

N00204.AR.004490  
NAS PENSACOLA  
5090.3a

LETTER SUBMITTING COPIES OF REMEDIAL INVESTIGATION ADDENDUM FOR SITE 2  
NAS PENSACOLA FL  
2/28/2003  
ENSAFE



ENSAFE INC.

ENVIRONMENTAL AND MANAGEMENT CONSULTANTS

---

5724 Summer Trees Drive • Memphis, Tennessee 38134 • Telephone 901-372-7962 • Facsimile 901-372-2454 • www.ensafe.com  
February 28, 2003

Jesse Rigby  
125 West Romana Street, Suite 800  
Pensacola, Florida 32501

Re: Site 2 (Operable Unit 3), NAS Pensacola  
Contract # N62467-89-D-0318/059

Dear Mr. Rigby:

On behalf of the Navy, EnSafe Inc. is pleased to submit one copy of the executive summary for the Site 2 RI Report Addendum at the Naval Air Station Pensacola.

If you should have any questions or need any additional information regarding the document, please do not hesitate to call me.

Sincerely,  
EnSafe Inc.

Allison L. Harris  
*Task Order Manager*

Enclosure

cc: Mr. Bill Hill, Code 1851 SOUTHNAVFACENGCOM without enclosure  
Mr. Harry White, NAS Pensacola PAO – 1 copy  
Mr. John Early – 1 copy  
Mr. Jerry Westmoreland – 1 copy  
Ms. Lisa Minshew – 1 copy  
Administrative Record  
EnSafe Inc. file without enclosure  
EnSafe Inc. Knoxville without enclosure  
EnSafe Inc. Pensacola without enclosure  
EnSafe Inc. Library without enclosure

CLARK, PARTINGTON, HART, LARRY, BOND, STACKHOUSE & STONE

ATTORNEYS AT LAW  
POST OFFICE BOX 13010  
PENSACOLA, FLORIDA  
32591-3010

TELEPHONE (904) 434-9200  
FAX (904) 432-7340  
E-MAIL [jrigby@cphlaw.com](mailto:jrigby@cphlaw.com)

ONE PENSACOLA PLAZA  
125 WEST ROMANA STREET, SUITE 800  
PENSACOLA, FLORIDA 32501

JESSE W. RIGBY

January 19, 1998

Commanding Officer  
NAS Pensacola, Code 00500  
Attn: Ron Joyner  
190 Radford Boulevard  
Pensacola, FL 32508-5217

**Re: *Comment on U.S. Navy Final Proposed Plan Site 2 (Operable Unit 3), NAS,  
Pensacola***


Dear Mr. Joyner:

I would appreciate it if the Navy would consider my comments with respect to the Proposed Plan for Site 2.

My concern is that the Navy is proposing to spend a considerable sum of money on a monitoring plan when the evidence does not demonstrate a need for continued monitoring. As I understand the information accompanying the proposed plan, there is no evidence of any adverse impact to human health if no action is taken with respect to this site. Likewise, the ecological risk appears to be negligible. I reached my conclusion that the ecological risk is negligible because the contaminated area is minuscule in relationship to the size of the bay. Therefore, it does not appear to me that there is any danger that any marine organism directly affected by the contamination runs any risk of eradication. Where such a small area is impacted, it also appears reasonable to assume that any impact on shellfish or fish that might feed on the micro-organisms is also minuscule.

If there is a serious risk that marine life in Pensacola Bay will be jeopardized by the contamination, then I would have to conclude that some clean-up action is necessary. However, a monitoring program seems to be nothing more than a waste of scarce dollars.

Sincerely,



Jesse W. Rigby

JWR:hm