

**From:** [Abrams, Gerard](#)  
**To:** [Riley, Norm](#)  
**Cc:** [Faulkner, Brian](#); [Pollock, Gerald](#); [Pappas, Jim](#); [Hathaway, TR](#); [Raine, Laura](#)  
**Subject:** Re: CSM Question  
**Date:** Thursday, October 23, 2008 12:40:17 PM  
**Attachments:** [Figure 4-1 SRAM Rev 2 CSM for Human and Eco.pdf](#)  
[2005 SRAM Rev2 Vol 2 Figures 1-6 to 12-1 APP ABC.pdf](#)  
[2005 SRAM Rev2 Vol 1 2005 SRAM Rev2 TXT, TBL, FIGS to 1-5.pdf](#)

---

Norm

This is a question we should ask Jerry and his team. Section 4 of the SRAM addresses the CSM for Human Receptors. I did a quick review. Fig 4.1 summarizes the CSM pathways for Eco and Human but considers only a Residential Receptor not the agricultural scenario of SB 990. I assume this section will need to be revised to reflect the full range of pathways possible under SB 990.

Dan Hirsch asked how DTSC plans to evaluate the cumulative effects of rad and the chemical in the risk assessment. I assume relevant sections of the SRAM will need to be revisited and updated to address this question and other aspects of SB 990.

>>> Norm Riley 10/23/2008 9:38 AM >>>

1. Do we need Boeing to update the CSM as presented in the current SRAM?
2. Do we need a separate CSM for radionuclides?