

M00263.AR.000378  
MCRD PARRIS ISLAND  
5090.3a

EMAIL REGARDING U S EPA REGION IV COMMENTS ON VERIFICATION SAMPLING AT  
SITE 12 JERICOHO ISLAND DISPOSAL AREA MCRD PARRIS ISLAND SC  
10/27/2005  
U S EPA REGION IV

**From:** [Koroma-Llamas.Lila@epamail.epa.gov](mailto:Koroma-Llamas.Lila@epamail.epa.gov)  
**To:** [Sanford, Art F CIV EFDSOUTH](#); [mac mcrae](#); [Mirna Zahan](#); [Sladic, Mark](#); [Harrington GS12 Timothy J](#)  
**Cc:** [Taylor.dawn@epamail.epa.gov](mailto:Taylor.dawn@epamail.epa.gov)  
**Subject:** RE: MCRD Jericho verification sampling  
**Date:** Thursday, October 27, 2005 9:19:08 AM

---

Hi all,

I spoke at length yesterday with Tim Harrington. Tim explained what he thought had happened with respect to data analysis. He stated that previously the data analysis had been done by other contractors prior to the work plan development, and that, for whatever reason, it did not happen quite that way this time. Tim understands what I am now asking for. All questions/comments have been addressed except for the question pertaining to the standard deviation (std) and other parameters used in the VSP program. Previous discussions with Mirna had left uncertainties about how the std had been derived, and there were concerns that some of the data being viewed would have made a std deviation much higher than presented in the work plan. When speaking with my statistician, it was suggested to me to use the data from those samples outside of the contaminated areas, as being reflective of what we expect the results to look like post excavation. So, from that data subset, we would derive a standard deviation, etc. He went into specifics which then left me glossy eyed, but it seemed very simple to him. That std should be very small, and look much like what is in the work plan, or most likely even smaller. If the result comes back smaller, and the Navy still wants to take more samples for contractual reasons, that is fine. EPA just needs to know that we can justify what we are doing if asked about it at some time in the future. This is what I explained to Tim, and it appeared the only concern was with expenses related to the data analysis. I offered to have EPA perform the analysis. Tim thought this was a fine idea and said he would communicate with you all to make this happen. I guess he did not, based on this e-mail, or was not successful. Apparently Art still wants an e-mail response, so here it is:

After speaking with Art and Tim, the concern on the part of the Navy appears to be costs related to analyzing data. After Dawn and I spoke, we agreed that it would be possible for EPA to analyze the data, using our in-house technical support staff, who have statistical expertise, and can do this with no expense to the Navy or Marines. This would also be an easier approach than having to go back and forth with Mark's data folks via third party discussions. EPA needs to be assured that the number of samples proposed by the Navy has statistical justification for verifying the site is clean. EPA is therefore requesting an Excel copy of the data set from the RI, including all follow-up sampling efforts made. This needs to be in an Excel format, so it can be analyzed, not pdf. The data set should be rather small. If you think the data can be e-mailed, please do so. Our e-mail system can handle pretty large files.

Please feel free to call me with any questions.

Thanks,  
Lila  
404-562-9969