

Pre-Meeting Conference Call with Peer Consultation Group
April 4, 2008
9:30 AM EDT

Participants:

Charlie Menzie, Donna Vorhees, Cheri Butler – Menzie-Cura

Bryan Boulanger, Jeffrey Driver, Michael Jayjock, Kurunthachalam Kannan, Ernst Kastning, Kirk Kessler, Linda Lee, Chuck Newell, Neil Sass – Peer Consultation Group members

Mike Santoro – 3M

Cathy Fehrenbacher – U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)

Charlie Menzie began by stating that the purpose of today's call is for the Peer Consultation Group (PCG) to ask any questions about the process, the information they have received, and the expectations of PCG members.

Introductions

The team organizing the Peer Consultation consists of Charlie Menzie, Donna Vorhees, and Cheri Butler. Charlie has many years of experience conducting exposure assessments, both human health and ecological. He has chaired many scientific panels and will be the Chair at the Peer Consultation Meeting. Donna is experienced in human health risk assessment, particularly exposure assessment. She has served on peer panels and looks forward to this peer consultation. Cheri is also experienced in risk assessment and is in charge of meeting logistics for this peer consultation.

Bryan Boulanger is an assistant professor at Texas A&M in the Department of Civil Engineering, Environmental and Water Resources Division. He began researching the fate and transport of fluorochemicals in 2001 then joined EPA's National Risk Management Research Laboratory (NRMRL) where he studied the biodegradation of fluorinated compounds. He has been at Texas A&M since 2007.

Jeffrey Driver is a toxicologist by training. He began working at the National Institutes of Health on occupational safety and health. In the last 15 years, he has been involved in measuring and quantifying exposures & risk in residential settings for chemical and biological agents.

Michael Jayjock worked as a risk assessor at Roman Hass for 20 years where he focused on risk assessment of products and intermediates and near-field exposures (i.e. human health exposure in occupational and residential settings), His primary area of expertise is exposure modeling. He currently worked for a nonprofit organization called the Lifeline Group.

Kurunthachalam Kannan is a professor at the State University of New York in Albany in the School of Public Health Department of Environmental Health Sciences. He is an environmental chemist with expertise in the fate and transport of organic chemicals.

Ernst Kastning is a retired professor from Radford University. He currently works for the New Hampshire Geological Survey and keeps active in consulting. His areas of expertise are geology and hydrogeology and he has studied karst environments in several states.

Kirk Kessler is a hydrogeologist by training and has over 20 years consulting experience. His expertise is in large, multimedia site characterizations, human health and ecological risk characterizations, remediation planning and remediation, and modeling groundwater and sediment.

Linda Lee is at Purdue University in the Department of Agronomy. She is an environmental chemist experienced in studying fate and transport of organics. In the past five years, she has studied the sorption, biodegradation, and abiotic, microbial, and fungal degradation of perfluorinateds, particularly the telomer alcohols and their metabolites.

Chuck Newell is from GSI Environmental Inc. and is an adjunct professor at Rice University. His expertise is in groundwater and soil source characterization and monitoring. He was also a Risk-Based Corrective Action trainer.

Neil Sass is the State Toxicologist, Chemical Laboratory Director and Counterterrorism Coordinator for the Alabama Department of Public Health. After receiving his Doctorate in Biochemistry, he began his career in the Army as a toxicologist studying Military Unique Compounds. He then worked for the Food and Drug Administration specializing in risk assessment and toxicology. He has previously served on Center for Disease Control panels and is looking forward to this peer consultation.

Purpose of the peer consultation

The Memorandum of Understanding between EPA and 3M and Dyneon provide the procedures for the peer consultation. The PCG has been formed to provide scientific inputs on the Assessment documents in light of the following Charge question in the MOU:

Are current PFOA environmental releases and sources of those environmental releases from the Site and the presence of PFOA in environmental media on and around the Site sufficiently understood so that pathways of migration and exposure to PFOA associated with that Site are adequately characterized and assessed on a screening level basis?

The MOU also provides definitions of the terms in the Charge. These definitions are provided along with the Charge in the clarifying questions document sent to the PCG. The focus of this peer consultation is on exposure analysis, not health implications or human health or ecological risk.

Donna highlighted that reviewers should refer to Section V.D. (p9-10) of the MOU for a discussion of what should be in the Assessment documents. Also, the term “Screening level basis” is not specifically defined in the MOU, but the MOU does specify that the Assessments should follow EPA Guidelines for Exposure Assessment. We provide

excerpts from EPA's Guidelines as an Attachment to the clarifying questions, so that all of the PCG members are aware of what this guidance says about screening-level assessments.

Outside deliberations

Charlie told the PCG that all conversations related to this peer consultation will take place in the public forum and will be posted on website. Also, the Peer Consultation Meeting and the PCG's deliberations at the meeting are in public forum. He discouraged the PCG from working together in small subgroups outside the public forum.

Expectations of the PCG

The PCG's review of the Assessments should be guided by the Charge question and the MOU.

The PCG should formulate their pre-meeting comments based on the clarifying question assignments each member has received. Menzie-Cura assigned questions to each PCG member based on his or her areas of technical expertise. These assignments have been provided in tabular format. If assigned to give primary emphasis to a question, Menzie-Cura is expecting the PCG member to write down their comments (can be half a page to a few pages, whatever is needed to convey your thought). If assigned to give a question secondary emphasis, Menzie-Cura would like you to provide your thoughts on those subjects. An asterisk symbol indicates that we encourage all of the PCG members to think about the entire set of Assessment documents. PCG members were encouraged to think holistically, but with the understanding that there are certain areas that each member will feel more comfortable with. PCG members are encouraged to share their opinions on all questions, within the limits of their scientific expertise and time constraints.

Charlie requested that PCG members send their pre-meeting comments electronically so he can organize them and redistribute to the PCG, EPA and 3M before the meeting. These comments will also be placed on the website. Charlie will use the PCG's comments to structure discussions at the Peer Consultation Meeting. Charlie encouraged the group to write their comments with the objectives of clearly conveying their thoughts and educating the rest of the group.

Linda Lee asked if the pre-meeting comments will be available to the public. Charlie said yes, because they will be posted on the website. The pre-meeting comments should reflect current scientific knowledge and be constructed in a professional manner. However, PCG members should not hesitate to provide their opinions about the Assessments as related to the Charge.

At the meeting, the PCG will have the opportunity to see the Site and discuss the clarifying questions organized around the three Assessment documents. At various points during the meeting, Charlie will sum up the PCG's comments thus far. It is not necessary to reach a consensus. After the meeting, Menzie-Cura will prepare a report that includes the opinions of all PCG members. Menzie-Cura will send the report to the PCG for

review. The five expectations of the PCG are to review the Assessment documents, submit pre-meeting comments, participate in the meeting, recommend any further data or information collection to fully address the Charge, and review the meeting report.

Charge and Clarifying Questions

Charlie asked each member of the PCG if he or she had any questions about what they are being asked to do and if they need any further information in order to proceed with his or her review?

Jeff Driver responded that he may need certain documents referenced in the Assessment, but he can probably get them.

Ernst Kastning asked if he could obtain reports for some studies previously done by Weston (especially dye tracing study).

Charlie asked that he send a list of the reports he needs in an email and Menzie-Cura will forward the request to 3M.

Kirk Kessler thought it would be useful to have the supporting data regarding flow net analyses. He will send a request via email.

Charlie mentioned that Kirk Kessler has already requested (and has received) Arc View files for data evaluation. He still needs one more file with a specific data format to complete his review. Kirk said that once he is done his review, he is willing to distribute the results to other team members. Ernst Kastning said he would like to see it. Charlie requested that Kirk submit his review to Menzie-Cura who will then distribute it to the entire PCG.

Mike Jayjock had a question regarding the volatility of PFOA, which he sent to Menzie-Cura via email. Charlie responded that his comment was appropriate to include in his written comments and this topic will be discussed at the meeting. Mike will send a request for some references he found.

Charlie instructed PCG members that if they have requests for additional information in order to be able to understand the Assessment documents, they should submit specific requests to Menzie-Cura via email.

Logistics and schedule for meeting

Cheri provided an overview of the Agenda for the meeting in Decatur. She also mentioned that she will be sending a file with additional logistics information. She said members are welcome to submit an expense form for their airfare now.

Linda Lee asked if a hard copy of the Assessment documents would be available at the meeting. Charlie said there would be a couple of copies available.

Mike Jayjock asked about Internet access. Cheri replied that there is wireless Internet access at the hotel.

Comments from 3M

Mike is looking forward to the discussion at the meeting.

In response to Cheri's question regarding proper attire for the site visit, he responded that long pants and close-toed shoes were appropriate. Any other safety gear needed (shouldn't be needed), would be provided by the Plant.

Mike asked if the Hampton Inn Decatur was the location of the meeting. Cheri confirmed that it was.

Mike asked Cathy if EPA had a recommendation about noticing the peer consultation meeting.

Comments from EPA

Cathy thanked the PCG and Menzie-Cura for their involvement in the Peer Consultation. In response to Mike's questions, she said she will call the Chemical Control Division today to get an answer about noticing the meeting. Typically, they notify the EPA region and the State, but she agrees that it makes sense to notify people in the local area too.