

Portland Harbor Community Advisory Group
Draft Minutes for August 8, 2007 Meeting
Minutes by Jackie L. Calder

Present at meeting:

Neighborhood Associations:

Jim Robison	jimrobison@aol.com	Vice Chairperson
Robin Plance	rgplance@hotmail.com	St. Johns Neighborhood
		<i>Education and Outreach Chair</i>
Peter Laughingwolf	wolf@lifeworks.ws	Cathedral Park Neighborhood,
		Webmaster
Jackie Calder	cleanriveroregon@yahoo.com	University Park Neighborhood
		<i>Secretary</i>
Darise Weller	dweller972@comcast.net	Linnton Neighborhood

Environment:

Business:

Steve Gunther	stephenmgunther@yahoo.com	Progressive Products and Services
---------------	--	-----------------------------------

At-Large:

Tom Chisolm	o2boutdoors@yahoo.com	Citizen
-------------	--	---------

Recreation:

Bill Egan	503-286-7734	Oregon Bass and Panfish Club
-----------	--------------	------------------------------

Absent:

Environment:

Travis Williams	travis@willamette-riverkeeper.org	Willamette Riverkeeper
Jane Harris	jane@oregon-health.org	Oregon Center for Environmental (OCEH), <i>Evaluation Chair</i>

Business:

Bill Barrett	barrettauto1@uswest.net	Waterfront Org. of Oregon (WOO)
--------------	--	---------------------------------

At Large:

Bill MacCauley	503-253-2491	Retired longshoreman
----------------	--------------	----------------------

August 8, 2007

Meeting called to order by Jim R at 6:10

Introductions were held.

Announcements: Jackie asked that each CAG member complete forms for PHCAG roster.

He called to have minutes read by each person quietly to themselves and make corrections to group. Minutes for July 11, approved

Outreach

Darise Weller is now Linnton Representative

Outreach meeting is the Field Day. Robin passed out copies of the Field Day Flyer.

Jim R asked for additional topics for monthly Presentations. Judy S asked to have 15 minutes for updates from EPA's Chip Humphrey: A Recon of the remaining Data Gaps for Round 3. They are pinpointing locations of actual sampling.

Jim Anderson—Weblink to Latest Source Control on DEQ website.

ARCO putting in rigid contaminants—sheet pile driven in to the soil. It is in the Linnton area.

Speaker Presentation: Mike Polson, Toxicologist for DEQ.

Topic: Risk Assessment

Everything is always viewed from the risk point of view. Risk Assessors ask what the risk is. Then decide if it is important. Now Planning and Scoping.

1. Hazard identification
 - a. Considers all things toxic.
 - b. Levels make the distinction
 - c. Dose makes the poison
2. Risk=Exposure * Toxicity
 - a. Considers concentration intake * Toxicity
 - b. Example: Assumes people drink 2 liters per day of (liquid) for average body weight 70 kg in US.
 - c. 70 ug/L
 - d. Dose for non-carcinogenic chemical=1 ug/kg per day

Jim R. discussed individual's sensitivity. How do you address various levels the of sensitivity of the community? What level do you choose as toxic when sensitivity levels for some members of the community might be more sensitive?

Response: We use the most conservative dose such as the lowest level of non-detect. It is not possible to test on humans so the lab rats are used because they are sensitive.

If > 1

Bill Egan: What about bacterial exposures?

Response: Unless it is listed as a Superfund chemical then the toxicologists do not review it.

Regina Skarsinskas Presentation

Topic: 4 Part evaluation of Potential Risk

We need to decide what is protective enough. Some folks have allergies. Some people cannot tolerate certain chemicals. But we cannot use zero tolerance.

Site Specific Information. If an employee works in one place for 25 years? Is that normal?

Some people live in a home for 30 years, is that average?

But site specific information must be tailor-made for the area that needs addressed. Perfectly clean is unrealistic. Problem with precautionary principle: is that you can take risk assessment from Oregon, Washington, Idaho—all will be different. Each community has different needs. It is important to serve this community's needs.

Laura –Discuss Portland Harbor Site-Human health risk assessment.

Prior approach used as follows.

Programmatic Work Plan—Iterative Approach—Sample, Review, Repeat, 2nd round: sample, review, and repeat.

Baseline Risk Assessment

They did a Conceptual Site Model—Explain how a source-uses a pathway-to get to People (receptors). Pathways-breath, ingest, touch.

Page 2 of handout

Pathways—Fish consumptions as an example. Use a range of ingestion rates. See example page 2 of handout.

Round 2—Addressed certain exposures—found fish ingestion the greatest threat. PCB's are the most problematic in amount and exposure.

Then they look at PCB's that are the highly toxic. They are both highly toxic and ubiquitous.

Robin: Do you review chemical combinations to find if they exacerbate the risk.

No, we do not look at chemical combinations or the synergistic effects.

Regina: It is very complex and thus too difficult to analyze combinations. If you take suggested numbers for water, air and earth, the combination may be too inadequate. The conclusions.

Peter: Can you complete the Risk Assessment and have somebody walk in and say, "This is ridiculous suggesting it is completely in error.

Chip: Most people involved or have an interest usually speak during the process. It would be unusual to have some entity arrive after the fact after all the years of study, analysis, discussion and remediation.

Regina: When they began pH assessment began with very broad perspective of chemicals because there were so many in the river.

Bill E: How can you say that in fish the levels of toxicity does not change?

Response: Because we choose the highest level of toxicity found in all of the samples.

Bill E: If you do not test the cooked fish then how can you know if it is not more toxic?

Peter: How does the Risk Assessment convert to what type of clean up method is used?

Response: Mike: actually, it is applied to the cleanup of the sediment? They use levels in sediment and then view what levels of toxicity in fish.

Tom: What type of cancer do you use to test the chemicals? What other studies do you use? Response: All kinds.

Other studies included would be skin diseases, breathing problems.

Steve G.: Now, US citizens have a 30% chance of getting cancer.

Mike Polson: Cancer probabilities. They make an assumption, that 0 risk is not realistic for cancer.

Steve G.: What is acceptable?

Mike Polson: Is 1 in 10 a good risk level, is 1 in 1000, or whatever. The Oregon Legislature decided that 1 in 1 million is an appropriate level of allowable carcinogen. If we have 1 million people exposed to a toxic dump, then they assume that 300,000 will get cancer from any source. So, the limitation is 300,100 for level of toxicity for the EPA and 300,001 for DEQ.

Jan—If the fish are affected by toxicity making their immune system less defensive and therefore the fish get flesh-eating disease, are they factoring that in? Response: The Eco-Team would need to address this issue. What about 2 liters for a baby? That is not realistic.

Mike Polson: Children are considered separately or they use children's level of toxicity. New directives consider children a major issue to address. In the Portland Harbor, each beach is considered recreational and separately as an individual site.

Jackie C.: When the ATSDR analyzed the Superfund in the beginning of the study, they mentioned that children were particularly vulnerable because they are lower and closer to the sediment, and therefore closer to the contamination. They are also more likely to be indiscriminate about contact with water, sediment and their personal ingestion of it.

Bill E: Is there any part of the Portland Harbor Superfund site that is not contaminated?

Mike Polson: There is some degree of risk throughout the Harbor.

Chip: If you look at the LWG Round 2 report, it shows distinct and separate areas of potential concern that represent specific areas of *higher* risk.

What are we doing to cut off upland sources of contamination to the river?

Jim A: We are doing a lot. We have a large source control program, and mostly due to historic sources, so many of the current sources are operating under permits. The contamination is not being added tremendously from the permittees.

Jim announced due to the late hour, we should close the meeting. Then Bill E. moved to adjourn the meeting, Robin seconded. Motion carried.