

Comments on the  
Human Health Risk Assessment  
GE/Housatonic River Site  
Rest of River  
Volumes I-V  
6 June 2003  
DCN:GE-060603-ABPM  
Environmental Remediation Contract  
US EPA  
US Army Corps of Engineers

31 July 2003

The following issues and questions are submitted for the Peer Review Panel on the HHRA:

- Fish consumption advisories remain in effect in both MA and CT. How do these factor in to the assessment of risks?
- The non-cancer health effects of TEQ's are not in the human health risk assessment at present, but are substantial. How can these effects and the risks be expressed in this quantitative risk assessment?
- Are there enough data from the right places in CT to make any conclusions of low risk, or no risk in CT?
- This risk assessment does not consider domestic and farm animals. Where and how should domestic and farm animals be included in the risk assessments? As part of this, or as part of the ecological risk assessment?
- There are no cultural practices included in the human health risk assessment, in spite of the fact that the Schaghticoke Tribe of Kent fish the river, and foreign immigrants are fishing the river. What should the HHRA do to include these groups and exposures? How much will the risks increase due to these practices?
- The human health RA does not use the same structured WOE analysis as the ecological, and would the conclusions not be strengthened if it did?
- New information (e.g. Schantz et al) shows neurological effects of PCB's on older adults, yet these do not seem to be in the RA. How much greater are the risks, the area of significant risks and the need for protective measures given these new findings?
- What additional data should be collected in CT to be sure that hot spots and older deposits of PCB's and TEQ's are found and cleaned up?

Dr. Peter L. deFur  
Technical Advisor , Housatonic River Initiative  
Richmond Virginia  
July 31, 2003