

Appendix 1
Response to Public Comments

A draft of the Cedar Service site Health Consultation was made available for public comment from December 8, 2005 until April __, 2006. Four comment letters/e-mails were received. The original comments are available for review from MDH. The comments were addressed as described below. In addition, the document was modified to include soil and groundwater data that was not available at the time the original Health Consultation was prepared.

1. An e-mail was received from an official at Trimodal, who operates a container business on the eastern side of the Cedar Service site. The comment expressed concern for employees at the company who may be exposed to site contaminants. The comment was addressed in a response to the e-mail better describing the location of contaminated soil at the site and the fact that employees at the facility are unlikely to be directly exposed; further description was also added to the text of the document.
2. An e-mail was received from the Bottineau Neighborhood Association expressing concern regarding the fact that the Cedar Service site is just one of a number of sites that could impact Northeast Minneapolis, and that the document did not directly account for the possibility of exposures from multiple sources. It also expressed hope that cleanup of the site is completed promptly, at the cost of the responsible party. Because exposures to contaminants from the site are difficult to quantify, and other exposures are also not quantified, it is not possible at this time to evaluate the potential health effects of multiple exposures.
3. A formal comment letter was received from Golder Associates Inc., on behalf of Soo Line Railroad Company (dba Canadian Pacific Railway, CP Rail). The letter contained a number of comments, which can be grouped as follows:
 - a. Several comments were related to the complex geology and groundwater flow at the site, and the fact that 2004 groundwater data was used in the report. Also, several clarifications were requested regarding the extent of PCP and VOC contamination in groundwater, and other possible sources of PCP. The document has been modified to reflect these changes, and the most recent (2005) groundwater data has been included (see Table 4, Figures 8 and 9).
 - b. Several comments described soil investigation data (especially dioxin data) that was not available when the report was drafted. The data has been included in the final report, and the appropriate sections modified to reflect the new data.
4. An e-mail comment letter was received from a resident and community member with a long-standing involvement in environmental issues at the Soo Line Shoreham Shops. The comments fell into the following general categories:
 - a. Several comments related to communication regarding public health issues, the need for a public meeting on the site, public education, and working with the City of

- Minneapolis. MDH will continue to communicate the results of this Health Consultation, and will work with MDA and the City to ensure that citizens receive the appropriate information.
- b. Public access to the Cedar Service site. The resident pointed out that access to the site is unrestricted, and that it may be a popular area for railfans, graffiti artists, or the homeless. The document has been modified to reflect the potential exists for exposure to these groups.
 - c. The resident expressed concern regarding the potential for inhalation exposure by people working or visiting the three businesses who use water from wells contaminated with PCP. The document acknowledges that such exposures may occur, but are difficult to estimate and are likely to be minor.
 - d. A comment was made regarding blood testing for contaminants of concern in people who may have been exposed to contaminants from the site. Due to the lack of certainty regarding exposure to contaminants from the site, and the fact that blood testing cannot identify the source of exposure, it is not warranted at this time.
 - e. Another comment expressed concern regarding the multiple number of sites and contaminant sources in Northeast Minneapolis, and that the document did not discuss or evaluate exposures from multiple sources. Again, because exposures to contaminants from the site are difficult to quantify, and other exposures are also not quantified, it is not possible at this time to evaluate the potential health effects of multiple exposures.
 - f. Concern was expressed about the lack of HRLs or HBVs for some of the contaminants found in groundwater at the site, and in off-site wells. MDH is in the process of developing HBVs for all compounds found in groundwater and wells at the site for which toxicological information is available.
 - g. A comment was made regarding the perceived uncertainty regarding the breakdown of PCP discharged to the sanitary sewer during wastewater treatment. The document has been modified to remove the uncertainty. PCP, at the concentrations found in the impacted off-site wells, will be fully degraded during wastewater treatment. The concentration of PCP in the wells is well below discharge limits established by the Metropolitan Council.
 - h. The final comments expressed concern over the possible impact of PCP discharges to the Mississippi River. Evaluating the possible ecological impact on the river is beyond the scope of this document. Discharge of PCP contaminated groundwater at the concentrations likely to be found at the river would be of minimal public health concern due to natural degradation of PCP in the river, dilution, and other natural processes.