

**MINUTES OF THE ALUMINUM STUDY REVIEW TEAM MEETING
APRIL 1, 2005**

Team Members Attending: Scott Simonton (EQB)
Linda Keller (DEP)
Kerry Bledsoe (DNR)
Evan Hansen (Citizen Groups)
Jennie Henthorn (Industry Groups)

Advent Rep. Attending: Scott Hall

Review of Request for Proposals

The ASRT reviewed Evan Hansen's concerns with the Request for Proposals (RFP):

- Evan Hansen expressed concern about limiting the pH range to 6-9 in the RFP Phase III description. Scott Simonton expressed that this was done to place the consultants on a level playing field for the proposals, but, as set forth in the RFP, was not intended to steer the ultimate scope of work.
- Scott Simonton stated that he shared Evan's concern, and part of Advent's job will be to look at available information, including pH data, and to find areas where data gaps exist.
- Scott Hall said that Advent will review the toxicity tests cited in the 1988 water quality criteria document and perform a literature review to identify other aluminum toxicity tests not included in the 1988 database. Advent will identify data gaps and will determine whether each toxicity test can be included in the database based upon EPA's guidance document for calculating water quality criteria. Advent will use this work to make its recommendations on how to proceed with any further toxicity studies in Phase III.
- Evan Hansen cited the ammonia criteria document (EPA-822-R-99-014) regarding the development of a pH-dependent criteria, and agreed to send the document to the group via e-mail.
- Evan Hansen expressed concern about sensitive life stages of aquatic species.
- Scott Hall said that the 1985 guidance document requires that different sensitivities of the life stages be addressed.

Review of Advent Capabilities

Scott Hall made a brief presentation on the Scope of Work and Advent's capabilities and experience with developing water quality criteria.

Review of Phase I Work Product

The ASRT members offered the following comments on the Phase I Study Plans:

- Evan inquired on which of the two methods for calculating chronic criteria would be used by Advent. Scott Hall stated that EPA appears to prefer the calculation of criteria based upon the eight family minimum database where possible. However, this matter was still open, and that the data availability would determine the method to be used
- Evan asked about the discussion in the scope of work regarding potential toxicity of the anion in the test solutions. Scott explained that toxicity tests where the anion would also be toxic may have limited usefulness, and that studies should involve a relatively innocuous paired ion so that you know that any toxicity is due to the aluminum.
- Evan asked whether studies which were rejected in the literature review would be included in the database with a notation of the reason that they were rejected. Scott Hall stated that this was their practice in the past and would be done in this study as well.
- Evan asked whether studies which failed to report an EC50 or LC50 would be used in the criteria development, and he suggested that there are likely to be situations when results other than EC50s and LC50s will help narrow in on a criteria value. For example, rather than reporting an LC50, a study might report an aluminum concentration where 45% of the individuals die. Scott Hall stated that the EPA guidance document is clear on what type of studies may be used in the calculation of criteria, but studies which did not meet the criteria would be reviewed to help determine Advent's recommendations for Phase III toxicity testing. Scott also stated that studies that don't report EC50s or LC50s would help Advent develop scenarios to clarify which tests to perform in Phase III and to predict a range of possible criteria values that are likely to be calculated from various Phase III toxicity tests. Studies without EC50s or LC50s would also be reviewed to identify other water quality parameters which might influence aluminum toxicity.
- Kerry Bledsoe asked how extensive the search for literature would be.
- Scott Hall answered that Advent will start with the EPA AQUIRE and Ecotox databases, a similar USGS database, and may use some university search services.
- The ASRT agreed for Advent to proceed with the Scope of Work, as drafted, and Scott Hall agreed that Advent would keep in mind the ASRT comments as it executed the Scope of Work.
- Scott Hall agreed to send monthly updates to the ASRT.

Other Matters Discussed

- Evan Hansen asked if the EQB was contributing money toward this project.

- Scott Simonton said that no EQB money going toward this project. He stated that ASRT members can ask the EQB to reimburse their personal travel expenses.
- Scott Simonton stated that he would send out the call for studies to be considered by Advent.
- The ASRT agreed that, as answers to the call for studies come in, they should be scanned and sent electronically to the everyone.
- Jennie Henthorn asked if anyone on the ASRT had a problem with her assistant, Melissa Liptrap, performing various administrative duties for the team, such as scanning documents and taking notes at meetings. No concerns were voiced.
- The ASRT discussed scheduling the next meeting. The ASRT deferred decision on the meeting schedule until progress was made on Phase II to provide a better idea of timing for deadlines.