From: POULSEN Mike
To: Eric Blischke/R10/USEPA/US@EPA
Subject: RE: Material to Review for Wednesday's (Dec 26) 2:00 PM (PST) Conference Call
Date: 12/27/2007 01:07 PM

Eric -

The original dermal evaluation was in anticipation of a question for the limited exposure scenarios (like swimming). Not that I believe the dermal results for large MW compounds, but I wanted a back-of-the-envelope answer in case it came up. We thought the LWG might as well include the evaluation. However, since we added residential and occupational drinking water to the mix, Dana and I decided to drop the issue. We'll keep the evaluation internally, and perhaps provide it to the LWG. If we include dermal for drinking water, the acceptable levels will go down by an order of magnitude, and the screening levels may not be considered appropriately conservative. I figure if EPA really believed in the water dermal evaluation provided in RAGS Part E, then MCLs for the big compounds would go down by a factor of 10 or 20. Until then, I prefer to see water dermal exposure discussed as an uncertainty. The big compounds are outside of the "effective predictive domain". As I said, I don't believe the results.

I went over the PBDE comment with Dana. She wanted to leave it vague. I figure it is EPA's call.

I think I should spend more time with the CSM (next week). There are some points in EPA's CSM that would be nice to include.

I don't understand your question on Section 3.5.1. I'm heading out the door, so let's discuss next year.

- Mike

-----Original Message-----
From: Blischke.Eric@epamail.epa.gov
[mailto:Blischke.Eric@epamail.epa.gov]
Sent: Thursday, December 27, 2007 10:33 AM
To: POULSEN Mike
Subject: RE: Material to Review for Wednesday's (Dec 26) 2:00 PM (PST) Conference Call

Mike, I think I am ok with Dana's comments. It looks like you decided to delete the comment regarding not evaluating the dermal absorption pathway in the screening step. There are a few comments that I have questions about:

1) The evaluation of PBDEs. It sounds like we do not have a proposal on how to evaluate PBDEs at this time. As always, the more direction the better. I was wondering if there is anything else we want to say about this?
2) The CSM comment. While I have not compared the LWGs release model with the one we developed, I recall from a couple years ago that they were not too different. In any event, I am comfortable with having the LWG use the CSM from our December 2, 2005 data gaps memo. However, I was not exactly sure how to incorporate the Yakama comments on exposure pathway. I probably just need to give it more thought but if you have any insights, let me know.

I think that's about it. Dana and everyone on the HH team did a great job of pulling together the HHRA comments.

Thanks, Eric

"POULSEN Mike"
<POULSEN.Mike@deq.state.or.us>
12/27/2007 09:45 AM

To
Eric Blischke/R10/USEPA/US@EPA
cc
<lavellejm@cdm.com>, Chip Humphrey/R10/USEPA/US@EPA
Subject
RE: Material to Review for Wednesday's (Dec 26) 2:00 PM (PST) Conference Call

Eric -

(b) (6)

(b) (6) If you have any questions on Dana's revisions, let me know.

- Mike

-----Original Message-----
From: Davoli.Dana@epamail.epa.gov [mailto:Davoli.Dana@epamail.epa.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, December 26, 2007 5:08 PM
To: Humphrey.Chip@epamail.epa.gov; FARRER David G; davoli.dana@epa.gov; Blischke.Eric@epamail.epa.gov; lavellejm@cdm.com; POULSEN Mike
Cc: Cox.Michael@epamail.epa.gov
Subject: Re: Material to Review for Wednesday's (Dec 26) 2:00 PM (PST) Conference Call

The conference call that I had planned for today was cancelled as I couldn't get the call in number to work. However, I did speak with Mike P, Dave F. and Eric B on the phone. Attached is the latest version of the comments after speaking with Mike. I made the changes to the 12/21 CHANGES NOT SHOWN file so you can see what changes Mike and I agreed to. Eric is going to incorporate this latest version of the comments into his table of all of the comments. I am hoping that you all review that part of the table to make sure it looks OK to you. We are also going to change all of the "COIs" in the TZW and SW flow diagrams to "COPCs" to be consistent with what is now in the comments.

(See attached file: 20071226 CHANGES SHOWN FINAL Edits to Comment Set Sent to Riskers on Dec 4 Davoli comments on RD 2 Report.doc)

David, I told Eric you would get back to him after hearing from Matt Hunter from ODFW.

HAPPY NEW YEAR!!! Talk to you in late January.