

Human Health Risk Assessment (HHRA) - Flin Flon / Creighton Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)

January 12, 2010

Teleconference

Attendance

MB Conservation:	Dave Bezak, Dean Kasur, Ines Hiraoka
MB Health:	Lawrence Elliott, Susan Roberecki
MB STEM:	None
MB Water Stewardship:	None
SK MOE:	George Bihun
SK Health:	David Sampson, Monika Dutt
Health Canada:	Sandra Slogan
HBMS:	Alan Hair, Shirley Neault
Intrinsic Environmental:	Elliot Sigal, Adam Safruk
Facilitator:	Sheldon McLeod
Observers:	Tom Lindsey (part of meeting)

Introduction

- The agenda was reviewed and accepted.
- The notes from the December 8 meeting were accepted.
- The action items from the previous meeting were updated as indicated in the tables below.

Update on HHRA

Reference Documentation – TAC-HHRA Update January 2010

- Intrinsic personnel provided an update on the responses to the Independent Expert Review Panel (IERP) comments and the revised draft HHRA report:
 - The response to the IERP comments was submitted to the TAC and to TERA on December 23, 2009 as Appendix T of the draft HHRA report. Also submitted on that date was the HHRA (main) report as amended in response to the IERP comments.
 - Once comments from the TAC and TERA are received, the report can be finalized and will be ready for publication. If necessary, a point-by-point response to comments will be provided.
 - The draft Evaluation of Exposure Study report is scheduled to be submitted on February 17 to the TAC for comment.
 - The face-to-face meeting scheduled for February 24 to discuss the Evaluation of Exposure Study report and the summary report can still proceed as scheduled.

Question: Did the panel supply any more reasons for the recommendation to not use 100% bioaccessibility for arsenic and lead in indoor dust (besides 100% being too conservative)? And does using 33% and 58% respectively have implications on the excel spreadsheet or IEUBK models?

Response: No additional reasons were supplied. The use of the recommended numbers affected the preliminary remediation goal (PRG) for lead in indoor dust in the spreadsheet but the default number was used in the IEUBK model, so there are no implications on the final number from that model. The remaining uncertainties are addressed in Chapter 7 of the HHRA report.

Question: Why wasn't the overall provisional trigger concentration (PTC) for lead adjusted? Why wasn't the total impacted?

Response: When using the IEUBK model, if site-specific data is not available, then the model uses default values, which are similar to the bioaccessibility numbers. The model looks at distributions allowing for predictions of soil concentrations.

Question: Then why did we use the excel spreadsheet model?

Response: Because it was needed for all of the other chemicals of concern. The bottom line is that either number still triggered the exposure study.

Question: We know that there is cadmium in the air, so why was cadmium not included in the exposure monitoring?

Response: With the pending closure of the Smelter, the assumption was made that the risk from air will be reduced in the near future. The estimated exposure to cadmium via inhalation accounted for only 4% of the total exposure.

Comment: The deadline for the TAC to supply comments on the draft report was agreed on as February 8 (see action #145). It is very important that the comments are supplied as they are known, rather than submitting them all on the deadline date. One comment has been received so far.

CAC

- The TAC was asked for their thoughts about the inclusion of the CAC over the next two months:
 - An “in-camera” meeting should be scheduled as soon as possible following this group’s face-to-face meeting so that the same information that the TAC has can be given to the CAC.
 - The meeting may need to be in a workshop format.
 - The CAC may want to meet to strategize the communication of the results. However, this would be hard to do without the information that will need to be communicated.
 - The weeks of March 8 and March 15 should be tested for availability of the CAC members (see action #146). More than two hours is likely needed.

Other Business

- A query from an area resident asked why biomonitoring for cadmium was not being done. An answer was prepared, based on materials from Intrinsik, and sent to the individual. However, he is not satisfied with the response. Input from MB Health may be helpful (see action #147 & #148).
- The process for responding to questions like the one described above was discussed. There have been few questions from the public to respond to date, and most of these have been satisfactorily answered at a local level. However, as previously discussed it should be anticipated that will be more in the near future, as more information is made public.
- The Communications Working Group was initially described to the CAC as having two main roles. They are to ensure the accuracy and consistency of information as well as be responsible for distributing information to interested parties. The CWG now needs to prepare a communications plan to address the issues around the release of the final reports and the questions that may arise. A meeting of the CWG should be arranged to start this process (see action #149).

**NEXT MEETING: Monday, February 8 at 8:00 A.M. (MB), if necessary
 Teleconference**

#	Action	Responsibility	Target Date	Status
143	Poll TAC members for suggestions for providing sufficient technical information to the CAC to enable confidence in process / results	Sheldon McLeod	2010-01-15	2009-12-08, new 2010-01-12, ongoing
144	Distribute one-pager described in action #133 to TAC	Lawrence / Susan / James	2009-12-18	2009-12-08, new 2010-01-12, Complete
145	Supply comments on the draft HHRA and responses to the IERP	TAC Members	2010-02-08	2010-01-12, new
146	Test availability of CAC members for a meeting during one of the weeks of March 8 or March 15	Sheldon McLeod	2010-01-29	2010-01-12, new
147	Send Lawrence the info supplied to the resident with the cadmium concern	Alan Hair	2010-01-15	2010-01-12, new
148	Prepare an additional response to the resident with the cadmium concern	Lawrence Elliott	2010-01-22	2010-01-12, new
149	Arrange a meeting of the CWG to prepare a communications plan.	George Bihun	2010-01-19	2010-01-12, new