluations of site and background data have been presented in the Tech Memo. A couple of "background" lines of evidence seem to indicate that the background and site tissue concentrations are similar. This would indicate that, for those specific chemicals, Site 3 would not be a significant source of those chemicals in fish tissue.

Resolution of these two issues should help guide the project team in making a final decision for Site 3.

In my opinion, there are a few possible outcomes. If the project team determines that individual subsistence fishing is viable and the chemicals are site-related, then signs prohibiting subsistence fishing (with adequate detail to define catch limits, etc) should be posted at Site 3 only. If the project team determines that individual subsistence fishing is not viable and the chemicals are site-related, then, if necessary signs should be posted to address any unacceptable risk for the viable exposure scenarios and perhaps a risk communication outreach effort be performed. If the project team determines that chemicals are not site-related, then no further action and risk communication efforts can be considered.

I hope this helps. I have copied Jennifer Corack (NMCPHC) and Bob Jupin (TTNUS) on this email. Both should be available for a call on July 20. Jennifer and Bob, please feel free to provide any input, corrections, or clarifications to the information contained in this email."

I will be out of the office until Monday, July 23, but can be contacted on my cell phone (610-213-0377).

Dave Barclift
NAVFAC Atlantic

Phone: 215-897-4913
Fax: 215-897-4902
david.barclift@navy.mil

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

From: Llamas.Lila@epamail.epa.gov [<mailto:Llamas.Lila@epamail.epa.gov>]

Sent: Tuesday, July 13, 2010 16:40

To: Cook, Charles CIV NAVFAC SE

Cc: AmickMS@dhec.sc.gov; bowersjb@dhec.sc.gov; darrel.pittman@usmc.mil; Barclift, David J CIV NAVFAC LANT, PNBC; frenchsl@dhec.sc.gov; Annie Gerry; kriegkm@dhec.sc.gov; Sladic, Mark; Reed, Sarah M CIV NAVFAC SE, JAX; Beverly, Stephen A CIV NAVFAC SE; timothy.j.harrington@usmc.mil; Frederick.Tim@epamail.epa.gov; Buxbaum.David@epamail.epa.gov; Llamas.lila@epa.gov

Subject: Re: CONFERENCE CALL 20 TH JULY SITE THREE

Hi Charles,

I hate to upset your apple cart, but as I had said previously, Tim Frederick is not available all of next week except Friday. We had offered the 14th and 15th, which would be tomorrow or the next day. I am not sure if David Buxbaum is available that next Friday, July 23, or not. David, let us know when you get this email. I'm available either day, 20 or 23.

Otherwise, my understanding of the original point of this call was to discuss Reasonable Maximum Exposure (RME), which is an EPA risk assessment term. Although EPA would prefer not to revisit an already agreed to pathforward, EPA is willing to have another conversation about RME to clarify any questions about the agreed to pathforward, if the Navy really feels it is necessary. However, due to Tim's schedule, it cannot happen on the 20th.

We later heard that attorneys would be in attendance, although there was no real explanation for the purpose of their attendance. Reportedly, it was maybe to discuss what actions are necessary to protect the RME.

This may be a beneficial discussion to have with attorneys present.

So..... if you decide you do not really need to discuss RME again, then it may be that we can have the call on the 20th with the attorneys about necessary actions, but not about RME. If there is still any chance you will be discussing the definition, use or applicability of the RME, then EPA needs Tim on the call and we need to find a different date and time to call.

Thanks,

Lila

From: "Cook, Charles CIV NAVFAC SE"
<charles.cook2@navy.mil>

To: <AmickMS@dhec.sc.gov>, "Annie Gerry" <GerryAM@dhec.sc.gov>,
<darrel.pittman@usmc.mil>,
<bowersjb@dhec.sc.gov>, <kriegkm@dhec.sc.gov>, Lila Llamas/R4/USEPA/US@EPA, "Sladic,
Mark"
<Mark.Sladic@tetrattech.com>, "Barclift, David J CIV NAVFAC LANT, PNBC"
<david.barclift@navy.mil>,
<frenchsl@dhec.sc.gov>, "Beverly, Stephen A CIV NAVFAC SE"
<stephen.beverly@navy.mil>,
<timothy.j.harrington@usmc.mil>

Cc: "Reed, Sarah M CIV NAVFAC SE, JAX"
<sarah.reed@navy.mil>

Date: 07/12/2010 02:27 PM

Subject: CONFERENCE CALL 20 TH JULY SITE
THREE

TEAM

This date is the earliest date for a conference call on site 3 Technical memo. Does anyone have a certain time this day that works better for them.

V/R
Charles Cook

NAVFAC SOUTH EAST , SOUTH CENTRAL IRP
PO BOX 30 , 135 AJAX DR,
Jacksonville, FL 32212
(904) 542-6409