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Life Before Exponent

Joy:

• B.S. – Manhattan College Biochemistry
• M.S. – Manhattan College Environmental Engineering
• 22 years at HydroQual/HDR – consulting services
• Started with Exponent in 2017

Amanda:

• B.S. – Drexel University Materials Science and Engineering
• M.S. – Drexel University Biomedical Engineering
• Ph.D. – Drexel University Materials Science and Engineering
• 10 years experience in characterizing nanomaterials for biomedical applications (i.e. drug delivery)
• Started with Exponent right after grad school in 2018
Environmental Science Practices

Environmental and Earth Sciences

Ecological and Biological Sciences

• Over 80 technical staff
• 13 principals
• Offices
  – Seattle, Boston, Oakland, San Francisco, Irvine, Pasadena, Alexandria, Atlanta, Phoenix, Houston, Washington DC
Recent Hires at Exponent

Dan Hoer

• B.S. – University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill (2009)
  o Environmental Science
  o Began working on a research project that became part of his PhD dissertation

• Ph.D. – University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill (2015)
  o Chemical Oceanography - Biogeochemistry
  o Chemical cycling and ecosystem ecology of Caribbean coral reefs and tropical nearshore waters.
  o Connections formed during side projects, led to a postdoctoral fellowship in a lab at Harvard.

• Postdoctoral Fellow – Harvard University (2015-2018)
  o Organismic and Evolutionary Biology
  o Biogeochemistry of deep sea hydrothermal vents and cold hydrocarbon seeps

• Research Scientist and Engineer – Harvard University (2018-2019)
  o Biogeochemistry and underwater technology development

• Exponent (October 2019)
Sean Ryan

- 2007 B.S., Conservation Biology, San Jose State University, CA
- 2010 M.S., Ecology and Evolution, Bowling Green State Univ, OH
- 2015 Ph.D., Evolution and Ecology, University of Notre Dame, IN
  - Government employee for 3 year position. Applied for and awarded USDA NIFA fellowship
- 2017-2019 USDA-NIFA postdoctoral fellow, dual affiliation: University of Tennessee, Knoxville, TN & North Carolina State University, NC
  - Principle investigator

2019 Exponent
Environmental Strengths: Multiple Disciplines

• Diverse, interlinked portfolio of technical strengths
  – Chemistry
  – Geology/Hydrogeology/Geomorphology
  – Aquatic and terrestrial biology
  – Ecology
  – Toxicology
  – Water resources

  – Veterinary medicine
  – Statistics
  – Modeling
  – Engineering
  – Economics
  – Data visualization and GIS
  – Data optimization
  – Editors/Library science
Types of Projects

Reactive (Litigation)
- Environmental claims (various)
  - Sites
  - Spills
  - Wildfires
- Toxic Tort claims
- Insurance cost recovery claims
- Maritime claims

Proactive (Risk Management)
- Liability estimation
- Product risks and liability
- Water resources
- Ecological asset valuation
- Climate change
Biomedical Engineering

- Over 35 technical staff, including Drexel co-ops
  - Diverse expertise
    - Biology
    - Biomedical Engineering & Sciences
    - Bioengineering
    - Mechanical Engineering
    - Chemical Engineering & Chemistry
    - Materials Science & Engineering
    - Electrical Engineering
    - Modeling
    - Physics
    - Veterinary medicine

- Primarily engineering focused compared to Health Sciences & Environmental/Ecological/Biological Sciences practices

- 5 principals

- Offices
  - Philadelphia, Menlo Park, Austin, Chicago/Warrenville, Detroit
Focus Areas: “Reactive” Work

• Primarily litigation based; work with medical device companies and their attorneys to analyze claims regarding specific medical devices

• Examples
  – Failure analysis of medical devices (Product liability)
  – Intellectual property litigation
Focus Areas: “Proactive” Work

- Perform nonclinical testing according to different standards and FDA guidances under GLP conditions for submission to national and international regulatory bodies
- Focused on evaluation of medical devices (occasionally pharmaceutics)
- Examples
  - Mechanical testing of medical devices and tissue-engineered constructs
  - MRI compatibility testing
  - Dissolution and solubility testing
  - Shelf life/stability testing
  - Materials characterization of biomaterials (SEM, FTIR, DSC, microCT, etc.)
  - Wear analysis of implants
Project Examples
What is Risk Assessment?

- Presence of Humans or Valued Ecological Receptors
- Potentially Complete Exposure Pathways
- Hazards or Effects Associated with Chemical or Physical Alterations on Site
- Exposure Levels (magnitude & duration)
Japan v. Korea Seafood Safety

- Great East Japan Earthquake and tsunami – March 11, 2011
- Caused nuclear accident at the Tokyo Electric Power Plant
- Emission of Cs-134 and Cs-137 (8-37 PBq)
- Seafood safety Cs - 100 Bq/kg
- From 2011-2014 – collected over 60,000 marine and freshwater samples
  - 17 highest priority samples – 99% of population <100 Bq/kg
Case Study – “Paintshop Pond”
Site History

- Henry Wood’s Son Paint Factory manufactured dry paint pigments (1848~1920s)
- Wellesley College purchased the land in 1932 and demolished all buildings
- Colorful red, yellow, orange, green soils around the pond were obvious
- 1903, health officials noted high levels of lead Lake Waban
- In 1970 DEP and environmental groups sampled soils around lake and pond noting high levels of lead, chromate (Cr(VI))
- Wellesley College covered the colored soils with a tarp, fenced it off and put signs up.
- Added 600 tons of clean sand to swimming areas of the lake annually
- 3000 tons of soil near paintshop pond were excavated
- College wanted to distance itself from responsibility for Lake Waban
- In 1982 environmental assessment began (Lake Waban, The Pond, Wetlands, Upland environments)
Initial protective step?
Things to Consider?
# Soil Data for A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compounds</th>
<th># Analyzed</th>
<th># Detected</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Metals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arsenic, Total</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cadmium, Total</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>0.045</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chromium, Total</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>110,000</td>
<td>2,883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copper, Total</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead, Total</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>214,000</td>
<td>5,433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mercury, Total</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nickel, Total</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>4,900</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silver, Total</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chromium III</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>61,600</td>
<td>1,753</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chromium VI</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>48,400</td>
<td>1,436</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Sediment Data for E

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compounds</th>
<th># Analyzed</th>
<th># Detected</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Metals (mg/kg dry wt.)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arsenic, Total</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cadmium, Total</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.045</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chromium, Total</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>10500</td>
<td>2883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copper, Total</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead, Total</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>15000</td>
<td>6000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mercury, Total</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nickel, Total</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>3000</td>
<td>1500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silver, Total</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chromium III</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>10500</td>
<td>2883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chromium VI</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Reference Data for Soil and Sediment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metal</th>
<th>Local Background for Soil (mg/kg)</th>
<th>Local Reference for Sediment (mg/kg)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arsenic</td>
<td>2–16</td>
<td>3–8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cadmium</td>
<td>1–5</td>
<td>1–4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chromium total</td>
<td>20–40</td>
<td>15–30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copper</td>
<td>10–25</td>
<td>15–40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead</td>
<td>20–45</td>
<td>30–50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mercury</td>
<td>0.1–1</td>
<td>0.1–1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nickel</td>
<td>10–35</td>
<td>5–45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silver</td>
<td>0.02–3</td>
<td>0.01–3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Our Screening Identified Key Metals

- Lead
- Chromium
- Arsenic
Other things to consider?

- What do we know about the toxicity of these chemicals?
- Receptors at site
Swim and Fish

Fish and Wildlife
- Waterfowl
- Upland birds
- Mammals
- Amphibians
- Fish
The data indicated….

- **Lake Waban**
  - Fish populations are sustained (only growth effects)
  - Metal exceedances of WQC
  - Food chain modeling indicated wildlife not impacted by metals
  - No significant risk found

- **Paintshop Pond**
  - WQC exceeded for Al (not site related)
  - Risks to benthos, fish and wildlife were low
  - No significant risk found

- **Wetlands**
  - Number and types of plants similar to references
  - Number and species of birds and wildlife similar to reference areas
  - Very few amphibians
  - Metals in the waters and soils are bioavailable
  - Wetland functions maybe comprised, some risk found

- **Upland**
  - Vegetation is stress
  - Food chain modeling indicated birds and mammals at risk
  - Visual observations
  - Risk is found
How might the risk be reduced?
Remedy

- Cleanup level of 600 ppm lead in sediment to protect water fowl
- Cleared 30 acres of trees
- Water drained from Paintshop Pond
- 1200 fish were moved to Lake Waban
- 20,000 yd$^3$ soil treated on site
- 36,000 yd$^3$ excavated
- Soil buried under protective barrier to prevent spread of contamination
- Athletic fields built on top of protective barrier
The End Result
Total Product Lifecycle

Postmarket

Premarket

Design

Analytical Evaluation

Clinical Evaluation

Quality Systems 21CFR §820

Reactive

Proactive

Manufactur. Compliance

Approval/Clearance

Postmarket Surveillance
Spinal Repair

• Kyphoplasty
  – Minimally invasive procedure for spinal compression fractures that occur in vertebrae weakened by osteoporosis
  – Aims to reduce pain, stabilize vertebrae, and restore vertebrae to its normal height
Exponent was asked to validate the method to determine mechanical stability.
Spinal Repair

• What can be tested to ensure mechanical stability?
  – Company is also making their own proprietary bone cement
  – Want to restore vertebrae to normal height
  – Want to restore vertebrae function
Spinal Repair

Step 1: Test stability of bone cement
  - Under static & fatigue conditions

Step 2: Test the entire procedure in cadaver spines
Spinal Repair

- **Step 3: Survivability**
  - Collaborative effort: Biomedical engineering, biostatistics, and health economics
  - BKP: balloon kyphoplasty; VP: vertebroplasty
  - BKP and VP are cost-effective alternatives to nonsurgical management
Surgical Mesh

Surgical Mesh Alert
If you or a loved one suffered medical complications from a Transvaginal Mesh Implant, you may be entitled to Financial Compensation.

www.FloodLawGroup.com
CALL 800-417-9951

THE BLEEDING EDGE
What life-saving technologies might actually be killing us?

Infection
Wound reopening
Chronic pain
Bowel obstruction
Revision or repair surgery

HERNIA MESH / LEGAL HELPLINE
CALL US NOW 1-800-916-6690
Surgical Mesh

• Medical device used to provide additional support when repairing weakened or diseased tissue
• Usually permanently implanted and fixed with sutures or tacks

What properties should be tested when designing this biomaterial?
Surgical Mesh

- Lawsuit claims:
  - Mesh degrades *in vivo* and suffers losses in physical performance

- Company asks Exponent to investigate these claims

- What are ways we can characterize the mesh?
  - We receive a small excised piece of the mesh (1” x 1”) from a patient that is surrounded with tissue and fixed in formalin
  - Part of the claim states that these meshes oxidize *in vivo*
Surgical Mesh

Plaintiff alleges that cracking on the mesh fibers indicates oxidation.

Exponent showed that this “cracking” effect was caused by tissue adherence, and it could be cleaned to expose an unoxidized, nondegraded surface.

Smooth surfaces exposed with no visible ductile damage, and have the same manufacturing extrusion lines.
Q & A