

**From:** [Patricia Cline](#)  
**To:** [Miller Scott](#); [Kestle Rusty](#)  
**Cc:** [John Mousa](#); [Pearson Stewart E.](#); [Schafer Amy](#); [Murry Fredrick J.](#); [Herbert John](#); [Hutton Rick](#)  
**Subject:** PVC Comments on Data Report.pdf  
**Date:** Monday, January 06, 2014 10:16:48 AM  
**Attachments:** [PVC Comments on Data Report.pdf](#)

---

Dr. Mousa is appropriately highlighting many of the key issues on the presentation of information in the data report. My focus in the attached comments relate to background and concerns about the fingerprinting - particularly for dioxins. I spent time in greater detail with these data - perhaps a separate more technical discussion with Paul would be appropriate if these data will be used in decision making. As it stands, I have no confidence in the identification of these "clusters" as having any meaning for our decisions - particularly for dioxins.

For background, the use of 3 ppt for dioxin based on the residential samples, or 4.3 ppt based on all background excluding the two outliers (Background defined as 2 times the mean) would be acceptable to me. The values for BGRS including the outlier is clearly unacceptable.

I hope to work with others to develop a more balanced communication of background, other sources, and the rationale for the delineation.

Thanks for the opportunity to review this report.  
Looking forward to the discussion on additional sampling and the approach to final decisions.

Regards

Pat