

# November 13, 2013, 1:00 – 2:30 EST

---

## Participants

**ATSDR:** Deborah Burgin, Olivia Harris, Steve Jones, John Wheeler

**EPA:** Michael Adam, Michelle Burgess, Vincent Cogliano, Melissa Dreyfus, Helen Duteau, David Herr, Kira Lynch, Mark Maddaloni, Chuck Maurice, Kathleen Raffaele

**NIEHS:** Beth Anderson, Danielle Carlin, Michelle Heacock, Heather Henry, Bill Suk

**MDB (Support Contractor):** Elmer Akin, Maureen Avakian, Larry Reed

## Introduction

Beth Anderson welcomed new work group member Melissa Dreyfus from the community involvement program in the Office of Solid Waste and Emergency Response's Office of Superfund Revitalization and Technology Innovation. She introduced Michelle Heacock of the SRP and acknowledged that Heacock is becoming an active member in the workgroup. Anderson thanked Anne Sowell of ATSDR for her previous participation. Anderson also noted that the action items from the previous webinar had been acted on and would be covered on today's agenda.

Bill Suk gave welcoming comments to the workgroup and emphasized the importance of the work of the R2RA work group to furthering scientific advancements, their application, and the public health goals of all three agencies.

## **Project Updates**

### **Phosphate Amendments to Treat Lead-contaminated Soils**

Mark Maddaloni and Heather Henry discussed the progress of the collaboration project in bringing together SRP researchers with EPA scientists to review the latest research on the use of phosphate amendments, the geochemistry involved, the long-term effectiveness of lead immobilization, the use of other amendments, and related issues such as the potential for mobilization of arsenic in soil when using phosphate amendments. EPA Region II is using this assistance to help direct their RARE grant to assess urban gardening public health concerns with lead, arsenic and other metals in New York City. Maddaloni and Henry and the other involved EPA and SRP scientists organized a panel in the American Chemistry Society's metals session ("Biogeochemical interactions affecting bioavailability and remediation of hazardous substances in the environment") in Indianapolis in September. Maddaloni, Henry and the other SRP and EPA participants also are preparing a journal article to summarize their work on the issue of lead in urban soils and implications for urban gardening. Henry also noted that this collaboration had been useful in adding soil amendments as an area of interest in the SRP RFA.

### **PCBs Inhalation Study**

Maddolni, Henry, and Cogliano gave an overview of the status and lessons learned from this collaboration effort. The importance of the PCBs inhalation study as designed by EPA and the University of Iowa SRP was emphasized for both the IRIS assessment process as well as the regional schools public health issues. It was agreed that it is highly necessary to support these critical needs. There was discussion of the internal EPA process for nominating priority research needs, including for the National Toxicology Program, which is underway and will be meeting soon. There was also an update that the University of Iowa SRP will be conducting a series of relevant webinars starting in January.

## **Soil Vapor Intrusion (SVI)**

Kathleen Raffaele gave a brief summary of the ongoing EPA SVI guidance development process, and that it was taking longer than originally expected. It was noted that it was good that the Brown University SRP conducted a webinar on SVI and included Henry Schuver from the Office of Resource Conservation and Recovery. It was appreciated that the webinar allowed other EPA and ATSDR staff to participate, especially given the very limited travel budgets all agencies are experiencing. Even given the delays in the issuance of the SVI guidance as final, there was one conference call with EPA and Brown SRP, as well as some site specific collaboration. It will be beneficial to have more collaboration in the future when the final EPA guidance is released.

## **BRIDGES (Biological Response Indicator Devices for Gauging Environmental Stressors – Passive Samplers)**

Kira Lynch noted the potential utility of passive samplers such as Oregon State University SRP Kim Anderson's BRIDGES, especially in assessing large contaminated sediment sites. Lynch has been working with Anderson on the Lower Duwamish site. Lynch mentioned that the timeliness of receiving sample results is a lesson learned in her work with the OSU SRP. She's evaluating how it could be integrated into the future sampling plans. There are lessons learned in coordinating sample results with the EPA. Lynch is hopeful about integrating such passive samplers into the long-term modeling plan. It was noted that there is a major need for these kinds of samplers across all the regions. Passive samplers offer a major opportunity to be a valuable reconnaissance tool for large sites in the US and internationally.

## **New Topics: R2RA Progress Report**

The draft R2RA Progress report was distributed to the R2RA work group a few days prior to the Work Group call. Anderson asked that the work group members review the draft and get back to her with

comments as soon as possible so that any changes could be incorporated and the report finalized and posted on the R2RA web site.

### **Ongoing Collaboration Efforts**

Anderson briefly highlighted several ongoing collaboration efforts among the three sister agencies that included the Risk e Learning webinar series, the SRP-ATSDR seminar series in Atlanta, and the Arsenic Scientific meeting planned for spring 2014. Danielle Carlson responded to questions regarding the arsenic meeting, specifying that the meeting is scheduled for March 3-4, 2014. Both Olivia Harris and Kathleen Raffaele noted that also having a webinar format for the meeting would be very helpful for ATSDR and EPA, given the deep cuts in travel budgets.

### **Potential Topics for Information Exchange (aka Mutual Understanding)**

The Work Group had discussed on earlier webinars the importance of increasing the understanding by the SRP research community of the key relevant research needs and programmatic drivers of EPA and ATSDR. The IRIS program was previously identified as a critical area for collaboration. Cogliano and Geniece Lehmann were requested to lead a discussion in the future to assist researchers to better understand the EPA's interests and needs in preparing IRIS assessments. This session may be held in late spring – early summer.

Anderson summarized several other potential information exchange topics, including how a site gets selected as a Superfund site, the importance of the exposure assessment, and the health and risk assessment processes. Raffaele and Burgess will work with Anderson to follow up on potential topics. One topic that generated considerable discussion was getting grantee access to Superfund sites. Given the potential sensitivities and uniqueness of each site, it was agreed that this topic was more suited for R2RA follow on discussions

with SRP, EPA and ATSDR to flesh out the most appropriate and beneficial approaches to this issue.

### **Potential New R2RA Collaboration Efforts**

The last topic on the Work Group agenda was to discuss potential new collaboration efforts. Anderson asked for Work Group input on either their particular knowledge of research/science needs and/or comments on the draft Collaboration Concepts document that was distributed the Thursday (November 7<sup>th</sup>) before the conference call. Anderson asked Larry Reed to summarize the Collaboration Concepts paper. Given the limited time left for the call, the Reed highlighted the seven tables of categories of SRP research projects at the front of the electronic version of the report. Each table represents either an aspect of site work (analytic methods to remediation), or categories of SRP research (Small Business Innovation Research – SBIR, and its R01 grants for discrete, specified, circumscribed research projects).

Only a couple examples of research ready for collaboration were highlighted. These included the Calux analytic method accepted in SW-846 and EPA ORD SITE program-evaluated (Table 1), as well as the research related to incorporating individual susceptibility in risk assessment (Table 5). R2RA Work Group members were asked to give thought to additional R2RA collaboration efforts and to get back to Anderson.

### **Action Items**

Action Items were highlighted during the call and are attached to these summary notes.