0075362

Elzie, Teri L

From: Brad_Frazier@r1.fws.gov
Sent: Tuesday, October 03, 2000 3:59 PM
To: james_h_jr_zeisloft@rl.gov; Aida_Farag@usgs.gov; Aaron_DeLonay@usgs.gov; JMCC461@ECY.WA.GOV; lgol461@ecy.wa.gov; viguelav@dfw.wa.gov; gadbois.larry@epa.gov
Cc: Tom_OBrien@r1.fws.gov; Dan_Audet@r1.fws.gov; TLElzie@mail.bhi-erc.com
Subject: RE: Cr/Salmon Study - Response to Comments, Conference call

Folks:

As promised, we are providing a more-detailed response to the most-recent comments (i.e., precisely how they will be addressed in the Final report) for your review prior to the conference call. The detailed responses to comments from DOE-RL are written below. The detailed responses to comments from EPA-Larry will be faxed shortly to Jamie, Jay, Larry Goldstein, Lauri, and Larry Gadbois (please let me know if you do not receive the faxed information). We will need to discuss the comments from WA Dept. of Ecology. Hope this helps in preparation for the conference call.

RECEIVED
JAN 15 2008
EDMC

Thanks,
Brad

These are the changes that we have proposed in response to the concerns expressed by DOE (RL). Perhaps this may alleviate the concerns or at least
help to focus the discussion on these points.

Inserted into the Summary and Methods Sections per DOE RL Comment #6:

"Chinook salmon parr were exposed for 105 days to 24 and 54 µg Cr/L. Neither growth nor survival of parr was affected as a result of exposure to these concentrations for 105 days. On day 105 concentrations were increased from 24 to 120 µg Cr/L and from 54 to 266 µg Cr/L until the end of the experiment on Day 134. Exposure concentrations were increased after the initial 105 days in an attempt to produce an observable response (e.g., behavioral abnormality, reduced growth, mortality) that could be related to fish health assessment parameters. Results and interpretation of data collected after Day 105 will refer to the three experimental treatments as 0, 24/120, and 54/266 g/L Cr to reflect the exposure history of these groups."

With respect to the use of the term, "Day":

In toxicological investigations, exposure is defined in terms of both the concentration of the substance and the duration of time the organism is exposed. The confusion over the use of the term "Day" might be best approached in the report in the following ways: 1.) Ensure that each study task clearly defines the lifestage(s) tested 2.) Clearly define in the Methods section for each study task a Day 0, which is the day that corresponds to the initiation of chromium exposure in that task. 3.) Add a sentence in the methods section to clarify the use of the term "Day", I suggest the paragraph below to be the most appropriate---

"The range of chromium (Cr) concentrations tested in the experimental water ranged from 0 to 266 µg/L. These concentrations were above and below the chronic AWQC for chromium, 11 µg/L (USEPA 1986). This concentration range is also representative of concentrations in pore water sampled from the intergravel substrates in locations where salmon spawn (Giest 1997, Hope and Peterson 1996). Specific concentrations are stated with each task. The day on which chromium

and 4.) rephrase sentences in the Summary sections (since these sections are often read without respect to the report in its entirety) to explicitly read in terms of exposure time, for example, "after 83 days of exposure" is preferable to "on Day 83" for these sections.

I hope these changes will provide more clarity.

Best regards,

Aaron J. DeLonay
Ecologist

U.S. Geological Survey
Columbia Environmental Research Center
Columbia, Missouri

James_H_Jr_Zeisloft@RL.gov
10/02/00 10:51 AM

To: Laurence_E_Gadbois@rl.gov, JMCC461@ECY.WA.GOV, lgol461@ECY.WA.GOV, viguelav@dfw.wa.gov, Brad_Frazier@r1.fws.gov, Aida_Farag@usgs.gov, Aaron_DeLonay@usgs.gov
cc: Tom_OBrien@r1.fws.gov
Subject: RE: Cr/Salmon Study - Response to Comments

Weds at 10:00 is the preferred time. I've set up our typical call-in conference call. The toll free number is 1-800-664-0771 and the local number is 376-7411 (when you get the recording, dial 0 and ask the operator for the Jamie Zeisloft conference call). Talk to you Weds.

Jamie

> -----Original Message-----
> From: Zeisloft, James H Jr
> Sent: Thursday, September 28, 2000 3:21 PM
> To: Gadbois, Laurence E; JMCC461@ECY.WA.GOV; lgol461@ECY.WA.GOV;
> viguelav@dfw.wa.gov
> Cc: Brad_Frazier@r1.fws.gov
> Subject: Cr/Salmon Study - Response to Comments
>
> Folks,
>
> Looks like we still have some unresolved issues pertaining to the subject
> responses and therefore need a conference call. RL's issues are
> relatively minor and should be easy to remedy. However, some of you seem
> to have more complicated issues. And I agree with EPA Larry that we need
> to see the changes that USGS intends to make.
>
> I'd like to suggest that we talk next Tues afternoon at 1:00 or 2:00 p.m.
> or Weds morning at 9:00 or 10:00 a.m. Please let me know your preference.
> Does anyone know who to contact at NOAA with regards to the responses?