

32501.000  
03.01.00.0074

N00204.AR.000561

NAS PENSACOLA

5090.3a

**Project Managers/Resource Trustees Meeting**  
**NAS Pensacola**  
**May 12 - 13, 1993**

**Attendees:**

<b>Linda</b> Martin	SOUTHNAVFAC	803-743-0574
Arlene Abernathy	E/A&H	901-372-7962
Henry H. Beiro	<b>E/A&amp;H</b>	901-372-7962
Paul V. Stoddard	E/A&H	901-372-7962
Jennifer Herndon	EPA/Groundwater	404-348-5866
Allison W. Drew	EPA/FFB-RPM	404-347-3015
Mickey Hartnett	EPA/FFB	404-347-3015
Joan Dupont	EPA/Groundwater	404-347-3866
Jorge R. Caspany	FDER	904-488-0190
Eric S. Nuzie	FDER	901-488-0190
Waynon Johnson	<b>NOAA</b>	404-347-5231
Trey Brown	NOAA	404-347-1586
Chuck Mason	E/A&H	901-372-7962
Allison Dennen	E/A&H	901-372-7962
Jeffrey Adams	SOUTHDIVNAVFAC	803-743-0360
Lynn Griffin	FDER	904-488-0784
Rick Dawson	<b>US Fish &amp; Wildlife Serv.</b>	404-331-6343

## AGENDA FOR 12 AND 13 MAY 1993

1. Discussion of the investigative approach used i the **CSAP** Section 8 vs approach used in the draft submittal for the Bay, Bayou, and Wetlands.
2. Discussion of terrestrial sampling intervals, i.e. **0-1/2'** vs **0-1'**, etc.
3. Discussion **of** length and objectives of offshore sampling, i.e. **300'** vs **700'**.
4. Discussion of spacing **and** location of transect, i.e. **regular** grid vs sampling near outfall vs sampling in finer grained sediments.
5. Discussion of preliminary remediation goals vs other ecological goals, i.e. **ER-L** vs PRG for human health.

**May 12, 1993**

**Allison Drew**

- e Opened the meeting.
- e Meeting to get a clear definition of where we're going with the last 3 ecological units.

**Linda Martin**

- e Reviewed the agenda.
- e Meeting to get direction to make a final agreement.
- e EnSafe will go over the new proposal on the approach for the Bay and Wetlands.
- e Look at each others' approach and reach **an** agreement.
- e To ensure that the draft-final of work plans will go in the right direction.

**Mickey Hartnett**

- e Compared Pensacola to another site he has been involved in. (Robbins Air Force Base)
- e Suggested that we track along with this project for **an** approach that works. The only difference is that it is 1 ecological system instead of 3.

**Linda Martin**

- e Asked for a copy of Mickey's **report** to look at the approaches that he used, since we are beginning to write the BLRA for Op. 10.

**Mickey Hartnett**

- e EPA did original scoping.
- Landfill was leaching into the Wetlands.
- e Stop the source and the Wetlands will clean itself up.
- e Can't destroy wetlands in an effort to clean it up (**i.e.** building roads all over to install wells).

**Waynon Johnson**

- e Monitor the flow of the wetlands — **5** years.
- e Determine where system is responding to the change.
- e Describe outer limits of NPL site.

**Mickey Hartnett**

- e Sediment exposed when water level drops, dries out and is carried off by the wind.
- Keep focus on NPL site — with everything else **going** on.

**Chuck Mason**

- e How will you know <sup>when</sup> ~~that~~ treatment is finished?

**Mickey Hartnett**

- e It's a subjective call.
- e Some say it's okay now because critters are living there now.

Linda Martin

- Asked Mickey to give us feedback they **are** getting, especially from the public.

Mickey Hartnett

- The Air Force couldn't meet NPDL limits.
- Pipeline unacceptable to public (5 miles).

Waynon Johnson

- Some dumping is acceptable in some places and not in others.

Henry Beiro

- Introduced Chuck.
- Chuck was involved in the development of the CSAP, Chapter 8 and the approach.

Allison Drew

- Stated that she was aware that there was a note-taker present and that she wanted it understood that these notes could not be a part of the administrative record.

Linda Martin

- Stated that the notes were intended for the Navy's use in writing the summary report.
- Several items had been left out in the past because there were not good notes from other meetings and she was trying to keep that from happening again.
- She expects to need to get comments, especially on the last agenda item.

Chuck Mason (Presentation attached)

- Baseline Risk Assessment
- Human Health/Ecological Assessment
- EnSafe sent staff to training course dealing with ecological assessment
- Vague — not a lot of precedence
- EPA document (Ecological Assessment of Waste Sites) — Had to come up with more specific protocols than available in this document.
- Also used guidance documents from Corps of Engineers.
- 3 Phases — **link** between qualitative and quantitative
- Phased approach will apply to all sites at Pensacola
- Phase 3 — more refined assessment, species of concern
- Risk Assessment — current and future effects on ecological assessment
- Phase 1 — Methods

1. Review site

- Aerial — trends in how and where deposited
- **Topo** — change in terrain, also historical topo maps **are** useful
- Records — of contaminants that entered the environment
- Relevant information — interview people who worked at the landfill

2. Qualitative evaluation

- CERCLA site, already have data
  - determine where contamination might be
  - runoff — which direction
  - endangered species, campgrounds, commercially imported species
3. Site conditions
    - go onsite, look for stressed vegetation (lesions, contusions) — get a local expert to help identify
    - pollution tolerant species
    - changes without a reason — usually there and not now or vice versa
  4. Delineate boundaries
    - contamination likely to migrate to area
    - characterize upland areas
  5. Reference areas
    - naturally occurring compounds (correlation) not really related to site
    - location away from areas of concern
  6. Develop sampling strategy
    - site 1 — several wetlands
    - terrestrial
    - sampling stations — determine how contamination might have spread

Wetland 16 — North Pond

- Open water organisms vs. juncus marsh
- Sampling station for all areas on map
- Treat area as own area — tidal area

**Joan Dupont**

- Inquired about sampling stations.

**Henry Beiro**

- Using a stratified sampling scheme in areas of concern
- 1 sample does not equal 1 station

**Joan Dupont**

- Random sampling/grid
- Do we know where contaminants are coming from?

**Chuck Mason**

- We suspect where they are coming from

**Waynon Johnson**

- Sources?

- What was the rationale that caused you to select **as** an **area** that needs assessment?

### **Henry Beiro**

- Records of drainage for 40 years
- e Site **41** is a wetland and will be studied

### **Lynn Griffin**

- Bayou?

### **Paul Stoddard**

- After Phase 1 it could be eliminated if not a receptor.

### **Henry Beiro**

- If no history of stress and contamination into it

### **Linda Martin**

- Will take one look at all wetlands

### **Waynon Johnson**

- Response first as opposed to exposure
- Look at what exposure is in 2nd stage

### **Henry Beiro**

- Historical link?
- a Response link
- Not seeing a response doesn't mean we won't study a wetland
- If there is history plus the phase 1 evaluation, we will

### **Waynon Johnson**

- Defining a pathway
- e Responding to exposure
- Source characterization

### **Henry Beiro**

- No response/no history — no study

### **Paul Stoddard**

- If there is a reason to look at it, we will **go** to the next step.

### **Rick Dawson**

- Effects may be invisible
- Same flouristic
- a Look at exposure limits

**Allison Drew**

- How far on a certain site?
- How will you know when to drop?

**Henry Beiro**

- e **Boundary** survey included in Phase 1

**Waynon Johnson**

- e Sampling

**Henry Beiro**

- Thought about adding to Phase 1
- Haven't disclosed all of the wetlands

**Trey Brown**

- Let them identify themselves

**Henry Beiro**

- e Not spending massive amounts of time looking for wetlands

**Paul Stoddard**

- No possible source of contamination — should write off after Phase 1

**Linda Martin**

- Need some way to rule it out

**Paul Stoddard**

- Only wetlands associated with a site, Trey is proposing to cut out all others.

**Trey Brown**

- e Groundwater migration has to be understood

**Waynon Johnson**

- Residue
- e Potential responses — may not reveal a response elicited by something that was there
- Collect matrix sample out of wetlands
- Identify whether there is something there or not

**Henry Beiro**

- That happens at the end of Phase 1

**Chuck Mason**

- e Wetland 4 sampling stations
- Outfall from Wetland 3
- From Wetland 3 to Wetland 4

- Outfall — Bayou Grande

### **Waynon Johnson**

- Erosional or dep. in nature?

### **Chuck Mason**

- Iron stained in Wetland 3 and outfall to wetland 4

### **Allison Drew**

- e Grid approach

### **Linda Martin**

- Grid within an area

### **Henry Beiro**

- Will use a stratified random sampling technique

### **Chuck Mason**

- e Phase 2

- Diversity study
  - e Healthy eco system — wide variety of microorganisms
  - Organisms exposed for extended period of time
  - Reference wetland for comparison

### **Lynn Griffin**

- Diversity doesn't always mean good health.

### **Rick Dawson**

- e Engineered habitats — diversity may not tell you a whole lot

### **Chuck Mason**

- Been exposed for a lifetime
- Change in diversity from reference area — food chain

### **Rick Dawson**

- Patchy distribution
- could have nothing to do with contamination
- Random sampling may not work

### **Henry Beiro**

- e Boils down to properly stratifying random sampling

### **Chuck Mason**

- e Samples broken up
- e Surface water

- Toxicity Tests
  - Contaminants that don't harm organisms
- Chemical Analysis
  - Difficulty — chronic screening levels
- Phase 3
  - Can be expensive (money/time)
  - Define what you want to achieve
- Methods — mathematical modeling, literature, further testing

**Rick Dawson**

- e Genetic testing? — better indicator, cheaper

**Chuck Mason**

- Flowchart — run chronic and acute at the same time
- Characterize risk
- Issues to address
- **Risk** description

[end of presentation]

[break]

**Linda Martin**

- Navy is not responsible unless the Navy is the source.

**Allison Dennen**

- Sites first or wetlands?

Allison **Drew**

- Agreed that the Navy is not responsible unless it is **owned** by the Navy.

**Rick Dawson**

- Even if you own it?

**Linda Martin**

- e If you own it, you're responsible.

**Allison Drew**

- Pioneer Sands Site?

**Linda Martin**

- Navy is polluter — others also, but they **are** no longer there.

**Joan Dupont**

- What wetlands?

**Linda Martin**

- Existing, known wetlands.
- Examination of a contaminated site will lead to finding more wetlands.

**Allison Drew**

- All wetlands?

**Linda Martin**

- Will have to get a ruling.

**Henry Beiro**

- Discussion of terrestrial sampling  
0 - 1/2'  
0 - 1'

**Linda Martin**

- 0 - 6" sediments
- 0 - 1' soil
- rest of depths to water table

**Paul Stoddard**

- Subaquatic 0 - 6"
- Sediments — human risk based & ecological 0 - 1'

**Linda Martin**

- They didn't specify whether sediment or soil

**Trey Brown**

- Sampling for?

**Henry Beiro**

- Chemical samples

**Linda Martin**

- E&E's 0 - 1/2', 1/2 - 2 1/2', etc.
- Need to know if we do need to split

**Trey Brown**

- Sample across the base

**Allison Drew**

- 0 - 1' surface soils, not sediments
- Human health risk

**Henry Beiro**

- Sediments — 0 - 6"} for the record
- soils 0 - 1'} "

**Joan Dupont**

- Gopher tortoises, etc. burrowing critters

**Henry Beiro**

- Surface to groundwater

**Waynon Johnson**

- Vertical profiling?

**Henry Beiro**

- 2 ft. core
- top 6" — one of the samples
- remaining 1 1/2' — composite
- consistent comparability

**Waynon Johnson**

- Won't necessarily make it consistent

**Linda Martin**

- Will also compare horizontally

**Henry Beiro**

- Along a given transect may not be comparable, but between certain transects, may be.
- Don't know much about what's going on out there.

**Rick Dawson**

- The **Corps** did a lot

**Henry Beiro**

- Related to intercoastal waterways

**Trey Brown**

- Shouldn't **you** define **first**?

**Linda Martin**

- Field work — Phase 1, January
- January 1994 — validated **data** on Categories 1, 2, & 3 (about 12 sites)
- 12 of 20 sites left
- remaining 7 sites — screening sites — expected **to** be least problem on base
- **Start** on wetlands first
- Have categories 1, 2, 3, 4 & 6 back

**Allison Drew**

- Impact — Bay, Bayou, and Wetlands

**Lynn Griffin**

- e Can't talk about Bay and Bayou transects yet?

**Linda Martin**

- e Proposed plan up front — what they expect as worse case

**Henry Beiro**

- e Blow schedule — reallocation of funds would cause

**Linda Martin**

- e Brac funds
- e Category 4 — all sites but, have been awarded
- e 4 up to go to field
- e problem will be getting the money to go to the field on category 4

**Mickey Hartnell**

- e Funding
- e Have work laid out with flexibility to be able to work with either cuts or more money available
- e Even with funding cuts everyone will get some money — won't get some money one year and none the next

**Linda Martin**

- e This is a cost plus contract.

**Allison Drew**

- Can we open up discussion on the 3 phase approach?

**Linda Martin**

- e It's really a 3 step approach/not phases like the old 3 phase approach.
- e If it's a potential source — will automatically go to phase 2 (testing, lab, sampling will be done)
- e Wetland — background information, if expect to be a reference
- If not expected to be a source or reference, do a phase 1 and make the call whether to stop or go further.

**Joan Dupont**

- e Migration on different sites
- More specifics needed
- What the investigation will encompass — Site 30, where do you stop?

**Linda Martin**

- e Set time limit as far as field work

**Joan Dupont**

- e Site specific data will be used
- e How much of the data will you use?

**Linda Martin**

- As it comes in

**Paul Stoddard**

- e Establish baselines to get more focused

**Linda Martin**

- e Category 1 — validated for work plan
- e Category 2 — validated at last minute of work plan

**Paul Stoddard**

- Grid system for conceptual use, may change
- Build into work plan

**Joan Dupont**

- Agreed

**Waynon Johnson**

- e What ultimately do we want to do?
- e Find out what parts of bay are contaminated and how to stop it?
- a Either by blocking off or carrying off to others to contend with?

**Henry Beiro**

- e Federal trustees

**Waynon Johnson**

1. Sites identified, source, pathways and exposures documented to the point of devising remedial action.
  2. **Make** decision whether to remediate or not. Response of receptors to exposure, document if something is going on there instead of documenting the exposure
- e Tracking contamination from the source — document whether exposure is eliciting a response

**Linda Martin**

- e Navy's position is to go to Phase 2 if a source or receptor

**Waynon Johnson**

- Tracking from source to receptor before doing Phase 2

**Linda Martin**

- Can make decision on a lot of sites with data already in hand

**Waynon Johnson**

- May be easier and simpler to document chemically

**Paul Stoddard**

- e Don't think our approach is any different  
EXAMPLE: OU 10
  - e automatically collecting samples
  - e supplemental to that — back into Phase 1 to get a feel for what's out there
  - e So much overlap
  - e need info from all other categories to tie into step 2 — hard core data
  - e Independent of that — those wetlands not associated with anything, how far we have to go

**Linda Martin**

- Steps often go on at the same time

**Paul Stoddard**

- e Think we are doing the same thing

**Waynon Johnson**

- Don't get into Step 2 until you know that you have to

**Henry Beiro**

- e OU 10 — good idea of contamination of concern
  - e surface water pathways
  - e groundwater pathways
  - go to Phase 2 — next recommendation

**Waynon Johnson**

- e Know source and going into OU 10 — what more do you need to know

**Linda Martin, Henry Beiro, Paul Stoddard**

- Nothing.

**Henry Beiro**

- e Wetlands adjacent to Op 10 — recommend to go to Phase 2

**Waynon Johnson**

- e Source control
- e Receptor area — residual contamination in wetland

**Linda Martin**

- Recommend Phase 2 and take care of Op 10 at the same time

**Mickey Hartnett**

- Treat to public health and environmental health, remediate, institutional controls, land use
- o Can't tell the environment what to do
- What is needed for public health and the environment may be 2 different things

**Linda Martin**

- Can't look at one site by itself
- Are doing it a lot like what you're saying
- e **Will** find source and go to receptor to clean up

**[Adjourned 4:15 p.m.]**

**[To meet again at 8:00 a.m. Thursday]**

May 13, 1993

**Linda Martin**

- We need to talk about the differences in approaches between **CSAP**
- How and why we changed the number of samples

**Chuck Mason**

- Sampling stations — how we set them up
  - a Area with the organisms you want to test
  - a Expected areas of contamination
- Vegetation
- Flow velocity in water
  - Type of organisms that will live there

North Pond — overhead (sampling stations)

- a 3 numbers randomly picked
- a **CSAP** said 8 samples
- a Consulted with a statistician — agreed that 3 would give a good sampling

Bayou Grande — overhead

- a Grid out sampling stations
- Take 3 samples from each station

**Linda Martin**

- Take back to Waynon that the **CSAP** says 8, make sure he knows we're back at 3.

**Trey Brown**

- a Not as concerned about the number of samples, but what is being sampled for
- Need to **do** basic chemical analysis
- Exposure pathways are well defined, will tell where to sample
- a Other studies are fine, but may not be what you need to **determine remediation**

**Joan Dupont**

- Need environmental data first
- *See* if a concern, if not, no need to **go** with toxicity testing

**Trey Brown**

- Not looking for amount **of** injury
- Other studies are available to base your decision **on**.

**Rick Dawson**

- If DOD is willing to stipulate to **EPA** we don't have to **go** to that level of testing.
- e Can save a lot of time and money without having to **go** to toxicity testing

**Joan Dupont**

- You can get a lot from the literature

**Paul Stoddard**

- e Wetland associated with sites — will study site and source areas
- e Accumulate data — go into wetland and sample to get the chemical data
- e Phase 1 is essential to do a Phase 2 — how can we set up a grid without doing Phase 1?
- e Determine impact on animals (bugs and bunnies)
- e ERL's

**Linda Martin**

- e Phase 3 is intended as a contingency plan
- e Plan to stop at Phase 2 most of the time
- e All situations won't have all steps

**Waynon Johnson**

- e Compensatory is not an issue (no settlement)
- e Remedial decisions primarily
- e Don't need to go further once you have enough data to determine remediation
- e Source, pathway, receptor, established concentration levels — no need to go further in quantitating
- e Receptor received enough discharge from a source to become a secondary source

**Paul Stoddard**

- e Agree to a point
- e Are trustees in agreement?

**Rick Dawson**

- e Yes.

**Chuck Mason**

- e Do chemical and stop if we don't need further information

**Paul Stoddard**

- e PRP
- e Big picture study — remedial action will be implemented

**Waynon Johnson**

- e If there is a discharge into a receptor area, may need to

**Rick Dawson**

- e If trashed — could be a restoration project

**Linda Martin**

- e Navy is a natural resource, too
- e State's point of view — shortest path
- If we can get there without going all the way through Phase 2 and Phase 3

**Chuck Mason**

- Diversity studies and toxicity tests may not be necessary

**Linda Martin**

- e If part of Phase 2 needed, it will be done — don't lock into a specific order

**Rick Dawson**

- e Who will make the decision?

**Paul Stoddard**

- By consensus technical memorandum to trustees

**Trey Brown**

- Grain size, use to determine sampling locations

**Paul Stoddard**

- Points of influence to a receptor area
- **Bias** sampling
- Random for statistical approach

**Trey Brown**

- Bias sampling is the way to go, looking at places where contamination **are** most likely to collect

**Henry Beiro**

- Focus the study where we're describing samples

**Trey Brown**

- e Depth profile, settling of organic materials

**Allison Drew**

- After where contamination will migrate, in how much detail do we need to set up a sampling plan?

**Paul Stoddard**

- Are you saying outfall area is only place we **need** to sample?

**Trey Brown**

- No, depth profiles, etc. to determine other areas

**Joan Dupont**

- In the Perdido area, a boat with a depth recorder was **used**
- Bottom sediment samples
- % clay, % sand

**Henry Beiro**

- Plan to do that
- Take other samples while we're there
- If we have to keep **going** to the field — schedule driven
- Rectangular search pattern to optimize schedule and data

**Paul Stoddard**

- Did you look at sampling density vs. **grain size** distribution?

**Joan Dupont**

- Gaps between points.

**Paul Stoddard**

- Is there a point where you would want us to concentrate **our** efforts?

**Joan Dupont**

- Had kicked around that point.
- **Need** some samples in that area
- Pros and cons for doing it either way

**Henry Beiro**

- What level of confidence are you willing to accept?

**Paul Stoddard**

- Don't need a grid

**Joan Dupont**

- Bias the grid

**Paul Stoddard**

- Identify high TOC
- Don't know enough to know

**Joan Dupont**

- Can you give a for-instance

**Rick Dawson**

- Site investigation — find hot spots — start off investigation to find if pockets **of** contamination or ubiquitous
- Describe nature and extent of contamination and impact **on** trustees (may not be able to do both at once)

**Henry Beiro**

- Category 3 — **July** timeframe
- Water stations in bay — grids in bay

- e We'll find out if this is the best way

### **Rick Dawson**

- e If you can ferret out — the Corps has dredged **42 million** cubic yards out of the bay in the past 100 years
- e forget about sampling the bay

### **Joan Dupont**

- e Focus and try to follow pathways

### **Allison Drew**

- e Site 2 good place to start

### **Paul Stoddard**

- e Want to leave with an agreed conceptual model
- e Likes Joan's approach a lot.
- e Need to consider the affect on the schedule

### **Joan Dupont**

- e Gulf Breeze data expected back soon
- e **A** few sample points around Pensacola

### **Paul Stoddard**

- Would like to refine proposed plan
- e If we can compromise

### **Joan Dupont**

- e Need to look at **Gulf** Breeze and corp. **info**

### **Henry Beiro**

- e Dredging

### **Trey Brown**

- e Before doing anything with the Bayou, determine pathways

### **Joan Dupont**

- e Agree
- e 3 - 8 samples?

### **Chuck Mason**

- e The statistician we consulted says that the data is just as good with 3 samples within a station as 8.

### **Paul Stoddard**

- e 3 locations within a station

- grid size affects level of confidence

**Henry Beiro**

- Again, we need to know what level of confidence we *can* settle for.

**Trey Brown**

- If there is no chance of contamination, do you not care?

**Paul Stoddard**

- If in **an** area that says there should be something there, we do.

**Trey Brown**

- Sampling locations should be wetland specific, like **Joan's** approach

**Paul Stoddard**

- For the Bay, not sure about Wetlands

**Trey Brown**

- Still taking 3 samples at each point

**Chuck Mason**

- The **CSAP** was created also for diversity studies

**Allison Drew**

- Discussion as to where to **start** sampling

**Waynon Johnson**

- a Flexibility is important.
- a May not know until you get to the field.

**Linda Martin**

- a In the work plan it says things can increase or decrease as **needed**.

**Trey Brown**

- Usually don't get away from plan.

**Linda Martin**

- Contractually set up where they have that avenue if needed

**Rick Dawson**

- Great opportunity in the past for things to be scattered over the **years**.

**Allison Drew**

- Work Plans are so general and conceptual
- a There is already a fair amount of **data** available on potential contamination and pathways

**Henry Beiro**

- We have some halfway decent data on metals
- Organics data is lacking

**Allison Drew**

- What were you planning on coming up with in the **first 2 steps of Phase 1**

**Henry Beiro**

- The work plan covers the worst case scenario
- We will generate a basic knowledge **of** what's **been going on in** the **eco** system

**Joan Dupont & Henry Beiro**

- Discussion of sampling locations

**Rick Dawson**

- Go to Corps for depth of harbor, point where marine influence yields to estaurine

**Linda Martin**

- Are we talking about combining plans?

**Henry Beiro**

- How will it affect the schedule?

**Linda Martin**

- **Look** at what will happen and new schedule and propose **to EPA** and **FDER**

**Eric Nuzie**

- **All 3**, or Bay and Bayou only?

**Paul Stoddard**

- Wetlands
- Bay and Bayou for marrying the plans

**Linda Martin**

- Difference in EnSafe's and Joan's plans was that **EnSafe** was trying to do all at once, Joan in stages.

**Trey Brown**

- How much effort **is** involved?

**Joan Dupont**

- Time wise — a lot

**Paul Stoddard**

- Prefer reg. **ASTM**

- Sketched plan, scaled back
- **Grain** size and TOCs — other water quality
- Parameters
- Dist. mapping
- Phase 2B — **more** specific locations
- Do chemical at **areas** of concern

**Chuck Mason**

- Toxicity and diversity

**Paul Stoddard**

- Down the road as needed

**Allison Drew**

- Phase 1 affected by merging?

**Linda Martin**

- Wouldn't be.

**Allison Drew**

- Level in Phase 1 bothers her

**Chuck Mason**

- Not a lot of time
- Looking for signs for diversity trends at same time

**Linda Martin**

- Schedule now - can complete Wetlands
- Change in schedule will come about with Bay and Bayou
- Suggest EnSAfe looks and presents new schedule to Navy for proposal to EPA

**Joan Dupont**

- How soon?

**Linda Martin**

- Approved work plans.
- Can you do that portion in six months?

**Paul Stoddard**

- Site 2 is the only site authorized right now.
- Don't have vehicle in place to do **grain size**, etc. right now
- If you can approve the concept to say go ahead

**Allison Drew**

- Separate section presented detailing that like a tech memo

**Linda Martin**

- Given that and approval on that — can go ahead and do it
- **SAP** is separate document

**Allison Drew**

- Conceptual approval?

**Linda Martin**

- Yes
- e Have out in January to start this

**Joan Dupont**

- Focus on 2 way — help, not hinderance

**Linda Martin**

- Bay and Bayou
- Category 4, new schedule
- e To **EPA** and **FDER**
- Start 1st part of January
- a Wetland — basic approach, perhaps scaling down

**Chuck Mason**

- Not interested in grain size, etc.

**Joan Dupont**

- Purpose is to focus

**Waynon Johnson**

- Quick core, or grab sample
- e Rather than having to go back and do lab samples

**Paul Stoddard**

- e Fate and transport movement — need **TOC and grain size up front**

**Waynon Johnson**

- ~~Need~~ companion with analytical data
- Qualitative visualization to set up sampling stations
- Toxicity only if necessary

**Chuck Mason**

- e **2A** — chemical analysis
- toxicity and diversity

**Allison Drew**

- e Grain size later?

**Waynon Johnson**

- No, toxicity later

**Henry Beiro**

- 1 per station for *grain size*

**Trey Brown**

- Do for every sample — not that much involved

**Henry Beiro**

- 1 per area associated with chemical sample

**Waynon Johnson**

- How big an area do you collect 3 samples?
- Need grain size at each sampling point.

**Henry Beiro**

- e Shift very little — clay and sands

**Trey Brown**

- Do TOC at every sampling point.

**Waynon Johnson**

- Do grain size for every sample, don't get hung up later

**Henry Beiro**

- e Acid volatile sulfides — how important?

**Waynon Johnson**

- e Collect biota samples and see if they've got it

**Linda Martin**

- e Agreement on Wetlands:  
Sediments 0 - 1/2'  
Soil - 1st sample at 0 - 1'

**Offshore Sampling - Bay & Bayou**

**Lynn Griffin**

- Part of fine tuning

**Waynon Johnson**

- Go farther if needed - flexible

**Linda Martin**

- As far as writing plan: until we pass the transition zone, 300 ft. first

**Henry Beiro**

- What if there is no transition zone to the intercoastal waterway, stop there?

*300' ft or a transition zone which exceeds laws*

**Preliminary remediation goals vs. other ecological goals - ER-L vs. PRG**

**Henry Beiro**

- Knowing when to quit
- Guidelines for applying literature

**Joan Dupont**

- Discussion earlier before meeting
- Numbers used as screening numbers, not for cleanup
- Have to decide if we exceed, do we look more?
- PRG might not be the term to use for eco.

**Linda Martin**

- Have any formulas?

**Joan Dupont**

- Not for eco
- Water standards, etc. are available

**Rick Dawson**

- Long and Morgan for numbers

**Waynon Johnson**

- In lieu of a decision to do some actual testing
- Limited number of compounds that those numbers are available on
- Best professional judgment

**Paul Stoddard**

- If we use ER-Ls or MS for guidance - what's the next step if exceedance?

**Waynon Johnson**

- Red flag — look at info there at site
- Determine what further testing if any is needed
- Follow-up assessment to see if right

**Rick Dawson**

- Will compounds naturally attenuate?

**Jorge Caspany**

- e Is the Navy willing to accept ERM values?

**Waynon Johnson**

- They are not values for cleanup

**Jorge Caspany**

- Air Force hasn't accepted **ERM** values

**Linda Martin**

- Navy's point of view for right now, also
- Would like to come up with some **PRGs**
- ERLs are absolutely too low

**Waynon Johnson**

- Don't see a reason to come up with something different

**Linda Martin**

- ERLs will always be below what we find

**Jorge Caspany**

- Background concentrations

**Paul Stoddard**

- Problems with ERMs and ERLs are that the levels are lower than naturally occurring

**Rick Dawson**

- Don't think exceedance will always be the case, especially in heavy metals

**Paul Stoddard**

- Other problem: no effects on some of this

**Joan Dupont**

- that's why you use a suite of tests
- Use as an indication of when to go to the next step

**Rick Dawson**

- Told the homosexual seagull story

**Waynon Johnson**

- e Dealing with inexact science
- Level of confidence still has to be determined
- Monitor the remedy to see if we attain what we want
- e Specific **PRGs** don't exist for any given chemical

**Joan Dupont**

- Weight of evidence
- Determine if a contaminant can have an effect on a resource and devise sampling from there

**Linda Martin**

- e Clarify — can we match at certain sites **and** come **up** with a PRG?

**Waynon Johnson**

- e On a case by case basis — flexible

**Joan Dupont**

- e Even though some contaminants **are** the same?

**Linda Martin**

- e Technically if we can show that?

**Waynon Johnson**

- Sure, if it works — use it
- e Can't apply generically

**Joan Dupont**

- e Can propose and have a basis for it
  - Use literature - Long & Morgan
  - Site specific
- e Red flag for screening, then further testing

**Linda Martin**

- e Further testing will have to be done on everything

**Waynon Johnson**

- e History can indicate whether to take a closure look

**Joan Dupont**

- e Don't do **all** of that testing up front

**Allison Drew**

- e What are some of the other steps?

**Linda Martin**

- e Are we stuck with ERLs and ERMs?

**Waynon Johnson**

- e Keeps you from redoing all of the analysis that the **data** came from

**Linda Martin**

- Southdiv may want to go back and examine the **data**

**Waynon Johnson**

- e If you want to reinvent the wheel — do it

**Paul Stoddard**

- e Base threshold value on ERL or ERM?

**Waynon Johnson**

- e It's just a tool

**Joan Dupont**

- e Just an exceedance of **EIU** number is not an indicator to **go** further

**Waynon Johnson**

- e The Navy's underwear is in a bunch over this.

**Linda Martin**

- e Consideration for multiple bases, not just Pensacola

**Waynon Johnson**

- e If you only use when it suits you — it's not fair

**Rick Dawson**

- Can't write in black and white in the ecology
- e Environment changes so much

**Joan Dupont**

- e Risk management decision will be made

**Henry Beiro**

- e Normal distribution - exceeding ERLs and ERMs, can we go to literature and documentation

**Waynon Johnson**

- Grey questions, might not be good enough

**Paul Stoddard**

- e Go to next step if can't document **from** literature

**Waynon Johnson**

- e Keep options open

**Jorge Caspany**

- Tool, not cleanup control

**Paul Stoddard**

- Past feeling is that they are remediation goals

**Linda Martin**

- Can't say that the Navy will buy them for screening

**Trey Brown**

- e Why don't we use what we consider is the best we have right now?

**Paul Stoddard**

- a We need to go back to the Navy

**Waynon Johnson**

- e Don't turn your back on the **data**

**Joan Dupont**

- e She will recommend next phase if above these screening levels

**Linda Martin**

- e Been told not to accept for the Navy, will present new evidence and get back to EPA

**Waynon Johnson**

- Don't just try to figure out how to get a higher number
- Have to consider where we're going in the **future** as a society

**Linda Martin**

- What we have done on the fifth item on the agenda is agreed to disagree.
- a Thanked everyone for coming.

**Meeting adjourned at 11:35 a.m.]**