

ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD

Site # EH File 1.07.06.00 P&E  
Confidential: Yes        No   ✓    
Admin. Record: Yes   ✓   No         
Key Words/Comments: re: questions  
raised by Health Board

Scott  
Brown/MO/R8/USEPA/US  
02/09/2007 03:44 PM

To Melanie Reynolds <mreynolds@co.lewis-clark.mt.us>  
cc Bill Brattin <brattin@syrres.com>, Jan Williams  
<janwilliams@co.lewis-clark.mt.us>, John  
Wardell/MO/R8/USEPA/US@EPA, Julie  
bcc  
Subject Re: Questions for EPA's toxicologists

Thanks, Melanie. Please let us know if additional questions arise. John Wardell and I have requested technical/toxicological support from Dr. Griffin and Dr. Brattin regarding these and other questions. Melanie Reynolds <mreynolds@co.lewis-clark.mt.us>



Melanie Reynolds  
<mreynolds@co.lewis-clark.mt.us>  
02/08/2007 04:02 PM

To Jan Williams <janwilliams@co.lewis-clark.mt.us>, Kathy  
Moore <kmoore@co.lewis-clark.mt.us>, Scott  
Brown/MO/R8/USEPA/US@EPA  
cc Julie DalSoglio/MO/R8/USEPA/US@EPA, Susan  
Griffin/EPR/R8/USEPA/US@EPA, John  
Wardell/MO/R8/USEPA/US@EPA, Bill Brattin  
<brattin@syrres.com>  
Subject Re: Questions for EPA's toxicologists

Hi Scott:

Yes, we would appreciate it if you would forward these questions to the toxicologists for their responses. I am working with the board of health to see if they have some additional questions that they would like to have answered.

Thanks again for your presentation last week.

Melanie

Melanie Reynolds, M.P.H.  
Health Officer  
Lewis and Clark City-County Health Dept.  
1930 Ninth Ave  
Helena MT 59601  
(406) 457-8910 (phone)  
(406) 461-0417 (cell)  
(406) 457-8990 (fax)

>>> <Brown.Scott@epamail.epa.gov> 2/2/2007 4:25 PM >>>

Melanie, Kathy and Jan: Below are the questions that were posed during last evening's meeting with the Health Board, which John Wardell and I offered to forward on to EPA's toxicologists. I took special note of the questions last night, to the best of my recollection; however, I would appreciate your review and concurrence that the Board members' questions are as accurately portrayed as possible.

1. In light of evidence that children may be affected by blood lead levels as low as 4 or 5 ug/dl, and evidence that any level of lead is unhealthy for developing children, "why did the EPA and CDC not lower

1070600



465910

19  
the level [of concern] below 10 micrograms [lead per deciliter blood]?"

2. "Won't the level [of concern] be lowered in the future? What if the level is lowered to 5 [micrograms per deciliter] sometime in the future?"

3. "Is it accurate that the model output for East Helena is 520 ppm?" [Clarification added: This question arose during the discussion, I assumed, in response to Daryl Reed's statements that (a) the model output specific for East Helena is 520 ppm and (b) the EPA's most recent guidance on setting cleanup levels "at sites like East Helena, says to use the model."]

4. "Why are the action levels at several other sites, like the Vasquez Boulevard site near Denver, 400?"

5. What percentage of [East Helena] children participate in blood lead screenings and is that enough? [Clarification added: This two-part question arose during discussion of (a) how many children participate each year, (b) how the numbers of participants vary each year, and (c) whether or not children in East Helena are still "elevated." An important corollary question should be: Are the East Helena blood lead data representative and useable?]