

**Drinking Water Quality Institute – Health Effects Subcommittee
NJDEP Building, 401 East State Street, Trenton, NJ
February 1, 2006**

Meeting Minutes

Members present: David Pringle, Perry Cohn, Leslie McGeorge

Also attending: Gloria Post, Diane Pupa, Gary Czock, Linda Walsh, Michele Putnam

Scheduled Agenda:

1. Status report on all chemicals with New Jersey-derived Health-based MCLs (Gloria Post)
2. Chemicals needing no further review – Discussion of draft Summary Document (Gloria Post)
3. Recommendation for Vinyl Chloride – Discussion of document (Perry Cohn)
4. Recommendation for 1,1-Dichloroethane – Discussion of document (Gloria Post)
5. Additional discussion and plans for next meeting (Subcommittee members)

Meeting Notes:

D. Pringle opened the meeting at 10 am and went over the topics of the three handouts; An agenda, a status report on the review of health-based MCLs, and a summary document for the review of the 17 chemicals needing further review.

It was noted that all of the support documentation for the chemicals under review is being included in a deliberative work product compiled by the Health Effects Subcommittee for public review.

G. Post went over the five categories of progress on her handout entitled “Status of Review of Health-Based MCLs”. The first category (No Further Review Needed) covers

the list of compounds referred over to Testing, and has been discussed in past meetings. A separate handout provides details.

PCBs are included on the list of compounds referred to the Testing Subcommittee. A question was raised on behalf of the Testing Subcommittee asking were specific PCBs reviewed (e.g. arachlors) and/or which CAS# was used by the Health Effects Subcommittee during its review process. Members discussed the need to ensure that the three subcommittees are consistent with specific chemicals being reviewed. Further talk on PCBs followed, including discussion that PCBs are more of a soil problem than a drinking water concern, application of the appropriate slope factor, and that the MCL is driven by analytical limitations. As a result of the discussion, G. Post will expand her write up for PCBs and provide to subcommittee for comments.

Chlordane, which is also on the list referred to testing, was brought up as well because there are three forms. Discussion followed including such points as chlordane is a mixture, it is used for termite control, and that chlordane is not very soluble in water.

The second category (Draft Review Document Complete) includes two compounds: 1,1-Dichloroethane and Vinyl Chloride. These have separate handouts and are discussed in detail later.

Compounds in category 3 (Potential Update Based on Revised Policy for Group C Carcinogens) are expected to be completed before the full Institute meeting on 3/31/06.

Much of the work is done for the compounds in the 4th category (Preparation of Draft Review Document in Progress) and should be completed in a few weeks. Specifically, the first four in this category plus two from the 3rd category will be completed in draft form to HE Subcommittee by 2/28.

UPDATE since meeting: The draft documents are prepared for three of these chemicals, 1,3-DCB, 1,4-DCB, and 1,1-DCE, and these are currently awaiting comment from the subcommittee per an email by G. Post dated 3/17/06.

The three contaminants in the 5th category are those currently without MCLs. The review of health-basis for these will be deferred until review of preceding four categories is complete (i.e. category 5 given lower priority vs. all those that do have MCLs). These three do have Ground Water Quality Standards. Members agreed that it is appropriate to refer these three contaminants to the other subcommittees in the meantime. Prior to referral to the other subcommittees, G.Post will provide D.Pupa with a ballpark of what the health-basis might be.

G.Post went over her draft document for 1,1-Dichloroethane which provides support for her recommendation. The current reference dose is 0.0065 mg/kg/day and current health-based MCL is 46 µg/l. She evaluated changing the reference dose based on a newly published study, but believes that the current reference dose is based on a more sensitive endpoint and, therefore, recommends no change in the current NJ health basis.

Question raised regarding the occurrence of this compound in drinking water. Discussion followed about the difference between the NJ and EPA carcinogen classifications. EPA classified this contaminant a Group C carcinogen while NJ considers it to be Group D. Considering it as Group C would likely result in lowering the health-based MCL to 4.6 µg/l (5 µg/l rounded). G.Post and P.Cohn are in agreement in the judgement that this chemical is not a Group C carcinogen, and that is not necessary to lower the health-based MCL. G.Post will make a few revisions to her support document to clarify her justification on why NJ should keep a Group D classification for this chemical. She will provide to subcommittee in about a week and subcommittee should provide comments by 2/28.

Note: Based on some comments made on discussion at the HE Subcommittee meeting, G.Post prepared a revised document in support of a revised recommendation that she (in consultation with P.Cohn) proposes to classify 1,1-Dichloroethane as Group C carcinogen. The final result is a recommended health-based MCL two-fold lower than the current one.

P.Cohn went over his support document on Vinyl Chloride. He explained that a newer EPA approach incorporates early life exposure and that results in a cancer potency slope factor of 1.47 mg/kg/day which is equivalent to a MCL of 0.024 µg/l. Changing the NJ health-based MCL accordingly is recommended. This change would be a 3.5-fold difference from the current NJ health-based MCL of 0.08 µg/l. Members requested that more information on the adjustment to the slope factor be added to the support document. This contaminant will now be referred to the testing subcommittee since an actual MCL change for this compound will likely be PQL driven.

P.Cohn discussed the status of his review of Benzene. He is in the process of evaluating two risk assessments: California Public Health Goals (0.35 µg/l) and IRIS (range 0.6 – 2 µg/l). He indicated that he is presently leaning in agreement with California's health basis. The PQL is 1 µg/l now, and NJ old number is 0.15 or 0.2 rounded.

G.Post asked for subcommittee input on 1,4 Dichlorobenzene. Current number is 75 ug/L and a review of health basis ug/L suggests 70 at this point. Would we want to suggest such a change or only if the difference is greater? Members discussed and decided that a change should be recommended.

Note: After further review, a G. Post revised her recommendation for 1,4-DCB and is now recommending that the HB MCL be changed to 14 ug/L.

Action Items:

G.Post and P.Cohn will revise their draft documents on Vinyl Chloride, and 1,1-Dichloroethane and will also make revisions to specific sections (PCBs and chlordane) of the Summary of A-280 chemicals not needing further review. The revised draft documents should be provided to the subcommittee members in about a week or so. Members should provide any comments to G.Post by 2/28 so that she can have final drafts ready for 3/14, and final versions prepared for full Institute meeting on 3/31.

Refer the three compounds (Ethylene glycol, MEK, 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol) currently without MCLs to other subcommittees for review. G. Post to provide ballpark idea of health basis prior to referral.

Refer Vinyl Chloride to the Testing Subcommittee since health basis is complete and any MCL change will likely be PQL driven.

Minutes Prepared By:
Linda Walsh & Diane Pupa
NJDEP-BSDW
Water Supply Operations