UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
OFFICE OF RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT
ENVIRONMENTAL CRITERIA AND ASSESSMENT OFFICE
CINCINNATI, OHIO 45268

November 7, 1991

SUBJECT: Meeting Notes of RATS, October 8, 1991

FROM: Cindy Sonich-Mullin
Acting Chief
Chemical Mixtures Assessment Branch

TO: Addressees

Attached please find the notes from the October, 1991 RATS meeting.

Attachment

ADDRESSEES:

Glen Adams (Region IV)
Elmer Akin (Region IV)
Bob Ambrose (ERL-Athens)
Lisa Askari (OSW)
Dorothy Baker (Region IX)
Dave Bennett (OERR/TIB)
Marie Ann Burke (Region I)
Ruth Bleyler (OERR/TIB)
Dermont Bouchard (Region VII)
Carole Braverman (Region V)
Dick Brunker (Region III)
Harlal Choudhury (OHEA/ECAO-Cin)
Pat Cirone (Region X)
Catherine Crane (OWEC)
Judy Crane (ASCI Corp. c/o Bob Ambrose ERL-Athens)
David Crawford (Region VII)
Harriet Croke (Region V/RCRA)
Chris Cubbison (OHEA/ECAO-Cin)
Monique Currie (OERR/TIB)
Dana Davoli (Region X)
Janine Dinan (OERR/TIB)
Bob Dyer (HERL-RTP)
Steve Ells (OWPE)
William Farland (OHEA)
Debra Forman (Region III)
Gary Foureman (OHEA/ECAO-RTP)
Rebecca Fox (Region IV)
Sheila Frace (OWEC)
Jerry Garman (ORD/OTTRS)
Kevin Garrahan (OHEA/EAG)

SUBJECT: Meeting Notes of RATS, October 8, 1991

PARTICIPANTS

Agency

Region I	Sarah Levinson, Steve Mangion and Jui-Yu Hsieh
Region II	Peter Grevatt, Mark Maddaloni, Marina Stephanidis and Larry Tannenbaum
Region III	Debra Forman, Dawn Ioven
Region IV	Elmer Akin, Becky Fox, Kevin Koporec
Region V	Pat VanLeeuwen, Turpin Ballard, LuAnn Vanderpool, Erin Moran and Andrew Podowski
Region VI	Jon Rauscher, Ghasson Khoury, Cindy Kaleri and Susan Swenson
Region VII	Dave Crawford
Region VIII	Chris Weis
Region IX	Roxy Barnett, Stan Smucker and Dan Stralka
Region X	Carol Sweeney
Headquarters	OERR/TIB: Susan Griffin, Janine Dinan, Bruce Means, Jim Konz and Ruth Bleyler
	OWPE: Steve Ells
	ORD/OTTRS: Jerry Garman
RREL-Edison:	Not Present
ERL-Athens:	Bob Ambrose, Bill Sutton and Judy Crane
ECAO-Cin:	Cindy Sonich-Mullin, Ken Poirier, Joan Dollarhide, Bruce Peirano, Harlal Choudury, Chris Haviland (TSC/Labat-Anderson, Inc.) and Tracy Dunkelberger (TSC/Labat-Anderson, Inc.)

Announcements

RAGS (Part B&C)

J. Dinan (TIB) announced that RAGS (Part B & C) has been signed by Henry Clay and is currently undergoing review by the Office of Waste Programs Enforcement (OWPE). It will hopefully be available to the Regions by the end of October 1991.

Proposed New Format for RATS Meeting Notes

C. Sonich-Mullin (ECAO-Cin) explained to the Regions that due to funding and the amount of time required to prepare a detailed description of the notes, the format has been changed and a short summary of the topics discussed and their outcome be reported in bullet form. T. Dunkelberger (TSC) announced that the September

Issues Under Discussion

<u>The Use of Filtered vs Unfiltered Water Samples in Risk Assessment</u>

P. Van Leeuwen (Region V) stated that there seems to be uncertainty across the regions on whether filtered or unfiltered water samples should be collected and which sample should be considered in the risk assessment.

Pat asked for Regional comment on the following two questions:

- Is more guidance information necessary on the issue of whether to use filtered or unfiltered water samples in the risk assessment?

- In your region, are both filtered and unfiltered samples collected? If only one type of sample is collected, which one is collected and which is used in risk assessment?

Region I - S. Levinson explained they usually consult their hydrogeologist, lab specialists and Office of Drinking Water. Sara personally tends to rely on unfiltered samples.

S. Mangion stated as of November 1, 1990, everyone in Region I should be collecting unfiltered samples for metals.

Region II P. Grevatt commented that it is policy in Region II to use only unfiltered samples. Peter suggested there be more guidance or discussion on when to use filtered or unfiltered samples.

Region III D. Forman explained that it is policy in Region III when considering monitoring wells, collect filtered and unfiltered samples, for residential wells collect unfiltered samples only. If the monitoring wells show a discrepancy between the metal concentration in the unfiltered vs. filtered samples, they use the dissolved or filtered samples in the risk assessment.

Region IV E. Akin stated that Region IV requires unfiltered samples be collected for risk assessment purposes, whether it is a monitoring well or a residential well (assuming the monitoring well for a future scenario represents a aquifer for drinking purposes). For fate and transport work they allow for filtered and unfiltered samples.

Theories of how the 0.45 μm filter originated:

1. Biological in origin and relates to bacteria size and mobility of bacteria

2. Relates to physiological considerations such as size of particulate matter that will move in the aquifer.

3. The 0.45 μm was chosen as an arbitrary pore size.

J. Dinan reminded the Regions to keep in mind the major contaminants of concern i.e., metals or organics. Will the metals adhere to the filter or be dissolve in water? You need to know ahead of time what you are looking for.

E. Akin (Region IV) explained there is uncertainty with the 0.45 μm filter. The 0.45 μm is a sterilizing filter it removes bacteria. There are few bacteria that can penetrate the 0.45 μm filter.

Standard Preliminary Remediation Goals (PRGs)

S. Ells (OWPE) led the discussion.

The Office of Waste Programs Enforcement is interested in developing standard PRGs to use at scoping to streamline the remediation process (similar to the Corrective Action Standards). Is this something that the regions would find useful, or would this lead to inadequate characterization of the site and inappropriate cleanup levels?

S. Ells proposed developing a table consisting of exposure values and reference values for chemicals commonly found at Superfund sites. This table would save the RPMs a lot of time during the initial scoping of the site and performing calculations on 10-20 chemicals.

Regional Response:

Region I — S. Levinson expressed support for the table.

Region II — P. Grevatt in agreed in general with the idea of compiling a table. Peter expressed concern that the numbers might be perceived as cleanup goals. The risk managers must understand these numbers are not cleanup goals.

Region III — D. Forman agreed that the table would be helpful. In addition it would be ideal to have an updated table of screening numbers that will accommodate all pathways and the child and adult occupational