



**U.S. Army
Corps of Engineers**

New England District
Concord, Massachusetts



**U.S. Environmental
Protection Agency**

New England Region
Boston, Massachusetts

RESPONSIVENESS SUMMARY TO PUBLIC COMMENTS ON NEW INFORMATION ECOLOGICAL RISK ASSESSMENT FOR THE GE/HOUSATONIC RIVER SITE REST OF RIVER

DCN: GE-021705-ACOQ

March 2005

**Environmental Remediation Contract
GE/Housatonic River Project
Pittsfield, Massachusetts**

Contract No. DACW33-00-D-0006

Task Order 0003

**RESPONSIVENESS SUMMARY TO PUBLIC COMMENTS
ON NEW INFORMATION — ECOLOGICAL RISK ASSESSMENT FOR
THE GENERAL ELECTRIC (GE)/HOUSATONIC RIVER SITE,
REST OF RIVER**

**ENVIRONMENTAL REMEDIATION CONTRACT
GENERAL ELECTRIC (GE)/HOUSATONIC RIVER PROJECT
PITTSFIELD, MASSACHUSETTS**

Contract No. DACW33-00-D-0006
Task Order No. 0003

DCN: GE-021705-ACOQ

Prepared for

U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS

New England District
Concord, Massachusetts

and

U.S. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

New England Region
Boston, Massachusetts

Prepared by

WESTON SOLUTIONS, INC.

West Chester, Pennsylvania

March 2005

Work Order No. 20123.001.096.0735

AUTHORS/CONTRIBUTORS

Tod DeLong
Avatar Environmental, LLC
West Chester, Pennsylvania

Scott Ferson, Troy Tucker
Applied Biomathematics, Inc.
Setauket, New York

Dwayne Moore, Roger Breton, Scott Teed, Ryan Thompson
CANTOX Environmental, Inc.
Ottawa, Ontario

Gary Lawrence
EVS Environment Consultants
Vancouver, British Columbia

Richard McGrath, Richard DiNitto
Sleeman Hanley & DiNitto, Inc.
Boston, Massachusetts

Francesca Langford
District of Squamish
Squamish, British Columbia

Susan Svirsky
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Boston, Massachusetts

Scott Campbell
Weston Solutions, Inc.
West Chester, Pennsylvania; Pittsfield, Massachusetts

John Lortie, Bob Roy, Michael Thompson
Woodlot Alternatives, Inc.
Topsham, Maine

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Section	Page
Introduction	1
Comments of the State of Connecticut, Department of Environmental Protection (CT)	4
Comments of the General Electric Company (GE)	15
Comments of the Housatonic Environmental Action League, Inc. (HEAL)	63
Comments of the Massachusetts Audubon Society (MAS)	72
Comments of the Technical Assistance Grant Recipient – Housatonic River Initiative/Environmental Stewardship Concepts (TAG)	74

LIST OF ACRONYMS

ANOVA	analysis of variance
CAE	chemical assimilation efficiency
COPC	contaminant of potential concern
CT DEP	Connecticut Department of Environmental Protection
DELT	deformities, erosions, lesions, and tumors
EPA	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
ERA	Ecological Risk Assessment
EROD	ethoxyresorufin-O-dethylase
FEL	Fort Environmental Laboratories, Inc.
GE	General Electric Company
GOF	goodness of fit
HEAL	Housatonic Environmental Action League, Inc.
HRI	Housatonic River Initiative
IMPG	Interim Media Protection Goal
LOAEL	lowest observed adverse effect level
µg	microgram
MATC	Maximum Acceptable Threshold Concentration
NOAEL	no observed adverse effect level
PCB	polychlorinated biphenyl
PSA	Primary Study Area
ROR	Rest of River
SSD	species sensitivity distribution
TAG	Technical Assistance Grant
TCDD	2,3,7,8-tetrachlorodibenzo-p-dioxin
TDI	total daily intake
TEF	toxic equivalency factor
TEQ	toxic equivalence
TMA	Trout Management Area
tPCB	total PCBs
USGS	U.S. Geological Survey

ERA Responsiveness Summary

INTRODUCTION

ERA Responsiveness Summary

1 Introduction

2 This document presents the response from the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
3 (EPA) to comments received from the public pertaining to new information included in
4 the Ecological Risk Assessment for the GE/Housatonic River Site, Rest of River (ERA).
5 The June 2003 ERA was revised and reissued in November 2004 in response to
6 comments and questions posed by a Peer Review Panel. The Peer Review was
7 conducted by seven independent experts in the field of ecological risk assessment.

8 Under the terms of the Consent Decree, EPA was required to conduct an ecological risk
9 assessment of the area referred to as the "Rest of the River," defined as the area of
10 river and adjacent floodplain downstream from the confluence of the East and West
11 Branches of the Housatonic River in Pittsfield, MA, and to conduct an independent Peer
12 Review of the ERA. The conclusions of the ecological risk assessment, along with the
13 conclusions from the human health risk assessment that was also conducted by EPA
14 and underwent Peer Review, will be taken into account by GE when developing an
15 Interim Media Protection Goals (IMPG) Proposal that will be submitted to EPA for
16 review.

17 Following the Peer Review of the July 2003 draft of the ERA, EPA chose to exercise its
18 option to revise and reissue the document in response to Peer Review comments. The
19 revised ERA was issued on November 15, 2004, and EPA announced a 30-day public
20 comment period, subsequently extended to 60 days, during which members of the
21 public were invited to submit written comments restricted to the new information
22 contained within the document. The public comment period closed on January 18,
23 2005. EPA received five sets of comments on the revised ERA. This document
24 provides EPA's response to those comments.

25 ***Approach and Organization of this Document***

26 The full text of each of the five sets of comments received and of comments excerpted
27 from transmittal letters are reproduced in this Responsiveness Summary. The
28 comments are presented alphabetically by commenter or group, as follows (the
29 abbreviation used for each commenter throughout the document is enclosed in
30 parentheses):

- 31 ▪ State of Connecticut, Department of Environmental Protection (CT).
- 32 ▪ General Electric Company (GE).
- 33 ▪ Housatonic Environmental Action League (HEAL).
- 34 ▪ Massachusetts Audubon Society (MAS).
- 35 ▪ Technical Assistance Grant recipient – Housatonic River Initiative/Environmental
36 Stewardship Concepts (TAG).

37 EPA carefully reviewed the comments from each of the above entities and identified
38 appropriate locations within each set of comments to insert responses. Each response

ERA Responsiveness Summary

1 is identified by the abbreviation for the commenter followed by a sequential number.
2 For example, the first response to comments from the State of Connecticut is identified
3 as RESPONSE CT-1; the seventh response to comments from the Housatonic
4 Environmental Action League is identified as RESPONSE HEAL-7. Each response is
5 intended to address the comment or related series of comments immediately preceding
6 it. In identifying appropriate locations for comments, EPA attempted to provide more
7 comprehensive responses to related comments, as opposed to responding to individual
8 sentences.

9 References used by EPA in responding to comments immediately follow the response.
10 Although this in some cases requires citations to be repeated, it will allow readers
11 interested in referring to the references to quickly identify those references that support
12 a particular response.

13 ***Relationship of the Responsiveness Summary to the Ecological Risk*** 14 ***Assessment for Rest of River***

15 The Peer Review Panel reviewed the July 2003 draft Ecological Risk Assessment and
16 comments provided to the Panel on that document by members of the public. A public
17 Peer Review meeting was held in January 2004, after which the Panel submitted their
18 final written comments on the document. At the beginning of the Peer Review process
19 in 2003, EPA provided the opportunity for any party to submit written comments on the
20 draft Ecological Risk Assessment to the Peer Review Panel during a public comment
21 period. EPA also provided the opportunity for any party to comment orally (and in
22 writing) at the January 2004 Peer Review Panel meeting. In June 2004, EPA produced
23 a Responsiveness Summary to the Peer Review Panel comments.

24 EPA chose to revise the ERA, including new information as necessary, to respond to
25 the Peer Review Panel comments; this resulted in the November 2004 revised
26 Ecological Risk Assessment. The November 15, 2004 notice issued by EPA soliciting
27 public comment on the new information stated that EPA was seeking comment on “only
28 the new information contained in the risk assessment regarding risks to animals that live
29 in or visit the river or floodplain.” This additional opportunity for input from the public to
30 the process was provided at this site to continue to promote public involvement in the
31 development of documents and the decision-making process for the Rest of River.

32 EPA provided paper and/or electronic copies of the November 2004 revised Ecological
33 Risk Assessment to the site information repositories and interested Citizens
34 Coordinating Council members, and also provided a detailed list of the new information
35 included in the revised Ecological Risk Assessment, to facilitate identification and
36 review of the new information. In addition, both the document and the list of new
37 information were posted on EPA’s website. At the December 1, 2004 Citizens
38 Coordinating Council meeting, EPA provided an overview of the changes to the ERA
39 based on the Peer Review Panel comments and answered questions from the public
40 regarding the new information and the comment period. At the request of members of
41 the public, EPA granted an extension of the public comment period to 60 days, closing

ERA Responsiveness Summary

1 January 18, 2005. If a comment received during the public comment period did not
2 pertain to the new information presented in the ERA in response to comments from the
3 Peer Review Panel, EPA did not provide a response in this Responsiveness Summary.

4 Together with this Responsiveness Summary, the November 2004 revised Ecological
5 Risk Assessment now is considered to be the final ERA for the GE/Housatonic River
6 Rest of River site. In addition to the opportunities described above that were available
7 for the public to provide input to the Ecological Risk Assessment, pursuant to the
8 Consent Decree, and the Reissued RCRA Permit (Appendix G to the Decree), all
9 parties will have an additional opportunity to comment when EPA issues the Statement
10 of Basis proposing a response action for the Rest of River.

ERA Responsiveness Summary

COMMENTS OF THE STATE OF CONNECTICUT, DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION (CT)

1 **Comments of the State of Connecticut, Department of** 2 **Environmental Protection (CT)**

3 EPA is currently accepting public comment, through January 18, 2005, on new information that
4 was added to the Ecological Risk Assessment for the GE-Pittsfield/Housatonic River Site (the
5 Site). This information was added in response to written comments provided by the Peer Review
6 Panel. EPA has provided a listing of the new material added to the risk assessment, along with the
7 revised Ecological Risk Assessment and the Responsiveness Summary, which provides EPA's
8 responses to the Peer Review comments received. I have reviewed these documents in addition to
9 the written comments provided by the Peer Review Panel in order to summarize these documents
10 with respect to their applicability to Connecticut and within context of the proposed remedial
11 process for the Site, identify issues of concern for the State, and provide comment to EPA.

12 **Background**

13 Polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs) were released into the Housatonic River from the General
14 Electric (GE) facility located in Pittsfield Massachusetts. These PCBs were subsequently
15 distributed throughout the river, including portions within Connecticut (CT). As a result, fish
16 consumption advisories have been in place for the CT portion of the river since 1977. GE is
17 currently involved in the investigation/remediation of contamination at their facility, within the
18 City of Pittsfield and within the river as a result of releases from their facility. This very large
19 study area has been divided into several portions. The Housatonic River within CT is included
20 in the Rest of the River portion of the Site that extends from the confluence of the East and West
21 Branches of the Housatonic River two miles below the GE facility in MA, to the confluence of
22 the Housatonic River with Long Island Sound in the Stratford/Milford Area. (See map in
23 Appendix A) Because of the presence of PCBs downstream of the Derby Dam from sources
24 other than GE, the practical limit of the study area within CT has been set at the Derby Dam.

25 As part of the regulatory process, Human Health and Ecological Risk Assessments have been
26 prepared for the Rest of River portion of the Site. These documents were previously released
27 and underwent public comment and a peer review process. The revised Ecological Risk
28 Assessment has recently been released for public comment. This document will contribute to
29 future regulatory decisions regarding what activities, if any, occur within the Connecticut portion
30 of the river. In the future, GE will propose cleanup values and analyze alternatives. EPA will
31 draft a Cleanup Plan, expected in 2007.

32 **Summary Ecological Risk Assessment for CT Portions of the River**

33 The Ecological Risk Assessment (ERA) was conducted to evaluate risks to ecological
34 populations within the Rest of River (ROR) portion of the Site. The main focus of the ERA was
35 the Primary Study Area (PSA), a 10.7 mile subset of the ROR area that is located in
36 Massachusetts and extends from the confluence of the East and West Branches of the Housatonic
37 River down to Woods Pond Dam. Extensive sampling of environmental media and biological
38 communities occurred within the PSA. Ecological risks within CT were evaluated by identifying
39 important biological communities within the State. These included benthic invertebrates,
40 amphibians, warmwater fish (e.g. bass, sunfish, perch), coldwater fish (trout), mink, river otter
41 and the bald eagle. Maximum Acceptable Threshold Concentrations (MATCs) for either

ERA Responsiveness Summary

1 sediment or biota (tissue) were developed based on the results of studies conducted within the
2 PSA. These values are set as threshold concentrations between low and moderate risks. As
3 such, they are not conservative concentrations delineating areas of "no risk" from "risk." Low to
4 moderate levels of risk are associated with the MATCs.

5 The MATCs were used within the ERA to screen sediment and fish tissue data available for CT
6 or were compared with the results of wildlife exposure modeling conducted for the mink, otter
7 and bald eagle. A summary of the ERA evaluation and conclusions regarding risks for each
8 organism is provided below:

9 Benthic Invertebrates: Two MATCs were developed to assess risks to this population. A
10 benchmark for PCB concentrations in bulk sediment of 3 mg PCB/kg sediment was developed
11 based on chronic toxicity tests using *Chironomus* and observed effects on the benthic community
12 in the Primary Study Area in Massachusetts. Another MATC was developed using tissue
13 concentrations reported in the scientific literature. The MATC of 3 mg/kg wet weight in tissues
14 of the benthic organisms represents the concentration below which adverse effects were not
15 reported in the studies examined. Based on comparisons to PCB concentrations in the upper 6
16 inches of sediments collected from various points in the river, and limited benthic tissue samples,
17 EPA concluded that PCBs within the CT portion of the river pose a low risk of harm to the
18 benthic community.

19 Amphibians: A soil and sediment MATC of 3.27 mg/kg tPCBs (total PCBs) was derived for the
20 PSA based on developmental malformations observed in studies conducted on amphibians. This
21 value represents the concentration of PCBs at which some sensitive endpoints (alteration of the
22 gender ratio within the population studied) showed a response, but was not deemed as
23 biologically relevant as the MATC based on malformations. Above this concentration,
24 ecologically significant responses are expected. Sediment concentrations for the Housatonic
25 River downstream of the PSA and into CT were used to evaluate potential effects on amphibians.
26 Additionally, estimates of floodplain tPCB concentrations were made by interpolating the river
27 based sediment values to the limit of the 100-year floodplain. In this manner, risks within the
28 floodplain were also assessed. Sediment PCB concentrations within CT were below the MATC
29 so amphibian populations were not identified as being at risk.

30 Warmwater Fish: A MATC of 55 mg/kg ww tPCBs in fish tissues was established to separate
31 low risk groups from those exposed to intermediate or high risks. This value was derived based
32 on results of studies on Largemouth Bass, evaluating accumulation of PCBs and potential
33 reproductive/developmental effects. Additionally, studies conducted on warmwater fish and
34 rainbow trout to simulate the maternal transfer of PCBs to oocytes were also considered.
35 Literature based tissue concentration thresholds were developed but not included in the MATC.
36 The literature based value was lower than that derived from the studies conducted as part of the
37 ERA. However, EPA determined that there was a higher level of uncertainty associated with the
38 literature studies. Tissue concentrations in warmwater fish (bass, perch, sunfish) collected in CT
39 were evaluated using the MATC of 55 mg/kg ww in fish tissue. Tissue concentrations in
40 warmwater fish collected in CT were below the MATC.

ERA Responsiveness Summary

1 Coldwater Fish (Trout): A MATC of 14 mg/kg ww tPCBs in fish tissues was established based
2 on the MATC for warmwater fish species, divided by a factor of 4 to account for potential
3 differences in sensitivities between the different species. The MATC separates low risk groups
4 from those exposed to intermediate or high risks. In order to evaluate risks to trout, warmwater
5 fish data, and/or trout fillet data were used to estimate whole body trout concentrations. These
6 estimates indicate that whole body trout concentrations within CT should be below the MATC
7 for trout. Risks to trout were not evaluated downstream of Reach 12 (Bull's Bridge). EPA did
8 not believe that there was suitable trout habitat below Bulls Bridge Dam. However, there is the
9 Bull's Bridge Trout Management Area, which extends from the Bull's Bridge Impoundment to
10 the Gaylordsville Bridge (Route 7) in New Milford.

11 **RESPONSE CT-1:** In western Connecticut, CT DEP opened a new Trout
12 Management Area (TMA) in 2002 (Bull's Bridge TMA) that is open year-round as
13 a catch-and-release only fishery. According to CT DEP (Barry, pers. comm.
14 2005), in addition to trout stocked in this area, there are some wild trout that are
15 associated with small feeder tributaries to the Housatonic River (e.g., Ten Mile
16 River). These fish are found primarily in the stretch of the Housatonic River
17 between Bull's Bridge Dam and Gaylordsville, CT, with very low numbers of trout
18 found farther downstream.

19 The establishment of the Bull's Bridge TMA does not affect the fish risk
20 characterization provided in the November 2004 ERA, for the following reasons:

21 (1) Suitability of Spawning Habitat - The Bull's Bridge TMA was sampled a
22 number of times prior to stocking of brown trout. Wild brown trout are present in
23 the area, but are present only at a "low level" (Humphreys, pers. comm. 2005).
24 Important limiting factors for trout habitat downstream of the Bull's Bridge Dam
25 are thermal stress (i.e., periodic increases in water temperature) and alterations
26 in flow regime related to regulation of the river by the Bull's Bridge and Falls
27 Village hydropower stations. A few young-of-year (i.e., non-stocked) trout have
28 been observed, but the level of reproduction in this reach is not adequate for
29 sustaining a significant natural fishery (Humphreys, pers. comm. 2005). EPA
30 acknowledges that the term "lack of suitable habitat" used in ERA Section F.4.6.2
31 requires clarification. A more precise statement is that trout spawning activity
32 downstream of Reach 12 occurs only at a low level relative to upstream
33 coldwater habitats in the Housatonic River in northern Connecticut and is
34 insufficient to sustain a natural fishery.

35 (2) Relevance of MATC to Stocked Fish – The PCB MATC for trout is intended to
36 be protective of reproduction, because reproductive endpoints were shown to be
37 more sensitive than survival or growth in older fish (in both literature-based and
38 site-specific effects assessments). The life stage of greatest biological sensitivity
39 to PCBs is fry development (swim-up and post swim-up fry). The trout in the
40 Housatonic River TMAs are stocked at an age and size (9 to 12 inches) that is
41 well beyond the sensitive life stages, which were the basis for the development of
42 the MATC.

ERA Responsiveness Summary

1 (3) Tissue concentrations of PCBs in Reach 13 fish (and farther downstream) are
2 lower than those observed in Reach 12. Because the measured/estimated whole
3 body concentrations in Reach 12 fish were demonstrated to be below the MATC,
4 estimates of Reach 13 fish tissue concentrations would therefore also not exceed
5 the MATC, even for the few wild trout present. Therefore, the overall risk
6 conclusion for downstream reaches of the Housatonic River remains as stated in
7 the November 2004 version of the ERA.

8 The fillet tPCB concentrations in brown trout and rainbow trout samples collected
9 from Reach 13 were 2.0 mg/kg ww and 2.4 mg/kg ww, respectively (BBL and QEA
10 2003). Fillet tPCB concentrations in all other species collected in Reach 13 since
11 1990 (n=91 individual measurements including smallmouth bass, yellow perch,
12 and centrarchid sunfish) were nearly all below 2 mg/kg ww, and the maximum
13 individual tPCB fillet concentration measured was only 3.8 mg/kg ww. Even
14 following extrapolations from fillet to whole-body measurements and interspecies
15 extrapolations (as described in the ERA), these concentrations would not exceed
16 the MATC for trout of 14 mg/kg ww. Therefore, the risk characterization for the few
17 reproducing wild trout in Reach 13 remains as “low risk.”

18 **References:**

19 Barry, T. 2005. Personal communication. Telephone conversation between Tim
20 Barry (Connecticut Department of Environmental Protection, Bureau of
21 Natural Resources, Fisheries Division, Western Connecticut) and Gary
22 Lawrence (EVS Environment Consultants, North Vancouver, BC) regarding
23 wild trout habitat within the Bull’s Bridge Trout Management Areas (TMA) on
24 the Housatonic River. February 8, 2005.

25 BBL (Blasland, Bouck & Lee, Inc.) and QEA (Quantitative Environmental
26 Analysis, LLC). 2003. *Housatonic River – Rest of River RCRA Facility*
27 *Investigation Report*. Prepared for General Electric Company, Pittsfield, MA.
28 September 2003.

29 Humphreys, M. 2005. Personal communication. Telephone conversation
30 between Michael Humphreys (Fisheries Biologist, Connecticut Department of
31 Environmental Protection, Inland Waters Division) and Gary Lawrence (EVS
32 Environment Consultants, North Vancouver, BC) regarding trout habitat
33 downstream of Bull’s Bridge and evidence of lesions on Connecticut portions
34 of the Housatonic River. February 9, 2005.

35 Mink and River Otter: A MATC of 0.984 mg/kg tPCBs in fish was developed based on the mink
36 kit survival from 0 - 6 weeks in a single, long-term feeding study on captive mink exposed to
37 fish collected from the Primary Study Area in Massachusetts. Dietary exposures to mink and
38 river otter were based on the proportion of contaminated prey items (fish and crayfish) likely
39 contained in their diets. Since data for tPCB concentrations in crayfish tissue was not available
40 for the rest of river study area, crayfish concentrations were assumed to be equal to fish tissue
41 concentrations. Based on these assumptions, it was assumed that 59% of the diet of mink and

ERA Responsiveness Summary

1 100% of the diet of river otter were composed of fish/crayfish. Mink and river otter were
2 identified as potentially at risk from the CT/Massachusetts border down to the Stevenson Dam
3 on Lake Zoar.

4 Bald Eagle: Risks to bald eagles were evaluated based on toxicity estimates from a surrogate
5 species as well as modeled concentrations to estimate accumulation of PCBs in eggs. The
6 MATC of 30.41 mg/kg tPCBs in fish was developed based on a determination of the threshold at
7 which the total daily intake of PCBs for an eagle would exceed the toxicity threshold for tPCBs
8 in eggs. The diet of eagles was assumed to consist of 83.4% fish and 16.1% waterfowl. EPA
9 assumed that the waterfowl consumed during the winter were likely to have migrated to the
10 Housatonic Area from northern locations, and therefore, were unlikely to contain PCBs.
11 However, it is the experience of CT DEP Wildlife staff that waterfowl residing in CT during the
12 winter are likely to remain in the area for extended periods of time, allowing for potential uptake
13 of contaminants such as PCBs.

14 **RESPONSE CT-2:** This comment does not address new information added to
15 the November 2004 revised Ecological Risk Assessment in response to Peer
16 Review comments. As stated in the introduction to this Responsiveness
17 Summary, EPA solicited public comment only on new information and is
18 responding only to comments that pertain to the new information.

19 Additionally, there are no data available to substantiate the assumption that waterfowl caught
20 within CT do not possess a body burden of PCBs. CT DEP has data from only one duck
21 collected within the Housatonic Basin, and tissue concentrations of PCBs were elevated.

22 **RESPONSE CT-3:** This comment does not address new information added to
23 the November 2004 revised Ecological Risk Assessment in response to Peer
24 Review comments. As stated in the introduction to this Responsiveness
25 Summary, EPA solicited public comment only on new information and is
26 responding only to comments that pertain to the new information.

27 Finally, it must be noted that there are bald eagles that reside within the basin for the entire year.
28 Assumptions made regarding contaminant concentrations in the diet of overwintering eagles may
29 not apply to those eagles that reside throughout the entire year.

30 **RESPONSE CT-4:** This comment does not address new information added to
31 the November 2004 revised Ecological Risk Assessment in response to Peer
32 Review comments. As stated in the introduction to this Responsiveness
33 Summary, EPA solicited public comment only on new information and is
34 responding only to comments that pertain to the new information.

35 An additional evaluation of risks to bald eagles breeding within the study area was conducted
36 within the ERA. The study focused on a breeding pair of bald eagles located south of Interstate
37 84. It was assumed that this pair would forage in the southern reach of Lake Lillinoah and
38 within Lake Zoar. Low, moderate and high tPCB intake rates were evaluated and compared with
39 the MATC. Risks to bald eagles within CT were determined to be low.

ERA Responsiveness Summary

1 Note: In Appendix K - Survival, Growth and Reproduction of Threatened and Endangered
2 Species, reference is made to a personal communication of Ms. Julie Victoria, CTDEP, with
3 Woodlot Alternatives Inc. on December 12, 2002. Ms. Victoria's name is misspelled throughout
4 the Appendix as "Bictoria".

5 **Revised ERA - Outstanding Issues**

6 Under the current comment period EPA has established that only issues raised during the peer
7 review process or modified within the risk assessment in response to comments are available for
8 further discussion.

9 **RESPONSE CT-5:** To clarify the purpose of this comment period paraphrased in
10 the comment above, as stated in the introduction to this Responsiveness
11 Summary, EPA solicited public comment only on new information included in the
12 November 2004 revised Ecological Risk Assessment in response to Peer Review
13 comments, and is responding only to comments that pertain to the new
14 information.

15 There are two issues that were raised during the peer review process that pertain to Connecticut:
16 1) the characterization of the river within the rest of river segment which includes CT; and 2)
17 the derivation of Maximum Acceptable Threshold Concentrations. These issues will be
18 discussed below.

19 1: Characterization of the Housatonic River within Connecticut

20 Peer Review Comments:

21 Several members of the Peer Review requested justification for the reduced sampling within CT
22 or recommended that the river within CT be better characterized. Several reviewers specifically
23 identified sediments behind the dams as areas that could accumulate higher concentrations of
24 PCBs in sediments.

25 EPA Response:

26 EPA disagreed and asserted that adequate characterization of the physical, ecological and
27 cultural aspects of the river were provided. EPA also sited the inclusion of historical data as well
28 as additional samples collected as part of the ERA.

29 Summary of CT DEP Response:

30 The characterization of PCBs within abiotic and biotic media in CT is limited and prevents a
31 complete evaluation of risk to ecological receptors at this time. The limitations of the
32 characterization arise from the difficulty in precisely characterizing such a large area as the
33 Housatonic River within the State. The data contained within the current draft of the ERA is
34 sufficient to provide a limited assessment of risks within CT. However, the inadequacies in the
35 dataset, both regarding the number and type of samples collected, prevent reaching a definitive
36 conclusion regarding risks within all reaches of the river in CT at this time. Additionally,

ERA Responsiveness Summary

1 potential future risks from mobilization or migration of deeper bedded sediments were not
2 included in the risk assessment.

3 Discussion:

4 The current revisions to the Ecological Risk Assessment do not adequately address concerns
5 regarding the environmental characterization within Connecticut. This is of particular
6 importance given that future activities within the river to address PCBs are based, at least in part,
7 on the conclusions of the human and ecological risk assessments.

8 The Ecological Risk Assessment reflects the following summary provided in the Executive
9 Summary (pages ES-1 to ES-2) in several places throughout the report:

10 "The purpose of this ecological risk assessment (ERA) is to **characterize and quantify**
11 **the current and potential risks to biota** exposed to contaminants of potential concern
12 (COPCs) in the Housatonic River below the confluence of the East and West Branches
13 (known as the "Rest of River"), **focusing on polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs) and**
14 **other hazardous substances** originating from the General Electric Company (GE)
15 facility in Pittsfield, MA." (Emphasis added)

16 Additionally, Section 1.3 (Regulatory Background) of the revised report states:

17 "The ecological risk assessment, together with the human health risk assessment and the
18 model of PCB fate, transport, and bioaccumulation, **will inform EPA's decision on what**
19 **additional remedial actions, if any, may be required** in the river and floodplain
20 downstream of the confluence." (Emphasis added)

21 The adequacy of the characterization of the Rest of River area is germane both to the ERA as
22 well as to potential future activities/requirements for the Connecticut portion of the river. In
23 response to comments expressing concern about the limited amount of data collected within CT,
24 EPA stated that the characterization was adequate. However, given the stated purpose of the risk
25 assessment, the characterization of current and potential risks, and the potential implications of
26 its conclusions, a further evaluation of the adequacy of the characterization within CT is
27 warranted.

28 Consider a practical illustration of this matter - a new project, possibly a new road project,
29 maintenance of a dam, installation of a fish ladder or a fishing pier, is proposed within the
30 Housatonic River somewhere in Connecticut. Is there sufficient information available within the
31 ERA to quantify the PCB concentrations within the proposed project area? Is there sufficient
32 information available within the ERA to determine that PCBs do not pose an environmental risk
33 within the project area? The answer to both questions is "no." The level of detail present within
34 the ERA is insufficient to adequately characterize the levels of PCBs with a high level of detail.
35 Any future activities within the river cannot rely on the environmental characterization of the
36 PCB levels in the river as present within the risk assessment to define the scope of the PCBs
37 within the project area. Similarly, this lack of specificity creates uncertainty regarding potential
38 risks to environmental receptors due to exposures to PCBs, currently and in the future.

ERA Responsiveness Summary

1 The study area within the CT portion of the river encompasses approximately 72 river miles.
2 This is a very large area to definitively characterize. It would take a huge effort, much time and
3 great expense to explicitly identify and quantify PCBs within an area this large. So, while a
4 large number of samples may contribute to the existing risk assessment, it is not sufficient to
5 definitively quantify the nature and extent of contamination within CT. There is not sufficient
6 information available to **specifically** identify PCB concentrations within various portions of the
7 river. There is sufficient information to **generally** identify PCB concentrations within surficial
8 sediments in the river. It is this general, surficial data that serves as the basis for the ERA.

9 There are several problems with this approach that must be considered as the river restoration
10 process moves forward. First, by restricting the evaluation of risk to the consideration of
11 surficial sediments, EPA is assuming that the river is static; that in the future there are no
12 opportunities for deeper sediments to become mobilized and influence the concentrations of
13 PCBs available within biologically active sediment horizons. Consideration of surficial
14 sediments may address **current** risks, but will not necessarily address **potential** risks, as
15 identified within the purpose for the risk assessment. There is limited data available for deeper
16 sediments, mostly from samples collected in association with the dams on the river. However,
17 this limited data set does identify higher concentrations of PCBs at depth within some areas.
18 Some of these concentrations exceed the MATC values used by EPA, indicating that risk to
19 various populations may occur if the deeper sediments were made available.

20 Secondly, there is the practical aspect that the risk assessment cannot assure that there are not
21 significant areas with elevated PCB levels within the river. It was not possible to sample all
22 major depositional areas within CT, for example. And so, the conclusions presented within the
23 ERA must be viewed with the understanding that they pertain to the current dataset but cannot be
24 taken as a definitive characterization for all portions of the river within CT.

25 The characterization within CT is also incomplete due in part to the omission of contaminants of
26 concern evaluated within the PSA in addition to PCBs. For example, within the PSA, risks to
27 the benthic invertebrate community were evaluated relative to exposures to dioxins/furans,
28 metals, dibenzofuran and PAHs in addition to total PCBs. Exposure to these additional
29 constituents potentially increases risks to exposed populations. The lack of inclusion of these
30 substances within the CT portion of the study is inconsistent with the goals of the ERA, to
31 characterize and quantify the current and potential risks to biota focusing on polychlorinated
32 biphenyls (PCBs) and other hazardous substances originating from the General Electric
33 Company (GE) facility in Pittsfield, MA. The omission is understandable due to the practical
34 consideration that the historical datasets that comprise a substantial part of the ERA data did not
35 include these substances. However, the lack of inclusion of these substances in the rest of river
36 evaluations and the lack of consideration, even indirectly, of these substances to contribute to
37 risk within CT is a data gap and contributes uncertainty to the conclusions reached in the ERA
38 and may underestimate risks to ecological populations within CT.

39 Additionally, adequate descriptions of the sampling locations within CT are not provided within
40 the report. It is not possible to determine if the sediment samples were obtained from
41 depositional areas, or were from areas less likely to accumulate PCBs, for example. The details

ERA Responsiveness Summary

1 of the sampling locations and sediment type are important factors for characterizing the
2 sediments within CT and interpreting the available data.

3 Finally, there was limited sampling of biological communities within CT. I do not believe that it
4 is necessary to conduct additional toxicity studies within CT as were conducted within the PSA.
5 However, additional sampling of biological tissues within CT may be needed. There are limited
6 data for fish and benthic invertebrates. However, there is no data available for waterfowl.
7 Waterfowl have accumulated PCBs within Massachusetts. Additionally, CT DEP has data from
8 one duck collected within the Housatonic River basin that had elevated PCB levels.

9 Recommendations - Characterization of CT

10 These criticisms underscore the difficult nature of the task undertaken to evaluate ecological
11 risks within the Housatonic River in CT. To summarize, the ERA provides an overview of the
12 general risks experienced by ecological populations within CT exposed to surficial sediments
13 under current conditions. However, the report does not present sufficient data to definitively
14 assess ecological risks within CT. Additionally, the report did not adequately assess potential
15 risks that could occur if bedded sediments with higher concentrations of PCBs were mobilized.
16 Therefore, revisions to the ERA to address these issues are recommended.

17 **RESPONSE CT-6:** EPA provided a response to the issue of sampling and risk
18 characterization in Connecticut in the Responsiveness Summary to the Peer
19 Review (see response to General Issue No. 5). The Ecological Risk Assessment
20 was not revised on this matter subsequent to the Peer Review meeting;
21 therefore, this comment is outside the scope of this public comment period and
22 Responsiveness Summary.

23 2: Maximum Acceptable Threshold Concentrations

24 Peer Review Comments:

25 The Peer Review Panel made several comments regarding the derivation of the MATC values.
26 The comments focused on the method by which the values were derived, such as separating
27 acute and chronic endpoints, eliminating redundancy, defining the most appropriate data to use,
28 etc. The Reviewers had differing opinions regarding the conservatism of the MATC values.

29 EPA Response:

30 EPA agreed with most of the recommendations and made changes within the documents. These
31 changes, however, did not change the conclusions from the first draft ERA to the revision.

32 Summary of CT DEP Response:

33 The MATC values developed within the risk assessment provide a means to evaluate risks to
34 ecological communities and are sufficient for the purposes of the ERA. However, these values
35 may not reflect acceptable thresholds from an environmental management perspective for ambient

ERA Responsiveness Summary

1 PCBs within the environment. Such discussions are most appropriate during the evaluation of
2 cleanup goals for the river.

3 Discussion:

4 The MATC values for the various endpoints were established to separate populations
5 experiencing lower levels of risk from those exposed to intermediate/high risk levels. The
6 different MATC values have differing levels of conservatism, depending upon the strength of the
7 data used and the interpretation of the data. Within the context of the ERA, the MATC values
8 serve a useful purpose, allowing the qualitative evaluation of risks within Connecticut. These
9 concentrations, however, have been established within a risk assessment, and, in accordance with
10 EPA Guidance, separate from the risk management process but considering general management
11 goals. These values are not numeric interpretations of acceptable environmental concentrations
12 established in accordance with State policy statements, such as the Connecticut Water Quality
13 Standards. In accepting the qualitative assessment of risks within CT, CT DEP does not imply
14 that the MATC values are numeric interpretations of our policy nor do we agree, at this time, that
15 these values are acceptable ambient concentrations of PCBs, beyond which there are no risks, or
16 acceptable risks, to the ecosystem within our State. It is beyond the scope of the risk assessment
17 to discuss the way these MATC values may be used, if at all, in future risk management
18 decisions. Acceptable ambient values based on State policy must be addressed as the remedial
19 process for the river moves forward.

20 Recommendations – MATC

21 CT DEP accepts the use of the MATC within the context of the ERA for delineating exposures
22 to PCB concentrations with lower risks from those associated with moderate/high risks. As such,
23 they are not conservative concentrations delineating areas of "no risk" from "risk." Low to
24 moderate levels of risk are associated with the MATCs.

25 However, it is noted that the level of risk associated with these values (intermediate risk to
26 exposed populations) is not necessarily consistent with management goals for the river. I
27 recommend that the CT portions of the Housatonic River be considered during the future phases
28 of remedial investigation and implementation, especially during the development of remediation
29 goals. I am not recommending changes to the ERA regard MATC values.

30 **RESPONSE CT-7:** The commenter does not request a change to the Ecological
31 Risk Assessment with this comment. This comment does not address new
32 information added to the November 2004 revised Ecological Risk Assessment in
33 response to Peer Review comments. As stated in the introduction to this
34 Responsiveness Summary, EPA solicited public comment only on new
35 information and is responding only to comments that pertain to the new
36 information.

37 Summary

38 I support the screening level approach to evaluating risks to ecological communities in CT used
39 within the ERA. However, due to the weakness associated with the characterization of the

ERA Responsiveness Summary

1 ambient PCB concentrations within the river and within associated biological communities, a
2 definitive characterization of risks within all areas of the river in CT is precluded.

3 **RESPONSE CT-8:** Please refer to Response CT-6.

4 Additionally, future risks from potential releases of bedded sediments that contain higher levels
5 of PCBs were not evaluated.

6 **RESPONSE CT-9:** This comment does not address new information added to
7 the November 2004 revised Ecological Risk Assessment in response to Peer
8 Review comments. As stated in the introduction to this Responsiveness
9 Summary, EPA solicited public comment only on new information and is
10 responding only to comments that pertain to the new information.

11 I recommend that these deficiencies be addressed within revisions to the ERA. Additionally,
12 remedial goals established consistent with management objectives for the river must be
13 established as part of the remedial process.

14 **RESPONSE CT-10:** The process set forth in the Consent Decree, and in
15 Appendix G to the Consent Decree, requires that GE propose Interim Media
16 Protection Goals (IMPGs), preliminary goals that are shown to be protective of
17 human health and the environment and that will serve as points of departure in
18 evaluating potential corrective measures. This comment does not address new
19 information included in the November 2004 revised Ecological Risk Assessment.

ERA Responsiveness Summary

COMMENTS OF THE GENERAL ELECTRIC COMPANY (GE)

ERA Responsiveness Summary

1 Comments of the General Electric Company (GE)

2 The following comment was excerpted from the cover letter accompanying GE's
3 comments on the November 2004 draft of the Ecological Risk Assessment:

4 GE appreciates the opportunity to submit comments on the new information and analyses in the
5 revised ERA. We note for the record, however, that this opportunity is only part of the process
6 that should be followed with respect to such new information and analyses. The Consent Decree
7 requires, in Paragraph 22.d, that EPA's ERA be subject to peer review by a panel of independent
8 risk assessment experts. That requirement contemplates that all significant analyses and
9 conclusions in the ERA be subject to such peer review. In this case, EPA has added new
10 analyses and conclusions to the ERA that were not included in the July 2003 draft and thus have
11 not been subject to peer review. These include a new analysis for a receptor (wood ducks) that
12 was not included in the July 2003 draft at all and new or changed statistical analyses of the data
13 on benthic invertebrates, mink, and shrews.

14 **RESPONSE GE-1:** The process undertaken by EPA is consistent with the
15 relevant provisions of the Consent Decree. As described above in the
16 Introduction to this Responsiveness Summary, the July 2003 version of the
17 Ecological Risk Assessment did undergo Peer Review, including a 4-day public
18 Peer Review meeting in January 2004. In the Peer Review process, the
19 panelists recommended particular areas for follow-up by EPA. Pursuant to that
20 direction, EPA gathered additional information and has solicited an additional
21 round of public comment on such information. The fact that EPA followed up on
22 specific recommendations of panelists and solicited public comment on new
23 information does not mean that EPA is required to convene another peer review
24 process at this point. Also, as noted above, all parties will be provided an
25 additional opportunity to comment when EPA issues the Statement of Basis
26 proposing a response action for the Rest of River.

27 1. Introduction and Summary

28 The General Electric Company (GE) is providing these Comments to the U.S. Environmental
29 Protection Agency (EPA) on the November 2004 draft of EPA's *Ecological Risk Assessment for*
30 *General Electric (GE)/Housatonic River Site, Rest of River* (ERA) (EPA 2004a). These
31 Comments were prepared on GE's behalf by BBL Sciences, ARCADIS G&M, Inc., Branton
32 Environmental Consulting, and LWB Environmental Services. They focus only on new
33 information and analyses presented in the November 2004 draft that were not presented in, or
34 have been changed from, the July 2003 draft of the ERA (EPA 2003). Moreover, these
35 Comments address only some of the assessment endpoints and are limited to discussing only the
36 most critical new information and analyses that affect the basic conclusions of the ERA
37 regarding those assessment endpoints. However, GE adheres to and preserves its positions on all
38 points set forth in GE's prior comments (BBL et al. 2003; GE 2004) on the July 2003 draft ERA,
39 and reserves the right to raise those points in any future proceeding. In addition, lack of
40 comment herein on other new material or interpretations in the ERA does not necessarily

ERA Responsiveness Summary

1 indicate GE's agreement with such material and interpretations; GE reserves the right to present
2 any arguments relating to such material and interpretations in an appropriate future proceeding.

3 Many of the changes that EPA has made to the ERA were intended to address comments made
4 by the peer reviewers on the prior draft ERA, as summarized in EPA's *Responsiveness Summary*
5 *to the Peer Review of the Ecological Risk Assessment for General Electric (GE)/Housatonic*
6 *River Site, Rest of River* (Responsiveness Summary) (EPA 2004b). In a number of respects,
7 however, the changes made are not responsive to and/or do not appropriately reflect the peer
8 reviewers' comments. In addition, a number of the new analyses presented in the revised ERA
9 do not properly characterize or interpret the data. These Comments identify and describe several
10 key instances of both of these types of flaws, and include recommendations for further changes
11 in the final ERA.

12 In summary, the main points set forth in these Comments are as follows, with GE's
13 recommendations for further revisions to the ERA highlighted in italics:

- 14 • Benthic invertebrates: The methods used to calculate the PCB effects thresholds for benthic
15 invertebrates are not responsive to comments of the peer review panel that all non-redundant
16 endpoints be used in the development of effects thresholds. The methods are also contrary to
17 EPA's statement in the Responsiveness Summary that the full range of endpoints would be
18 used in the development of the MATC. Instead, the chronic toxicity effects threshold is
19 based on the most sensitive endpoint for the most sensitive species. *EPA should use all non-*
20 *redundant endpoints in the calculation of effects thresholds, rather than only the most*
21 *sensitive*. In addition, for the benthic community data, four of the five effects levels used in
22 the calculation of the threshold are from coarse-grained stations, which showed greater
23 effects relative to reference stations than did fine-grained locations; and only the most
24 sensitive of three diversity indices is used to calculate the effects threshold. *Separate benthic*
25 *community effects thresholds should be developed for coarse- and fine-grained sediments to*
26 *account for the confounding effect of habitat, and all three diversity indices should be used.*
27 *Similarly, separate maximum acceptable threshold concentrations (MATCs) should be*
28 *developed for coarse- and fine-grained sediments; otherwise, the assessment of risk in fine-*
29 *grained sediments will be driven by effects observed only in coarse-grained sediments.*

30 **RESPONSE GE-2:** The EPA response to the summary GE comments
31 concerning the benthic invertebrate assessment endpoint is provided below in
32 the detailed response to comments.

- 33 • Wood frogs: The sediment PCB MATC for amphibians is based on only one endpoint in
34 EPA's wood frog study – the 20% effect level for metamorph malformations in Phase III of
35 the study – with further, anecdotal support provided by another endpoint – the Phase III sex
36 ratio data. If the malformation and sex ratio data are to be relied upon, then all the relevant
37 results for those endpoints should be used in developing the MATC, as recommended by the
38 peer review panel. *In that event, a revised MATC should be calculated based on the*
39 *geometric mean of all three relevant endpoints that showed effects – the 20% effects levels*
40 *for Phase I and Phase III malformations and the 50% effects level for sex ratio (given EPA's*
41 *own conclusion that the 20% effects level for sex ratio is likely not biologically relevant). In*

ERA Responsiveness Summary

1 addition, while the revised wood frog population model addresses some of the GE and peer
2 reviewer comments on the July 2003 draft, it still fails to account for density-dependence
3 within the base model or to provide a realistic description of wood frog population dynamics,
4 both with or without the influence of PCBs. *GE recommends that compensatory density-*
5 *dependence be included in the base scenarios rather than only in the sensitivity analysis.*

6 **RESPONSE GE-3:** The EPA response to the summary GE comments
7 concerning the amphibian assessment endpoint is provided below in the detailed
8 response to comments.

- 9 • Wood ducks: EPA's new modeling analysis for wood ducks, which predicts high risks, is not
10 borne out by either field collections or dose-based hazard quotients. That modeling uses both
11 effects metrics and exposure assumptions that overestimate risks. *GE recommends that: (1)*
12 *for the lower end of the effects metric range for total PCBs, EPA should use a study of*
13 *reproductive effects of PCBs on mallards (which is more closely related species to wood*
14 *ducks than the chickens now used); (2) due to the many uncertainties associated with*
15 *modeling maternal transfer of TEQs and estimating egg-based effects metrics for TEQs, TEQ*
16 *risks should be evaluated based on dose, rather than egg concentration; (3) if an egg-based*
17 *TEQ approach is retained, EPA should revise its method of estimating maternal transfer*
18 *from hen to egg and should include metabolism of PCBs in the model; and (4) the model*
19 *should be revised to account for the substantially different proportions of invertebrates in the*
20 *hen's diet between the pre-laying and laying periods.*

21 **RESPONSE GE-4:** The EPA response to the summary GE comments
22 concerning wood duck as a representative species in the insectivorous bird
23 assessment endpoint is provided below in the detailed response to comments.

- 24 • Tree swallows: The most substantial change made to the discussion of the tree swallow field
25 study is the change from "no" to "yes" for the evidence of harm assigned to the study.
26 However, the text that precedes the risk characterization for tree swallows continues to show
27 that the study does not in fact provide evidence of harm. *EPA should reverse the change in*
28 *the evidence-of-harm designation in order to ensure that the risk findings are fully supported*
29 *by the underlying study.*

30 **RESPONSE GE-5:** The EPA response to the summary GE comments
31 concerning tree swallows as a representative species in the insectivorous bird
32 assessment endpoint is provided below in the detailed response to comments.

- 33 • Mink: The revised ERA uses a new probit analysis (not suggested by the peer reviewers) to
34 develop a new PCB MATC for mink from the kit survival data in the mink feeding study.
35 This new MATC does not appropriately reflect the spread in the data and is inconsistent with
36 the site-specific NOAEL and LOAEL values reported by the investigators. Moreover, EPA's
37 claim that the revised MATC is supported by studies from other sites is incorrect.
38 *Accordingly, EPA should not base the MATC for mink on the new probit analysis results.*

ERA Responsiveness Summary

1 **RESPONSE GE-6:** The EPA response to the summary GE comments
2 concerning the piscivorous mammal assessment endpoint is provided below in
3 the detailed response to comments.

- 4 • Shrews: The primary change in the discussion of effects on shrews is the development of a
5 PCB MATC, based on a new hockey stick regression analysis of the site-specific short-tailed
6 shrew demography study. In addition, the language describing the results of EPA's
7 supplemental analysis of the short-tailed shrew data has been changed to de-emphasize the
8 weakness of the statistical results, and the evidence-of-harm conclusion has been changed
9 from "undetermined" to "yes," despite the lack of any new data. These changes fail to reflect:
10 (a) the substantial uncertainty in the new MATC, as demonstrated by the fact that the
11 regression can only be fit to the data based on one of the two exposure scenarios (arithmetic
12 mean soil PCB concentrations, but not spatially weighted average PCB concentrations); and
13 (b) the uncertainty and weakness of the results of EPA's statistical analysis, as noted by
14 several peer reviewers and acknowledged by EPA in the Responsiveness Summary. *Given*
15 *these uncertainties, the final ERA should: (1) explicitly recognize the uncertainty associated*
16 *with basing the MATC on an analysis that can be fit to the data only under one of two*
17 *exposure scenarios; (2) re-insert a discussion of the uncertainty and weakness in the*
18 *exposure-response relationship found in EPA's statistical analysis; and (3) change the*
19 *conclusion in the weight of evidence back to "undetermined."*

20 **RESPONSE GE-7:** The EPA response to the summary GE comments
21 concerning the omnivorous and carnivorous mammal assessment endpoint is
22 provided below in the detailed response to comments.

23 **2. Community Structure, Survival, Growth, and Reproduction of Benthic** 24 **Invertebrates**

25 A number of changes were made in the benthic invertebrate assessment in the November 2004
26 ERA based on input from the peer review panel. The key changes made in this assessment were
27 the separation of chronic and acute toxicity thresholds, the development of separate thresholds
28 for coarse- and fine-grained sediment in the benthic community analysis, and the use of the
29 threshold from the benthic community analysis in development of the sediment MATC. Despite
30 the substantial changes in methodology, however, the MATC of 3 mg/kg for total PCBs (tPCBs)
31 remains unchanged from the July 2003 ERA (see EPA 2004a, Vol. 1, p. 3-59; Vol. 4, p. D-118).

32 The majority of the changes made in the benthic invertebrate assessment are responsive to the
33 peer review panel's comments, and their application is straightforward. However, the current
34 analysis does not incorporate the peer reviewers' recommendation that all species, rather than the
35 just the most sensitive, and all available data be used in the development of toxicity thresholds
36 (e.g., EPA 2004b, pp. 116 & 154, 131, and 142, reflecting comments of peer reviewers
37 Thompson, Forbes, and Sample, respectively, and not disputed by any other reviewers). Instead,
38 the ERA bases the chronic effects threshold from the toxicity tests solely on the most sensitive
39 species and endpoint (*Chironomus tentans* ash free dry weight), rather than all non-redundant
40 endpoints. Similarly, in developing the effects thresholds for the benthic community assessment,
41 the ERA does not use all relevant data. Rather, four of the five effects levels used in the

ERA Responsiveness Summary

1 calculation are for benthic community metrics in coarse-grained stations, which appear to be
2 more sensitive to PCBs than those in fine-grained locations. In addition, only the most sensitive
3 of three diversity indices (Shannon-Wiener function) is used to calculate the effects threshold.

4 An additional problem with the revised benthic invertebrate assessment is that only one MATC
5 is developed for coarse- and fine-grained sediment. The benthic community assessment
6 appropriately separates coarse- and fine-grained locations when developing effects thresholds
7 (e.g., EC20, EC50). This separation should be carried through to the development of the MATC;
8 otherwise, the assessment of risk in fine-grained sediments will be driven by effects observed
9 only in coarse-grained sediments.

10 Specific concerns related to the development of the chronic effects threshold from the toxicity
11 tests, the benthic community assessment threshold, and the derivation of the MATC are
12 discussed below.

13 **RESPONSE GE-8:** The EPA response to these comments is provided below for
14 each of the three points raised by GE, respectively.

15 **2.1 Chronic Effects Threshold from Toxicity Tests**

16 The chronic effects threshold is based on only one of six available endpoints for only one of two
17 species evaluated (i.e., IC20 for *C. tentans* 20-d ash free dry weight) (EPA 2004a, Vol. 1, p. 3-
18 41; Vol. 4, p. D-61). The rationale provided for this approach is that, because only two possible
19 species were available for the development of a chronic toxicity threshold, a species sensitivity
20 distribution (SSD) could not be developed and, therefore, the most sensitive endpoint from the
21 most sensitive species was used to derive the effects threshold (EPA 2004a, Vol. 1, p. 3-41; Vol.
22 4, p. D-61).

23 This approach clearly contradicts the intent of several of the peer review comments, which
24 recommended use of all available test species (e.g., EPA 2004a, pp. 131, 142, 154). This
25 approach is also contrary to EPA's statement in the Responsiveness Summary that the full range
26 of endpoints would be used in the development of the MATC. Regarding the *Hyallela azteca*
27 laboratory tests, the Responsiveness Summary stated that "EPA believes that the chronic tests
28 with endpoints for survival (42-day), growth (28day), and reproduction (28-42 day) are equally
29 important and provide relatively independent measures of contaminant stress and should all be
30 considered in the MATC derivation" (EPA 2004b, Response 3.1-TT-8, pp. 118-119). EPA
31 responded similarly for the endpoints of survival and growth in the *C. tentans* test, stating that
32 "...a concentration-response relationship exists and therefore the data are appropriate for use in
33 the MATC calculation" (EPA 2004b, Response 3.1-TT-8, p. 119). EPA also stated that,
34 "[a]lthough multiple endpoints are included for both laboratory species (mortality and sublethal
35 responses), this is appropriate given that the sublethal responses (growth and reproduction) are
36 ecologically relevant endpoints" (EPA 2004b, Response 3.1-VF-18, p. 150). Even though these
37 multiple endpoints were deemed appropriate for consideration in developing the MATC, only
38 one of them, the IC20 for *C. tentans* ash free dry weight, is used in the developing the MATC in
39 the revised ERA. It is inappropriate for the other endpoints to be used only as anecdotal support
40 for the threshold developed from the most sensitive endpoint for the most sensitive species, as is
41 currently done in the ERA (EPA 2004a, Vol. 4, p. D-62).

ERA Responsiveness Summary

1 As previously discussed in GE's comments on the July 2003 ERA (BBL et al. 2003, p. 56), GE
2 does not agree with the use of 20% effect levels in calculating a threshold.¹ However, EPA
3 claims that these results are "ecologically relevant" and uses them as the basis for the chronic
4 toxicity effects threshold (EPA 2004a, Vol. 4, p. D-48). If EPA continues to use the 20% effect
5 levels for the development of the chronic toxicity effects threshold, we believe that the threshold
6 should be calculated as follows: The chronic toxicity effects threshold should be set equal to the
7 geometric mean of all the LC20/IC20s for all six non-redundant endpoints evaluated in the
8 laboratory studies (see Table 2.1 below). Where endpoints were measured multiple times in the
9 same study, the endpoint from the longest exposure period should be used. Further, where two
10 similar endpoints were measured in the same study (i.e., total young and total young per female),
11 the more sensitive of the two endpoints should be used in the threshold. This practice would be
12 consistent with the methods used to develop the acute toxicity threshold (EPA 2004a, Vol. 1, p.
13 3-42; Vol. 4, p. D-62).

14 When the geometric mean of the LC20/IC20s of the non-redundant endpoints is calculated, the
15 chronic toxicity intermediate risk threshold is 7.0 mg/kg tPCB (Table 2.1), rather than 2.0 mg/kg
16 tPCB, as is currently presented. Similarly, using the above approach, the chronic toxicity high
17 risk threshold based on the LC50/IC50s is 13.7 mg/kg tPCB (Table 2.1), rather than 4.7 mg/kg
18 tPCB, as is currently presented.

¹ The reason is that the use of 20% effect levels may overestimate effects if they cannot be statistically distinguished from the reference response. For the LC20 and IC20 values to be statistically distinguishable from the reference, and thus valid, the minimum significant difference (MSD) between them must be less than or equal to 20%. High variability in response in the toxicity tests yielded MSDs that usually exceeded 20% and were often greater than 50% (EPA 2004a, Vol. 4, p. D-48; Table D.3-2).

ERA Responsiveness Summary

1 **Table 2.1. Summary of Endpoints Calculated for Chronic Toxicity Tests: Calculations Made Using**
 2 **"Most Synoptic" Exposure Data Set Only and Non-redundant Endpoints**

Endpoint	Results (mg/kg PCB)	
	LC20/IC20 by Probit ^a	LC50/IC50 by Probit ^a
<i>C. tentans</i>		
20-d ash-free dry weight	2.0	4.7
20-d survival	<8.7 ^b	<8.7 ^b
43-d emergence	<8.7 ^b	<8.7 ^b
Geometric mean for <i>C. tentans</i>	5.3	7.1
<i>H. azteca</i>		
42-d dry weight	66.3 (NC)	>72 ^b
42-survival	3.1	22.8
42-d total young	3.9	11.1
Geometric mean for <i>H. azteca</i>	9.3	26.3
Overall geometric mean based on geometric means for each species	7.0	13.7

3
 4 Summary of data provided in EPA (2004a), Tables D.3-7 and D.3-8.

5 ^a Mean of comparison to references A1 and A3.

6 ^b When value is ">" or "<", the value itself is used in the calculation of the threshold consistent
 7 with the method used to derive a threshold from the six lowest endpoints in the July 2003 ERA.

8 NA=not applicable, NC=not calculated

9 **RESPONSE GE-9:** EPA disagrees that the approach to developing a chronic
 10 threshold applied in the revised ERA contradicts the intent of the Peer Review
 11 comments, and also disagrees that the approach is contrary to EPA's statements
 12 in the Responsiveness Summary. Both the Peer Review Panel and the
 13 Responsiveness Summary indicated that the full range of toxicity endpoints
 14 should be considered in the MATC derivation, and this was done in November
 15 2004 ERA. The response to General Issue 6.F in the Responsiveness Summary
 16 stated:

17 *EPA agrees that the toxicity thresholds for multiple endpoints should be*
 18 *considered. However, the analysis must also take into consideration the*
 19 *sensitivity of the test endpoints, in terms of exposure type/duration, the*
 20 *tolerance of the test organisms, and the relevance of the measurement*
 21 *endpoint to the Assessment Endpoint. It should also be recognized that*
 22 *investigators commonly include collection of data for a variety of metrics*
 23 *that may not necessarily reflect the impact of a stressor on the test*
 24 *organism, and may therefore not be appropriate for development of a*
 25 *toxicity threshold. In the revised ERA, EPA will develop MATCs based on*

ERA Responsiveness Summary

1 *consideration of all species and endpoints relevant to the Assessment*
2 *Endpoint, but with the recognition that the conclusions and actions based*
3 *on the risk assessment must be protective.*

4 EPA did in fact evaluate the full range of endpoints in the *Hyalella* and
5 *Chironomus* tests in the derivation of the chronic toxicity threshold. However,
6 consideration of the full range of endpoints is not synonymous with simple
7 application of an arithmetic mean, geometric mean, or other measure of central
8 tendency of the threshold concentrations of all endpoints. Neither the Peer
9 Review comments nor the Responsiveness Summary indicate that EPA should
10 calculate a simple measure of central tendency.

11 There was not consensus among Peer Review Panel members regarding the
12 details of the calculation method for deriving toxicity thresholds. However, the
13 Panel indicated a preference for evaluation of the range of endpoint sensitivities,
14 preferably using a distributional approach (such as the species sensitivity
15 distribution [SSD]; see Response 3.1-TL-4). Unfortunately, the number of
16 species and endpoints available for chronic MATC derivation were only six and
17 two, respectively, because the Panel also indicated a preference for the
18 separation of endpoints into acute versus chronic and for the elimination of
19 “redundant endpoints.” While six endpoints is inadequate for application of a
20 quantitative SSD, a semi-quantitative integration of the six endpoints was
21 conducted by EPA that considered the following factors: endpoint sensitivity;
22 effect size; statistical power; consistency of responses across treatments (e.g.,
23 28-d, 35-d, and 42-d reproduction); and biological relevance.

24 Use of a geometric mean, or any other averaging procedure, was not specified
25 by the Peer Review Panel. Use of such a procedure effectively dilutes the
26 results of sensitive endpoints with results of insensitive endpoints, such that the
27 derived threshold value is not protective of a large proportion of the endpoints. In
28 fact, one Peer Reviewer (see Response 3.1-VF-6) indicated that use of the most
29 sensitive endpoint for each species was an acceptable approach once the data
30 were separated into acute and chronic endpoints.


31 EPA believes that GE’s proposed chronic toxicity threshold is not adequately
32 protective because it fails to protect against effects for the majority of test
33 endpoints. The lack of protectiveness of GE’s proposed threshold is illustrated in
34 Table 2.1 in the GE comments. Use of an overall geometric mean (LC_{20}/IC_{20}) in
35 the derivation resulted in a threshold (7.0 mg/kg tPCB) that is clearly not
36 protective of *Chironomus* growth, *Hyalella* survival, or *Hyalella* reproduction. In
37 addition, the 7.0 mg/kg tPCB threshold may not be protective of *Chironomus*
38 survival or *Chironomus* emergence, given that the thresholds used in the
39 calculation were unbounded (i.e., <8.7 mg/kg) and were very close to the
40 calculated value of 7.0 mg/kg tPCB. Therefore, only one of the six chronic
41 endpoints is adequately protected using the calculation method proposed by GE.

ERA Responsiveness Summary

1 The GE calculations of MATCs are strongly influenced by the absence of a
2 sensitive *Hyalella* growth response, which led to high threshold values for that
3 individual endpoint. Because the exact mechanism for PCB toxicity in aquatic
4 invertebrates is unknown, lack of a growth response should not substantially
5 weaken the evidence from other biologically-relevant endpoints, particularly
6 mortality. If a threshold does not protect against mortality to an organism, it is
7 illogical to assert that a higher threshold can be justified simply by averaging with
8 less sensitive sublethal endpoints.

9 EPA, in considering the full range of chronic toxicity endpoints, sought to derive
10 an MATC that would be protective of survival, growth and reproduction endpoints
11 for the aquatic invertebrates found in the field. Consistent with the SSD
12 approach used in ERA Attachment D.7, the transition from low to intermediate
13 risk was defined using the approximate 20th percentile of the distribution (see
14 Figure GE-9-1). In establishing water quality criteria, the 5th percentile is often
15 chosen as the value considered protective for most species in a community
16 (Posthuma et al. 2002). However, EPA selected a 20th percentile to be
17 consistent with risk definitions applied elsewhere in the ERA, and considering the
18 sensitivity of the laboratory test species.

19 **Figure GE-9-1. Distribution of LC₂₀/IC₂₀ Values from Chronic Toxicity**
20 **Endpoints (Survival, Growth, Reproduction) for *Hyalella* and *Chironomus***



21 The approach presented in Figure GE-9-1 is consistent with the requests of the
22 Peer Reviewers that EPA consider all the available endpoints, and that
23 consideration be given to distribution-based methods for evaluating sensitivity. A
24 formal species sensitivity distribution (SSD) could not be applied because there
25 were only two species with chronic toxicity endpoints (*Hyalella* and *Chironomus*).

ERA Responsiveness Summary

1 However, both chronic test species indicated either mortality or ecologically
2 relevant sublethal effects at concentrations close to the 2.0 mg/kg threshold.
3 *Hyalella* exhibited 20% responses to both the survival and reproduction
4 endpoints at 3.1 and 3.9 mg/kg, respectively, whereas *Chironomus* exhibited
5 20% responses to the survival and reproduction endpoints at 2.0 and <8.7 mg/kg,
6 respectively (i.e., unbounded effect concentration).

7 Even if the toxicity thresholds (i.e., thresholds at which 20% effects to survival,
8 growth, or reproduction occur) for the two species were averaged, the resulting
9 chronic toxicity threshold would be 2.5 mg/kg, which is only slightly higher than
10 the 2.0 mg/kg threshold that coincides with the most sensitive individual
11 endpoint. This demonstrates that the two chronic tests were in strong agreement
12 and that the chronic toxicity threshold was not driven by an anomalous individual
13 endpoint result.

14 Part of GE's criticism of the EPA's threshold derivation stems from the use of
15 20% effect levels in calculating thresholds. The selection of effect sizes
16 representing low, intermediate, and high risk did not change between the July
17 2003 and November 2004 ERA versions; therefore, this comment does not apply
18 to the new information contained in the November 2004 revised Ecological Risk
19 Assessment. As stated previously, in this Responsiveness Summary, EPA is
20 responding only to comments made on new information added to the November
21 2004 revised Ecological Risk Assessment.

22 References:

23 Posthuma, L., T.P. Traas, and G.W. Suter II. 2002. General introduction to
24 species sensitivity distributions. Chapter 1 in L. Posthuma, G.W. Suter II, and
25 T.P. Traas. *Species Sensitivity Distributions in Ecotoxicology*. Boca Raton,
26 Lewis Publishers. pp. 3-10.

27 **2.2 Effects Thresholds from Benthic Community Assessment**

28 A critical problem with the derivation of the threshold concentration from the benthic
29 community endpoints is that a single threshold is calculated for both coarse- and fine-grained
30 locations. Multiple metrics are used to evaluate the benthic community data in coarse- and fine-
31 grained locations; however, the effects threshold for the benthic community is based on the
32 geometric mean of only one metric from the fine-grained locations (SSD) and four from coarse-
33 grained locations (SSD, abundance, richness and the Shannon-Wiener function) (EPA 2004a,
34 Vol. 1, p. 3-57; Vol. 4, p. D-96). This approach is inconsistent with the analyses that EPA
35 conducted on the benthic community in the ERA, which were applied separately for coarse- and
36 fine-grained locations to minimize the impact of habitat (i.e., grain size, which substantially
37 influences benthic community metrics) as a confounding factor (EPA 2004a, Vol. 4, p. D-93).
38 Moreover, EPA's approach puts considerably greater weight on the results from the coarse-
39 grained stations, which showed more adverse effects relative to reference stations than did the
40 fine-grained stations. Thus, that approach results in the assessment of risks in fine-grained
41 stations being based mainly on effects observed in coarse-grained stations. For these reasons, the

ERA Responsiveness Summary

1 effects thresholds for the benthic community study should be developed separately for coarse-
2 and fine-grained sediments.

3 **RESPONSE GE-10a:** EPA did not derive separate community-based threshold
4 PCB concentrations for coarse- vs. fine-grained sediment due to larger
5 uncertainties in the dose-response relationships for fine-grained sediments.
6 These uncertainties included:

- 7 ▪ Sample size – For fine-grained sediments, there was only one reference
8 location (R4; total of 12 replicates) available for comparison against the
9 fine-grained contaminated sediment in the PSA. This is in contrast to the
10 coarse-grained stations, for which three separate reference stations (A1,
11 A2, A3; total of 36 replicates) were collected.
- 12 ▪ Proximity and relevance to exposed PSA habitat – Because no suitable
13 fine-grained reference habitat could be located within the Housatonic
14 River, the R4 reference location was 13 miles south of the PSA, at
15 Threemile Pond. Although the particle size distributions of the reference
16 sediment were similar to the contaminated stations, uncertainty remains
17 with respect to whether this single station located outside the main
18 channel of the Housatonic River is truly representative of the downstream
19 areas of the PSA.
- 20 ▪ Variability in assemblages – The fine-grained PSA habitats exhibited a
21 large degree of inter-station variability in the invertebrate abundance and
22 biomass. As shown in Figure D.3-23 of the November 2004 ERA, the
23 fine-grained locations exhibited qualitative differences in benthic
24 communities among stations, possibly related to variations in surrounding
25 riparian habitat (wet meadow, shrub swamp, shallow emergent marsh).
26 These natural variations complicated the assessment of contaminant
27 dose-response to some extent.
- 28 ▪ Exposure concentration range – The sediment tPCB exposure
29 concentrations measured in fine-grained benthic community grab samples
30 tended to be lower than PCB concentrations measured in adjacent
31 sampling conducted in fine-grained PSA reaches. For example, three of
32 four contaminated stations had mean and median tPCB concentrations
33 below 5 mg/kg tPCB. Combined with large PCB heterogeneity at the
34 micro-scale, this made discrimination of significant dose-response
35 relationships difficult, because the ratio of variability to concentration
36 gradient was large.

37 In light of these uncertainties, a single community-based threshold was
38 developed for the PSA. The threshold is intended to provide protection for not
39 only the substrate types evaluated in the community study (which were
40 standardized among stations during sampling, to the extent possible), but also for
41 other substrates that are intermediate between (or slightly different from) the
42 tested substrates. It was not practical to evaluate all substrate types found in the

ERA Responsiveness Summary

1 PSA; therefore, extrapolation of findings to different substrate types was
2 necessary. Although EPA agrees that the evidence of community impairment in
3 fine-grained sediment is not as compelling as in coarse-grained sediments, it is
4 unclear to what extent this degree of observed impairment results from the
5 uncertainties described above, as compared to systematic differences in
6 environmental responses across habitats. Consequently, the benthic community
7 threshold places greater weight on the effects observed in coarse-grained
8 sediment.

9 An additional problem with the selection of metrics used in the derivation of the effects threshold
10 for the benthic community is that only one of three available diversity indices is used. Three
11 diversity indices were calculated, including the Shannon-Wiener function, Simpson's Index, and
12 Simpson's modified Index. However, the ERA used only the results of the most sensitive of
13 these, the Shannon-Wiener function (for coarse-grained sediments only), in the calculation of the
14 benthic community effects threshold (EPA 2004a, Vol. 1, p. 3-57; Vol. 4, p. D-96). This is
15 inappropriate for two reasons. First, several peer reviewers indicated there are problems with the
16 Shannon-Wiener function and recommended using the Simpson's Index (EPA 2004b, pp. 121,
17 134, and 135, reflecting comments of reviewers Thompson, Forbes, and LaPoint). Second, the
18 use of only the Shannon-Wiener function for coarse-grained sediments as a representative of
19 diversity in the calculation of the benthic community toxicity threshold is contrary to peer review
20 comments that all endpoints, not just the most sensitive, be used to calculate thresholds (e.g.,
21 EPA 2004b, pp. 131, 142, 154, reflecting comments of reviewers Forbes, Sample, and
22 Thompson). It would be more appropriate to take the geometric mean of the three diversity
23 indices to represent diversity in the development of the effects threshold.

24 **RESPONSE GE-10b:** Calculations of both Shannon-Wiener and Simpson's
25 Index were provided in response to the request of the Peer Reviewers that the
26 Shannon-Wiener results not be discarded (see Responsiveness Summary
27 Specific Response 3.1-TT-12; response to General Issue 11.A). The criticisms of
28 Shannon-Wiener H' in the Peer Review comments were based mainly on the
29 presumed insensitivity of the index for communities that exhibit low species
30 richness. As indicated in the Responsiveness Summary (see Response 3.1-TL-3),
31 one reviewer claimed that Shannon-Wiener "is an insensitive measure of the
32 relative frequency of species" (May 1975) and does not consider "differences in
33 species taxonomy among sites." The Housatonic River results indicate that
34 Shannon-Wiener H' was actually more sensitive to differences in coarse-grained
35 sediment, exhibiting the highest regression r^2 and lowest p-value of all three
36 diversity measures. The other criticisms of the Shannon-Wiener Index raised by
37 the Peer Reviewers can also be made with regard to all simple diversity indices,
38 and therefore cannot be used as a rationale for favoring one diversity index over
39 another.

40 All diversity indices have limitations, both theoretical and practical in nature, and a
41 number of reviews have been conducted to evaluate the various merits and
42 limitations of simple diversity indices (Washington, 1984; Hill 1973; May 1975).
43 For example, Washington (1984) has criticized application of Shannon-Weiner H'

ERA Responsiveness Summary

1 due to "lack of exploration of biological relevance," whereas Hill (1973) has
2 criticized the Simpson index as being a measure of "dominance concentration"
3 because it is sensitive to the abundance of only the more plentiful species. There
4 are also conflicting opinions regarding the relative sensitivity of various diversity
5 indices. In contrast to the opinion offered during Peer Review (see Response 3.1-
6 TL-3), in some cases Shannon's index has exhibited lower variation and more
7 sensitivity to impairment than Simpson's index (Rabeni et al. 1997).

8 Based on the available information, there is no reason to consistently adopt one
9 diversity metric over another. However, the benthic community data suggest that
10 there is a rationale for selecting the most sensitive diversity metric in effect
11 threshold derivation. This is due to the observed heterogeneity in responses of
12 individual taxa to PCBs, an aspect of the benthic community analysis that was
13 requested by the Peer Review Panel before and during the ERA Document
14 Overview meeting. When individual taxa were evaluated (e.g., at genus and
15 species level), it was observed that several taxonomic groups were relatively
16 tolerant of PCB contamination, whereas others were highly sensitive. When the
17 benthic communities are viewed using broad metrics (e.g., abundance, richness,
18 diversity), significant perturbations to the benthic community were often present
19 but could not be discriminated using simple diversity indices alone. This
20 suggests that the more sensitive diversity-based thresholds are more likely to
21 represent the actual environmental concentrations at which ecological responses
22 occur in the Housatonic River. This theory was supported by results of the
23 species sensitivity distribution (SSD) analysis (Attachment D.7 of November
24 2004 ERA), which yielded effects thresholds similar to the lower bound of the
25 diversity-based thresholds.

26 EPA disagrees that the results of the diversity-based thresholds should be
27 derived using a geometric mean or other measure of central tendency. That
28 approach would yield thresholds that are not sufficiently protective, for the same
29 reasons described above.

30 **References:**

31 Hill, M.O. 1973. Diversity and evenness: a unifying notation and its
32 consequences. *Ecology* 54: 427-432.

33 May, R.M. 1975. Patterns of species abundance and diversity. In M.L. Cody and
34 J.M. Diamond (Eds.). *Patterns of Species Abundance and Diversity*. Harvard
35 University Press, MA. pp. 81-120.

36 Rabeni, C.F., R.J. Sarver, N. Wang, G.S. Wallace, M. Weiland, and J.T.
37 Peterson. 1997. *Biological Criteria for Streams of Missouri: A Final Report to*
38 *the Missouri Department of Natural Resources from the Missouri Cooperative*
39 *Fish and Wildlife Research Unit*. November 1997. Cooperative Fish and
40 Wildlife Research Unit, University of Missouri, Columbia, Missouri.

ERA Responsiveness Summary

1 Washington, H.G. 1984. Diversity, biotic and similarity indices. A review with
2 special relevance to aquatic ecosystems. *Water Research* 18:653-694.

3 Effects concentrations (i.e., EC20/HC20, EC50/HC50) for all available metrics (abundance, taxa
4 richness, diversity and SSD) should be used to develop the effects thresholds for the coarse- and
5 fine-grained benthic community locations. These metrics for the coarse-grained locations are
6 provided in the ERA with the exception of the EC50 for diversity (EPA 2004a, Vol. 1, p. 3-57;
7 Vol. 4, p. D-96). All EC50s for diversity, for both coarse- and fine-grained sediments, were
8 above the range of PCB concentrations tested. For the fine-grained locations, the highest tPCB
9 sediment concentration tested (14.1 mg/kg sediment tPCB) should be used as the no effect level
10 for taxa richness and total abundance, given that no adverse effects on abundance or ecologically
11 relevant effects on taxa richness, relative to reference locations, were observed at those
12 concentrations. Using these no effect levels as surrogates for the 20% effects levels results in a
13 very conservative threshold. As discussed previously, diversity should be represented by the
14 geometric mean of the three diversity indices that were measured. For the SSD, a 20% effects
15 level is calculated in the ERA for fine-grained sediments (6.4 mg/kg tPCB) (EPA 2004a, Vol. 1,
16 p. 3-57; Vol. 4, p. D-91, D-96; Vol. 4, Att. D.7, p. 13). This can be considered a very
17 conservative estimate of effects based on the gradual slope of the SSD regression (EPA 2004a,
18 Vol. 1, Figure 3.3-17; Vol. 4, Att. D.7, Figure 1). That regression indicates that the highest
19 measured concentration, which is more than twice the estimated 20% effects PCB threshold
20 (14.1 mg/kg tPCB and 6.4 mg/kg tPCB), is associated with only slightly more than a 20% effects
21 level.

22 If the effects threshold is calculated separately for coarse- and fine-grained locations and the
23 values described in the previous paragraph are used in the threshold derivation, the intermediate
24 risk threshold, represented by the 20% effects level, would be 7.7 mg/kg tPCB for coarse-grained
25 sediment and 17.4 mg/kg tPCB in fine-grained sediment (Table 2.2 below). These values should
26 replace the current value reported in the ERA of 5.6 mg/kg tPCB for both coarse- and fine-
27 grained sediment (EPA 2004a, Vol. 1, p. 3-57; Vol. 4, p. D-96). The high-risk threshold of 27.9
28 mg/kg tPCB presented in the November 2004 ERA is based on only three endpoints for coarse-
29 grained sediments (SSD, taxa richness and total abundance) (EPA 2004a, Vol. 1, p. 3-57; Vol. 4,
30 p. D-96). As indicated in Table 2.2 below, for a majority of endpoints measured, no effects were
31 seen at the 50% effects level. As a result, the high-risk threshold for coarse-grained sediment
32 presented in the ERA should be considered very conservative.

ERA Responsiveness Summary

1 **Table 2.2. Benthic Community Metrics for Coarse- and Fine-grained Sediment**

Metric	Coarse-grained sediment		Fine-grained sediment	
	EC20/HC20	EC50/HC50	EC20/HC20	EC50/HC50
Species sensitivity distribution	2.3	4.1	6.4	e
Taxa richness	13.4	141 to 195 ^a	>14.1 ^c	c
Total abundance	5.8	37.3 to 40.4 ^a	>14.1 ^d	d
<i>Diversity indices</i>				
Shannon Wiener H'	4.7	b	58.7	b
Simpson's Index		b	275	b
Modified Simpson's Index	23.5	b	22.8	b
Geometric mean of diversity indices	19.8		71.7	
Geometric mean using geometric mean of diversity indices	7.7		17.4	

2
3 Summary of abundance and richness data provided in EPA (2004a), Vol. 4, pp. D-80 - 81; SSD
4 data provided in Att. 7, diversity data provided in Attachment D.8, Table 3.

- 5 ^a Range of concentrations based on DL substitution method.
6 ^b All calculated EC50 values were outside the range of PCB concentrations measured.
7 ^c No ecologically significant effect.
8 ^d Not significantly different from reference at highest tPCB concentration.
9 ^e Effects at this magnitude were not seen at the sediment tPCB concentrations evaluated.

10 **RESPONSE GE-10c:** EPA disagrees that the MATC should be calculated using
11 simple arithmetic averaging (geometric mean) of all endpoints as presented in
12 GE Table 2.2. There are three specific problems with the approach proposed by
13 GE for benthic community MATC derivation:

14 (1) Over-Reliance on Broad Metrics – GE proposes to average the thresholds
15 derived from abundance, taxa richness, diversity, and the SSD. This leads to a
16 bias of the threshold toward the three broad benthic community metrics
17 (abundance, richness, diversity) that were demonstrated to be less sensitive (i.e.,
18 less capable of discriminating alterations in benthic communities that affect
19 individual taxa) relative to the analysis of individual taxa. EPA believes that the
20 species sensitivity approach should be afforded more weight, in part because the
21 broad metrics are somewhat redundant (i.e., richness and diversity are highly
22 correlated). It is for this reason that two of the five endpoints selected by EPA for
23 the effects threshold calculation represent SSD thresholds.

24 (2) No Consideration of Endpoint Relevance – GE proposes to assign equal
25 weight to each endpoint. Such an approach ignores important differences
26 among endpoints with respect to sensitivity, uncertainty, and relevance to the
27 assessment endpoint. Just as some measurement endpoints are assigned

ERA Responsiveness Summary

1 greater weight in the formal weight-of-evidence evaluation of harm, it is not
 2 necessary to assign equal weighting to all endpoints for which sediment tPCB
 3 thresholds can be calculated. Although EPA acknowledges that professional
 4 judgment is required in the selection of endpoints considered relevant for MATC
 5 derivation, the derivation method applied is appropriate and technically
 6 defensible. For example, results of the M-HBI measurement endpoint (which
 7 would yield unbounded effects thresholds) were excluded from the calculation
 8 due to undesirable and non-site-specific attributes of this endpoint (e.g.,
 9 specificity for organic pollution; Washington 1984). Using the calculation
 10 rationale provided by GE, additional no-effect endpoints that have poor relevance
 11 to the assessment endpoint (such as M-HBI) could be added to the calculation,
 12 thereby diluting the sensitive responses observed in endpoints that have a higher
 13 level of ecological relevance.

14 (3) Use of Geometric Mean of Diversity Indices – The use of a geometric mean
 15 results in an overestimate of the concentration at which community impacts are
 16 observed, as discussed in Response GE-10b.

17 2.3 Calculation of MATC

18 The MATC for benthic invertebrates (coarse- and fine-grained sediment) in the November 2004
 19 ERA is based upon the geometric mean of the intermediate risk thresholds from the toxicity
 20 study and the benthic community study (EPA 2004a, Vol. 1, p. 3-59; Vol. 4, p. D-118). As
 21 discussed previously, separate MATCs should be developed for coarse- and fine-grained
 22 sediment to minimize grain size as a confounding factor. Using the geometric mean of the effects
 23 thresholds calculated in these Comments (see Tables 2.1 and 2.2), the MATC for coarse-grained
 24 sediment should be 7.4 mg/kg tPCB and the MATC for fine-grained sediment should be 11
 25 mg/kg tPCB (Table 2.3 below). These values should replace the MATC of 3 mg/kg tPCB that is
 26 presented in the November 2004 ERA.

27 **Table 2.3. MATC for Coarse- and Fine-Grained Sediment**

Endpoint	Intermediate Risk Threshold mg/kg tPCB	
	Coarse-grained Sediment	Fine-grained Sediment
<i>Toxicity Study</i>		
Overall geometric mean based on geometric means of all endpoints for each species	7.0	7.0
<i>Benthic Community Study</i>		
Geometric mean of all metrics using geometric mean of diversity indices	7.7	17.4
MATC based on geometric mean of species/diversity indices	7.4	11.0

28

ERA Responsiveness Summary

1 **RESPONSE GE-11:** The calculations provided by GE in Table 2.3 are based on
2 data-processing assumptions that, in EPA’s opinion, do not provide a sufficient
3 level of protection to the benthic community. EPA’s concerns with the proposed
4 toxicity-based threshold of 7.0 mg/kg dw are summarized in Response GE-9.
5 EPA’s concerns with the proposed community-based thresholds of 7.7 to 17.4
6 mg/kg dw are summarized in Response GE-10(a-c).

7 Overall, GE’s suggested modifications to EPA’s threshold derivation reflect a
8 difference of opinion with respect to the appropriate degree of conservatism
9 required in the face of uncertainty. The calculation formulas proposed by GE
10 advocate the use of geometric means of intermediate-level effects
11 concentrations. Using the geometric mean approach, large responses to
12 sensitive taxa or endpoints can be diluted by a few endpoints that are insensitive
13 to PCB contamination. This approach is advocated by GE in spite of the
14 numerous endpoints that indicate pronounced responses (e.g., greater than 80%
15 mortality in *Chironomus* survival; greater than 50% reduction in multiple
16 individual taxa) at PCB concentrations below the suggested thresholds. EPA
17 believes that the steep dose-response curves for some endpoints, and the
18 concordance of other lines of evidence not considered in the MATC calculation
19 (e.g., acute in-situ toxicity results, rank analyses, and multidimensional scaling of
20 community data), justify and require a higher level of conservatism than has been
21 incorporated in GE’s analysis.

22 **3. Community Condition, Survival, Reproduction, Development and Maturation of** 23 **Amphibians**

24 In the most recent draft of the ERA (EPA 2004a), the sediment MATC for PCBs in vernal pools
25 has been raised from 3 mg/kg to 3.27 mg/kg and is presented as based on an “integrated”
26 threshold for malformations and sex ratio. In fact, that MATC does not take account of all
27 relevant endpoints. In addition, a sensitivity analysis has been provided for the population
28 model; however, the model still does not properly account for density-dependence and the
29 models’ predictions of extinction within 20 years (even without the presence of PCBs) are
30 contradicted by the presence of an amphibian population in the Housatonic River floodplain.
31 These problems with the sediment MATC and the population model are discussed below.

32 **RESPONSE GE-12:** The EPA responses to the specific comments summarized
33 here are provided below for each of the two points raised by GE.

34 **3.1 Basis for the Sediment MATC for Amphibians**

35 The MATC is described in the November 2004 ERA as being based on an “integrated” threshold
36 for two sensitive endpoints – metamorph malformations and sex ratio (EPA 2004a, Vol. 1, p. 4-
37 67; Vol. 5, p. E-142). However, as explained elsewhere in the ERA, the MATC is actually based
38 on the EC20 for Phase III malformations, with further support provided by the sex ratio data,
39 although EPA notes that the EC20 for sex ratio is of uncertain biological relevance (EPA 2004a,
40 Vol. 1, p. 4-53; Vol. 5, p. E-144). As discussed in GE’s prior comments (BBL et al. 2003, pp. 6-
41 7 - 6-10, 6-12 - 6-14, Att. G), the development of an effects threshold based on malformations is

ERA Responsiveness Summary

1 extremely conservative, since it does not consider data on survival, growth, or metamorphosis,
 2 which showed no effects of PCBs; and the sex ratio data do not provide reliable evidence of
 3 adverse PCB effects and thus should not be used to develop site-specific effects thresholds.
 4 However, if EPA continues to rely on the malformation and sex ratio data, then *all* results for
 5 those endpoints (excluding the endpoints that EPA agrees are of questionable biological
 6 relevance) should be used in developing an integrated MATC.

7 Three endpoints showed significant effects of PCBs in EPA's three-phase wood frog study:
 8 larval malformations and metamorph abnormalities in Phases I and III and skewed sex ratios in
 9 Phase III. Detailed statistical analyses were conducted on all three of these endpoints. However,
 10 the Phase I malformation data are excluded from the integrated threshold. Based on peer review
 11 comments that all relevant endpoints, not just the most sensitive, should be used in the
 12 development of thresholds (EPA 2004b, pp. 131, 142, 154), the Phase I malformation data
 13 should be used in the integrated threshold for amphibians. In addition, if EPA continues to use
 14 the skewed sex ratio endpoint, then the EC50 for sex ratio should be used in the development of
 15 the effects threshold, as the ERA itself indicates that a 20% effects level for sex ratio is likely not
 16 biologically relevant (EPA 2004a, Vol. 1, p. 4-53; Vol. 5, pp. E-116, E-144).

17 Using this approach, an integrated effects threshold for amphibians should be based on the
 18 geometric mean of the EC20 for Phase I and Phase III abnormalities and malformations and the
 19 EC50 for Phase III sex ratio. Given the uncertainties associated with the ecological relevance of
 20 both the malformations and sex ratio for the population, this approach provides a conservative
 21 assessment of risk. If the threshold is calculated in this way, the integrated MATC for low risk
 22 would be 12.5 mg/kg tPCB in sediment (Table 3.1). Similarly, the high-risk threshold should be
 23 based on the EC50s for all endpoints, rather than just the most sensitive endpoint – sex ratio – as
 24 is currently done (EPA 2004a, Vol. 5, p. E-145). If the threshold is calculated in this way, the
 25 integrated high-risk threshold would be 28.4 mg/kg tPCB in sediment (Table 3.1).

26 **Table 3.1. MATC based on Geometric Mean of Phase I and Phase III Malformations and Phase III**
 27 **Sex Ratio**

Endpoint	Low Risk High Risk	
	mg/kg tPCB*	
Phase I Malformations ^a	LC20 >62	LC50 >62
Phase III Malformations ^b	LC20 3.27	LC50 38.6
Phase III Sex Ratio ^b	LC50 9.54	LC50 9.54
MATC based on geometric mean of above endpoints	12.5	28.4

28 ^a vernal pool sediment tPCB concentration

29 ^b spatially weighted mean sediment tPCB concentrations

30 **RESPONSE GE-13:** ERA Section E.4.9.1 describes the decision criteria EPA
 31 applied to the derivation of the MATC. A total of 11 endpoints were evaluated in
 32 the wood frog study to assess the potential impact of PCBs on different
 33 amphibian life stages, including reproduction, growth, and maturation based on
 34 known or expected toxicological effects of PCBs on amphibians. Some of these

ERA Responsiveness Summary

1 endpoints were insensitive, or effects data were incomplete or inconclusive.
2 Later developmental stages were observed to be more sensitive indicators of
3 toxic effects than earlier life stages for the wood frog, and demonstrated a dose-
4 response relationship.

5 The MATC for amphibians was based on the integration of the two sensitive and
6 biologically relevant endpoints (metamorph malformation and sex ratio). The
7 rationale for integrating the point estimates of the two endpoints was that it is
8 difficult to determine which endpoint is more sensitive with respect to population-
9 level impacts. Furthermore, the two endpoints may act in concert to limit the
10 viability of local wood frog populations. For example, of the Phase III wood frog
11 metamorphs that were malformed, a higher proportion of the total number of
12 malformed animals were female (the proportion of malformed males ranged from
13 0 to 42% at the four pools with the highest sediment tPCBs; the proportion of
14 malformed females ranged from 33 to 67%).

15 Characteristic malformations observed in Phase III metamorphs included
16 abnormal development of the lens of the eye, liver necrosis, gonadal necrosis,
17 gonadal translocation, abnormal skin maturation, cardiac and cardio-vascular
18 mal-development, and visceral and abdominal edema (FEL 2002). As described
19 in Section E.4.9.2, Dr. Fort stated that, based on the degree of malformation
20 observed in the gonads of the female wood frog metamorphs, most individuals
21 (approximately 70 to 100%) would likely be sterile. The likely rate of sterility
22 predicted by Dr. Fort was one line of evidence considered during the derivation of
23 the MATC for both tissue and sediment.

24 Skewed sex ratio was another line of evidence that was considered in the
25 derivation of the MATCs. Most amphibians, unlike higher trophic-level predators,
26 have a reproductive strategy wherein large numbers of young are produced,
27 minimal parental care of the young is typical, and higher juvenile output *and*
28 mortality are typical of amphibians relative to animals located higher in the food
29 web. There is a compensation mechanism in many amphibian species (including
30 those resident in the PSA), such that an effect size of 5% to 10% may be of **less**
31 **biological relevance** (emphasis added to clarify that EPA did not state that this
32 endpoint is **not** relevant, but rather is **less** biologically relevant) to the local
33 population. (Such an effect size could be a significant for a higher-order predator
34 that has more limited reproductive resources).

35 One of the MATC decision criteria was to use endpoints with dose-response
36 relationships. The incidence of malformations in Phase I and III metamorphs and
37 skewed sex ratios in Phase III metamorphs all showed dose-response
38 relationships. Phase I metamorph malformation dose-response relationship
39 data, however, were incomplete because only external malformations were
40 recorded. This underestimated the likely true overall rate of malformations, and
41 resulted in EC₂₀s and EC₅₀s that were uncertain. Because of this, EPA does not
42 agree with the derivation of the MATC as proposed by GE.

ERA Responsiveness Summary

1 There are a number of possible methods for calculating MATCs using the dose-
2 response data presented in the ERA. For example, a numerically integrated
3 sediment MATC of 1.41 mg/kg tPCB could be derived from the geometric mean
4 of EC₂₀ Phase III metamorph malformation (3.27 mg/kg tPCB) and EC₂₀ Phase III
5 metamorph sex ratio (0.67 mg/kg tPCB) data; however, as discussed above in
6 Response GE-9, simply calculating a measure of central tendency of a number of
7 effects thresholds does not necessarily produce the most scientifically defensible
8 MATC. Instead, the sediment MATC of 3.27 mg/kg tPCB was derived in the
9 manner that it was because a 20% incidence of malformation was considered
10 more biologically relevant than a 20% effect size for sex skewness (as described
11 in Section E.4.3.3). In addition, an MATC of 3.27 mg/kg is believed to provide
12 adequate protection for other amphibian species, which is also an objective of
13 this Assessment Endpoint. Therefore, given the likelihood of adverse population
14 effects associated with the skewed sex ratios and malformed gonads and other
15 malformations observed in the wood frog metamorphs, as well as the uncertainty
16 regarding the relative sensitivity of other species such as leopard frogs or
17 salamanders, EPA does not believe that raising the MATC above 3.27 mg/kg
18 tPCBs is sufficiently protective of amphibians.

19 References:

20 FEL (Fort Environmental Laboratories, Inc.). 2002. *Final Report – Frog*
21 *Reproduction and Development Study. 2000 Rana sylvatica Vernal Pool*
22 *Study*. Study protocol no.: WESR01–RSTS03–1. Prepared by Fort
23 Environmental Laboratories Inc., Stillwater, OK.

24 **3.2 Wood Frog Population Model**

25 The revised wood frog population model documented in Attachment E-4 of the November 2004
26 ERA addresses some of the GE and peer reviewer comments on the July 2003 draft, but it still
27 fails to account for density-dependence within the model or to provide a realistic description of
28 wood frog population dynamics, both with or without the influence of PCBs.

29 The summary results presented in Table 20 of Attachment E-4 (EPA 2004a) show that the
30 revised model predicts even more rapid extinction of the wood frog population in the PSA than
31 did the original model (EPA 2003, Vol. 5, Att. E.3). In the revised model, even under the most
32 optimistic assumptions (non-declining population, no PCB impacts), the median time to
33 extinction of the PSA wood frog population is only 20 years, compared to 32 years in the
34 original model. Median time to extinctions for populations exposed to PCBs range from 4.5 to
35 11 years. As noted in GE's previous comments on the model (BBL et al. 2003, pp. 6-10 - 6-11,
36 G-9 - G-12), if EPA's model were accurate, the wood frog population on the floodplain should
37 already be extinct, and it is not.

38 The ERA claims that the base model incorporates density-dependence by establishing a ceiling
39 beyond which frog populations were not allowed to grow (EPA 2004a, Vol. 5, Att. E-4, p. 21).
40 Such an approach, however, does not adequately take account of density-dependence because it
41 does not permit the population growth rate to increase at low abundance levels. By contrast, the

ERA Responsiveness Summary

1 ERA also includes a sensitivity analysis that takes account of density-dependence incorporating
2 compensation (increase in survival or fecundity as density decreases) (EPA 2004a, Vol. 5, pp. E-
3 137 - E139 and Att. E-4, pp. 54-56). The inclusion of such compensatory density-dependence
4 substantially decreases the risk of extinction for all model projections. Figure 16 (EPA 2004a,
5 Vol. 5, Att. E-4, p. 57) shows the influence of alternative assumptions concerning density-
6 dependence on the risk that the abundance of wood frogs will be at or below a given level after
7 10 years. In the non-declining base model (Panel B), there is greater than a 30% risk that the
8 population will decline from the starting value (~75,000 frogs) to only 10,000 frogs after 10
9 years, even with no PCB impacts. With compensatory density-dependence included (Panel A),
10 the risk that the population will decline to 10,000 frogs is far less than 10% for even the most
11 severely PCB-impacted model projections. In the declining base model (Panel D), there is
12 approximately a 90% risk that the population will decline to less than 10,000 frogs even with no
13 PCB impacts. With compensatory density-dependence included (Panel C), the risk of a decline
14 to less than 10,000 frogs is less than 40% for even the most severely PCB-impacted model
15 projections.

16 EPA's claim that the models are "robust in projecting the increased risk of population decline
17 and extinction due to tPCB contamination" (EPA 2004a, Vol. 5, p. E-139) is based on the
18 differences in estimated extinction risks for unimpacted and impacted populations. With respect
19 to the absolute extinction risk, however, it is clear that the model still substantially overpredicts
20 extinction both with and without PCB exposure. Based on the sensitivity analysis, extinction
21 risks for both unimpacted and impacted populations are far lower when compensatory density-
22 dependence is included in the model projections. Since that approach better takes account of
23 density-dependence, GE recommends that compensatory density-dependence be included in the
24 base scenarios rather than only in the sensitivity analysis. This is particularly important if the
25 wood frog population model may be used in remedial action planning to balance the benefits of
26 PCB exposure reduction against the increased risk of population extinction resulting from habitat
27 disturbance during remediation.

28 **RESPONSE GE-14:** The wood frog stochastic population model was developed
29 to determine whether the adverse effects of PCB exposure on wood frogs,
30 including increased incidences of internal and external malformations on
31 individual frogs and skewed sex ratios within the population, influence the
32 dynamics of the wood frog population within the Housatonic River Primary Study
33 Area (PSA). To model density-dependence in a stochastic population projection,
34 relationships between density, the timing of metamorphosis, survival, and
35 reproductive success must be specified. The data necessary to specify such
36 relationships are not fully available for the PSA. The model, however, was
37 designed from the outset to examine the sensitivity of the population-level
38 projections to tPCB impacts on wood frogs using site-specific data (both field
39 studies and laboratory toxicity studies) to the maximum extent possible. In this
40 manner it did provide a realistic description of wood frog population dynamics,
41 both with and without the influence of tPCBs. To evaluate the potential
42 importance of density-dependence on the results of the wood frog population
43 modeling, a sensitivity analysis was performed by increasing and decreasing vital
44 rates by 5 and 10%, and by evaluating changes in environmental correlation

ERA Responsiveness Summary

1 assumptions and dispersal rates. This analysis was included in the November
2 2004 revised ERA.

3 As with most population modeling exercises, certain vital rate information was not
4 available for the PSA. Literature values, therefore, were used, which resulted in
5 some uncertainty in model outputs. Additionally, it was assumed that there was
6 no immigration or emigration of frogs into or out of the PSA during the modeling,
7 when in fact there is likely some movement of frogs in and out of the PSA. This
8 is particularly true in places where there are adjacent vernal pools that are
9 outside the 10-year floodplain, where the vast majority of tPCBs occur in the soil
10 and sediment. This spatial arrangement of contaminated and uncontaminated
11 vernal pools provides a mechanism for repopulating impacted vernal pools,
12 which is one possible explanation for why the wood frog is not extinct in the PSA.

13 While it is true that wood frogs are observed in the PSA, the population modeling
14 study, including the sensitivity analysis, showed that even with strong density-
15 dependence, the impact of tPCBs on the probability of population decline and
16 extinction is significant. There was increased risk due to tPCB exposure relative
17 to the uncontaminated base model in every sensitivity analysis. Lastly, the
18 population model as constructed for the ERA was not intended to be used to
19 develop specific media protection goals. It was demonstrated that there is
20 increased risk to amphibians from exposure to PCBs; the degree to which
21 impacts to the local subpopulation are compensated for by density-dependence
22 is not a consideration in determining risk. Population modeling was conducted to
23 propagate the effects from PCBs to local amphibian populations to determine
24 whether there is a likelihood of long-term negative effects; the modeling indicated
25 that such effects are in fact likely.

26 4. Survival, Growth, and Reproduction of Insectivorous Birds

27 The primary changes to the assessment of survival, growth, and reproduction of insectivorous
28 birds are the addition of wood ducks as a receptor and the change in the conclusion regarding
29 evidence of harm provided by the tree swallow study. The addition of the wood duck appears to
30 be in response to one peer reviewer's repeated comment on the matter (Ottinger 2004, pp. 5, 6,
31 13, 14, 15; EPA 2004b, pp. 227, 233, 247). Because this entire measurement endpoint is new,
32 GE is providing comments and recommendations on EPA's overall wood duck analysis. The
33 change in the evidence of harm attributed to the tree swallow field study appears to be in
34 response to two peer reviewers' comments (see EPA 2004b, pp. 235, 243, addressing comments
35 of reviewers LaPoint and Sample). However, because neither the underlying study (Custer
36 2002) nor the analysis of that study changed since the July 2003 version of the ERA, there is
37 now an inconsistency between the analyses and the risk characterization for tree swallows.

38 **RESPONSE GE-15:** The EPA responses addressing each of these comment
39 areas are provided below.

ERA Responsiveness Summary

1 **4.1 Measured Exposure and Effects for Wood Ducks**

2 The November 2004 ERA includes a new measurement endpoint for insectivorous birds based
3 on modeled exposure and effects (or hazard quotients, HQs) in wood ducks. The approach
4 employed with wood ducks is similar to that used for other avian HQs, with a few exceptions. As
5 with most other avian receptors, risks posed by PCBs were evaluated by estimating the dietary
6 intake (i.e., dose) of PCBs in laying hens and comparing that dose to effects metrics developed
7 from published toxicological studies on the avian receptors that EPA regards as most sensitive
8 (i.e., white leghorn chickens, studied by Lillie et al. 1974) and most tolerant (i.e., American
9 kestrels, studied by Fernie et al. 2001) (EPA 2004a, Vol. 2, p. 7-40; Vol. 5, p. G-82). The
10 approach taken to evaluate risks posed by TEQs differs somewhat from that used for other avian
11 receptors. As described in the ERA (EPA 2004a, Vol. 2, p. 7-11; Vol. 5, pp. G-51, G-52), the
12 concentration of TEQ (ng/kg) in female breeding wood ducks over the 14-day pre-laying period
13 was estimated by multiplying the total daily intake (TDI) (in ng/kg bw/d) by the chemical
14 assimilation efficiency (CAE) (unitless) and summing the results for 14 days. The concentration
15 of TEQ in hens was then multiplied by a literature-derived egg:adult concentration ratio to
16 determine the concentration of TEQ (ng/kg ww) in the egg. Finally, the modeled egg
17 concentration was compared to a literature-derived egg-based effect metric specific to wood
18 ducks and TEQ, based on a study by White and Seginak (1994), in order to determine risk.

19 GE has several major concerns about EPA's new analysis:

- 20 • The model's predictions are not borne out by incidental field observations and collections.
- 21 • The effects metrics used by EPA for PCBs are not based on the most appropriate species or
22 studies, and the effects metric used for TEQs appears to overestimate risks to Housatonic
23 River wood ducks.
- 24 • EPA's exposure modeling employs several assumptions that tend to overestimate exposure.

25 Each of these points is discussed further below.

26 **4.1.1 Inconsistency with Field Observations**

27 The ERA predicts high risks posed to wood ducks from both PCBs and TEQs (EPA 2004a, Vol.
28 2, pp. 7-60, 7-65, 7-70; Vol. 5, pp. G-88 - G-91). This conclusion is based on high HQ values.
29 For example, EPA's analysis predicts concentrations of TEQs in eggs ranging from 40.9 ng/kg to
30 7,907 ng/kg, with mean values in the range of 595 ng/kg to 2,943, depending upon location and
31 egg order (EPA 2004a, Vol. 5, Table G.2-40). TEQ concentrations in five eggs that were
32 collected from the Site and analyzed generally support the model's predictions, although the
33 sample size was low (n=5, mean = 1,336 ng/kg ww, range = 703 to 2,077 ng/kg ww) (EPA
34 2004a, Vol. 2, p. 7-61; Vol. 5, p. G55). For comparison, effects metrics in the range of >20 ng/kg
35 to 50 ng/kg were derived by White and Seginak (1994) in a field study of wood ducks exposed to
36 a mixture of dioxins and furans in Bayou Meto, Arkansas (see EPA 2004a, Vol. 1, p. 7-40). At
37 concentrations above that range, White and Seginak (1994) observed large proportions of
38 nonviable eggs, deformities of the lower bill, and subcutaneous edema of the head and neck.

ERA Responsiveness Summary

1 Thus, egg TEQ concentrations in the Housatonic River wood ducks may be up to 400 times
2 higher than those that produced overt adverse effects in Bayou Meto. Nevertheless, no
3 malformations or edemas have been reported in the four years of field work and two years of
4 wood duck collections conducted in support of the ERA. Although a controlled quantitative
5 study of reproductive success and teratogenicity in wood ducks has not been conducted on the
6 Housatonic River, wood ducks are fairly common in the area and biologists' time in the field has
7 been extensive. Thus, such overt effects should be apparent through incidental observations if
8 they are indeed occurring, given that HQs are as high as 400. No such observations have been
9 made and none of the adult wood ducks or wood duck embryos collected to date have been
10 deformed. It stands to reason, then, that ERA's predictions must be overestimating risks to wood
11 ducks at the Housatonic River site.

12 **RESPONSE GE-16:** Two waterfowl sampling efforts were conducted by EPA in
13 the PSA, one in 1998 and one in 2004. In the first sampling event, waterfowl
14 were both trapped and collected using an airboat in backwaters near Woods
15 Pond during August and September 1998 to provide tissue samples to support
16 the human health and ecological risk assessments. During the 1998 sampling,
17 20 wood ducks from the PSA were examined and dissected, and tissue was
18 subsequently analyzed for PCBs, dioxins, furans, and other Appendix IX
19 contaminants. In the second event, on May 10, 2004, five wood duck eggs were
20 collected from nest boxes located along the edges of the backwaters upstream of
21 Woods Pond. The contents of these eggs were prepared for chemical analysis
22 and subsequently analyzed for PCBs, dioxins, furans, and other Appendix IX
23 contaminants.

24 There were no additional field survey efforts or field studies conducted to
25 investigate the effects of tPCBs on wood ducks in the PSA. The wood ducks
26 collected in August and September of 1998 for tissue analysis were all
27 individuals that had hatched and survived to near-adulthood. Individuals that
28 may have succumbed to the effects of tPCBs, other contaminants, or predation,
29 were obviously not available for collection. No young birds were examined in this
30 field event. It is possible that wood ducks with deformed bills, edema, or other
31 documented effects from exposure to TEQ congeners would not have survived to
32 adulthood. Deformities affecting the feeding ability of a juvenile wood duck have
33 the potential to make that individual less fit, and more susceptible to starvation.
34 Similarly, ducklings suffering from other toxic effects of a contaminant are likely
35 to be less fit.

36 Four of the five wood duck eggs collected in 2004 contained fresh embryos less
37 than 4 to 5 days old, and one egg contained an embryo approximately 2.5 to 3
38 weeks old. No embryo deformities were observed in that latter egg sample. No
39 bill or other deformities could have been observed in the other four egg samples
40 because of their age and lack of development, i.e., they consisted of an egg yolk
41 and albumin.

ERA Responsiveness Summary

1 EPA strongly disagrees with the assertion that edema or deformities could have
2 been observed during the course of other field investigations. While there were
3 multiple sightings of wood ducks during field activities, they were
4 characteristically of wood ducks fleeing. Ducklings are trained to seek cover
5 whenever a potential predator appears. When this occurs, there is little to no
6 opportunity to observe a deformity. Edema, or palpable swelling of skin or
7 subcutaneous tissue, is extremely difficult to observe in the field, particularly if
8 birds are not in the hand. Most of a wood duck's body is covered in feathers, and
9 the feet are usually in the water or tucked close to the body of a flying individual,
10 making field observations of edema extremely difficult. The fact that none of the
11 birds processed for tissue analysis showed signs of edema is not indicative of the
12 lack of toxic effects, because the sampling effort was biased towards the
13 collection of surviving individuals near adulthood.

14 The following sections discuss parameters that are most likely contributing to this overestimate
15 and that, in GE's view, should be changed.

16 **4.1.2 Effects Metrics**

17 *Effects Metrics for tPCBs*

18 The most important limitation of the wood duck PCB HQs is the use of a range of PCB effects
19 metrics based on white leghorn chickens (Lillie et al. 1974) as reportedly representing the most
20 sensitive avian species, and American kestrels (Fernie et al. 2001) as reportedly the most tolerant
21 species.

22 For the lower bound of the range, it is inappropriate to use the dated Lillie et al. (1974) study on
23 white leghorn chickens, which are domesticated and are substantially more sensitive than wild
24 species to PCBs (Bosveld and Van den Berg 1994), when a suitable study on another duck
25 species (mallards) is available (Custer and Heinz 1980). As recognized in EPA's (1995) *Great*
26 *Lakes Water Quality Initiative Technical Support Document for Wildlife Criteria*: "many
27 traditional laboratory species...are bred from a fairly homogeneous gene-pool. Use of a [test
28 dose] derived from a 'wildlife' species is thought to provide a more realistic representation of the
29 dose-response relationship which may occur in the natural environment" (EPA 1995, p. 11). The
30 same is true for domesticated chickens. Thus, effects metrics based on domesticated species
31 should be used only in the absence of any suitable studies on wild species. In this case, a study
32 by Custer and Heinz (1980) on mallards, which was not included in the ERA, provides a suitable
33 study on a closely related wild species. That study yielded a NOAEL of 1.4 mg/kg bw/d tPCBs,
34 which should be used for the lower bound of the range.

35 For the upper bound of the range, EPA's site-specific field study of tree swallows (Custer 2002)
36 shows that species to be more tolerant than American kestrels. Hence, a site-specific and
37 stressor-specific dose-based metric should be generated from that study and used for the upper
38 bound of the range.

39 **RESPONSE GE-17:** Effects data can be characterized and summarized in a
40 variety of ways, ranging from benchmarks designed to be protective of most or all

ERA Responsiveness Summary

1 species to dose-response curves for the representative species of interest. In
2 this ERA, effects characterization preferentially relied on concentration or dose-
3 response curves, but defaulted to benchmarks or other estimates of effect when
4 insufficient data were available to derive the dose-response curve. Figure 6.6-1
5 in the ERA illustrates the decision criteria used to characterize effects for each
6 representative wildlife species throughout the ERA and does not represent new
7 information. In their review of the July 2003 draft of the Ecological Risk
8 Assessment, Peer Review Panel members commented favorably on the decision
9 criteria used to select effects metrics for wildlife.

10 Because laboratory and field studies were not available to characterize effects of
11 tPCBs to wood duck, a threshold range was derived, in accordance with the
12 decision criteria. A threshold range is intended to provide a range of doses that
13 would be protective of the most sensitive bird species (the lower end of the
14 range) and the most tolerant bird species (the upper end of the range). The
15 assumption is that species that have not been tested with regard to their
16 sensitivity to tPCBs (e.g., wood duck) have a sensitivity intermediate between the
17 most sensitive and most tolerant species studied. This approach is intended to
18 be unbiased (i.e., no safety factors used to derive the threshold range) and to
19 account for the uncertainty regarding sensitivity of wood ducks to tPCBs. The
20 threshold range for the reproductive success of wood ducks exposed to tPCBs
21 selected for this assessment is 0.12 to 7.0 mg/kg bw/d based on reproductive
22 studies conducted on white leghorn chickens (Lillie et al. 1974) and American
23 kestrels (Ferne et al. 2001), respectively.

24 The use of a threshold range, when other data were not available for the
25 representative species, was accepted by the Peer Reviewers. The threshold
26 range used for wood ducks exposed to tPCBs is the same as that used for other
27 bird species lacking species-specific toxicity information for tPCBs (i.e., American
28 robin, belted kingfisher, osprey). No Peer Reviewer expressed concerns
29 regarding use of the threshold range for the latter species.

30 As presented in Section G.3.1.1.2 of the November 2004 ERA, Custer and Heinz
31 (1980) observed no significant effects on reproductive success of 9-month-old
32 mallard ducks fed a diet containing 25 mg/kg ww Aroclor 1254. A previous study
33 by Heath et al. (1972) had similar results. Neither study converted the dietary
34 concentration of 25 mg/kg ww Aroclor 1254 to a dose. Therefore, it is unclear
35 how the "NOAEL of 1.4 mg/kg bw/d tPCBs" cited in the comments prepared on
36 behalf of GE was derived.

37 Further, neither study included other Aroclor 1254 treatments. Thus, a dose-
38 response relationship has not been demonstrated for mallards exposed to tPCBs
39 in these or other studies (i.e., control and 25 mg/kg treatments both showed no
40 effect). As discussed in the response to General Issue 6 of the Responsiveness
41 Summary document, three Peer Reviewers suggested that MATC derivation
42 should consider only test endpoints that demonstrate dose-response

ERA Responsiveness Summary

1 relationships. EPA accepted this recommendation. The recommendation
2 logically extends to the selection of effects metrics for representative wildlife
3 species. Thus, the results of the mallard studies were not used as the basis for
4 developing the tPCB effects metric for wood duck.

5 In addition to the above issues, Heath et al. (1972) reported that mallard and
6 bobwhite quail were insensitive to dietary exposure of Aroclor 1254. Custer and
7 Heinz (1980) also reported that mallards are less susceptible to Aroclor 1254
8 than are many other avian species. Wood ducks are known to be sensitive to
9 dioxin and furan contamination and have been recommended as a bioindicator
10 species for monitoring biological impacts from these contaminants (White and
11 Seginak 1994; White and Hoffman 1995). This determination of sensitivity was
12 based on the results of a field-based study where relative risk of toxicity of
13 dioxins and furans was determined using a toxic equivalence (TEQ) approach
14 (White and Seginak 1994). Therefore, it was assumed that wood ducks would be
15 more sensitive than mallards to PCB congeners, as was demonstrated for dioxin
16 and furan congeners.

17 EPA concurs with the GE comment that an effects metric derived from a wildlife
18 species is preferred over an effects metric based on a domesticated species, but
19 only if a dose-response relationship can be demonstrated for the wildlife species.
20 Otherwise, effects metrics from domesticated species may be used, as was the
21 case in the wood duck assessment.

22 **References:**

23 Custer, C.M. 2002. *Exposure and Effects of Chemical Contaminants on Tree*
24 *Swallows Nesting Along the Housatonic River, Berkshire Co., Massachusetts,*
25 *1998-2000*. Final Report to U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. USGS,
26 Upper Midwest Environmental Sciences Center, La Crosse, WI.

27 Custer, T.W. and G.H. Heinz. 1980. Reproductive success and nest
28 attentiveness of mallard ducks fed Aroclor 1254. *Environmental Pollution*
29 (Series A) 21:313-318.

30 Fernie, K.J., J.E. Smits, G.R. Bortolotti, and D.M. Bird. 2001. Reproductive
31 success of American kestrels exposed to dietary polychlorinated biphenyls.
32 *Environmental Toxicology and Chemistry* 20:776-781.

33 Heath, R.G., J.W. Spann, E.F. Hill, and J.F. Kreitzer. 1972. Comparative Dietary
34 Toxicities of Pesticides to Birds. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Special
35 Scientific Report on Wildlife 152. 57 pp.

36 Lillie, R.J., H.C. Cecil, J. Bitman, and G.F. Fries. 1974. Differences in response
37 of caged white leghorn layers to various polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs) in
38 the diet. *Poultry Science* 53:726-732.

ERA Responsiveness Summary

1 White, D.H. and Seginak, J.T. 1994. Dioxins and furans linked to reproductive
2 impairment in wood ducks. *J. Wildlife Management* 58(1):100-106.

3 White, D.H and D.J. Hoffman. 1995. Effects of Polychlorinated Dibenzo-p-
4 dioxins and Dibenzofurans on Nesting Wood Ducks (*Aix sponsa*) at Bayou
5 Meto, Arkansas. *Environmental Health Perspectives* 103(4):37-39.

6 *Effects Metrics for TEQs*

7 As noted above, EPA has used the wood duck study by White and Seginak (1994) in Bayou
8 Meto as the basis for the TEQ effects metrics. Although this study does not require interspecies
9 extrapolation, there are important differences in field conditions at Bayou Meto and the
10 Housatonic River that limit extrapolation of the effects metrics. Differences in the TEF schemes
11 used (I-TEFs vs. WHO TEFs) are acknowledged in the ERA (see EPA 2004a, Vol. 2, p. 7-41;
12 Vol. 5, Att. G.2). That difference alone, however, does not appear to be sufficient to account for
13 the absence of overt abnormalities in Housatonic wood ducks despite concentrations of TEQs in
14 eggs that are hundreds of times greater than White and Seginak's (1994) effects metrics. The
15 mixtures of dioxins, furans, and PCBs differ substantially between Bayou Meto and the
16 Housatonic River, and those different mixtures may have very different toxicities (even apart
17 from the differences due to the TEF schemes). For example, Bayou Meto is primarily impacted
18 with dioxins, while PCBs are predominant in the Housatonic River. Moreover, there may be
19 secondary stressors in the Arkansas population that were not considered. Differences in
20 competition, food sources, bioenergetics, co-contaminants, or other factors may also be relevant.
21 Although the cause of the over-prediction of risks based on White and Seginak's (1994) effects
22 metrics cannot be determined based on the information provided by White and Seginak (1994),
23 the absence of any evidence of malformations or edema in the Housatonic River wood duck and
24 egg collections suggests that the study does indeed overestimate TEQ risks to Housatonic River
25 wood ducks.

26 In an effort to ground-truth the ERA's egg-based HQ findings, GE calculated risks posed by
27 TEQs under the more conventional dose-based approach. Using the equation for TDI that is
28 provided in the ERA (EPA 2004a, Vol. 1, pp. 6-8, 7-10; Vol. 5, p. G-14), as well as the ERA's
29 reported median concentrations of TEQ in aquatic invertebrates and litter invertebrates at
30 location 13 (EPA 2004a, Vol. 5, Table G.2-38), and the ERA's assumptions regarding foraging
31 time, food ingestion rate, and the proportion of diet derived from aquatic invertebrates and litter
32 invertebrates (EPA 2004a, Vol. 5, Table G.2-34), the median TEQ dose to breeding wood ducks
33 is 99 ng/kg bw/day. That value may be compared to the same dose-based effects metrics for
34 TEQ that are applied to all other avian receptors, which range from 44 ng/kg bw/day to 25,000
35 ng/kg bw/day (EPA 2004a, Vol. 2, p. 7-40; Vol. 5, p. G-83). Resultant HQs range from 0.004 to
36 2.3, consistent with a finding of low or borderline risks. Under most circumstances, low or
37 borderline risks would not be expected to cause overt malformations and edema that could be
38 observed incidentally. Hence, a dose-based approach to evaluating TEQ risks to wood ducks
39 would appear to yield results that are more consistent with field observations and collections.
40 This dose-based TEQ risk calculation supports GE's contention that the White and Seginak
41 (1994) study overestimates risks to Housatonic River wood ducks, in part due to the TEF scheme

ERA Responsiveness Summary

1 applied, but likely also due to differences in contaminant mixtures, secondary stressors,
2 ecological factors, and/or confounding factors.

3 **RESPONSE GE-18:** No field studies were conducted to determine if overt
4 abnormalities are present in wood ducks residing in the Primary Study Area of
5 the Housatonic River (see Response GE-16). Without this information, there is
6 no basis for suggesting that the dose-based approach for assessing risk of TEQ
7 to wood ducks is more appropriate than the egg concentration modeling
8 approach used in the November 2004 ERA. The latter approach was used in this
9 case because species-specific toxicity data were available for TEQ in wood duck
10 eggs (White and Seginak 1994). A similar approach was used for bald eagles,
11 which the Peer Review Panel found preferable to the parallel dose-based
12 approach when effects data for eggs are available. No species-specific toxicity
13 data were available for wood ducks (or eagles) expressed as a dose-based
14 metric.

15 The study by White and Seginak (1994) examined the link between TEQ and
16 reproductive impairment in wood ducks in Bayou Meto, Arkansas. In the TEQ
17 approach, toxicity equivalence factors (TEFs) are assigned to coplanar PCB,
18 PCDF, and PCDD congeners that share a similar mode of action. This approach
19 is based on the in vivo and in vitro toxicity of each planar chlorinated
20 hydrocarbon congener in relation to 2,3,7,8-tetrachlorodibenzo-*p*-dioxin (TCDD)
21 (Van den Berg et al. 1998). TEQ is calculated by summing the congener-specific
22 TEQ (TEF x concentration) for all coplanar PCB, PCDF, and PCDD congeners.
23 The TEQ approach was developed to estimate and compare effects as 2,3,7,8-
24 TCDD equivalence at different sites even if the composition of the congener
25 mixtures at the sites differs substantially.

26 The GE comment suggests that differences in competition, food sources,
27 bioenergetics, or other factors may have contributed to the calculated toxicity
28 threshold range (>20 to 50 ng/kg TEQ in egg ww) in the White and Seginak
29 (1994) study. However, White and Seginak observed high wood duck
30 productivity in the site farthest downstream from the source (i.e., with the lowest
31 TEQ in eggs) relative to the two more contaminated locations that were located
32 closer to the source. Productivity at the site farthest downstream from the source
33 was similar to the productivity observed at a nearby reference site. Thus, it
34 appears that stressors other than those associated with the TEQ exposure are
35 not causing impacts on wood duck productivity. Because Bayou Meto flows
36 through agricultural land, wood duck egg samples were analyzed for persistent
37 organochlorine pesticides (e.g., DDT) to determine if they could have contributed
38 to observed effects on wood duck productivity. Very low concentrations of
39 organochlorine residues were detected in these samples. Therefore, the
40 presence of co-contaminants in Bayou Meto is not anticipated to be an important
41 secondary stressor in the Arkansas wood ducks.

References:

Van den Berg, M., L. Birnbaum, A.T.C. Bosveld, B. Brunstrom, P. Cook, M. Freely, J.P. Giesy, A. Hanberg, R. Hasegawa, S.W. Kennedy, T. Kubiak, J.C. Larsen, F.X. Rolan van Leeuwen, A.K. Djien Liem, C. Nolt, R.E. Peterson, L. Poellinger, S. Safe, D. Schrenk, D. Tillitt, M. Tysklind, M. Younes, F. Waern, and T. Zacharewski. 1998. Toxic equivalency factors (TEFs) for PCBs, PCDDs, PCDFs for humans and wildlife. *Environmental Health Perspectives* 106(12):775-792.

White, D.H. and Seginak, J.T. 1994. Dioxins and furans linked to reproductive impairment in wood ducks. *J. Wildlife Management* 58(1):100-106.

4.1.3 Specific Exposure Assumptions

In addition to the effects metrics used, three exposure assumptions used in EPA's modeling tend to result in over-predictions and should be revised – namely, (1) the assumed composition of the diets of pre-laying and laying hens, (2) the application of the maternal transfer data reported by Bargar et al. (2001), and (3) the assumption that PCBs are not metabolized.

Diet Composition

EPA's modeling assumes that the percentage of aquatic and terrestrial invertebrates (combined) in the diets of breeding wood duck hens is 76% (EPA 2004a, Vol. 2, p. 7-19; Vol. 5, p. G-49). That percentage represents the wood duck hens' diet during the laying period, as reported by Drobney and Fredrickson (1979). Those authors report that, during the 14-day pre-laying period, invertebrates comprise a substantially lower proportion (i.e., 53%) of the wood duck hen diet. Because EPA's calculation of wood duck total daily intake (TDI) spans both the pre-laying and laying period, uncertainty in the model result would be reduced by applying Drobney and Fredrickson's (1979) pre-laying proportions to the pre-laying part of the breeding cycle and then applying their laying proportions to the laying part of the cycle.

RESPONSE GE-19: The egg concentration model for wood ducks spans a period of 13 days prior to egg laying (Day 1 to Day 13) and 14 days during egg laying (Day 14 to Day 27), as discussed in the November 2004 ERA. Drobney and Fredrickson (1979) reported that the mean proportion of invertebrates in the diet of pre-laying and laying female wood ducks was 54% and 76%, respectively. These results were from a study conducted in southeastern Missouri.

The rate of change for the proportion of invertebrates in the wood duck diet is unknown, but likely depends on the availability of invertebrates in the local ecosystem, given that wood ducks are opportunistic feeders (Grice and Rogers 1965).

The Housatonic River PSA has an extensive forested floodplain, backwater areas, and other habitat that supports aquatic and terrestrial invertebrate populations. Therefore, female wood ducks have the opportunity for high

ERA Responsiveness Summary

1 invertebrate consumption rates, which may not be the case in other areas. Thus,
2 for the egg TEQ concentration modeling reported in the November 2004 ERA, it
3 was assumed that 76% of the diet of pre-laying and laying wood duck females
4 was composed of invertebrates. This assumption was considered reasonable
5 given the results reported by Drobney and Fredrickson (1979). This dietary
6 assumption is further supported by the similarity between predicted egg TEQ
7 concentration from the modeling effort and measured concentrations in wood
8 duck eggs sampled (n=5) from the PSA.

9 **References:**

10 Drobney, R.D. and L.H. Fredrickson. 1979. Food selection by wood ducks in
11 relation to breeding status. *J. Wildlife Manage.* 43:109-120.

12 Grice, D. and J. P. Rogers. 1965. *The Wood Duck in Massachusetts*. Final
13 Report. Massachusetts Division of Fisheries and Game. Final Report.
14 Federal Aid in Wildlife Restoration Project No. W-19-R.

15 ***Maternal Transfer***

16 To determine the concentration of TEQ in wood duck eggs, the estimated TEQ concentration in
17 hens was multiplied by an egg:hen concentration ratio derived from a study by Bargar et al.
18 (2001) (see EPA 2004a, Vol. 2, p. 7-19; Vol. 5, p. G-52). The manner in which the Bargar et al.
19 (2001) study is used to estimate maternal transfer appears to result in unnecessary uncertainty
20 and overestimation of exposure. Bargar et al. (2001) injected three different PCB congeners
21 (PCBs 105, 156, and 189) individually and as a mixture subcutaneously into white leghorn
22 chicken hens every four days during a 21day period. They quantified maternal transfer to eggs on
23 both a mass basis and a concentration ratio basis. On a mass basis, 0.42% to 0.61% of the
24 injected PCBs (in µg) were excreted into eggs. On a concentration ratio basis, the egg:hen
25 concentration ratio averaged 0.22 (for wet weight measurements).

26 As noted by Bargar et al. (2001), egg size relative to body size is a possible reason for
27 interspecies excretion variability. GE also notes that interspecies differences in lipid fractions in
28 hens and eggs likely contribute to interspecies excretion variability. One would only expect
29 egg:hen concentration ratios to be similar across species if the relative masses of the egg and the
30 hen, as well as the lipid fractions in eggs and hens, were also similar across species. Although
31 Bargar et al. (2001) present no data on the lipid fractions of their study animals, they report that
32 each egg laid by white leghorn chickens accounts for approximately 3% of the hen's body
33 weight. By contrast, data in the literature indicate that each wood duck egg accounts for 6% to
34 6.5% of the hen's weight.² Due to this considerable difference in the relative masses of hens and
35 eggs between these species, Bargar et al.'s (2001) egg:hen concentration ratios yield estimates of

² Hepp and Belrose (1995) report that a wood duck's clutch accounts for 78% of the hen's weight. The same authors report an average clutch size of 12, while Grice and Rogers (1965) report an average clutch size of 13. Dividing 0.78 by 12 and 13 yields the range of 6% to 6.5% presented above.

ERA Responsiveness Summary

1 maternal transfer that are higher than those generated from mass-based measures of maternal
2 transfer. As noted above, GE recommends using a dose-based approach to quantify TEQ risks
3 for wood ducks. However, if an egg-based approach is retained, maternal transfer should be
4 estimated based on transfer of 0.42% to 0.61% of the PCB mass ingested by wood duck hens,
5 instead of the egg:hen concentration ratios reported by Bargar et al. (2001), because of the
6 substantial difference in the relative masses of eggs and hens in chickens and wood ducks.

7 In addition, Bargar et al.'s (2001) method of administering the dose (subcutaneous injection) and
8 timing of doing so may not accurately represent maternal transfer that occurs at steady-state
9 through dietary exposure. In particular, the absorbed doses of PCBs in the chickens treated by
10 Bargar et al. were not likely at steady-state before egg-laying was initiated. Excretion rates are
11 expected to differ under steady-state and non-steady-state conditions, particularly when multiple
12 dosings are administered discontinuously. If egg-based HQs are retained in the ERA, this
13 uncertainty should be acknowledged.

14 **RESPONSE GE-20:** As noted in the GE comment, there is uncertainty
15 associated with extrapolating the TEQ egg:adult concentration ratio for white
16 leghorn chicken to calculate TEQ in wood duck eggs. This uncertainty was
17 acknowledged and discussed in the November 2004 ERA (Section G.4.6, page
18 G-124). EPA concurs with the comment that each wood duck egg likely
19 accounts for a greater proportion of hen body weight than is the case with white
20 leghorn chickens. That is not, however, sufficient justification for using a mass-
21 based approach to estimate PCBs in wood duck eggs, and even if a mass-based
22 approach were used, it would be inappropriate to simply apply the relationship
23 derived from white leghorn chickens – the difference in egg:adult mass ratio
24 between the two species must be taken into consideration.

25 It is also important to recognize that the mass of PCBs transferred from adult to
26 egg is also partially controlled by other factors. Barger et al. (2001) and Nosek et
27 al. (1992) reviewed the literature on maternal transfer of PCBs and TCDD,
28 respectively, and found that the mass transferred to eggs is highly variable and
29 species specific. This point argues against the approach suggested by GE.
30 Nosek et al. (1992) conclude that:

31 *“The total percentage of female TCDD body burden eliminated by egg*
32 *laying is probably influenced by differences in adult body size, amount of*
33 *maternal body fat reserves, number of eggs laid per clutch, and degree to*
34 *which maternal body fat is mobilized during egg laying.”*

35 Use of a concentration ratio for egg to adult is likely to be less variable between
36 species because factors such as differences in adult and egg weights, and clutch
37 size have less influence on a concentration ratio (i.e., terms cancel out) than on
38 the absolute mass of PCBs transferred from the hen to the eggs. Bargar et al.
39 (2001), in fact, make this argument, where they note that egg:adult concentration
40 ratios are similar between white leghorn chicken and Adelie penguins (Tanabe et
41 al. 1986).

ERA Responsiveness Summary

1 Based on this information, EPA chose to extrapolate the concentration ratio for
2 egg:adult for white leghorn chicken to calculate TEQ in wood duck eggs in the
3 November 2004 ERA, rather than use the absolute mass approach suggested by
4 GE. EPA believes that this approach results in less overall uncertainty, even
5 though egg:adult TEQ concentration ratios are likely to vary somewhat between
6 species because of, for example, species differences in maternal and egg lipid
7 reserves, and degree to which maternal body fat is mobilized during egg laying.
8 These factors apply also to the mass-based approach.

9 As noted above, even if the mass-based approach is used, it would not be
10 appropriate to apply the transfer ratio from the Bargar et al. study on chickens
11 (i.e., approximately 0.5% of adult contaminant mass per egg) to wood duck due
12 to the difference in egg size relative to the adult. When the difference in relative
13 egg mass between ducks and chickens (approximately 6% vs. approximately
14 3%, respectively) is accounted for, the mass-based approach produces final
15 transfer ratios for wood duck (an egg:hen concentration ratio of approximately
16 0.17) similar to that reached using the concentration-based approach. In
17 addition, modeled egg TEQ results for wood duck were close to measured values
18 in the PSA, although the sample size for the latter is small (n=5). Therefore,
19 despite the uncertainty regarding maternal transfer of PCBs in wood duck, the
20 egg concentration model appears to perform well.

21 EPA concurs with the GE comment that the method and timing of PCB injection
22 used in the Bargar et al. (2001) study is not likely representative of wood duck
23 exposure patterns in the PSA. EPA acknowledges that this source of uncertainty
24 exists, in addition to the other uncertainties discussed in the November 2004 ERA.

25 **References:**

26 Bargar, T.A., G.I. Scott and G.P. Cobb. 2001. Maternal transfer of contaminants:
27 Case study of the excretion of three polychlorinated biphenyl congeners and
28 technical grade endosulfan into eggs by white leghorn chickens (*Gallus*
29 *domesticus*). *Environmental Toxicology and Chemistry* 20:61-67.

30 Nosek, J.A., S.R. Craven, J.R. Sullivan, J.R. Olson and R.E. Peterson. 1992.
31 Metabolism and disposition of 2,3,7,8-tetrachlorodibenzo-p-dioxin in ring-
32 necked pheasant hens, chicks, and eggs. *Journal of Toxicology and*
33 *Environmental Health* 35:153-164.

34 Tanabe, S., A. Subramanian, H. Hidaka and R. Tatsukawa. 1986. Transfer rates
35 and pattern of PCB isomers and congeners and pp-DDE from mother to egg
36 in Adelie penguin (*Pygoscelis adeliae*). *Chemosphere* 15:343-351.

37 ***Assumption of No PCB Metabolism***

38 The ERA assumes that no metabolism of PCBs occurs in the hens (EPA 2004a, Vol. 5, p. G-51).
39 However, as subsequently noted in the ERA (EPA 2004a, Vol. 6, p. K-28), Dahlgren et al.

ERA Responsiveness Summary

1 (1971) estimated metabolism of 2.4% of the PCB dose over a 28 day period. Given the available
2 data, metabolism of PCBs warrants quantitative inclusion in the ERA model for wood ducks, in
3 order to reduce the model's uncertainty and overestimation of exposure.

4 **RESPONSE GE-21:** Inclusion of metabolism in the exposure model for wood
5 duck would have little impact on estimated TEQ in wood duck eggs. Dahlgren et
6 al. (1971) estimated metabolism of Aroclor 1254 in pheasants at 2.4% of oral
7 dose mass over a 28-day period. The authors also reported that the mass of
8 PCBs excreted into the four eggs laid over that 28-day period was substantially
9 higher than the mass of PCBs metabolized (8.4% of PCBs vs. 2.4%). Further,
10 Nichols et al. (1995) reported that there is little or no metabolism of highly
11 chlorinated congeners by avian species.

12 Wood duck and pheasant clutches are similar in size, ranging from 6 to 15 eggs
13 (Grice and Rogers 1965; Ehrlich et al. 1988). Therefore, PCB excretion into the
14 eggs is an important mechanism of PCB mass reduction in adult female wood
15 ducks, as is the case with pheasant. Further, the ratio of total egg mass (number
16 of eggs times mass of each egg) to body mass is higher for wood ducks than for
17 pheasants. DARDNI (2005) reported an average pheasant egg mass of 33 g;
18 the mean wood duck egg mass was 41 g in Housatonic River PSA (n=5). The
19 average mass of a female pheasant is 953 g (Martin and Nelson 1952), whereas
20 the mass of the female wood duck is 564 g (Landers et al. 1977). Therefore,
21 assuming 13 eggs in a clutch for each species, the ratio of total egg mass to
22 body mass for pheasant is 0.45, whereas the same ratio for wood duck is 0.99.

23 Therefore, excretion to eggs would be a more important route of PCB elimination
24 in wood ducks than is the case with pheasants, and metabolism of PCBs, relative
25 to transfer into eggs, would be a relatively minor route of PCB elimination.
26 Because only 2.4% of PCBs were metabolized in pheasants over the 28-day
27 study, inclusion of an even lower rate of metabolism in the wood duck egg
28 concentration model would produce negligible improvement in its predictive
29 capability.

30 Therefore, EPA believes that no change to the egg concentration model is
31 required because:

- 32 ▪ No data on wood duck-specific PCB metabolism are available.
- 33 ▪ Metabolism is a minor elimination route for PCBs in pheasants and other
34 bird species.
- 35 ▪ Female wood ducks transfer far more PCB burden into eggs than would
36 be removed by metabolism.
- 37 ▪ Measured TEQ concentrations in wood duck eggs collected from the PSA
38 (n=5) were close to the predictions of the egg concentration model
39 (Section G.2.1.10.3 of the November 2004 ERA), further confirming that
40 metabolism is a minor PCB removal mechanism.

ERA Responsiveness Summary

References:

- 1 Dahlgren, R.B., Y.A. Greichus, R.L. Linder. 1971. Storage and excretion of
2 polychlorinated biphenyls in the pheasant. *Journal of Wildlife Management*.
3 35(4):823-828.
4
- 5 DARDNI (Department of Agriculture and Rural Development Northern Ireland)
6 2005. Poultry. <http://www.ruralni.gov.uk/livestock/poultry/incubation/incubat1.htm>
7 Accessed February 16, 2005.
- 8 Ehrlich, P., D. Dobkin, and D. Wheye. 1988. *The Birders Handbook: A Field*
9 *Guide to the Natural History of North American Birds*. Simon and Schuster
10 Inc., New York.
- 11 Grice, D. and J.P. Rogers. 1965. *The Wood Duck in Massachusetts*. Final
12 Report. Massachusetts Division of Fisheries and Game. Federal Aid in
13 Wildlife Restoration Project No. W-19-R.
- 14 Landers, J.L., T.T. Fendley, and A.S. Johnson. 1977. Feeding ecology of wood
15 ducks in South Carolina. *J. Wildlife Management* 41:118-127.
- 16 Martin and Nelson. 1952 Every one counts. *Sports Afield*. September, pp. 17-23.
- 17 Nichols, J.W., C.P. Larsen, M.E. McDonald, G.J. Niemi, and G.T. Ankley. 1995.
18 Bioenergetics-based model for accumulation of polychlorinated biphenyls by
19 nesting tree swallows, *Tachycineta bicolor*. *Environmental Science and*
20 *Technology* 29:604-612.

4.2 Change in Designated Evidence of Harm to Tree Swallows

22 As in the July 2003 draft of the ERA, the November 2004 ERA uses two lines of evidence to
23 evaluate potential risks to tree swallows – a field study conducted by Custer (2002) and
24 measured exposure and effects (i.e., HQ). The most important change made to the tree swallow
25 assessment endpoint is the change from “no” to “yes” for the evidence of harm assigned to the
26 tree swallow field study. Based on the EPA Responsiveness Summary (EPA 2004b, pp. 46, 48,
27 235, 238, 243), it appears that this change was made in response to comments by two peer
28 reviewers (reviewers LaPoint and Sample), even though the majority of the peer reviewers did
29 not disagree with the July 2003 ERA’s characterization of this study (see EPA 2004b, pp. 235-
30 236, 238, 247-248).

31 Because the underlying study itself was not changed since the July 2003 version of the ERA, the
32 change in evidence of harm (from “no” to “yes”) must be based on a change in the interpretation
33 of that study. However, the text that precedes the risk characterization for tree swallows
34 continues to indicate that the study does not in fact provide evidence of harm. For example, the
35 ERA states that “the tree swallow reproduction study (Custer 2002) indicated that tree swallows
36 did not experience serious adverse effects, despite high tissue concentrations of tPCBs and TEQ
37 in nestlings in the PSA locations. The fecundity of tree swallows in the PSA was not

ERA Responsiveness Summary

1 significantly different from that of tree swallows generally in central Massachusetts as reported
2 by Chapman (1955)” (EPA 2004a, Vol. 2, p. 7-60). Elsewhere, the ERA states that “fecundity of
3 tree swallows in the PSA seemed to be unaffected by contaminants” (EPA 2004a, Vol. 5, p. G-
4 67). Similarly, after acknowledging that the robin field study provides no evidence of adverse
5 effects, the ERA reports that “the tree swallow field study similarly suggests this species does
6 not experience serious adverse effects” (EPA 2004a, Vol. 5, p. G-112).

7 Given these statements, the ERA’s change in conclusion must be based on giving greater
8 importance to the two findings in the tree swallow study that the ERA indicates may suggest
9 effects. Those findings, however, do not demonstrate evidence of harm. First, the ERA notes
10 that there was a “significant negative relationship between tPCBs in eggs and hatching success in
11 1999” (EPA 2004a, Volume 5, p. G-66). Despite a p-value less than 0.05, however, this finding
12 should not be considered statistically significant result because it relies on flawed application of
13 logistic regression. Custer (2002, p. 14) defined a good fit of the model to the data as a
14 Goodness of Fit (GOF) with $p > 0.05$. Because a GOF at that level was not attained ($p = 0.028$,
15 Custer 2002, p. 21), the logistic regression should not have been used to draw conclusions
16 regarding the effects of exposure to PCBs on hatching success. Although Custer (2002) and the
17 ERA did state that the quality of the fit was poor, neither report adequately discounted the
18 relationship between PCB exposure and hatching success given that poor fit. Furthermore, based
19 on an R^2 value of 0.06, the relationship between tPCBs in eggs and hatching success was
20 extremely weak; that is, differences in PCB concentrations accounted for only 6% of the
21 variability observed in hatching success.

22 Second, one might infer evidence of harm from the observation that clutches with dead embryos
23 had geometric mean concentrations that “exceeded the field-based threshold of 62.2 mg/kg ww
24 tPCBs in eggs established from the studies by McCarthy and Secord (1999a, 1999b)” (EPA
25 2004a, Vol. 5, p. G-68). Such an inference is flawed because it compares concentrations across
26 different age classes. Contrary to the above quote, McCarty and Secord’s (1999a) threshold of
27 62.2 mg/kg is based on mean 14-day nestling concentrations in 1994, rather than egg
28 concentrations: “[c]oncentrations in nestlings ranged from 3,710 ng/g at Saratoga to 39,800 ng/g
29 at Special Area 13 and 62,200 ng/g at the Remnant site (all PCB concentrations from Secord et
30 al., unpublished data)” (McCarty and Secord 1999a, p. 1433), and “[t]ree swallow nestlings were
31 collected for chemical analysis from the same nests...on day 14 (1994) or day 15 (1995)
32 posthatch (Secord et al. 1999, p. 2520).

33 The piper and nestling tissue measurements presented in the ERA clearly demonstrate
34 differences in concentrations of PCBs between hatching and nestling development (EPA 2004a,
35 Vol. 2, pp. 7-32, 7-33; Vol. 5, Tables G.2-6, G.2-19, G.2-20, G.2-21, G.2-22, G.2-23). Thus, the
36 ERA’s comparison of measured concentrations of PCBs in eggs to a literature-based benchmark
37 for nestling concentrations does not provide defensible evidence of risk. Regardless of the
38 finding, such comparisons are only relevant to the HQ line of evidence and should not be used in
39 the interpretation of a field study.

40 For these reasons, the tree swallow field study does not provide any reliable evidence of harm to
41 tree swallows. GE believes that EPA should reverse the change in the evidence-of-harm
42 designation in order to ensure that the risk findings are fully supported by the underlying study.

ERA Responsiveness Summary

1 In addition, EPA should eliminate or correct the language comparing egg concentrations in the
2 field study to the McCarty and Secord (1999a,b) effect metric for nestlings.

3 **RESPONSE GE-22:** The comment above and the many quotes from the
4 November 2004 ERA cited therein can be responded to in a single summary
5 statement: EPA believes that the results of the tree swallow field study (Custer
6 2002) provide evidence of harm, but that the magnitude of harm is expected to
7 be low. As discussed in ERA Section G.4.2.2, the primary evidence for this
8 conclusion comes from the following results:

- 9 ▪ There was a significant relationship between tPCB concentrations in eggs
10 and hatching success in 1999 ($p=0.044$), though the relationship was not
11 strong. No significant relationship was observed in 2000.
- 12 ▪ In 1998 and 1999, clutches that contained dead embryos had significantly
13 higher concentrations of tPCBs than those that hatched normally
14 ($p<0.001$).
- 15 ▪ EROD activity was significantly induced at locations along the main stem
16 of the Housatonic River compared to Threemile Pond. This result is not
17 an indicator of harm, but rather provides supporting evidence that PCBs
18 and other dioxin-like chemicals are contributing to the observed, albeit
19 minor, effects on hatching success.

20 As noted in the GE comment, two Peer Reviewers (Sample and LaPoint)
21 suggested that the results of the tree swallow field study did provide evidence of
22 harm, even if the harm was not severe. EPA found these comments to be
23 persuasive, and because of these comments, and also the Panel comments to
24 review the entire weight-of-evidence to ensure consistency, revised the
25 November 2004 ERA accordingly. The remaining reviewers did not comment on
26 whether they agreed or disagreed with the July 2003 ERA conclusion that the
27 tree swallow field study did not provide evidence of harm. The remaining
28 reviewers, as well as Sample, however, generally agreed with the conclusion of
29 low risk for tree swallows that was presented in the July 2003 ERA. That
30 conclusion was not changed in the November 2004 ERA.

31 The GE comment notes that the logistic regression conducted by Custer (2002)
32 for hatching success versus tPCB concentrations in eggs did not pass the
33 goodness-of-fit test. This is not unexpected given the wide scatter in the data
34 and the weak relationship between tPCB concentration in eggs and hatching
35 success. The results of goodness-of-fit tests should be used with caution
36 (Aldenberg et al. 2002) and should not be the sole criterion for selecting a
37 regression model or fitted distribution (EPA 1999). Equally, or more important is
38 to graphically evaluate the fit of a model to the data (EPA 1999). Examination of
39 Figure 4 in Custer (2002) indicates that the logistic model fits the data reasonably
40 well. Further, the data do not systematically depart from the model for any given
41 concentration range. Given these considerations, EPA believes that the results

ERA Responsiveness Summary

1 of the logistic model shown in Figure 4 of Custer (2002) may be used in the ERA
2 for tree swallows.

3 EPA acknowledges that the comparison of egg concentrations for tree swallows
4 in the PSA to the effect metric from McCarty and Secord (1999) involves a
5 comparison across different life stages. This comparison was considered
6 ancillary evidence in the November 2004 ERA, and was not used in the weight-
7 of-evidence determination of risk.

8 **References:**

9 Aldenberg, T., J.S. Jaworska and T.P. Traas. 2002. Normal species sensitivity
10 distributions and probabilistic ecological risk assessment. In: *Species*
11 *Sensitivity Distributions in Ecotoxicology*. Posthuma, L., G.W. Suter and T.P.
12 Traas, eds. Lewis Publishers, Boca Raton, FL. pp. 49-102.

13 Custer, C.M. 2002. *Exposure and Effects of Chemical Contaminants on Tree*
14 *Swallows Nesting Along the Housatonic River, Berkshire Co., Massachusetts,*
15 *1998-2000*. Final report to U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. USGS,
16 Upper Midwest Environmental Sciences Center, La Crosse, WI.

17 EPA (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency). 1999. *Risk Assessment Guidance*
18 *for Superfund: Volume 3 – Part A, Process for Conducting Probabilistic Risk*
19 *Assessment*. Solid Waste and Emergency Response, U.S. Environmental
20 Protection Agency, Washington, D.C.

21 McCarty, J.P. and A.L. Secord. 1999. Reproductive ecology of tree swallows
22 (*Tachycineta bicolor*) with high levels of polychlorinated biphenyl
23 contamination. *Environmental Toxicology and Chemistry* 18:1433-1439.

24 **5. Survival, Growth and Reproduction of Piscivorous Mammals**

25 The primary change to the assessment of survival, growth, and reproduction of piscivorous
26 mammals in the November 2004 ERA consists of the addition of a new probit analysis to assess
27 the dose-response curve for 6-week kit survival from EPA's mink feeding study (EPA 2004a,
28 Vol. 6, p. I-52). This analysis is in addition to the statistical analysis, using analysis of variance
29 (ANOVA), performed by the study investigators (Bursian et al. 2003) and reported in the July
30 2003 draft ERA. This analysis has resulted in the development of a new PCB MATC of 0.98
31 mg/kg (EPA 2004a, Vol. 6, p. I-106), to replace the MATC of 2.65 mg/kg in the July 2003 draft
32 (which was the geometric mean of the LOAEL and NOAEL reported by Bursian et al. (2003)).
33 As discussed below, this new MATC does not adequately reflect the spread of the kit survival
34 results across treatments, which show no evident dose-response relationship, and is inconsistent
35 with the site-specific NOAEL from the study. Moreover, the ERA's use of literature data from
36 other sites to support this new MATC is inappropriate due primarily to differences in toxicity
37 between the PCB test mixtures used in the selected literature studies and the PCB mixture
38 present in the Housatonic River area.

ERA Responsiveness Summary

1 **RESPONSE GE-23:** EPA's responses to the issues summarized in the
2 paragraph above are provided following the more detailed technical comments
3 below.

4 At the outset, it should be noted that the new probit analysis presented in the November 2004
5 ERA was not recommended by the peer reviewers. One peer reviewer (Thompson) noted that
6 EPA should address GE's comment that no dose-response relationship was demonstrated in the
7 mink feeding study (EPA 2004b, p. 277), and another reviewer (Stahl) indicated that there was
8 no definitive dose-response relationship between kit survival and PCB concentrations in fish
9 (EPA, 2004b, p. 291). These reviewers, however, did not suggest the type of analysis that EPA
10 has now conducted. Further, the majority of the peer reviewers agreed that the July 2003 ERA's
11 presentation and analysis of the mink feeding study were appropriate (EPA 2004b, pp. 282-285).
12 While GE had commented that the identified LOAEL from the study (3.7 mg/kg in diet) should
13 in fact be a NOAEL (BBL et al. 2003, pp. 10-3 - 10-4 & Attachment N), the peer reviewers were
14 satisfied with the NOAEL and MATC derived in the July 2003 ERA (EPA 2003, Vol. 2, p. 9-78;
15 Vol. 6, p. I-83). Moreover, in the Responsiveness Summary, EPA asserted that the statistical
16 analysis (ANOVA) used by Bursian et al. (2003) and presented in the July 2003 draft ERA "is a
17 reasonable methodology given the design of the study (EPA 2004b, p. 49). Nevertheless, EPA
18 has conducted a new probit analysis of the 6-week kit survival data that has resulted in estimated
19 values of LC10 (0.231 mg/kg in diet) and LC20 (0.984 mg/kg in diet) that are well below EPA's
20 statistically determined NOAEL from the study (1.6 mg/kg in diet). The EPA has used the LC20
21 value of 0.984 mg/kg in fish as the new MATC for PCBs (EPA 2004a, Vol. 2, p. 9-51; Vol. 6, p.
22 I-106).

23 **RESPONSE GE-24:** Those Peer Reviewers who commented directly on the
24 statistical analysis used in the July 2003 ERA for the mink feeding study
25 expressed a range of comments, including:

- 26 ▪ Sample stated that "it is unfortunate that the dose range used in the study
27 did not extend to one or possibly two higher doses. These higher doses
28 would have likely produced more severe effects and would have
29 strengthened the overall dose-response relationships." (ERA
30 Responsiveness Summary, p. 271).
- 31 ▪ Thompson stated that "with the caveat of needing to look again at GE's
32 comments on dose/response – this is a very well done study ..." (p. 285).
- 33 ▪ Stahl stated that "there is no definitive dose-response relationship
34 between kit survival and tPCB content of the fish ..." (p. 291).

35 No other Peer Reviewers commented directly on the statistical analysis (ANOVA)
36 used in the July 2003 ERA to analyze the mink feeding study results. Reviewers
37 commented in general that other statistical methods should be considered in the
38 revision of the ERA, and EPA agreed to do so in the Responsiveness Summary
39 (see response to General Issue 1.C). Further, in written comments to the Peer
40 Review Panel (Attachment N, Comments of General Electric Company on the
41 Ecological Risk Assessment for the General Electric/Housatonic River Site, Rest
42 of River [July 2003 Draft]) and in their presentation at the Peer Review Public

ERA Responsiveness Summary

1 Meeting, GE's consultants were highly critical of the ANOVA conducted on the
2 mink feeding study results and expressed the opinion that they did not believe
3 that there was evidence of a dose-response relationship.

4 In response to the comments from the Peer Reviewers, including those to
5 address GE's expressed concerns, EPA committed in the ERA Responsiveness
6 Summary (response to General Issue 15.B, p. 49) to conduct a regression
7 analysis. A regression analysis more directly tests whether there is a dose-
8 response relationship than does an ANOVA, and, as described in the ERA
9 Responsiveness Summary, "The regression analysis will allow for a better
10 discussion of the relationship between the dose-response from the mink feeding
11 study and the dose-response presented in the ERA from published Aroclor 1254
12 feeding studies, as these analyses would then be more directly comparable.
13 This will provide for better use of the mink feeding study data in the risk
14 characterization, as was noted by one Reviewer." (Responsiveness Summary, p.
15 49).

16 A probit analysis assuming an underlying binomial error distribution is the
17 standard regression technique for analyzing toxicity test results for quantal
18 endpoints (e.g., mortality of kits) (Bailer and Oris 1997), and was the technique
19 employed to further explore the comments regarding the dose-response
20 relationship.

21 In addition, in the Responsiveness Summary (response to General Issue 6.D, p.
22 21), EPA agreed with Peer Reviewer comments that MATCs be derived only
23 from study results that demonstrated a dose-response relationship. Consistent
24 with this commitment, it was logical to use the results of the probit analysis
25 conducted for kit survival from 0 to 6 weeks in the mink feeding study, which did
26 show a statistically significant dose-response relationship, to develop the MATC
27 for piscivorous mammals. MATCs are generally used as an estimate of the
28 threshold concentration above which effects are expected to occur. For the
29 piscivorous mammals MATC, EPA set the MATC equal to the LC₂₀ from the
30 probit analysis (no safety factors were used to adjust this value). A concentration
31 that results in 20% lethality (a component of the definition of the threshold break
32 between low and intermediate risk used in the ERA for multiple endpoints)
33 exceeds what would typically be considered by EPA as a maximum acceptable
34 threshold value for effects for a species such as mink.

35 Reference:


36 Bailer, A.J. and J.T. Oris. 1997. Estimating inhibition concentrations for different
37 response scales using generalized linear models. *Environmental Toxicology*
38 *and Chemistry* 16:1554-1559.

39 While the probit analysis conducted by EPA for the 6-week survival results from the mink
40 feeding study was found to be significant (based on a p value of 0.0021), it is apparent, based on
41 Figure I.3-4 of the ERA, that the probit curve and in particular the confidence intervals do not

ERA Responsiveness Summary

1 adequately reflect the data given the spread in results across all treatment groups. As shown in
2 Figure 5.1 below, the mink data are highly variable, and no dose-response is evident, especially
3 given that the second highest treatment group had the highest survivability for the 6-week kit
4 survivability endpoint. Moreover, the NOAEL determined by ANOVA provides a measured
5 threshold dose while the probit analysis provides a modeled or estimated dose. Given the
6 inconsistency between the probit curve and the underlying data, and the fact that the probit
7 analysis results are not consistent with previously conducted statistical analysis for the data, it is
8 inappropriate to use this analysis to estimate an LC20 and/or a MATC value for mink.

9 **Figure 5.1. Summary of Six Week Kit Mortality by Treatment**



10

11 **RESPONSE GE-25:** As is often the case in toxicity tests such as the mink
12 feeding study where the replication within treatment involves proportion mortality
13 (or survival) among a limited number of individuals (median = 5 live-born kits),
14 there is much intra-treatment variability for survival of mink kits from 0 to 6 weeks
15 of age. However, if the sample size is high (n [treatments x replicates] = 58 for
16 mink feeding study) and there is a relationship between the response and
17 independent variables, regression analysis will detect a significant dose-
18 response relationship in spite of the high intra-treatment variability. This was the
19 case with kit survival from 0 to 6 weeks in the mink feeding study. Figure I.3-4 in
20 the November 2004 ERA shows the fitted probit model as well as the scatter of
21 the data.

22 The GE comment regarding confidence limits reflects a common
23 misunderstanding about what confidence limits represent. They do **not**
24 represent the bounds within which 95% of data points are expected to fall, as
25 implied in the GE comment. The confidence limits shown in Figure I.3-4

ERA Responsiveness Summary

1 represent, as they do for any regression analysis, the 95% confidence limits
2 about the estimated mean. A 95% confidence interval around an arithmetic
3 mean implies that 95% of the intervals calculated from repeated sampling of a
4 population will include the unknown (true) arithmetic mean (Warren-Hicks and
5 Moore 1998). Thus, if sample size is high and model fit is reasonable,
6 confidence intervals can be narrow even with much data scatter.

7 The comment that the ANOVA results are preferred over the results of the
8 regression analysis for expressing the results from toxicity testing is counter to
9 the recent scientific literature on the topic. A synopsis of this topic follows.

10 The use of NOAELs or LOAELs as the basis for estimating "no effects" levels
11 has been criticized (Stephan and Rogers 1985; Bruce and Versteeg 1992;
12 Hoeckstra and Van Ewijk 1993; Pack 1993; Suter 1996; Chapman et al. 1996;
13 Moore and Caux 1997) for a variety of reasons including:

- 14 ▪ Hypothesis testing procedures clearly state the α value (Type I error) but
15 generally leave the β value (Type II error) unconstrained meaning that the
16 typical test will err on the side of stating that there is no toxicity present
17 even when it is (Type II error) (Peterman and M'Gonigle 1992).
- 18 ▪ The NOAEL and LOAEL are always test levels and do not necessarily
19 correspond to biologically relevant thresholds or specified effects levels.
- 20 ▪ Poor experimental design (e.g., small sample size, improper spacing of
21 treatment doses, large intra-treatment variance) can mistakenly indicate
22 that the substance is less toxic than it really is (Stephan and Rogers 1985;
23 Suter et al. 1987; Barnthouse et al. 1987).
- 24 ▪ Most of the information in the dose-response curve (e.g., the slope,
25 confidence limits) is lost and thus the investigator has no means of
26 evaluating the test results, and cannot, for example, use the results to
27 estimate risks of differing severity.

28 An alternative for estimating low toxic effects is the regression-based approach.
29 This approach involves fitting a regression model equation (e.g., probit, logistic)
30 to toxicity test results to estimate the dose-response function and then
31 interpolating or extrapolating to the effect level of interest (e.g., LC_{20}). The
32 analysis may be done by means of a non-linear regression or a weighted linear
33 regression on transformed data (Nyholm et al. 1992). Some of the major
34 advantages of the approach over hypothesis testing for estimating low toxic
35 effects include:

- 36 ▪ It is a well-defined procedure for interpolation of effects to untested
37 concentrations.
- 38 ▪ Test statistics can determine whether model fit is adequate and whether
39 the assumptions of the analysis have been met, thus precluding the use of
40 poor quality information or inappropriate models.

ERA Responsiveness Summary

- 1 ▪ All of the information in the dose-response curve is used in the analysis
2 (Stephan and Rogers 1985; Bruce and Versteeg 1992; Pack 1993).

3 For the above reasons (also see Response GE-24), EPA believes that the LC₂₀
4 from the probit analysis is responsive to the Peer Review Panel comments, is
5 scientifically valid, and preferable to the NOAEL and LOAEL derived from the
6 ANOVA conducted on kit survival from 0 to 6 weeks.

7 **References:**

8 Barnthouse, L.W., G.W. Suter, A.E. Rosen and J.J. Beauchamp. 1987.
9 Estimating responses of fish populations to toxic contaminants.
10 *Environmental Toxicology and Chemistry* 6:811-824.

11 Bruce, R.D. and D.J. Versteeg. 1992. A statistical procedure for modeling
12 continuous toxicity data. *Environmental Toxicology and Chemistry* 11:1485-
13 1494.

14 Chapman, P.M., R.S. Caldwell and P.F. Chapman. 1996. A warning: NOECs are
15 inappropriate for regulatory use. *Environmental Toxicology and Chemistry*
16 15:77-79.

17 Hoeckstra, J.A. and P.H. Van Ewijk. 1993. Alternatives for the no-observed-effect
18 level. *Environmental Toxicology and Chemistry* 12:187-194.

19 Nyholm, N., P.S. Sorensen and K.O. Kusk. 1992. Statistical treatment of data
20 from microbial toxicity tests. *Environmental Toxicology and Chemistry* 11:157-
21 167.

22 Moore, D.R.J. and P.-Y. Caux. 1997. Estimating low toxic effects. *Environmental*
23 *Toxicology and Chemistry* 16:794-801.

24 Pack, S. 1993. A review of statistical data analysis and experimental design in
25 OECD aquatic toxicology test guidelines. Unpublished report, Shell Research
26 Ltd., Sittingbourne Research Centre, Sittingborne, Kent, U.K. 42 p.

27 Peterman, R.M. and M. M'Gonigle. 1992. Statistical power analysis and the
28 precautionary principle. *Marine Pollution Bulletin* 24:231-234.

29 Stephan, C.E. and J.W. Rogers. 1985. Advantages of using regression analysis
30 to calculate results of chronic toxicity tests. In R.C. Bahner and D.J. Hansen,
31 eds., *Aquatic Toxicology and Hazard Assessment*. STP 891. American
32 Society for Testing and Materials, Philadelphia. pp. 328-338.

33 Suter, G.W. 1996. Abuse of hypothesis testing statistics in ecological risk
34 assessment. *Human and Ecological Risk Assessment* 2:331-347.

ERA Responsiveness Summary

1 Suter, G.W., A.E. Rosen, E. Linder and D.F. Parkhurst. 1987. Endpoints for
2 responses of fish to chronic toxic exposures. *Environmental Toxicology and*
3 *Chemistry* 6:793-809.

4 Warren-Hicks, W.J. and D.R.J. Moore (eds). 1998. *Uncertainty Analysis in*
5 *Ecological Risk Assessment*. SETAC Press, Pensacola, FL.

6 In addition to the probit analysis, to support the new MATC, the ERA argues that that MATC
7 should not be considered conservative because it is above similar metrics from other mink
8 feeding studies (EPA 2004a, Vol. 6, p. I-106). This statement is based on a comparison of the
9 MATC to one observed LOAEL from the literature (Heaton et al. 1995) and to the literature-
10 based TRV developed in the ERA for comparison to modeled food chain exposure. This TRV in
11 turn was based on an LC20 that EPA derived from the literature using a dose-response analysis
12 of combined doses from studies reported in two other papers (Aulerich and Ringer 1977,
13 Aulerich et al. 1985)³. As discussed below, the ERA's comparison is completely inappropriate
14 and lends no additional credibility to the new MATC value.

15 The Heaton et al. (1995) study involved mink that were fed Saginaw Bay fish, which contain a
16 PCB mixture different from that in Housatonic River fish as well as other contaminants (e.g.,
17 dioxin). The other two papers used for TRV development (Aulerich and Ringer 1977, Aulerich et
18 al 1985) included studies conducted with a variety of individual PCB congeners and mixtures.
19 The Aulerich and Ringer (1977) paper summarized multiple studies which utilized Great Lakes
20 or marine fish containing PCBs and other contaminants, non-weathered Aroclor 1254,
21 combinations of Aroclor 1254 and pesticides, and other non-weathered Aroclors (1016, 1221,
22 and 1242). The Aulerich et al (1985) study evaluated the effects of non-weathered Aroclor 1254
23 as well as three individual PCB congeners (136, 153 and 169). While the EPA was not explicit
24 about which specific treatments from the two Aulerich papers were included in the development
25 of the dose-response curve used to determine the LC20, none of the data sets included in these
26 papers represents a weathered mixture similar to the Housatonic River fish. Due to these
27 differences, these studies are not suitable for comparison to the feeding study using Housatonic
28 River fish.

29 The ERA itself acknowledges that “most of the difference in results between the Saginaw Bay . .
30 . and Housatonic River mink feeding studies is due to the reduced absorption and toxicity of the
31 congener mixture in the Housatonic River fish” (EPA 2004a, Vol. 6, p. I- 62). EPA also
32 acknowledged in the Responsiveness Summary that “the contaminant mixture present in the PSA
33 appears to be less toxic than observed at other sites” (EPA 2004b, Response 3.6-BS-5, p. 271),

³ Use of these two papers to develop the literature-based dose-response curve for mink represents a change from the July 2003 draft ERA, which stated that the two acceptable studies for developing such a curve were Bleavins et al. (1980) and Aulerich et al. (1985) (EPA 2003, Vol. 6, p. I-53). In the November 2004 ERA, Bleavins et al. (1980) is apparently no longer considered acceptable, while Aulerich and Ringer (1977) is now considered acceptable (EPA 2004a, Vol. 6, p. I-67). As a result, a new dose-response curve has been fit, and slightly revised (lower) tPCB TRVs have been derived (EPA 2004a, Vol. 6, p. I-67). No explanation is given for this change and none of the peer reviewers commented on this.

ERA Responsiveness Summary

1 demonstrating further the limited utility of literature derived toxicity thresholds and the
2 importance of site-specific studies for the mink evaluation.

3 **RESPONSE GE-26:** EPA acknowledges that the congener mixture at any other
4 site will differ from that present in the Housatonic River. Those differences were
5 acknowledged and discussed in detail in the November 2004 ERA (Section
6 I.3.2.5, p. I-60 to I-62), comparing the results of the mink feeding studies
7 conducted for the Housatonic River to those conducted for Saginaw Bay.

8 The comment from GE incorrectly asserts that, “the EPA was not explicit about
9 which specific treatments from the two Aulerich papers were included in the
10 development of the dose-response curve used to determine the LC₂₀.” In Section
11 I.3.3.2, p. I-67, of the November 2004 ERA, EPA stated that, “the derivation of a
12 dose-response relationship for fecundity was further refined to include only those
13 studies that had PCB mixtures with at least 54% chlorine content ...” In addition,
14 the first sentence of ERA Section I.3.3.2 indicates that development of a dose-
15 response curve for tPCBs would focus on studies conducted with “mink exposed
16 to Aroclor 1254.” The PCB treatments used in the dose-response modeling for
17 mink contained only Aroclor 1254. These treatments and the control treatments
18 used in the dose-response modeling can be found in Tables 7, 9, and 10 of
19 Aulerich and Ringer (1977) and Table 5 of Aulerich et al. (1985).

20 As is the case with the Saginaw Bay congener mixture, the congener
21 composition of Aroclor 1254 will differ from the weathered mixture of Aroclor
22 1260 and 1254 found in fish from the Housatonic River PSA. There is also,
23 however, considerable overlap in congener composition. It is for this reason that
24 MATCs at other PCB-contaminated sites (e.g., Calcasieu Estuary in Louisiana)
25 have typically relied on the published results from feeding studies using
26 commercial Aroclors. Thus, it is reasonable to compare the results of the
27 Saginaw Bay, Aroclor 1254, and Housatonic River mink feeding studies, as long
28 as the differences between the studies are acknowledged and considered. As
29 noted above, this was done in the ERA.

30 The comparison of the results of the Saginaw Bay, Aroclor 1254, and Housatonic
31 River mink feeding studies indicate that the LC₂₀ for tPCBs from the Housatonic
32 River study (0.984 mg/kg tPCBs) was higher than the LOAEL from the Saginaw
33 Bay study (0.72 mg/kg tPCBs) and the LC₂₀ from the Aroclor 1254 studies (0.248
34 mg/kg tPCBs). In light of the discussion in Section I.3.2.5 of the November 2004
35 ERA, this result is not surprising, and further indicates that the MATC derived for
36 the Housatonic River is not overly conservative. First, the MATC is equivalent to
37 the concentration that would be expected to cause 20% reduced survival of mink
38 kits from 0 to 6 weeks. In addition, no safety factors were used to adjust the LC₂₀
39 to a concentration expected to cause no effect, as is traditionally done in nearly
40 all ecological risk assessments. Finally, the Housatonic River MATC is higher
41 than corresponding results from other mink feeding studies, as the data indicate
42 and as noted by GE in the comment above.

ERA Responsiveness Summary

References:

Aulerich, R.J. and R.K. Ringer. 1977. Current status of PCB toxicity to mink, and effect on their reproduction. *Archives of Environmental Contamination and Toxicology* 6:279-292.

Aulerich, R.J., S.J. Bursian, W.J. Breslin, B.A. Olson and R.K. Ringer. 1985. Toxicological manifestations of 2,4,5-, 2',4',5'-, 2,3,6,2',3',6'-, and 3,4,5,3',4',5'-hexachlorobiphenyl and Aroclor 1254 in mink. *Journal of Toxicology and Environmental Health* 15:63-79.

For the above reasons EPA should not base the MATC for mink on the new probit analysis. Instead, while GE preserves its prior position that the mink feeding study did not show effects even at the highest dose, GE believes that basing the MATC on the geometric mean of the NOAEL and LOAEL values reported by Bursian et al. (2003) is more supportable and consistent with the underlying data than is the new MATC.

RESPONSE GE-27: Based on the rationale provided in the Responsiveness Summary to the Peer Review, the November 2004 revised ERA, and the responses to GE's comments above, EPA believes that the MATC for mink is fully supported by the data, consistent with sound scientific practice, and responsive to the comments of the Peer Review Panel.

6. Survival, Growth and Reproduction of Omnivorous and Carnivorous Mammals

The primary change to the assessment of survival, growth, and reproduction of omnivorous and carnivorous mammals is the development of a PCB MATC based on a new regression analysis of the data from the site-specific short-tailed shrew demography study. In addition, the language describing the results of EPA's supplemental statistical analysis of the short-tailed shrew data has been changed to de-emphasize the weakness of the statistical results; and the conclusion in the weight of evidence has also changed from "undetermined" to "yes." As discussed below, these changes fail to appropriately recognize the substantial uncertainty of the new MATC and of EPA's statistical results and the weakness of any apparent relationship between PCB exposure and effects on shrew survival.

No MATC was provided in the July 2003 ERA. In the November 2004 ERA, a MATC is derived based on a hockey stick regression between the arithmetic mean of tPCB concentrations in soil and shrew survival (EPA 2004a, Vol. 1, p. 10-43; Vol. 6, p. J-82, J- 91, Figure J.4-9). In fact, this hockey stick regression can only be used with the arithmetic mean soil tPCB concentrations. If the spatially weighted average tPCB concentrations are used, the highest sediment tPCB concentration does not have the highest mortality (i.e., no evidence of an exposure-response relationship between tPCBs and mortality), and therefore the shape of the curve would not support a hockey stick regression (see EPA 2004a, Vol. 6, Figures J.3-8 and Figures J.3-9). The fact that the hockey stick regression can only be fit to the data based on one of the two exposure scenarios illustrates the weakness of any apparent PCB-related response. As a result, the MATC resulting from this analysis should be considered uncertain. In these circumstances, the ERA

ERA Responsiveness Summary

1 should be revised to explicitly acknowledge that the regression only works with one of the two
2 exposure scenarios and to recognize the consequent weakness of any exposure-response
3 relationship and the uncertainties associated with using this analysis as the basis for the MATC.

4 **RESPONSE GE-28:** The hockey stick regression model for shrew mortality can
5 be fit to spatially weighted average tPCB concentrations in soil. The fit of the
6 model ($p=0.051$), however, is weaker than was the case for the model that used
7 measured average tPCB concentration in soil ($p=0.0012$). Probit analyses
8 presented by EPA in the July 2003 (Section J.4.3.4.6) ERA and November 2004
9 (Section J.3.3.4.6) ERA “indicated a significant relationship between the spatially
10 weighted mean concentration of tPCBs in soil and survival of shrews” for males,
11 females, and males and females combined. Similar results were obtained using
12 mean measured concentrations of tPCBs in soil. The preponderance of
13 evidence thus indicates that there is a relationship between tPCB concentration
14 in soil and shrew survival. Even so, there is an acknowledgement in Section
15 J.3.3.4.6 that the results of the regression analyses may have been influenced
16 “by habitat differences among the grids, small sample sizes, the effects of
17 flooding, the analytical methods used to measure tPCBs, and the relatively small
18 number of treatments.” Because the hockey stick regression model using
19 measured average tPCB concentration produced a better model fit than did the
20 model using spatially weighted average tPCB concentration, the former was used
21 in MATC development.

22 In addition, the language used in the November 2004 ERA to describe the results of the EPA
23 reanalysis of data from the shrew demography study has been changed. The July 2003 ERA
24 acknowledged that, although EPA’s supplemental analysis found a significant relationship
25 between concentrations of tPCBs in soil and survival of shrews from summer to autumn for
26 males, females, and males and females together, the relationship was not strong (EPA 2003, Vol.
27 1, p. 10-54; Vol. 6, J-57, J-58). The text also indicated that because the slope of the regression
28 model is not steep (EPA 2003, Vol. 6, Figures J.3-8 and J.3-9), survival was “only slightly
29 reduced at the ‘high’ contaminated grids compared to the ‘low’ contaminated grids” (EPA 2003,
30 Vol. 6, p. J-58). By contrast, the current text simply indicates that there was a significant
31 relationship and that, based on the regression model, survival was reduced in the “high”
32 contaminated grids compared to the “low” contaminated grids (ERA 2004a, Vol. 2, p. 10-32;
33 Vol. 6, p. J-55).

34 This change in language substantially affects how the strength of EPA’s reanalysis of the shrew
35 survival data is communicated in the ERA. This revision is contrary to the spirit of the comments
36 made by several of the peer reviewers, who indicated that the results of the shrew reanalysis
37 were uncertain. For example, one peer reviewer (Forbes) stated that, “[g]iven the dependence of
38 the statistical significance on subtle differences between two (seemingly) appropriate statistical
39 methods, the most robust conclusion that can be made from this study is that the response is
40 borderline” (EPA 2004b, p. 294). Other peer reviewers (Sample and Thompson) commented that
41 while the Boonstra and EPA statistical analyses are different, both should be presented (EPA
42 2004b, pp. 297, 298), with reviewer Thompson noting that “[b]ottom line is that response is not
43 strong” (EPA 2004b, p. 298). The change in language is also inconsistent with the statement

ERA Responsiveness Summary

1 made in the Responsiveness Summary that EPA “concur with the comment that the conclusion
2 from this study is that the dose-response relationships were not strong” (EPA 2004b, p. 52).

3 **RESPONSE GE-29:** As noted in Response GE-28, there is acknowledgement in
4 ERA Section J.3.3.4.6 that the results of the EPA regression analyses may have
5 been influenced “by habitat differences among the grids, small sample sizes, the
6 effects of flooding, the analytical methods used to measure tPCBs, and the
7 relatively small number of treatments.” Further, as recommended by the majority
8 of Peer Reviewers, both the Boonstra and EPA statistical analyses were
9 presented in the November 2004 ERA (see Section J.3.3.4), and both analyses
10 were compared and discussed in detail in Section J.4.3. For the reasons
11 outlined in ERA Section J.4.3, EPA believes that the supplemental analyses
12 conducted are correct and make better use of the data than did the Boonstra
13 analyses. This opinion was supported by two Panel members (Section 3.7(b) of
14 Responsiveness Summary). Presentation of both sets of analyses in the ERA
15 provides readers with the ability to compare and evaluate the EPA and Boonstra
16 analyses.

17 Although the differences between the statistical analyses are discussed (EPA 2004a, Vol. 6, p. J-
18 66), the uncertainties associated with the statistical analyses – and not just the uncertainties
19 associated with the study itself (EPA 2004a, Vol. 6, p. J-90) – should be addressed. Further,
20 consistent with the peer reviewers’ comments and given that, as noted above, EPA’s hockey
21 stick regression analysis can be fit to the data only using arithmetic means and not spatial
22 average concentrations, the ERA should be revised to reinsert the language indicating that, even
23 accepting EPA’s reanalysis, the relationship between PCB concentrations and shrew survival
24 from summer to autumn is not strong.

25 **RESPONSE GE-30:** Please refer to Responses GE-28 and GE-29.

26 In the weight-of-evidence analysis, the finding for evidence of harm has changed from
27 “undetermined” (EPA 2003, Vol. 1, p. 10-58) to “yes” (EPA 2004a, Vol. 1, p. 10-36) despite the
28 lack of any new data. There is no basis for this change. Considering the uncertainties associated
29 with the contradictory findings of the Boonstra and EPA statistical analyses and the dependence
30 of EPA’s hockey stick regression on one of the two exposure estimates (i.e., arithmetic means vs.
31 spatially weighted averages), the finding for evidence of harm should remain “undetermined.”

32 **RESPONSE GE-31:** As noted in Responses GE-28 and GE-29, EPA believes
33 that a preponderance of evidence indicates a negative relationship between the
34 survival of shrews in the PSA and tPCB concentration in soil. Further, the
35 hockey stick regression analysis was strongly significant ($p=0.0012$) using
36 measured mean concentration of soil concentration and borderline significant
37 ($p=0.051$) using spatially weighted soil concentration. Based on these analyses,
38 EPA believes that the shrew demography study does provide evidence of harm.
39 Section J.4.4 of the November ERA provides further support for this position.

ERA Responsiveness Summary

COMMENTS OF THE HOUSATONIC ENVIRONMENTAL ACTION LEAGUE, INC. (HEAL)

1 **Comments of the Housatonic Environmental Action League,** 2 **Inc. (HEAL)**

3 The Housatonic Environmental Action League, Inc. (HEAL) is a 501(c)(3) non-profit, non-
4 partisan, broad-based, grassroots environmental advocacy coalition that includes individuals and
5 organizations from the tri-state area (CT, MA, NY) who are dedicated to the protection of the
6 Housatonic River and its watershed. Our organization has been actively involved with the
7 Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) Housatonic River Project particularly as it relates to
8 General Electric's (GE) polychlorinated biphenyl (PCB) contamination of the river system.

9 Please enter HEAL's comments for the revised EcoRA into consideration.

10 1. HEAL fully supports and endorses the comments submitted by Dr. Peter L. deFur and his
11 associates at Environmental Stewardship Concepts. Dr. deFur was contracted by the
12 Housatonic River Initiative (HRI) who is the single recipient of the EPA's Technical
13 Assistance Grant (TAG). HEAL appreciates the opportunity afforded our organization to
14 provide input to Dr. deFur during his expert review of the revised EcoRA.

15 2. In EPA's November 15th press release, Robert Varney, EPA's Regional Administrator states:
16 *"In the spirit of full and open participation at this unique site, EPA is providing an*
17 *opportunity for interested individuals to review and comment on the new information in this*
18 *important document."*

19 HEAL appreciates this additional opportunity to provide comments on one of the most
20 critically important documents associated with this site. HEAL requested an extension to the
21 comment period due to the absence of the document in at least one of the official
22 repositories. The Cornwall [CT] repository was provided only CDs of the revised EcoRA;
23 not even a hardcopy of the Executive Summary accompanied the CDs. In order to compare
24 the original and revised EcoRA, one would either need two computers or the complete
25 hardcopy(ies). It is difficult to ascertain what the revisions are in the new document in the
26 absence of the ability to cross-reference. We understand the need for the document to be
27 highly technical with scientific language. An additional non-technical Executive Summary
28 written for the lay public would go far to satisfy Mr. Varney's desire for "full and open
29 participation".

30 **RESPONSE HEAL-1:** As discussed above, EPA has made considerable efforts
31 to encourage and solicit input from the public at this site in general and for this
32 Ecological Risk Assessment in particular. As noted, EPA provided a detailed list
33 of the new information in the revised Ecological Risk Assessment to make the
34 review more accessible. EPA believes that the current Executive Summary
35 provides a reasonable level of detail for all readers, with a more detailed
36 summary of the entire risk assessment provided in Volume 1 for the more
37 technical audience. In addition, to enhance public participation, EPA has
38 provided a Technical Assistance Grant (TAG) to allow for the retention of
39 qualified technical representatives on technical issues.

ERA Responsiveness Summary

- 1 3. (ES-2; line 9) *Site-specific toxicity tests*. This entry is more accurate by including “(*limited*
2 *testing conducted in Connecticut*)”.

3 **RESPONSE HEAL-2:** This comment does not address new information added
4 to the November 2004 revised Ecological Risk Assessment in response to Peer
5 Review comments. As stated in the introduction to this Responsiveness
6 Summary, EPA solicited public comment only on new information and is
7 responding only to comments that pertain to the new information.

- 8 4. (ES-2; line 17) *...where farming was the main occupation from colonial settlement through*
9 *the late 1800s*. Life in the Housatonic River basin did not begin with European introduction.
10 Please consider a characterization that includes pre-colonial occupation.

11 **RESPONSE HEAL-3:** This comment does not address new information added
12 to the November 2004 revised Ecological Risk Assessment in response to Peer
13 Review comments. As stated in the introduction to this Responsiveness
14 Summary, EPA solicited public comment only on new information and is
15 responding only to comments that pertain to the new information.

- 16 5. (ES-4; line 1) *The GE facility in Pittsfield is the only known source of PCBs found in the*
17 *Housatonic River sediment and floodplain soil in Massachusetts*. To expand on the accuracy
18 of this statement, please consider adding “*and in Connecticut as far south as the Derby*
19 *Dam*”.

20 **RESPONSE HEAL-4:** This comment does not address new information added
21 to the November 2004 revised Ecological Risk Assessment in response to Peer
22 Review comments. As stated in the introduction to this Responsiveness
23 Summary, EPA solicited public comment only on new information and is
24 responding only to comments that pertain to the new information.

- 25 6. (ES-4; line 9) *The Rest of River is the portion of the river from the confluence of the East and*
26 *West Branches of the Housatonic River (the confluence) to the Massachusetts border with*
27 *Connecticut, a distance of approximately 54 miles (87 km), and beyond into Connecticut to*
28 *Long Island Sound*. The Consent Decree characterizes Rest of River (ROR) from the
29 confluence in Massachusetts to Derby Dam in CT. This statement needs to be revised. A
30 second entry can then be inserted to define the PSA and the CT section of the river. If you
31 include the mileage of the MA section of ROR, it is only logical to include the mileage of the
32 CT section of ROR.

33 **RESPONSE HEAL-5:** This comment does not address new information added
34 to the November 2004 revised Ecological Risk Assessment in response to Peer
35 Review comments. As stated in the introduction to this Responsiveness
36 Summary, EPA solicited public comment only on new information and is
37 responding only to comments that pertain to the new information.

- 38 7. (ES-4; line 14) *The lateral extent of the area under investigation includes the floodplain*
39 *extending to the 1-ppm tPCB isopleth, which is approximately equivalent to the 10-year*

ERA Responsiveness Summary

1 *floodplain*. The floodplain in the CT section of the river has not been adequately tested or
2 characterized. This statement needs to qualify that EPA is referring to the PSA in MA.

3 **RESPONSE HEAL-6:** This comment does not address new information added
4 to the November 2004 revised Ecological Risk Assessment in response to Peer
5 Review comments. As stated in the introduction to this Responsiveness
6 Summary, EPA solicited public comment only on new information and is
7 responding only to comments that pertain to the new information.

8 8. (ES-4; line 22) *The ERA also includes an evaluation of the river and floodplain downstream of*
9 *the PSA to the Derby Dam in Connecticut, approximately 14 miles upstream from Long Island*
10 *Sound*. We request that you include the word “abbreviated” (or one similar) before the word
11 evaluation. Why do you include the mileage backward from Long Island Sound yet you never
12 include the miles from the CT/MA border to Derby Dam?

13 **RESPONSE HEAL-7:** This comment does not address new information added
14 to the November 2004 revised Ecological Risk Assessment in response to Peer
15 Review comments. As stated in the introduction to this Responsiveness
16 Summary, EPA solicited public comment only on new information and is
17 responding only to comments that pertain to the new information.

18 9. (ES-4; line 25) *Next to the initial 0.5-mile (0.8-km) reach bordering the GE facility, Reach 5*
19 *has the highest concentrations and highest frequency of detections of PCBs in sediment*. Please
20 consider adding “in sampling and testing to date”.

21 **RESPONSE HEAL-8:** This comment does not address new information added
22 to the November 2004 revised Ecological Risk Assessment in response to Peer
23 Review comments. As stated in the introduction to this Responsiveness
24 Summary, EPA solicited public comment only on new information and is
25 responding only to comments that pertain to the new information.

26 10. (ES-6; line 26) **Reach 17** – *From downstream of the Derby Dam to Long Island Sound (tidal,*
27 *and not part of GE/Housatonic River site due to other sources of PCBs) (13.7 miles)*. On line 22,
28 EPA indicates the miles from Long Island Sound to Derby Dam is 14; which is correct.
29 Additionally, the river downstream from Derby Dam is not included in the Consent Decree as a
30 result of closed-door negotiations between General Electric and EPA. Claiming “other sources of
31 PCBs” is a misrepresentation of facts.

32 **RESPONSE HEAL-9:** This comment does not address new information added
33 to the November 2004 revised Ecological Risk Assessment in response to Peer
34 Review comments. As stated in the introduction to this Responsiveness
35 Summary, EPA solicited public comment only on new information and is
36 responding only to comments that pertain to the new information.

37 11. (ES-6; line 28) *The land uses of the floodplain properties in Massachusetts include*
38 *residential, commercial/industrial, agricultural, recreational (such as canoeing, fishing, and*

ERA Responsiveness Summary

1 *hunting), wildlife management, and parks and a golf course. The Housatonic River floodplain is*
2 *an attractive area for recreation, including fishing and waterfowl hunting.*

3 These two sentences are redundant, disregard the floodplain uses in CT and assume that the
4 listed land uses are the only ones taking place. Why are land uses by humans being included in
5 the revised EcoRA?

6 **RESPONSE HEAL-10:** This comment does not address new information added
7 to the November 2004 revised Ecological Risk Assessment in response to Peer
8 Review comments. As stated in the introduction to this Responsiveness
9 Summary, EPA solicited public comment only on new information and is
10 responding only to comments that pertain to the new information.

11 12. (ES-16; line 24)*Therefore, the overall risk conclusion for fish is low/intermediate risk. We*
12 *would like to reinforce our concerns regarding the data that indicates apparent reproducing*
13 *populations of certain species in the riverine system. The current EPA risk assessment protocol*
14 *that relies solely on evidence of reproducing populations as an indicator of the “health” of a*
15 *species is inadequate and, we believe, incorrect in the presence of polychlorinated biphenyls and*
16 *other toxins introduced/dumped into the Housatonic River watershed by General Electric. We*
17 *have found this to be most dramatically demonstrated in the fish population in the Connecticut*
18 *section of the river. Multiple HEAL members and other stakeholders continue to observe fish*
19 *with gross external abnormalities in various species (e.g. various body lesions, sores and*
20 *anatomical anomalies). Toxins that do not overtly lead to the immediate demise of a*
21 *contaminated organism and allows continued, yet impaired, reproduction, do not fit within the*
22 *EPA’s ecological risk assessment framework. Additional attention in the data to individuals*
23 *within a population is indicated. To repeat HEAL’s oral testimony presented to the Peer Review*
24 *panel: **IF THE PISCIVOROUS MINK AND OTTER POPULATIONS ARE***
25 ***EXPERIENCING SEVERE HEALTH EFFECTS AND CONSIDERED AT HIGH RISK IN***
26 ***A SYSTEM, HOW CAN FISH IN THAT SAME SYSTEM BE CONSIDERED AT LITTLE***
27 ***TO NO OR LOW RISK??***

28 **RESPONSE HEAL-11:** The incorporation of the USGS histopathology analyses,
29 combined with the DELT (deformities, erosions, lesions, tumors) information
30 collected during tissue sampling, expanded upon the effects assessment
31 provided in the July 2003 ERA, in response to comments from the Peer Review
32 Panel. The fish weight-of-evidence assessment also included evaluation of both
33 site-specific and literature-based fish reproductive and developmental toxicity
34 studies. Therefore, the November 2004 ERA did not rely “solely on evidence of
35 reproducing populations as an indicator of the ‘health’ of a species,” but rather
36 considered multiple lines of evidence, and appropriately included an expanded
37 discussion of adult fish abnormalities as requested by the Peer Reviewers. The
38 weighting factors and evidence of harm designations applied to population
39 endpoints (e.g., GE largemouth bass reproduction study) were refined in the
40 November 2004 ERA, but these changes were made in a manner consistent with
41 Peer Reviewer comments.

ERA Responsiveness Summary

1 The comment from HEAL implies that EPA did not consider biological endpoints
2 that “do not overtly lead to the immediate demise” of fish. Both the revisions
3 incorporated in the November 2004 ERA (summarized above) and the material
4 included in the July 2003 ERA directly address sublethal endpoints. Endpoints
5 that are linked to “impaired reproduction” are included in the ERA, and where
6 individual-level responses were discussed in the November 2004 ERA, their
7 potential implications for reproduction and community health were considered.

8 The comment repeats references to anecdotal observations of gross external
9 abnormalities in various species (e.g., various body lesions, sores, and
10 anatomical anomalies). In the November 2004 ERA, EPA considered all of the
11 available information on fish abnormalities in the PSA, including information from
12 the extensive fish sampling conducted by EPA as part of the Rest of River study,
13 and concluded that, with the exception of some incidence of tumor-like lesions on
14 koi (goldfish) and incidence of glob-eye in yellow perch, individual fish examined
15 in the PSA appeared normal and healthy. References to observations of fish by
16 the public were not included in the ERA because no summaries of these
17 observations (e.g., survey results) or means of evaluating the accuracy/reliability
18 of the observations were available. Therefore, it was not possible to validate or
19 discuss these anecdotal observations in an objective or defensible manner.

20 EPA has recently contacted three government agencies to gain additional insight
21 to the issue of visual observations of abnormalities:

- 22 ▪ According to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (McKeon, pers. comm.
23 2005), based on the extensive sampling that was performed of the river
24 and associated impoundments, visible fish abnormalities (i.e., lesions,
25 tumors) were observed only on goldfish and a few bullheads, whereas
26 other species appeared normal.
- 27 ▪ Massachusetts Division of Fisheries and Wildlife (MassWildlife) (Madden,
28 pers. comm. 2005) conducts surveys in the Housatonic River to provide
29 data on species composition and length frequency for purposes of
30 fisheries management. According to MassWildlife, some fish with
31 abnormalities are observed during their sampling, but formal records of
32 these abnormalities are not maintained and they have no basis on which
33 to compare the frequency of such abnormalities relative to other river
34 systems.
- 35 ▪ The Connecticut Department of Environmental Protection (CT DEP)
36 (Barry, pers. comm. 2005; Humphreys, pers. comm. 2005) conducts
37 sampling and inspection of CT portions of the Housatonic River,
38 particularly in trout management areas. CT DEP has not observed gross
39 external lesions warranting investigation by the DEP fish pathologist.

40 Overall, the information obtained from these regulatory agencies is consistent
41 with EPA’s observations and indicates that the effects observed in individuals
42 were properly characterized in the November 2004 ERA.

ERA Responsiveness Summary

1 **References:**

2 Barry, T. 2005. Personal communication. Telephone conversation between Tim
3 Barry (Connecticut Department of Environmental Protection, Bureau of
4 Natural Resources, Fisheries Division, Western Connecticut) and Gary
5 Lawrence (EVS Environment Consultants, North Vancouver, BC) regarding
6 wild trout habitat within the Bull's Bridge Trout Management Areas (TMA) on
7 the Housatonic River. February 8, 2005.

8 Humphreys, M. 2005. Personal communication. Telephone conversation
9 between Michael Humphreys (Fisheries Biologist, Connecticut Department of
10 Environmental Protection, Inland Waters Division) and Gary Lawrence (EVS
11 Environment Consultants, North Vancouver, BC) regarding trout habitat
12 downstream of Bull's Bridge and evidence of lesions on Connecticut portions
13 of the Housatonic River. February 9, 2005.

14 McKeon, J. 2005. Personal communication. Electronic mail from Joseph F.
15 McKeon (Central New England Anadromous Fish Coordinator, U.S. Fish and
16 Wildlife Service, Central New England Fishery Resources Complex, Nashua,
17 New Hampshire) to Gary Lawrence (EVS Environment Consultants, North
18 Vancouver, BC) regarding evidence of external lesions on Housatonic River
19 fish observed during electrofishing sampling. February 9, 2005.

20 Madden, A. 2005. Personal communication. Electronic mail from Andrew
21 Madden, Western District Aquatic Biologist, Massachusetts Division of
22 Fisheries and Wildlife) to Gary Lawrence (EVS Environment Consultants,
23 North Vancouver, BC) regarding evidence of external lesions on Housatonic
24 River fish observed during electrofishing sampling of Massachusetts below
25 Woods Pond Dam. February 16, 2005.

26 13. (ES-18; line 3) *The effect of this impairment on local fish population size, recruitment,*
27 *and/or resilience to natural or anthropogenic stressors is not known.* In light of this statement,
28 Table ES-3 (ES-17), F-Field Study Endpoints, Evidence of Harm should be changed from "No"
29 to "Undetermined".

30 **RESPONSE HEAL-12:** EPA revised the risk characterization for the field study
31 measurement endpoints from "Undetermined" to "No" in the November 2004
32 ERA. This change was in response to comments from some Peer Reviewers
33 that fish field studies demonstrate a lack of large-scale population effect (see
34 response to General Issue 13). However, the ERA also documented the
35 uncertainty in these measurement endpoints and qualified the "No" assignments
36 by indicating that the "No" designation applies only to moderate to large
37 population-level responses. The "undetermined" designation would be applicable
38 only for evaluation of subtle population-level responses. There was not
39 consensus among the Peer Reviewers on this issue:

ERA Responsiveness Summary

- 1 ▪ Three Reviewers commented that the risk characterization was generally
2 appropriate (Responses 3.3-RS-2 and 3.3-BS-3; Mary Ann Ottinger, p.
3 206, line 12).
- 4 ▪ One Reviewer (Responses 3.3-TT-11 and 3.3-TT-12) disagreed with the
5 “undetermined” assignment for field survey endpoints, commenting that
6 the field studies provided useful information, but also agreed that field
7 studies cannot predict lesser impacts.
- 8 ▪ One Reviewer (Response 3.3-VF-7) commented that the risk
9 characterization depends on the interpretation of the assessment endpoint
10 for fish.
- 11 ▪ Two Reviewers (Responses 3.3-TL-1 and 3.3-JO-13) commented that the
12 “self-sustaining” nature of the population was inadequate for assessing
13 whether harm has occurred.

14 Given the diversity of viewpoints provided by the Panel, and given that the issue
15 is partly of a semantic nature, EPA believes that the November 2004 ERA
16 revisions were consistent with the Peer Review comments and with the
17 Responsiveness Summary.

18 14. (ES-33; line 19) *In general, potential risks to benthic invertebrates occur in limited areas*
19 *downstream of Woods Pond to Rising Pond. These areas are depositional and tend to have*
20 *higher concentrations of tPCBs. Below Rising Pond, sediment does not contain concentrations of*
21 *tPCBs that represent a potential risk to benthic invertebrates. The latter conclusion is supported*
22 *by comparison of field-collected invertebrate tissue residue data (West Cornwall, CT) to*
23 *literature-derived PCB tissue thresholds.* The West Cornwall area of the river is rocky with less
24 deposition of sediment as compared to the areas behind dams. Inadequate sediment
25 sampling/testing was completed behind all of CT’s dams.

26 **RESPONSE HEAL-13:** This comment does not address new information added
27 to the November 2004 revised Ecological Risk Assessment in response to Peer
28 Review comments. As stated in the introduction to this Responsiveness
29 Summary, EPA solicited public comment only on new information and is
30 responding only to comments that pertain to the new information.

31 15. (ES-48; line 27) *The detailed ecological characterization performed at this site has greatly*
32 *reduced the uncertainties associated with problem formulation.* Although the PSA benefited
33 from a detailed ecological characterization, CT continues to be inadequately sampled, tested and
34 characterized.

35 **RESPONSE HEAL-14:** This comment does not address new information added
36 to the November 2004 revised Ecological Risk Assessment in response to Peer
37 Review comments. As stated in the introduction to this Responsiveness
38 Summary, EPA solicited public comment only on new information and is
39 responding only to comments that pertain to the new information.

ERA Responsiveness Summary

1 16. (ES-49; line 11) *There are several sources of uncertainty in the assessment of effects,*
2 *including extrapolation errors and a limited number of toxicity studies conducted with the*
3 *representative species. We would like to see added at the end of this sentence: “particularly in*
4 *Connecticut”.*

5 **RESPONSE HEAL-15:** This comment does not address new information added
6 to the November 2004 revised Ecological Risk Assessment in response to Peer
7 Review comments. As stated in the introduction to this Responsiveness
8 Summary, EPA solicited public comment only on new information and is
9 responding only to comments that pertain to the new information.

10 17. (ES-49; line 21) *The greatest potential source of uncertainty for the fish and wildlife effects*
11 *assessments, however, was associated with the lack of toxicity studies involving the*
12 *representative species. Same as 16 above... “particularly in CT”.*

13 **RESPONSE HEAL-16:** This comment does not address new information added
14 to the November 2004 revised Ecological Risk Assessment in response to Peer
15 Review comments. As stated in the introduction to this Responsiveness
16 Summary, EPA solicited public comment only on new information and is
17 responding only to comments that pertain to the new information.

18 18. (ES-50; line 16) *An assessment of risk downstream of the PSA indicated that tPCBs could*
19 *potentially be causing adverse effects to benthic organisms in depositional areas as far as Reach*
20 *8, amphibians in floodplain areas as far as Reach 9, trout in Reach 7, mink as far as Reach 15,*
21 *and river otter as far as Reach 15, and bald eagle in Reach 8. However, the magnitude of risks in*
22 *these areas is lower than in the PSA. HEAL believes that there is insufficient and inadequate*
23 *data in CT for EPA to reach these conclusions.*

24 **RESPONSE HEAL-17:** This comment does not address new information added
25 to the November 2004 revised Ecological Risk Assessment in response to Peer
26 Review comments. As stated in the introduction to this Responsiveness
27 Summary, EPA solicited public comment only on new information and is
28 responding only to comments that pertain to the new information.

29 HEAL continues to be concerned that EPA does not adequately acknowledge the PCB
30 contamination in the CT section of the river (primarily behind the dams). PCBs will continue to
31 be transported into CT from the upper reaches until such time that the PSA (and beyond) are
32 contained. We look forward to that decision.

33 **RESPONSE HEAL-18:** This comment does not address new information added
34 to the November 2004 revised Ecological Risk Assessment in response to Peer
35 Review comments. As stated in the introduction to this Responsiveness
36 Summary, EPA solicited public comment only on new information and is
37 responding only to comments that pertain to the new information.

ERA Responsiveness Summary

1 The revised EcoRA clearly shows adverse impacts to the species that live in the river system. We
2 are disappointed that EPA made no mention of the global transport of GE/Housatonic River
3 PCBs that adversely affect species throughout the world.

4 **RESPONSE HEAL-19:** This comment does not address new information added
5 to the November 2004 revised Ecological Risk Assessment in response to Peer
6 Review comments. As stated in the introduction to this Responsiveness
7 Summary, EPA solicited public comment only on new information and is
8 responding only to comments that pertain to the new information.

9 We again ask EPA to acknowledge and embrace the Precautionary Principle.

10 **RESPONSE HEAL-20:** This comment does not address new information added
11 to the November 2004 revised Ecological Risk Assessment in response to Peer
12 Review comments. As stated in the introduction to this Responsiveness
13 Summary, EPA solicited public comment only on new information and is
14 responding only to comments that pertain to the new information.

15 Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the revised EcoRA.

16 Sincerely,

17 Judith A. Herkimer, Director

ERA Responsiveness Summary

COMMENTS OF THE MASSACHUSETTS AUDUBON SOCIETY (MAS)

1 **Comments of the Massachusetts Audubon Society (MAS)**

2 On behalf of Mass Audubon, we submit the following comments on the revised Ecological Risk
3 Assessment (ERA) for the Housatonic River. Mass Audubon appreciates the efforts the EPA has
4 engaged in to make this document as complete and rigorous as possible. We urge that the
5 cleanup planning process for the Rest of the River proceed expeditiously but in a continued
6 rigorous manner in order that risks to wildlife and people will be mitigated as soon and as
7 thoroughly as possible.

8 Mass Audubon owns and operates the 262-acre Canoe Meadows Wildlife Sanctuary, located in
9 Pittsfield within reach 5A, not far downstream from the confluence of the East and West
10 branches. The sanctuary, which fronts the Housatonic River for approximately one-half mile, is
11 home to seven state-listed species of animals and plants, including American Bittern (state
12 endangered) and Wood Turtle (special concern). A considerable amount of the sanctuary's
13 acreage is within the 10-year floodplain directly affected by PCB contamination. The sanctuary,
14 since its establishment in 1975, has been dedicated to natural resource conservation and
15 education. As such, the negative impacts on wildlife as a result of PCB contamination weigh
16 even more heavily upon the sanctuary than upon parcels dedicated to other uses.

17 Canoe Meadows Wildlife Sanctuary is located in Reach 5A, the first section (most northerly)
18 dealt with in this report. The highest concentrations and frequency of detections of PCBs are
19 found in Reach 5. The predicted risks to amphibians is highest in Reach 5A; a majority of the
20 amphibians and 50% of the vernal pools are at risk. Fish are at risk in all reaches of the Prime
21 Study Area. Other wildlife species deemed to be at high risk include birds (Bald Eagle, Wood
22 Duck, and Osprey) and mammals (Mink, River Otter, Short-tailed Shrew). Several other species
23 were estimated to be at intermediate risk. The studied species are representative of many other
24 species of wildlife present in the area, which are likely to be at risk from exposure to PCBs.

25 Mass Audubon urges that the EPA and General Electric move expeditiously to the next phase of
26 the cleanup planning, i.e. establishment of Interim Media Protection Goals (IMPG). The IMPGs
27 should be set at levels that will protect human and ecological health, both on Mass Audubon
28 property and throughout the Rest of the River. The associated remediation measures to achieve
29 these goals should address the potential future spread of contamination through flooding events.

30 **RESPONSE MAS-1:** The establishment of IMPGs and the evaluation of
31 potential Corrective Measures are steps that are included in the Rest of River
32 process, pursuant to the Consent Decree and the Reissued RCRA Permit, which
33 is Appendix G to the Decree. Among the general standards for evaluating
34 Corrective Measures is b. Control of Sources of Releases, which addresses how
35 each alternative or combination of alternatives would reduce or minimize possible
36 further releases, including (but not limited to) the extent to which each alternative
37 would mitigate the effects of a flood that could cause contaminated sediments to
38 become available for human or ecological exposure.

39 Mass Audubon requests that we continue to be kept informed about the restoration planning
40 process, especially in regards to any activities or remediation on Mass Audubon property. Canoe

ERA Responsiveness Summary

1 Meadows sanctuary director Rene Laubach can be reached at 413-637-0320 x 8351 or
2 rlaubach@massaudubon.org.

3 Thank you for considering these comments.

4 Sincerely,

5 E. Heidi Ricci
6 Senior Environmental Policy Specialist

René Laubach
Sanctuary Director
Berkshire Wildlife Sanctuaries

7

ERA Responsiveness Summary

COMMENTS OF THE TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE GRANT RECIPIENT – HOUSATONIC RIVER INITIATIVE/ENVIRONMENTAL STEWARDSHIP CONCEPTS (TAG)

1 **Comments of the Technical Assistance Grant Recipient –** 2 **Housatonic River Initiative/Environmental Stewardship** 3 **Concepts (TAG)**

4 **Introduction and disclaimer**

5 This review of the Final Ecological Risk Assessment of the Housatonic River/GE Site was
6 conducted under a grant from the Environmental Protection Agency to the Housatonic River
7 Initiative. The materials and conclusions presented here are those of the authors and do not
8 represent the position of the EPA, ACOE or any other federal or state agency.

9 This report was prepared by: Dr. Peter L. deFur and Mr. Kyle Newman of Environmental
10 Stewardship Concepts, under contract to the Housatonic River Initiative.

11 The context of this report is to provide feedback on the Final Ecological Risk Assessment to the
12 EPA and to inform the citizens (through Housatonic River Initiative and Housatonic
13 Environmental Action League) of the strengths and weaknesses of the Ecological RA. This
14 feedback and evaluation is intended to identify major issues that remain particularly in light of
15 the earlier comments provided to EPA. It is the intent of the reviewers and authors of this report
16 to improve the Ecological RA and eventually result in a more protective site cleanup.

17 The purpose of these comments is to evaluate if the Ecological Risk Assessment adequately
18 protects the ecological health of the environment of western Massachusetts and Connecticut from
19 the toxic chemicals released from the GE facility in Pittsfield, MA. This review examines the
20 scientific information and methods used, the underlying information, both quantitative and
21 qualitative, the assumptions, logic and reasoning and other significant aspects of the Ecological
22 RA.

23 **General Comments**

24 Overall, the report was comprehensive and well informed. ESC agrees that risks remain
25 significant throughout the study area to most forms of wildlife. Changes made to the document
26 are helpful and provide the reader with much more useful information that leads to a more
27 comprehensive document. ESC recommends few substantial changes to the document.

28 We appreciate EPA's efforts to satisfy reviewer's comments that the chapters are too technical
29 for general readers and contain too little information for technical use. However, in attempting to
30 satisfy these concerns, EPA is attempting to write a single document for two completely different
31 audiences. The result can be, and in this case, seems to be text in the main report that is
32 insufficient for the technical audience. EPA would have been better off to have kept the risk
33 assessment written for a technical audience and prepared a completely separate and substantially
34 shorter document for public consumption.

35 **RESPONSE TAG-1:** This comment does not address new information added to
36 the November 2004 revised Ecological Risk Assessment in response to Peer
37 Review comments. As stated in the introduction to this Responsiveness

ERA Responsiveness Summary

1 Summary, EPA solicited public comment only on new information and is
2 responding only to comments that pertain to the new information.

3 Revisions to the document seem to give added weight to field studies, even when those studies
4 are flawed. In several instances (fish, insectivorous birds, and piscivorous birds), field studies
5 that did not accurately represent endpoints associated with chronic PCB exposure were given
6 more weight than the computer modeling that indicated high levels of risk for target species. The
7 belted kingfisher field study that led to the conclusion that kingfishers were at intermediate risk
8 in spite of high risks predicted by models was even criticized by the EPA as in Appendix H
9 saying that “EPA does not believe the study can be used to conclude that tPCB exposure did or
10 did not adversely affect kingfisher reproductive output in the PSA.” Without evidence from the
11 studies to specifically discredit the modeling, field studies should not be given more weight than
12 comprehensive modeling efforts.

13 **RESPONSE TAG-2:** In response to a number of Peer Review comments, EPA
14 committed to “reconsider the WOE designation for the field studies in the revised
15 ERA” and to “provide a more transparent assessment of how field studies are
16 used in the risk characterization” (response to General Issue 8.B in
17 Responsiveness Summary). The revised weighting of the field study
18 measurement endpoints followed the methodology proposed by the
19 Massachusetts Weight-of-Evidence Workgroup (Menzie et al. 1996; see Section
20 2.9 of November 2004 ERA for details).

21 The weight assigned to the two field study endpoints for fish (F-1: Community
22 studies; F-2: Largemouth bass reproduction study) was increased from
23 “low/moderate” to “moderate.” A third field study endpoint (F-3: population
24 demographics) was added to the formal WOE based on Peer Reviewer
25 recommendations (see response to General Issue 13.F), but was assigned a
26 “low/moderate” weighting. The changes in weighting were appropriate because:

- 27 ■ The revised weightings are consistent with the opinion of some Peer
28 Reviewers that the fish field studies should be weighted more strongly
29 relative to the July 2003 ERA (Responses 3.3-VF-12 and 3.3-TT-17).
- 30 ■ Revised weightings were based on a systematic and transparent
31 averaging of the individual attributes, as requested by some of the Peer
32 Reviewers (Response to General Issue 8.A; Specific Responses 3.3-BS-6
33 and 3.3-JO-16). This resulted in a change of overall weighting for both
34 F-1 (community studies) and F-2 (bass reproduction study) from
35 “low/moderate” to “moderate,” even though most individual attribute
36 weightings remained unchanged from the November 2004 ERA.
- 37 ■ The revised weightings include a small number of revisions to individual
38 attribute weightings, based on feedback from the Peer Review Panel. The
39 rationales for individual attribute assignments are detailed in Table F.4-
40 3(c). The “degree of association” attribute weighting for F-2 was
41 increased to “moderate” from “low/moderate.” This change was based on

ERA Responsiveness Summary

1 the comments from the Peer Reviewers that the reproductive study,
2 although of narrow scope, was an important summary of bass ecology and
3 reproduction (Response 3.3-TT-5). The “spatial representativeness”
4 attribute weighting for F-1 and F-2 was also increased to “moderate” from
5 “low/moderate.” The reproduction study was described as “very
6 comprehensive” by one Reviewer (Response 3.3-TT-5), but several
7 Reviewers also indicated that the linkage between reproductive success
8 and variations in PCB exposure over space was not addressed
9 (Responses 3.3-TT-5, 3.3-VF-1, 3.3-BS-1, 3.3-MO-2, and 3.3-JO-5). The
10 “quantitative measure” attribute weighting for F-2 was increased to “low-
11 moderate” from “low.” Although some measurements of reproduction
12 were assessed qualitatively, other parameters, such as YOY catch-per-
13 effort and YOY growth rates, were quantified.

14 The overall weighting of the tree swallow field study was “high” in both the July
15 2003 and November 2004 ERA. The study was location- and species-specific
16 and measured parameters directly relevant to the assessment endpoint. Further,
17 the study was conducted over a period of 3 years and was well designed and
18 well executed. More information on the weighting of the tree swallow field study
19 can be found in Table G.4-7 of the November 2004 ERA. Compared to the tree
20 swallow field study, the corresponding modeled exposure and effects line of
21 evidence had several shortcomings that resulted in it being given an overall
22 weighting of moderate. For example, sample size was small for concentrations
23 of tPCBs and TEQ in prey; other exposure parameters were literature based, as
24 were effects metrics. A detailed description of the weighting of the tree swallow
25 modeling line of evidence is presented in ERA Table G.4-8.

26 As with the tree swallow field study, the weighting given to the American robin
27 field study and modeling line of evidence did not change between the July 2003
28 and November 2004 ERAs. There were some concerns regarding the American
29 robin field study (e.g., only one breeding season, small sample size at low end of
30 the concentration gradient), but overall the study was given a moderate/high
31 weight. ERA Table G.4-9 provides more information on the weighting of the
32 American robin field study. The American robin modeling line of evidence had
33 many of the same shortcomings as the tree swallow modeling, resulting in an
34 overall weight of moderate (see ERA Table G.4-10 for more information).

35 As indicated in the TAG comment above, EPA had some concerns regarding the
36 belted kingfisher field study. As a result, it was given a lower overall weight
37 (moderate) than the tree swallow and American robin field studies. These
38 concerns are outlined in Table H.4-6 of the November 2004 ERA. Some of the
39 concerns included short duration of study (i.e., one field season), low sample
40 size, lack of a reference area, and narrow dose gradient. However, the study did
41 directly investigate reproduction of belted kingfishers in the PSA. The modeling
42 line of evidence suffered from many of the same shortcomings as did the tree
43 swallow and American robin modeling line of evidence, resulting in an overall
44 weight of moderate (see ERA Table H.4-5 for more information).

ERA Responsiveness Summary

1 **Reference:**

2 Menzie, C., M.H. Henning, J. Cura, K. Finkelstein, J. Gentile, J. Maughan, D.
3 Mitchell, S. Petron, B. Potocki, S. Svirsky, and P. Tyler. 1996. Special report
4 of the Massachusetts Weight-of-Evidence Workgroup: A weight of evidence
5 approach for evaluating ecological risks. *Human and Ecological Risk*
6 *Assessment* 2(2):277-304.

7 The revisions have not addressed most of ESC's previous comments, in particular those
8 regarding Connecticut. The lack of samples in the Connecticut section of the river constitute a
9 large data gap that must be resolved. This gap exists despite evidence that a substantial
10 floodplain exists in the state (please refer to our previous comments for more information
11 regarding this). The recent floods of January 2005 support the point that the Connecticut flood
12 plain requires evaluation. Without more comprehensive data on this section of the river,
13 uncertainties will remain regarding the conclusions for the Connecticut reaches. More sampling
14 locations should be defined and more sediment samples taken for a complete risk assessment that
15 addresses Connecticut.

16 **RESPONSE TAG-3:** Please refer to Response CT-6.

17 We remain opposed to EPA insisting that a sustaining population of sick fish is an acceptable
18 condition at this site or any other. Comments on the original draft of the Ecological Risk
19 Assessment explained why EPA is wrong in this position. A fish population that has 30, 40 or
20 50% of the individuals with an abnormality that prevents or impairs reproduction or performance
21 is not a healthy population. The number of animals in a population over time is NOT the only
22 measure of population sustainability. This point cannot even begin to discuss the evolutionary
23 implications of such a condition of animals.

24 **RESPONSE TAG-4:** Please refer to Response HEAL-11 regarding the
25 incorporation of abnormality information in the revised ERA. The abnormalities
26 that were observed in adult fish (e.g., glob-eye in yellow perch; growths on
27 goldfish in Woods Pond) and summarized in the November 2004 ERA have not
28 been identified to impair "reproduction or performance" and should not be
29 confused with the reproductive and developmental abnormalities that were
30 explicitly considered in the USGS Phase I and Phase II assessments.

31 Other points raised in this comment do not address new information added to the
32 November 2004 revised Ecological Risk Assessment in response to Peer Review
33 comments. As stated in the introduction to this Responsiveness Summary, EPA
34 solicited public comment only on new information and is responding only to
35 comments that pertain to the new information.

36 **Executive Summary**

37 The more detailed highlights section is an improvement, but we would like to see the language
38 saying that high risks are unacceptable be reinserted into the text.

ERA Responsiveness Summary

1 **RESPONSE TAG-5:** During the Peer Review, some Reviewers indicated that
2 the evaluation of risks as acceptable or unacceptable is a value judgment that
3 should be left to risk managers rather than included as part of the risk
4 assessment per se. Accordingly, such language was removed from the risk
5 assessment in response to the Peer Review and is consistent with the
6 Responsiveness Summary.

7 **Section 3**

8 3-1, lines 34-37: Even pockets of high risk can be significant- flooding or other natural
9 disturbances to the sediment bed can expose other areas to higher levels of risks to invertebrate
10 populations in other areas. We also maintain that there is not enough data to substantiate the
11 claim that risks are low in Connecticut.

12 **RESPONSE TAG-6:** Please refer to Response CT-6.

13 **Appendix D**

14 D-66-68, Section D.3.2.3: The use of concentration analysis alone cannot accurately determine if
15 secondary COCs are influencing toxicity tests. The data from Locations 7 and 8 does not explain
16 the results obtained. Simultaneous exposure to several metals at once including lead, magnesium,
17 and arsenic has been demonstrated to cause more serious effects than expected when individuals
18 are exposed to them singly. It is therefore possible that Locations 7 and 8 have mixtures of
19 metals that exhibit greater levels of toxicity than at other sites.

20 **RESPONSE TAG-7:** This comment does not address new information added to
21 the November 2004 revised Ecological Risk Assessment in response to Peer
22 Review comments. As stated in the introduction to this Responsiveness
23 Summary, EPA solicited public comment only on new information and is
24 responding only to comments that pertain to the new information.

25 The COC interaction does not seem to be correct. The text that discusses differences between
26 reaches 7 and 8 does not explain the results. Positive correlation does not provide evidence for
27 negative results at other locations.

28 **RESPONSE TAG-8:** This comment does not address new information added to
29 the November 2004 revised Ecological Risk Assessment in response to Peer
30 Review comments. As stated in the introduction to this Responsiveness
31 Summary, EPA solicited public comment only on new information and is
32 responding only to comments that pertain to the new information.

33 **Section 4/ Appendix E**

34 Removal of Barium from the list is highly questionable (E-9)- this was in previous draft

35 **RESPONSE TAG-9:** This comment does not address new information added to
36 the November 2004 revised Ecological Risk Assessment in response to Peer

ERA Responsiveness Summary

1 Review comments. As stated in the introduction to this Responsiveness
2 Summary, EPA solicited public comment only on new information and is
3 responding only to comments that pertain to the new information.

4 E-15, lines 16-17: There should be clarification as to if the leopard frogs in the EPA study were
5 captive bred or wild caught. Other studies mentioned used wild caught frogs obtained from a
6 biological company as controls.

7 **RESPONSE TAG-10:** This comment does not address new information added
8 to the November 2004 revised Ecological Risk Assessment in response to Peer
9 Review comments. As stated in the introduction to this Responsiveness
10 Summary, EPA solicited public comment only on new information and is
11 responding only to comments that pertain to the new information.

12 E-17, Line 10-19: There should be a better explanation of why no frogs were captured from
13 reference sites. Have any researchers returned to collect frogs from the reference site since? If
14 none have, plans should be made for them to. Without the data those collections would provide,
15 uncertainty will remain regarding the results of the study.

16 **RESPONSE TAG-11:** This comment does not address new information added
17 to the November 2004 revised Ecological Risk Assessment in response to Peer
18 Review comments. As stated in the introduction to this Responsiveness
19 Summary, EPA solicited public comment only on new information and is
20 responding only to comments that pertain to the new information.

21 E-21, Lines 17-18: Units of measure for larval density not listed in GE study. These should be
22 included.

23 **RESPONSE TAG-12:** This comment does not address new information added
24 to the November 2004 revised Ecological Risk Assessment in response to Peer
25 Review comments. As stated in the introduction to this Responsiveness
26 Summary, EPA solicited public comment only on new information and is
27 responding only to comments that pertain to the new information.

28 Section 5

29 The conceptual model section of the highlights should be reinserted for consistency.

30 **RESPONSE TAG-13:** The July 2003 version of the ERA for the fish endpoint
31 (Section 5) included in the list of highlights the statement that “Conceptual model
32 for fish indicates that the most important exposure pathways are diet and
33 contaminated sediment.” This highlight was inadvertently omitted in the
34 November 2004 revised ERA.

35 The inadvertent deletion of this statement (which remains accurate) does not in
36 any way affect the ERA approach or conclusions. The information contained in
37 this statement was, and remains, included in more detail in ERA Section 5.1.1,

ERA Responsiveness Summary

1 so the November 2004 ERA is not lacking the appropriate technical content
2 regarding the importance of diet and contaminated sediment as exposure
3 pathways for fish.

4 We respectfully disagree with the change in risk probability in fish from high to intermediate.
5 The decision to lower this probability seems based on the magnitude of effects on endpoints
6 rather than the probability of them occurring. The data presented does not seem to support this
7 conclusion. In Table 5.4-3, the overall endpoint values are mostly in the moderate to high range.
8 The lowest values occur where there is the most uncertainty, specifically the field studies. Table
9 5.4-4 shows that there is evidence of harm for all assessment endpoints, even if of only
10 intermediate harm.

11 **RESPONSE TAG-14:** The risk characterization for fish (as with all other
12 Assessment Endpoints in the November 2004 ERA) was based upon a
13 combination of probability and magnitude of response, as described in Section
14 F.4 of the November 2004 ERA (page F-85, lines 10-16). The term
15 “intermediate” was applied to risk magnitude, not to “risk probability,” which was
16 characterized as “generally high” (page F-89, line 16) and was not changed in
17 the November 2004 ERA. The overall risk characterization was revised from
18 “low” to “low to moderate” in the November 2004 ERA, so the reference in the
19 comment to a change from “high to intermediate” risk is not correct.

20 The entries in Table 5.4-3 refer to the weighting value for each measurement
21 endpoint, and are unrelated to either probability or magnitude of harm. The
22 values presented in Table 5.4-4 indicate high evidence (probability) of harm and
23 intermediate magnitude of harm for most endpoints – these results are fully
24 consistent with, and in fact are largely responsible for, EPA’s rationale for the
25 overall risk characterization for fish, which is provided in Section F.4.9: “Two of
26 the three lines of evidence (site-specific toxicity, fish tissue concentrations
27 compared to MATCs) suggest intermediate risk to fish in the Housatonic River.
28 However, the field surveys suggest that PCBs and/or other COCs are not
29 causing obvious effects to fish populations. Therefore, the overall risk conclusion
30 for fish is low/intermediate risk.”

31 We continue to argue that supporting reproducing populations of sick fish is unacceptable. There
32 is the potential for these illnesses to magnify within the population over long periods of time and
33 cause significant harm. Additionally, populations of sick but still reproducing fish are more
34 susceptible to other stressors. Allowing fish populations to remain in this state would leave them
35 vulnerable and less able to respond to changes in habitat brought on by man-made influences or
36 natural disasters. This point was covered in original comments and EPA is referred to the
37 literature and documents for that submission.

38 **RESPONSE TAG-15:** Please refer to Response HEAL-11 and Response TAG-4
39 regarding the incorporation of abnormality information in the revised ERA. Other
40 points raised in this comment do not pertain to new information added to the
41 November 2004 revised Ecological Risk Assessment in response to Peer Review

ERA Responsiveness Summary

1 comments. As stated in the introduction to this Responsiveness Summary, EPA
2 solicited public comment only on new information and is responding only to
3 comments that pertain to the new information.

4 Section 7

5 Without evidence as to why the modeling was wrong, the weight of evidence for the field studies
6 should not have as significant weight as they are given in this section. There is a fair amount of
7 uncertainty in the threshold range derived in Custer's field study (2002), stemming from the fact
8 that the ecological significance of the observed effects (abnormal nest abandonment and larger
9 clutch sizes), and if those levels were effecting hatchling success. The time limitations of the
10 study did not allow for researchers to examine the long term effects of such exposure.
11 Considering that Custer's study found the highest tPCB tissue concentration recorded in
12 literature lends additional evidence to the model's results. Considering the tremendous amount of
13 literature suggesting that those concentrations do lead to serious adverse effects for bird
14 populations, the ramifications of the Custer study should be reexamined because the data
15 suggests the possibility for serious harm to bird populations from PCB exposure. Because of this,
16 ESC disagrees strongly with the conclusion that insectivorous birds such as tree swallows and
17 robins are at low risk.

18 **RESPONSE TAG-16:** This comment does not address new information added
19 to the November 2004 revised Ecological Risk Assessment in response to Peer
20 Review comments. As stated in the introduction to this Responsiveness
21 Summary, EPA solicited public comment only on new information and is
22 responding only to comments that pertain to the new information.

23 Section 8

24 While we agree with the decision to raise the estimated level of risk for belted kingfishers to
25 intermediate, this still may be underestimating actual risks. Though the belted kingfisher study
26 exceeded the requirements for degree of association according to Menzie et al (1996), the
27 limitations of the study make the data obtained by it irrelevant. There was no data on clutch size
28 or hatchling success, two significant reproduction endpoints affected by PCB exposure. By only
29 sampling during one breeding season, no long term trends could be obtained and therefore no
30 useful reproductive data. Sample sizes were small, and the modeling of diet to estimate PCB
31 intake of birds was imprecise. These are all problems noted by EPA in Appendix H, and as stated
32 in lines 28-30 on page H-51 EPA does not believe that the study can be used to determine
33 whether or not tPCB exposure is adversely effecting kingfisher populations. Because of these
34 limitations, the field study should be dropped from the WOE and more weight given to the
35 modeling as done for osprey.

36 **RESPONSE TAG-17:** EPA agrees with the comments outlined above regarding
37 the belted kingfisher field study. However, the study did indicate that kingfishers
38 foraging and residing in the PSA are breeding successfully. Whether the
39 observed rate of reproductive success is sufficient to sustain the local population
40 without recruitment from other populations of kingfishers, is not known.

ERA Responsiveness Summary

1 Nevertheless, the observation that kingfishers can successfully reproduce in the
2 PSA likely indicates that they are not at severe risk. In consideration of these
3 results and the moderate weight assigned to the modeling line of evidence (see
4 Response TAG-2), the WOE conclusion that belted kingfishers are at
5 intermediate risk in the PSA seems reasonable. There is uncertainty about this
6 conclusion, as is acknowledged and discussed in Sections H.4.5 (Sources of
7 Uncertainty) and H.4.6 (Conclusions) of the November 2004 ERA.

8 **Section 12**

9 The expanded and more detailed highlight section is an improvement, though we would like the
10 language referring to high risks as unacceptable be reinserted.

11 **RESPONSE TAG-18:** Please refer to Response TAG-5.