From:	OMEALY Mikell
To:	OMEALY Mikell; Jeremy Buck; PETERSON Jenn L; Robert.Neely@noaa.gov; Ron Gouguet; Joe Goulet/R10/USEPA/US@EPA; Chris Thompson; rgensemer@parametrix.com; Burt Shephard/R10/USEPA/US@EPA; howp@critfc.org
Cc:	Chip Humphrey/R10/USEPA/US@EPA; ANDERSON Jim M; Eric Blischke/R10/USEPA/US@EPA; Valerie Lee
Subject:	RE: Project Meeting to discuss Scale (as in risk)/Facililitator for Framework Discussions
Date:	03/24/2006 06:38 PM

Sorry - my reference to the April 4 meeting below is incorrect; it's April 3 in Centralia.

-----Original Message-----
From: OMEALY Mikell [mailto:Mikell.Omealy@state.or.us]
Sent: Friday, March 24, 2006 5:18 PM
To: Jeremy Buck; PETERSON Jenn L; Robert.Neely@noaa.gov; Ron Gouguet; joe goulet; Chris Thompson; rgensemer@parametrix.com; shephard.burt@epa.gov; howp@critfc.org
Cc: Humphrey.Chip@epamail.epa.gov; ANDERSON Jim M; Blischke.Eric@epamail.epa.gov; Valerie Lee
Subject: RE: Project Meeting to discuss Scale (as in risk)/Facililitator for Framework Discussions

Hello Eco Team members,

In preparation for the April 11 meeting with the LWG (location TBD) to discuss scope and scale issues for the ERA, we need your thoughts and comments on the March 15 LWG submittal, "Proposed Ecological Risk Assessment Decision Framework." Your comments on this document will help determine the issues we'll discuss on April 11, and inform our April 4 internal meeting in Centralia. Here's what I need from you.

By next Thursday, March 30 (if possible), please review LWG's March 15 ERA Framework document and send me the following information:

-- What are a few aspects of the proposed framework that you like? This can include specific ideas or general concepts proposed in the document.

-- What statements, ideas, approaches or concepts in the proposed framework do you disagree with, and what alternatives do you suggest for what the LWG has proposed? Please provide your ideas for how we should do things for each area you disagree with, along with a short statement about why your idea/approach is what we should do/use.

-- What aspects of the LWG's proposal need a greater level of definition or detail to be useful to us, and what should that level of definition or detail be? Please provide your ideas on how to better define any areas you think are too vague at this point.

If you have other comments that don't fit into one of these questions, feel free to send me those as well. If the March 30 deadline for this information poses a problem for you, please let me know. Once I receive your comments, I'll compile them (consolidating if appropriate) and send them back out to the group for review. We'll use the issues you identify as background information for our April 4 meeting and as the basis for developing an agenda for the April 11 meeting. If you have any questions or other ideas to prepare us, please let me know.

Thanks,
Mikell

-----Original Message-----
From: Humphrey.Chip@epamail.epa.gov [mailto:Humphrey.Chip@epamail.epa.gov]
Sent: Friday, March 24, 2006 5:02 PM
To: audiehuber@ctuir.com; ANDERSON Jim M; cunninghame@gorge.net; exec@envintl.com; howp@critfc.org; jean.lee@envintl.com; jeremy_buck@fws.gov; Smith.Judy@epamail.epa.gov; Kawabata.Sylvia@epamail.epa.gov; KEPLER Rick J; tomd@ctsi.nsn.us; Lori_Cora/R10/USEPA/US@epamail.epa.gov; Sheldrake.Sean@epamail.epa.gov; Blischke.Eric@epamail.epa.gov; joeo@nezperce.org; MCCLINCY Matt; struck.rodney@deq.state.or.us; PETERSON Jenn L; POULSEN Mike; Fuentes.Rene@epamail.epa.gov; Black.Curt@epamail.epa.gov; Robert.Neely@noaa.gov; emadden@ecoisp.com; Goulet.Joe@epamail.epa.gov; Davoli.Dana@epamail.epa.gov; jeff.baker@grandronde.org; Shephard.Burt@epamail.epa.gov; OMEALY Mikell; Koch.Kristine@epamail.epa.gov; TOEPEL Kathryn; Rose Longoria
Subject: Project Meeting to discuss Scale (as in risk)/Facililitator for Framework Discussions

Two quick items before Eric and I check out for Spring Break

1) We have asked Mikell OMealy to facilitate planning for the Eco/HH Subgroup meeting April 3rd (internal meeting on "scale") and April 11th (meeting with LWG to discuss the eco framework), and to be our facilitator for the April 3rd and April 11 meetings. Mikell will be sending out further details &instructions soon, which will include reviewing the LWG's Eco Framework Document . Please work with Mikell so we can have a productive discussion on the 3rd and start our preprations for meeting with LWG on the April 11th.

2) A few details and initial thoughts on April 3rd - The SCALE Meeting

Location: Centralia, Washington - Olympic Club (Joe - this is reserved, right?)
Time: 9:30am to 3:30pm

Mikell will be developing the agenda with input from the group. Here are some thoughts about what we need to accomplish. Basically, we are trying to come up with an approach to answer those nagging questions about the appropriate scale(s) of the risk assessment.

1) What are the options for looking a scale, (ie, site-wide, point by point, intermediate). What basis - home range, AOPC, physical constraints, habitat, etc. Is the LWG Eco Framework document the appropriate vehicle for moving forward?

2) Eco and HH overlap on scale discussions, framework discussions.

2) Other examples - Ron Gouguet, NOAA discussion on approaches used at other sites.

3) What difference do the different approaches make in determining site risk? - Parametrix thoughts on looking at different assumptions for exposure estimates; ie preliminary risk calculations (via Eco and HH hazard quotients, existing TRVs) for example chemicals using a couple of example receptors (including human health from fish consuption pathway).

4) Preparation for the April 11 meeting with the LWG - this meeting will focus on the LWG's framework for eco

If time allows, we will also need to have a short discussion on the PRE comments.