From: **Dawn Ioven/R3/USEPA/US**
Sent: 7/18/2012 3:28:21 PM

To: johnson.eric@epa.gov
CC:
Subject: READING FILE - Fw: Revised Tox Eval for Radionuclides - Dimock

----- Forwarded by Dawn Ioven/R3/USEPA/US on 07/18/2012 03:27 PM -----

From: Dawn Ioven/R3/USEPA/US
To: Kelley Chase/R3/USEPA/US@EPA
Cc: Richard Fetzer/R3/USEPA/US@EPA
Date: 07/18/2012 12:38 PM
Subject: Re: Revised Tox Eval for Radionuclides - Dimock

Hi, Kelley. Made that minor modification to the radionuclide memo; I also struggled with the term "contaminants," so I appreciate your suggestion. This should be good to go.

[attachment "Radiological Data.docx" deleted by Dawn Ioven/R3/USEPA/US]

I'm wrapping up the lithium (R2) memos right now; just want to give them a quick review to avoid mistakes. You should get them within the hour. Regarding the new data you mentioned in your e-mail, just send me the electronic file when you have it. Dimock is a priority, so I'll drop whatever else I'm doing to get to that. Thanks.

Dawn

Dawn A. Ioven, toxicologist
U.S. EPA - Region III
(3HS41)
1650 Arch street
Philadelphia, PA 19103
215.814.3320

From: Kelley Chase/R3/USEPA/US
To: Dawn Ioven/R3/USEPA/US@EPA
Cc: Richard Fetzer/R3/USEPA/US@EPA
Date: 07/18/2012 12:12 PM
Subject: Re: Revised Tox Eval for Radionuclides - Dimock

Hi Dawn -

No problem - thanks for double checking. The revised memo looks good - one minor comment on something we missed before. Would it be acceptable to change: "the presence or absence of *chemical*contamination" to .... presence or absence of chemical substances... ?

Lithium memos by COB today or tomorrow is great!

Just one more thing...

We neglected to mention that we expect (hope) to send you additional data for review later today. This would include the following:

1) Results of recent (July?) sampling for Mn only at HW-8a and HW-8b (wellhead samples collected at HW-8a and post treatment samples collected at taps at HW-8a and HW-8b)

 DIM0101224

2) Supplemental R1 sampling of three new homes in May (HW-62, HW-63 and HW-64). This will include reports for chemical and biological data (SVOCs, VOCs, metals, glycols, methane, micro etc.) and the RAD reports. I think that there were a few exceedances of the chromium TL - not MCLs.

Not sure what your schedule is this week? Sorry - I know you don't have this yet - but when we send it - need your review ASAP. The results will also be sent to HQs, water division and ATSDR - per the established process.

The plan is to release ALL data next week.

THANKS for your help - Kelley

From: Dawn Ioven/R3/USEPA/US
To: Kelley Chase/R3/USEPA/US@EPA
Cc: Richard Fetzer/R3/USEPA/US@EPA
Date: 07/18/2012 08:03 AM
Subject: Revised Tox Eval for Radionuclides - Dimock

Hi, Kelley. Good news (although, I'm a bit embarrassed). Two weeks ago, when I ran the PRG Calculator for Pb-214, I mistakenly didn't adjust the trigger to reflect a cancer risk of 1E-04. (I used the value for 1E-06.). After making the adjustment last night, there are no trigger exceedances for Pb-214 (or any other radionuclide). I revised the language in the draft memo to accurately capture this; I also clarified that triggers are set at an excess cancer risk of 1E-04.

I will get started on the lithium memos, so language is consistent with the original memos. I should have that to you by COB today. Also, I'll call Janine later today to inform her of the changes. Thanks.

Dawn

[attachment "Radiological Data.docx" deleted by Kelley Chase/R3/USEPA/US]

Dawn A. Ioven, toxicologist
U.S. EPA - Region III
(3HS41)
1650 Arch street
Philadelphia, PA 19103
215.814.3320