

**From:** [John Mousa](#)  
**To:** ["Murry, Fredrick J."](#); ["Pearson, Stewart E."](#); ["Anthony\\_Dennis@doh.state.fl.us"](#)  
**Cc:** [Chris Bird](#); [Robin Hallbourg](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Question Regarding FDEP Estimate of Risks For Creek Sediments and Requirement (?) for Creek Signs  
**Date:** Tuesday, July 06, 2010 2:23:00 PM

---

Latest information from Kelsey last week on rationale of signs in the creek. We still have not figured out who is going to physically place the signs yet. This may have to occur after the 12<sup>th</sup> when Kelsy returns from her medical leave.

John

---

**From:** Helton, Kelsey [<mailto:Kelsey.Helton@dep.state.fl.us>]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, June 30, 2010 10:02 PM  
**To:** John Mousa  
**Cc:** Helton, Kelsey; Murchison, Nancy; [Miller.Scott@epamail.epa.gov](mailto:Miller.Scott@epamail.epa.gov)  
**Subject:** RE: Question Regarding FDEP Estimate of Risks For Creek Sediments and Requirement (?) for Creek Signs

John- DEP has completed review of the sediments and evaluated the potential risk. The Dept will forward those review comments from UF with our recommendations to you upon my return from medical leave (July 12 or sooner I hope).

To briefly summarize-

Based on 1) DEP's 10-6 risk management criteria, 2) the presence of dioxin and/or cPAHs in sediments deposited above the surface water interface along the creek banks with concentrations above default residential SCTLs; 3) the potential for sediments (with concentrations > default SCTLs) to be reworked and redispersed above the surface water interface along the creek banks where direct contact to public could occur; DEP is recommending removal of sediments in the creek(s) with contaminant concentrations above the default residential SCTLs. Although UF concluded that with the appropriate institutional controls (deed restrictions requiring permission of property owners), alternative SCTLs (above the default residential SCTLs) could be allowed (due to a likely lesser frequency of exposure), there would still be areas in the creek where sediment concentrations would exceed the alternative SCTLs based on the DEP 10-6 risk management level. As deed restrictions are not likely to be granted, use of the default SCTLs is recommended by DEP.

Until those sediments are removed, warning signs will be posted at public access points advising the public to avoid contact with contaminated soils in the creek. DEP is currently discussing with the City/County how we can work together to get the warning signs installed. DEP will provide the signs.

In addition, sediments with concentrations above DEP's sediment quality guidelines for dioxin and PAHs exist. These sediment guidelines can be used to determine what sediments pose a potential ecological risk and should therefore be removed. There is also the option to conduct a site specific eco-risk assessment to develop site specific sediment cleanup goals to protect the ecosystem and determine what sediments warrant removal.

I hope this is helpful. All this is will be discussed in the upcoming referenced correspondence.

I apologize for the delay and will get back to you as quickly as I am able.

Thank you-

Kelsey Helton  
DEP- Bureau of Waste Cleanup  
Hazardous Waste Cleanup Section  
Tallahassee, FL  
850-245-8969

*The Department of Environmental Protection values your feedback as a customer. DEP Secretary Michael W. Sole is committed to continuously assessing and improving the level and quality of services provided to you. Please take a few minutes to comment on the quality of service you received. Simply click on [this link to the DEP Customer Survey](#). Thank you in advance for completing the survey.*

**From:** John Mousa [mailto:jjm@alachuacounty.us]

**Sent:** Tuesday, June 22, 2010 5:18 PM

**To:** Helton, Kelsey

**Subject:** Question Regarding FDEP Estimate of Risks For Creek Sediments and Requirement (?) for Creek Signs

Kelsey,

With the release of the FDOH Health Consultation regarding the Springstead and Hogtown Creek Sediments today, they have concluded that there is no significant health risks associated with the arsenic, BAP and TCDD in the creek sediments found in ACEPD's report.

I have not seen FDEP's evaluation of risk yet, is it coming out soon?

Based on our previous discussion, I understood that FDEP felt there was some cause for some concern, but I do not recall whether that was due to human health risk or ecological risks or the fact that the levels were above default SCTLs.

One question is why are we considering posting the signs on the creek. Remind me again, is it due to the fact that contaminants exceed SCTLs or is it based on the FDEP risk evaluation that we have not seen yet?

I am sorry for the confusion, but it is important that I understand and am able to communicate the rationale for the creek signs and the difference between the FDEP and FDOH risk evaluations.

Please call me or e-mail me if more convenient tomorrow WED if you get the chance to discuss.

Thanks

John

