Message

From: Hays, David C Jr CIV USARMY CENWK (USA) [David.C.Hays@usace.army.mil]
Sent: 10/20/2020 8:00:02 PM
To: Walker, Stuart [Walker.Stuart@epa.gov]; Praskins, Wayne [Praskins.Wayne@epa.gov]
Subject: RE: HPNS

Stuart, I agree. We have not finished paper yet. But close. Will go through USACE review and then to yall. I need to get you an updated schedule.

From: Walker, Stuart <Walker.Stuart@epa.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, October 20, 2020 2:56 PM
To: Hays, David C Jr CIV USARMY CENWK (USA) <David.C.Hays@usace.army.mil>; Praskins, Wayne <Praskins.Wayne@epa.gov>
Subject: [Non-DoD Source] RE: HPNS

Since DOE Argonne, which manages RESRAD Build can't really figure out how its handling risk assessments for external ground plane fixed contamination, I don't think the Navy is going to figure it out.

On dust, do they even have a similar method to RESRAD Build for addressing chemically contaminated dust in a building? It's a key point for having consistent chemical and radiological risk assessments, particularly since ingestion drives the dust PRGs so its so much a rad as general risk assessment issue.

Dave, did you guys finish the HPNS evaluation paper? I thought it was going to be done on the 15th, I was on AL yesterday but haven't seen anything.

Stuart Walker
Superfund Remedial program National Radiation Expert
Science Policy Branch
Assessment and Remediation Division
Office of Superfund Remediation and Technology Innovation
W (703) 603-8748
C (202) 262-9986

From: Hays, David C Jr CIV USARMY CENWK (USA) <David.C.Hays@usace.army.mil>
Sent: Tuesday, October 20, 2020 2:43 PM
To: Praskins, Wayne <Praskins.Wayne@epa.gov>; Walker, Stuart <Walker.Stuart@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: HPNS

Wayne, you are correct (tres set to 1yr only in BDCC). FYI: I do not see anything in this that we don't already know. The statement "While the calculation of dose for each model is illustrated below, risk is generated by replacing DCFs with slope factors (risk coefficients), in units of (risk/yr)/(pCi/cm2) for external exposure risk." is still a question as all the author does is present the dose assessment. Which we agree makes sense in both RESRAD-BLD and BDCC. What we cant determine is how RESRADBLD applies the Navy selected HEAST value SFs to derive risk from an area source. If the author could demonstrate that it would be very helpful.

I agree model can be tweaked but think in general the issue is that the actual site conceptual model is not what is modeled in the BPRG calculator, or RESRAD-Build for that matter. Back to "all models are wrong, but should be useful". So tweak a model to be useful but as we have discussed, it seems the most likely things to tweak either EPA or the Navy has taken a hard stand on. Obviously just my opinion and hopefully some room for compromise on both sides. I do have some other thoughts on possible paths forward, which we can discuss.

Dave

From: Praskins, Wayne <Praskins.Wayne@epa.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, October 20, 2020 12:42 PM
To: Walker, Stuart <Walker.Stuart@epa.gov>; Hays, David C Jr CIV USARMY CENWK (USA) <David.C.Hays@usace.army.mil>
Subject: [Non-DoD Source] HPNS

Stuart/Dave –

Attached is a write up that the Navy's consultant recently prepared about the evaluation of the HPNS building remediation goals.

It provides summaries of the RESRAD BUILD and EPA calculators, makes a pitch that RESRAD is better, and then briefly discusses two of the calculator inputs (dissipation factor and fraction transferred surface to skin).

(Is it correct that the statement about the 1 year resident time applies to the BDCC, not the BPRG?)

I don't want to use our time tomorrow for a point by point rebuttal or to argue which model is better, but to instead try to focus on the potential for making site-specific changes to BPRG dust model (dissipation factor, exposure assumptions, progeny decay/ingrowth). Let's discuss in our call later this afternoon.

Wayne Praskins | Superfund Project Manager
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Region 9
75 Hawthorne St. (SFD-7-3)
San Francisco, CA 94105
415-972-3181