### Cleanup Standards Scientific Advisory Board Risk Assessment Subcommittee Teleconference Meeting July 12, 2004

The Risk Assessment Subcommittee held a conference call on Monday July 12, 2004 at 9:30 a.m. in the Rachael Carson State Office Building (PADEP) in Harrisburg.

#### Attendees:

Subcommittee Members:

Annette Guiseppi-Elie	Dupont, CSSAB
Bruce Fishman	RBR Consulting, Inc.
Kevin Reinert	Rohm & Haas, CSSAB (chair, RASC)
Randy Shuler	ERM

#### DEP Staff:

Samuel Fang	Land Recycling
Jim Shaw	Land Recycling

Public:

Brian Magee	AMEC
Joe Reinhart	BCCZ
Tim Wolfson	BCCZ

#### **RfD values for resorcinol**

Kevin Reinert summarized current status on the development of the reference dose (RfD) for resorcinol. Rohm and Haas developed an oral RfD of 0.5 mg/kg/d based on a 28-day repeat oral rat study (available on the internet) with a LOEL of 504 mg/kg/d. An oral RfD of 0.45 mg/kg/d could also be derived based on the new 2G drinking water study (rats) from the Resorcinol Task Force (RTF). Previously, Beazer East Inc. (Beazer) also developed an RfD, which was peer-reviewed by Toxicology Excellence for Risk Assessment (TERA). Kevin indicated that he did not have a copy of the original 2G study. Annette Guiseppi-Elie questioned about the unit to represent the RfD value in Kevin's original emails because the unit normally used is mg/kg/day, not mg/kg. The /d was erroneously not included in the original Beazer's RfD value is being revised based on this new 2G study and the recommendations of a TERA review scheduled for November. AMEC, consultant for Beazer, will be revising the RfD recommendation and the report should be available to the RASC in September when it is provided to TERA for review. In comparison with the NOEL value of 45 mg/kg/d in Kevin's email, AMEC is

expected to derive a preliminary draft NOEL value based on the 2G study similar to 45 mg/kg/d (actual number to be determined based on AMEC report and TERA review). Tim Wolfson stated that they had contacted the RTF to obtain a copy of the 2G study. On behalf of Beazer, they have tentatively arranged another TERA peer review meeting in Harrisburg on November 17 and 18 to review the new AMEC report on resorcinol RfD.

In addition to the TERA review, both Randy Shuler and Bruce Fishman expressed the desire to review the original 2G study personally. Because the original 2G study is a document of over one thousand pages, Kevin asked if an electronic copy of the 2G study would be available. After some discussions, it was agreed that Tim Wolfson will send a copy of the 2G study to Samuel Fang once available. Brian Magee will also send a copy of the new AMEC report to Sam when prepared. Sam will arrange to distribute these documents to the subcommittee members once received.

# **MSCs for resorcinol**

Kevin Reinert summarized some resorcinol MSC values derived by Rohm and Haas based on the oral RfD of 0.5 mg/kg/day. These MSCs could be found in Kevin's email and in a final report approved by the DEP Southeast Regional Office. Because the RfD value for resorcinol may be different from 0.5 mg/kg/day as a result of the TERA peer review meeting in November and additional RASC review, there were some discussions regarding the timely development of the resorcinol MSCs to be included in the proposed regulation amendment. Jim Shaw indicated that he would be able to derive the new resorcinol MSCs very quickly when the official resorcinol RfD value is available. The new resorcinol MSCs should be available in time for the next proposed regulatory amendment in Spring of 2005.

# Secondary MCLs

Kevin Reinert summarized the SMCL table distributed by DEP. Jim Shaw indicated that the major issue surrounding the SMCLs was that a site could meet the Statewide Health standard MSCs, but the groundwater might still not potable due to taste, odor, color, foaming, etc. This issue is not limited to resorcinol only. Other compounds could also raise the same SMCL issue. DEP is asking for suggested paths forward. Bruce Fishman suggested that it would be useful to prepare the alternate MSCs as a separate table to prevent them from being confused with health-based MSCs. If the alternate MSC is lower than the MSC, the alternate MSC would apply. Jim stated that the Regulations had included a separate table for some of SMCLs already. Jim indicated that DEP was considering to change the regulations to address the SMCLs. However, because the MSCs were developed on a compound-by-compound basis, and many of the SMCLs are not compound-specific, it might be difficult to enforce in the Regulations. Kevin Reinert stated that the SMCLs are not enforceable in the drinking water program. Act 2 is riskbased but SMCLs are not and there might be no regulatory basis to address SMCLs under Act 2. Jim stated that whether there was a regulatory basis or not might be subject to the regulatory interpretation. DEP might consider SMCLs as part of the MCLs. Annette

Guiseppi-Elie suggested that DEP could use policy, not regulations, to address SMCL concerns on a site-by-site basis. This suggestion was supported by Kevin. Jim agreed to bring this recommendation to Tom Fidler for consideration.

### Discussions the need for new members

Due to the job relocation or other reasons, some members can no longer participate the subcommittee meetings. Kevin Reinert stressed the need to recruit new members of the academic or local government type and located in Pennsylvania. Annette Guiseppi-Elie suggested the subcommittee to compile a list of persons who might be interested in joining the subcommittee. When an issue surfaces, the subcommittee could select persons directly from the list for participation. After some discussions, it was agreed that current members should send the names of potential candidates to Kevin Reinert and Samuel Fang. The subcommittee will be particularly interested in candidates from academic or governmental sectors.

The call ended at 10:30 AM

S. Fang 15 July 2004