From:	ANDERSON Jim M
To:	Eric Blischke/R10/USEPA/US@EPA; Chip Humphrey/R10/USEPA/US@EPA
Cc:	MCCLINCY Matt; POULSEN Mike; PETERSON Jenn L; GAINER Tom
Subject:	RE: Summary of Outstanding Portland Harbor Issues
Date:	05/13/2008 09:52 AM

Eric,
Your summaries very much help identify, define, & frame the issues we've resolved & need to resolve. In your e-mail below you ask us identify any omissions or inaccuracies in your summary (recognizing of course that it is a summary) prior to Wednesday's meeting. Here are several minor "book-keeping" issues you may want to include for completeness:

1) You list a number of issues in your 2-page "Issue Resolution Summary" that are not covered in your longer "PH Issue Resolution Summary" including:

-"Resolved"- 23. Evaluation of a future erosion scenario in the BERA. You should add this issue in your longer "PH Issue Resolution Summary".

-"Unresolved- To be resolved post June 1, 2008"- 8. TZW PRGs; 9. Schedule for developing and use of PRGs; 11. Refinement of floating percentile model; 12. Application of the WOE approach. You should add these 4 issues to your "PH Issue Resolution Summary".

2) In your 2-page "Issue Resolution Summary", you don't list "Dilution factor to apply to TZW TRVs"(John Toll's "shielding" issue) in the "Resolved" section…, but it is included on page 8 of your "PH Issue Resolution Summary". You should add this issue to your 2-page "Issue Resolution Summary". On page of your "PH Issue Resolution Summary" you say that the "Dilution factor to apply to TZW TRVs" is discussed under TZW. I assume you mean in the "Transition Zone Water- Risk to Benthic Community" on page 3…, but this section on page 3 doesn't really describe the resolution of the issue. The resolution was that the LWG should not apply a dilution factor, but can talk about shielding or dilution in uncertainty text.

Jim

-----Original Message-----
From: Blischke.Eric@epamail.epa.gov [mailto:Blischke.Eric@epamail.epa.gov]
Sent: Friday, May 09, 2008 12:07 PM
To: Shephard.Burt@epamail.epa.gov; Humphrey.Chip@epamail.epa.gov; Davoli.Dana@epamail.epa.gov; GAINER Tom; Grepo-Grove.Gina@epamail.epa.gov; PETERSON Jenn L; jeremy_buck@fws.gov; ANDERSON Jim M; Goulet.Joe@epamail.epa.gov; Smith.Judy@epamail.epa.gov; Koch.Kristine@epamail.epa.gov; MCCLINCY Matt; howp@critfc.org; POULSEN Mike; Fuentes.Rene@epamail.epa.gov; Robert.Neely@noaa.gov; Sheldrake.Sean@epamail.epa.gov; tomd@ctsi.nsn.us; csmith@parametrix.com; rgensemer@parametrix.com; rose@yakama.com; erin.madden@gmail.com; jay.field@noaa.gov; Cora.Lori@epamail.epa.gov; Ader.Mark@epamail.epa.gov; BBarquin@hk-law.com; audiehuber@ctuir.com; Lisa.Bluelake@grandronde.org; sheila@ridolfi.com; Benjamin Shorr; LavelleJM@cdm.com; Mary.Baker@noaa.gov; Michael.Karnosh@grandronde.org; FARRER David G; dallen@stratusconsulting.com; jpeers@stratusconsulting.com; (b) (6) ; Bob Dexter; cunninghame@gorge.net; JMalek@parametrix.com; Madalinski.Kelly@epamail.epa.gov

Cc: Yamamoto.Deb@epamail.epa.gov; Cox.Michael@epamail.epa.gov; lbernardini@parametrix.com
Subject: Summary of Outstanding Portland Harbor Issues

I am attaching two documents that summarize where we are on a number of Portland Harbor technical and management issues that we have been discussing over the past few months. The first document provides an overview of the various issues and identifies whether that issue is resolved or unresolved and identifies those issues that we expect to resolve by next week and those that will be resolved post our June 1, 2008 deadline for resolution of RI and BRA issues. The second document provides a summary of each issue and the resolution status.

As everyone should be aware, we have a technical team meeting scheduled for Wednesday, May 14th to resolve outstanding technical issues. A follow-up management meeting is scheduled for Thursday morning, May 15th to confirm the status of each issue and resolve any outstanding management issues.

If you are planning on attending the Wednesday meeting, please review these attachments in advance of the meeting. Although there are a large number of unresolved items, many of these may only require a clarification or confirmation that the issue is in fact resolved. However, there are a number of issues that will required some detailed discussion. These include:

Data Presentation Issues: This is really the chemical lists that were sent out and the scale of the CSM and nature and extent presentations in the RI report. Chemical Degradation Rates: The issue here is whether to calibrate the fate and transport model or test the model using a range of conservative degradation rates to see which rate best matches site data. BERA Problem Formulation: The key issue here is probably the interpretation of bioassay data and the related use of negative controls and the total biomass endpoint.

The three items outlined above are not meant to be a comprehensive list. Rather I provide this list as a starting point for getting ready for Wednesday's meeting. Please be prepared to discuss the above topics as well as any other topics you identify based on a review of the summary document that will also require detailed discussion. If you identify any items, please send them to me along with your perspective so I can

be prepared for Wednesday. In addition,please identify any omissions or inaccuracies in my summary (recognizing of course that it is a summary) prior to Wednesday's meeting.

If you have any questions about all of this, please let me know. As usual, I appreciate everyone's efforts in working to resolve key issues related to the draft RI and BRA reports.

Thanks, Eric

(See attached file: IssueResolutionOverview050908.doc)(See attached file: PHIssueResolutionSummary050908.doc)