Message

From: Mead, Ralph N. [meadr@uncw.edu]
Sent: 2/2/2018 5:14:54 PM
To: Mark Strynar[Ex. 6 Personal Privacy (PP)]; Strynar, Mark [/o=ExchangeLabs/ou=Exchange Administrative Group (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/cn=Recipients/cn=5a9910d5b38e471497bd875fd329a20a-Strynar, Mark]
Subject: Re: UNCW's test results for GenX, etc.

Hi Mark,

I hope all is well. In light of the data released this week from DEQ, it seems like we captured the plum in our sampling of raw and finished water at CFPUA. Our location downstream and weekly sampling will hopefully shed some light on the variability of GenX and other potential non-point sources (e.g.rain, groundwater, sediments) in the Cape Fear system. We are currently processing our duplicates for all of of those samples and will include in our next report to CFPUA once complete.

Will you be free for a phone call Feb. 12th to touch base?

Have a good weekend,

Ralph

.
-- Ralph N. Mead Ph.D.
Professor
Dobo 242b
Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry
UNCW
Office: 910-962-2447

From: Mark Strynar <Ex. 6 Personal Privacy (PP) n>
Date: Monday, January 29, 2018 at 7:38 AM
To: Ralph Mead <meadr@uncw.edu>, "Strynar, Mark" <strynar.mark@epa.gov>
Subject: Fwd: UNCW's test results for GenX, etc.

Hi Ralph,

I had this email exchange with Vaughn Hagerty over the weekend. My comments were mainly on the Figs and Tables did not seem to agree in the report and a couple of Figs seemed to show the same data (Fig 1,2). Now when I come into work this AM I have multiple emails in my EPA inbox discussing the results compared to other results (I think from a CFPUA) sampling event offset by one day each). Glad to chat if you have some time.

Mark

---------- Forwarded message ----------
From: **Vaughn Hagerty** <Ex. 6 Personal Privacy (PP)>

Date: Sat, Jan 27, 2018 at 7:06 AM
Subject: Re: UNCW's test results for GenX, etc.
To: Mark Strynar <Ex. 6 Personal Privacy (PP)>

Thanks, Mark. This is very helpful. Most of the questions I and others had about the data in Table 1 had to do with the degree of variability. And, while I realize it's a big, twisting, moving river among other factors, in a number of cases UNCW's data seem to contradict data from DEQ and CFPUA on or near the same dates.

Ralph Meade was out, so I spoke with a couple of others involved in the project. They seem confident in their methods and data, though they're awaiting results from the duplicate samples. Though UNCW did not mention it, one person I spoke with said it might be prudent in a case like this to pass the duplicate to a different lab, perhaps one with more experience in testing these particular compounds.

In any case, I appreciate the response ... at 4:15 in the morning!

-Vaughn

On Sat, Jan 27, 2018 at 4:15 AM, Mark Strynar <Ex. 6 Personal Privacy (PP)> wrote:

Hi Vaughn. Not sure about the numbers in Table 1 on page 3. Seem plausible. However if Table 1 is correct Figure one does not show the proper data. The y axis says PFMOAA which is not GenX. Also Figs 1and 2 appear to be the same data. Lastly the final figure plots Nafion BP2 but no structure is shown in appendix. Ralph Meade at UNCW is the lead. I would ask him.

Mark

On Jan 26, 2018 7:08 AM, "Vaughn Hagerty" Ex. 6 Personal Privacy (PP) wrote:

Hi, Mark. I'm hoping you can help shed some light on what's going on here. As you know UNCW is conducting tests as part of HB 56. CFPUA published the most recent results here:

http://www.cfpua.org/DocumentCenter/View/10623

I'm curious what you think about the numbers reported on Page 3, particularly for GenX. I'm certainly no scientist but I can tell you that there's far less salt in my house right now than the quantity required for me to take these at face value.

Would I be correct in saying that researchers familiar with analyzing PFAS would conclude that there is almost certainly something wrong with UNCW's data? And, if so, why?

If the numbers are plausible, then what is going on?

Regards,

Vaughn Hagerty