From:	HOPE Bruce
To:	Eric Blischke/R10/USEPA/US@EPA; Chip Humphrey/R10/USEPA/US@EPA
Cc:	POULSEN Mike; PETERSON Jenn L
Subject:	FW: Conf call yesterday and FWM programming issues
Date:	06/01/2006 11:30 AM

Unless I hear otherwise, I will send Nancy a copy of the VBA code for the FW model, probably modified for PRG purposes. I do think that we should maintain and run our own version of this model, using Monte Carlo, so that we account for uncertainty in the input parameters (particularly the dietary matrix) and show uncertainty in the output. I'm sure that Windward will be aiming for a single number PRG - it would be good for the gov't team to know where this number falls with respect to protection - 5% or 95% or ?? With John Toll onboard it should be a problem for Windward to follow along.

And one last time, let me say that I think this sets you on a path toward a food web model exclusively for PRGs and another (maybe) for the FS.

-----Original Message-----
From: Nancy Judd [mailto:nancyj@windwardenv.com]
Sent: Thursday, June 01, 2006 10:56 AM
To: HOPE Bruce
Subject: Conf call yesterday and FWM programming issues

Bruce,
I think the call yesterday was very useful- although it was unfortunate the time did not work out for you. We went through the list of issues Eric sent out, including the programming issue. You and I talked about this some last week, and I told Eric I thought we could work it out in advance of the June 6th meeting. As we discussed, you have already converted the FWM into VBA with an Excel overlay- this is consistent with agency comments on the FWM TM that it be converted to VBA to improve transparency.

For application of the FWM with time steps, I can see that this conversion would be very useful. I think we would be willing to use your VBA version of the FWM for the development of PRGs for the Round 2 report if you can make it available to us in the next few weeks. Otherwise I would propose we just use the Excel version Jon Arnot provided. The only other alternative would be for us to independently convert the model from Excel to VBA which I think could create problems of its own since ours would likely be different from what you now have even if the models functioned the same. I'm not sure if this VBA transparency comment was yours or someone else's on the agency team. Based on the call the call yesterday, I got the impression that the Excel based model (which lacks macros except one for results display, which can be removed) was not an issue for all on the agency team. Please let me know what you think. My preference would be for us to just use Jon's Excel version or secondly, to use yours if its ready. It would be great if we could resolve this in advance of the June 6th meeting and focus that time on the other issues we have to work out. I am around all day today if you want to discuss this further.
Thanks, Nancy

From: HOPE Bruce [mailto:HOPE.Bruce@deq.state.or.us]
Sent: Wednesday, May 31, 2006 8:52 AM
To: Nancy Judd
Subject: RE: Selection of species for FWM- 2 smaller issues

We're taking these and other FW model issues up at a gov't conference call this morning. I (or maybe Eric) will be getting back to you on what happens there.

-----Original Message-----

From: Nancy Judd [mailto:nancyj@windwardenv.com]
Sent: Friday, May 26, 2006 3:46 PM
To: HOPE Bruce
Subject: Selection of species for FWM- 2 smaller issues

Bruce,
Since the FWM will be used for RBCT (PRG) development for both eco and human health, we need agreement from both risk assessment groups on our list of species to model. I think several agency eco folks are already involved but wasn't sure about HH? On our side, the eco team seems to be fine with a reduced list of modeled species, but the HH team has some concerns about not including carp since there are populations that fish specifically for carp. The LWG HH team thought the agency HH team might have similar concerns.

Another issue is related to scavenging and cannibalism. In your doc (section 1.2.2.1) it says, that since the purpose of the model is to inform remediation decisions and not precisely predict tissue residues these relationships are not included. For application of the model to develop RBCTs (PRGs) would we want to consider those feeding strategies since precision is more of a priority? We had a generic juvenile fish compartment in our model for this reason. I can see the advantage of having the same structure for the FWM for both the RBCT application and fate and transport modeling, but we should all be comfortable with the assumptions we are making for both applications.

Thanks, Nancy

Nancy Judd

Windward Environmental, LLC

200 West Mercer St., Suite 401

Seattle, WA 98119

Phone(direct line): 206-812-5419

Phone(main line): 206-378-1364

Fax: 206-217-0089

E-mail: nancyj@windwardenv.com

www.windwardenv.com

This communication is made under the framework of the LWG Participation Agreement and in the parties' common interests in meeting LWG member obligations under the Administrative Order on Consent and in anticipation of litigation concerning liability for the Portland Harbor Superfund site. This communication is intended and believed by the parties to be part of an ongoing and joint effort to develop and maintain a common legal strategy and contains strategies, work product and legal advice within the "common interest" extension of the attorney-client privilege and the work product doctrine. This communication may include attorney-client communications. With respect to communications by private LWG members to public members, those communications are with the expectation that they will be kept confidential by the public entities. The information is intended to be for the use of the individual or entity named above. If you are not the intended recipient, please be aware that any disclosure, copying, distribution or use of the contents of this information is prohibited. If you have received this electronic transmission in error, please notify me by telephone at (206)812-5419, or by electronic mail, nancyj@windwardenv.com.