Northeast Cape
Risk Assessment Meeting

September 20, 2001
10:30 am Alaska (11:30 Pacific, 2:30 Eastern)
via conference call
1-800-779-3215 code #49153 / Virginia Talley Room

Attendees:
Lisa Geist, Corps of Engineers
Richard Jackson, Corps of Engineers
Bruce Narloch, Montgomery Watson Harza
Jeff Brownlee, Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation
Stephanie Pingree, ADEC
Ronie Shackleford, US Army Center for Health Promotion and Preventive Medicine
Larry Tannenbaum, US CHPPM

Agenda

Introductions

Purpose and Objectives of the Conference Call

Discuss conceptual site model and additional details to be incorporated into the draft risk assessment workplan under development.
Reach agreement on methods, including proposed receptors/pathways.

Proposed Methods for the Human Health Risk Assessment

Tier I Assessment
Tier II Assessment

Proposed Methods for the Ecological Risk Assessment

Tier I Assessment
Tier II Assessment

Resolution of Outstanding Risk Assessment Issues

Discuss New Issues Regarding the 2001 Phase III Remedial Investigation

Adjourn

Summary of 9/6 Conference Call

Proposed Approach for Human Health Risk Assessment (HHRA)

Conduct a Tier I Screening HHRA for each source area:

Screen maximum soil and sediment concentrations against ADEC Method 2 Soil Cleanup Levels (Tables B1 and B2).

Screen maximum groundwater concentrations against ADEC Method 2 Groundwater Cleanup Levels (Table C).

Depending upon the screening results, proceed to a Tier II HHRA.

Conduct a Tier II Baseline HHRA

Evaluate exposure scenarios as described in the Preliminary CSM.

For the consumption of biota by local residents, the following methods will be proposed:

- Reindeer (use the results of the ATSDR study, which suggests that this is not a significant exposure pathway).
- Fish (exposure point concentrations to be based on the NEC fish sampling results).
- Plants (exposure point concentrations to be based on the NEC plant sampling results).
- Marine mammals (we will propose that this is not a significant exposure pathway due to home range considerations).

For direct/indirect contact with abiotic media, the following will be proposed:

- Incidental ingestion of soil/sediment.
- Dermal contact with soil/sediment.
- Inhalation pathways for soil/sediment (we believe that this pathway is insignificant, and will request ADEC's concurrence).
- Consumption of, and bathing with, surface water.
- Consumption of, and bathing with, groundwater (we believe it is highly unlikely that groundwater would ever be used as a drinking water resource, and we request to know if ADEC has designated groundwater at NEC as a drinking water resource).

Proposed Approach for Ecological Risk Assessment (ERA)

Conduct a Tier I Screening ERA for each source area containing adequate habitat:

Screen maximum soil concentrations against Eco SSLs and other applicable soil benchmarks.

Screen maximum sediment concentrations against EPA sediment quality benchmarks, Ontario sediment benchmarks, or NOAA effects range low (ERL) values.

Screen surface water concentrations against National Ambient Water Quality Criteria (NAWQC) or other aquatic benchmarks

Depending upon the screening results, proceed to a Tier II ERA.

Conduct a Tier II Baseline ERA

For terrestrial habitats and receptors:

- Quantitatively evaluate hazard indices (HI) for the following food chain: Soil-to-Plants-to-Rodents-to-Fox.

- Propose that reindeer need not be quantitatively evaluated because
  (1) they have a large home range, (2) they do not utilize the wetland areas for foraging or breeding, and (3) the results of the ATSDR study suggest that they are not being impacted by site-related contaminants.

For aquatic/wetland habitats and receptors:
- Quantitiatively evaluate HIs for resident and anadromous fish.
- Propose that waterfowl need not be quantitatively evaluated because they
  (1) have a wide home range, (2) are migratory and are only present a for a small fraction of the year, and (3) are observed on site and do not appear to be impacted. (Based on the 9/6 conference call, we have flexibility on this issue, and will evaluate waterfowl as requested by ADEC).

For marine habitats and receptors:
- Propose that marine mammals need not be quantitatively evaluated because they
  (1) have a wide foraging range, (2) are migratory, (3) do not use inland areas of NEC for foraging or breeding, and (4) are abundant and do not appear to be impacted.
- Propose that the glaucus gull also need not be evaluated because
  (1) although they use both inland and marine areas, they have a wide foraging range, (2) are migratory, and (3) are abundant and do not appear to be impacted. (Based on the 9/6 conference call, we have flexibility on this issue, and will evaluate the glaucus gull as requested by ADEC).

Regarding an agenda for the meeting, I recommend keeping it simple. I would propose something to the effect:

Introductions
Purpose and Objectives of the Conference Call
Proposed Methods for the Human Health Risk Assessment
  Tier I Assessment
  Tier II Assessment
Proposed Methods for the Ecological Risk Assessment
  Tier I Assessment
  Tier II Assessment
Resolution of Outstanding Issues
Adjourn

You may also have issues related to the biological sampling that was just completed, or the proposed ecological monitoring approach that you want to discuss.

I hope this helps. Please let me know if you have any disagreements with my summary of the 9/6 conference call, or whether we need to discuss anything else before the call. Thanks.

Bruce.