Message

From: LEAD, JAMIE [JLEAD@mailbox.sc.edu]
Sent: 1/24/2020 4:24:51 PM
To: Partridge, Charles [Partridge.Charles@epa.gov]; MCDERMOTT, SUZANNE [SMCDERMO@mailbox.sc.edu]; Katie Hailer [khailer@mtech.edu]
CC: Wall, Dan [wall.dan@epa.gov]; Greene, Nikia [Greene.Nikia@epa.gov]
Subject: RE: Meconium paper

Flag: Follow up

Dear Charlie,

I am back in my office and working on it now.

Best, Jamie

From: Partridge, Charles [mailto:Partridge.Charles@epa.gov]
Sent: Thursday, January 23, 2020 6:12 PM
To: LEAD, JAMIE <JLEAD@mailbox.sc.edu>; MCDERMOTT, SUZANNE <SMCDERMO@mailbox.sc.edu>; Katie Hailer <khailer@mtech.edu>
Cc: Wall, Dan <wall.dan@epa.gov>; Greene, Nikia <Greene.Nikia@epa.gov>
Subject: Re: Meconium paper

Drs. McDermott, Hailer and Lead,

Please find attached an external memorandum that we recently received from Montana Resources. Please note that EPA did not collaborate or provide any input into this document so all inquiries should be directed to Montana Resources. Also, any update on the anticipated timeline of your review of the literature and/or our access to the instrument data from South Carolina would be greatly appreciated.

Thank you for your time,

Charlie Partridge

From: LEAD, JAMIE <JLEAD@mailbox.sc.edu>
Sent: Monday, December 23, 2019 4:28 AM
To: Partridge, Charles <Partridge.Charles@epa.gov>
Cc: MCDERMOTT, SUZANNE <SMCDERMO@mailbox.sc.edu>; Katie Hailer <khailer@mtech.edu>; Wall, Dan <wall.dan@epa.gov>; Greene, Nikia <Greene.Nikia@epa.gov>
Subject: Re: Meconium paper

Dear Charles

I will critically review literature data as soon as I get back to my office. I do have other deadlines but know this is important. I hope to complete my own evaluation of the literature data by end January. Happy to discuss with you subsequently. My own reading was initially different, but as there is disagreement, it is important to reassess everything. If the findings are interesting enough (whatever the conclusion), I would hope to publish the data in the form of a short review in STOTEN. A broader review would look at current knowledge and utility of meconium as an indicator of exposure.

I'll use your question (and implied hypothesis) as basis for the search.

Best, Jamie

Sent from my iPhone

On 21 Dec 2019, at 22:16, Partridge, Charles <Partridge.Charles@epa.gov> wrote:

> Dear Dr. Lead,
>
> From the email traffic and the conversations we had with Drs. McDermott and Hailer, I understand that you may be out of the country and/or on travel for work/vacation. I would like to thank you for taking the time to respond to our questions. I am providing the attached papers (links) for your information and review. (Unfortunately, we cannot provide the pdf of each article in this email, due to copyright restrictions.). If you have any difficulty obtaining from your library the full text of the articles we reference, I am sure I can send them to you directly via traditional mail. We realize your time is valuable; however, due to concern this has generated in the Butte community, we would appreciate a prompt review Please find attached two files: 1) a copy of the results of our literature search and the associated links, and 2) a graphical representation in tabular, log scale and linear scale of the results of the references cited in your paper and others we have identified in the literature. I have 2 questions, based on your paper and the ongoing literature review we are performing. Our review of the literature is draft and ongoing, and we therefore request that this information not be shared outside of the individuals on this email.
>
> Can you or your co-authors please identify the reference on page 1 of your paper, second sentence in your Abstract Results: "The concentrations found in Columbia were in the low ug kg-1 range (or less) and were similar to the low levels that have been identified in other studies of meconium"
>
> According to the literature review and the data presented, wouldn't the correct conclusion be that the infants tested in SC were far below reported in the literature? And that the infants tested in Butte were within the observable range of that which is seen in the literature?
>
> After you and your co-authors have had a chance to review this information, we would like to arrange a call to discuss your findings at your convenience.
>
> Thank you
>
> Charlie Partridge
>
> Charles R. Partridge, Ph.D.
> Toxicologist
> U.S. EPA, Region 8
> Technical Assistance Branch
> Denver, Colorado
> 303-312-6094 (office)
> 720-498-3715 (cell)
>
> <Summary table-figs_12-19-19.pdf>
>
> <Meconium References.docx>