

From: Miller.Scott@epamail.epa.gov
To: [Pat.Cline](mailto:Pat.Cline@epa.gov); [Helton.Kelsey](mailto:Helton.Kelsey@epa.gov); [John.Mousa](mailto:John.Mousa@epa.gov)
Cc: paul.anderson@amec.com; Koporec.Kevin@epamail.epa.gov
Subject: Fw: Supplemental Information for the Koppers Soil and Sediment Risk Assessment
Date: Thursday, April 02, 2009 3:44:59 PM
Attachments: [Diliberto_800_20080527104033.pdf](#)
[HHRA_Note2_dioxin-2.pdf](#)

Folks,

Greetings, attached is additional information that Paul Anderson has submitted related to the Koppers Soil and Sediment Risk Assessment.

Thanks,

Scott Miller
Remedial Project Manager
Superfund Division
Superfund Remedial Branch
Section C
U.S. EPA Region 4
61 Forsyth Street, SW
Atlanta, GA 30303
Phone (404) 562-9120
Fax (404) 562-8896

"Anderson, Paul D \ (Westford\)" < paul.anderson@amec.com > 03/30/2009 09:03 AM AST	To Scott Miller/R4/USEPA/US@EPA cc "Brouman, Mitch \ (Pittsburgh\)" NA < Mitch.Brouman@hanson.biz >, "Council, Greg" < Greg.Council@geotransinc.com >, "Wolfson, Timothy C." < timw@bccz.com >, "Calland, Dean" < dcalland@bccz.com >, "Chris Kirman" < crk@thesapphiregroup.com > bcc Subject
--	--

Good Morning Scott:

Attached is the paper I mentioned on Friday. It presents the results of a study that found that concentrations of dioxins/furans in the blood serum of reproductive age women living in the Kanawha River valley of West Virginia are no different than in the women living in other parts of the US (the valley is reported to have elevated environmental concentrations of dioxins and furans because of releases associated with historical industrial manufacturing).

This study, and the work of Dr. Garabrant, was cited as the basis for California's (CA's) recent proposal to increase the residential remediation goal from 5 to 50 parts per trillion. I have also attached a draft of CA's supporting information for that proposed change. Note that Todd Bernhardt of AMEC has been in touch with Kimiko Klein of CA DTSC suggesting that the real basis for the adjustment of CA's remediation goals should be a change in the expected exposure, and not a change in the allowable risk level, which is how CA is currently justifying the change. The

Garabrant and Kanawha River valley studies showed that exposures to dioxins in soil are lower than expected; they were not studies of regulatory allowable risk levels. Thus, it seems more appropriate to adjust how we estimate potential exposure when deriving remediation goals, not the allowable risk level. Kimi indicated to Todd that others have also provided similar comments and that the DTSC will at some point in the future "...be looking at justifying/supporting the 50 ppt on the basis of 'relative source contribution', 'soil exposure factor', or some like term to acknowledge the very minor role soil plays in dioxin exposure..." (The quote is from an unofficial email Kimi sent back to Todd.)

If Florida were to take the approach that Kimi indicates that CA is likely to move towards, it would mean the residential SCTL for dioxins and furans would increase from 7 to 70 ppt and the industrial SCTL would increase from 30 to 300 ppt, and still be protective at a 1×10^{-6} risk level.

Paul

Paul D. Anderson, Ph.D.
Vice President,
Technical Director, Risk Assessment
AMEC
2 Robbins Road
Westford, MA 01886

Tel: 978-692-9090
Fax: 978-692-6633
paul.anderson@amec.com