APPENDIX D

GUIDELINES FOR ASSESSING~~:~~ CONSTITUENTS WITH SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS

- ~~PETROLEUM HYDROCARBONS~~
- ~~POLYCYCLIC AROMATIC HYDROCARBONS~~
- ~~LEAD~~
- ~~POLYCHLORINATED DIBENZODIOXINS AND POLYCHLORINATED DIBENZOFURANS~~
- ~~NON-TRADITIONAL PARAMETERS~~

~~PETROLEUM HYDROCARBONS~~

D1.0 ~~GUIDELINES FOR ASSESSING~~ PETROLEUM HYDROCARBONS

~~This Appendix presents guidelines for a risk-based approach for the assessment and management of soil and groundwater impacted by petroleum hydrocarbons. This approach includes the evaluation of indicator constituents and residual petroleum hydrocarbon constituents.~~

~~Petroleum-impacted soil and groundwater shall be assessed using the **TPH Fraction and Indicator Approach** as described by the TPH Criteria Working Group (TPHCWG) (TPGCWG, 1997c). The TPH Fraction and Indicator Approach is based on the assessment of: (1) individual petroleum-related constituents (indicators) using constituent-specific toxicity criteria and physical/chemical properties, **and** (2) total petroleum hydrocarbon (TPH) fractions using fraction-specific toxicity criteria and physical/chemical properties. The indicator constituents and hydrocarbon fractions are identified for different types of releases in Table D-1. In the absence of fraction-specific data, the evaluation of petroleum-impacted media shall include the assessment of: (1) individual petroleum-related constituents (indicators) using constituent-specific toxicity criteria and physical/chemical properties, **and** (2) total petroleum hydrocarbon mixtures (TPH-GRO, TPH-DRO, and/or TPH-ORO).~~

~~The hydrocarbon fractions for the TPH Fraction and Indicator Approach were defined based on: (1) environmental behavior and (2) equivalent carbon number. Fractions were defined separately for aliphatics and aromatics due to the great variation in environmental behavior between these two chemical groups. To define the TPH fractions, the potential for individual TPH constituents to leach from soil to groundwater and to volatilize from soil to air was modeled using equations from *Standard Guide for Risk-Based Corrective Action Applied at Petroleum Release Sites* (American Society for Testing and Materials, 1995). The individual constituents were grouped into fractions based on their modeled environmental behavior. Fractions of these TPH constituents were then defined such that the difference in modeled environmental behavior between the fractions was no greater than an order of magnitude. Each of these fractions were then further subdivided based on the equivalent carbon number index. The equivalent carbon number index is related to: (1) the boiling points; and (2) the retention times in a gas chromatographic column of individual TPH constituents, normalized to the n-alkanes. Fate and transport parameter values were assigned to each fraction based on the average values of the individual constituents comprising the fraction (TPHCWG, 1997a). These values are presented in Table D-2. For additional information on how these fractions were defined refer to *Total Petroleum Hydrocarbon Working Group Series Volume 3, Selection of Representative TPH Fractions Based on Fate and Transport Considerations* (TPHCWG, 1997a).~~

~~Oral reference doses (RfD_o) and inhalation reference concentrations (RfC) were derived for aliphatic and aromatic fractions based on the best available toxicity data for individual TPH constituents, well-defined petroleum mixtures, and whole petroleum products. The RfD_o and RfC were developed in accordance with EPA methodologies and provide a representative and conservative estimate of each fraction's toxicity. The RfC values (mg/m^3) were converted to inhalation reference doses (RfD_i) (mg/kg-day) by dividing by a body weight of 70 kg and multiplying by an inhalation rate of 20 m^3/day. The RfD_o~~

~~and RfD_i for the TPH fractions are presented in Table D-3. For additional information on how these toxicity values were derived for the TPH fractions refer to *Total Petroleum Hydrocarbon Working Group Series Volume 4, Development of Fraction Specific Reference Doses (RfDs) and Reference Concentrations (RfCs) for Total Petroleum Hydrocarbons (TPH)* (TPHCWG, 1997b).~~

~~The LDEQ approach presented herein differs from the TPH Fraction and Indicator Approach (TPHCWG, 1997b and 1997c) in that: (1) toluene, xylene, and ethylbenzene are evaluated as indicator constituents in lieu of aromatic fractions $C_{>5}$-C_7 and $C_{>7}$-C_8; and (2) the approach has been modified to include the evaluation of TPH-GRO, TPH-DRO, and TPH-ORO mixture data.~~

Petroleum-impacted soil and groundwater shall be assessed for: (1) individual petroleum-related constituents using constituent-specific toxicity values and physical/chemical properties, **and** (2) petroleum hydrocarbon aliphatic and aromatic fractions using fraction-specific toxicity values and physical/chemical properties (EPA 2009; TPHCWG 1997). An overview of the components to be addressed for low, medium and high carbon range petroleum mixtures are listed in Table D-1. The components requiring evaluation for different types of petroleum releases are identified in Table D-2. These components are subject to modification based on the nature of the petroleum mixture released and other relevant site-specific considerations. The aliphatic and aromatic fraction carbon ranges are consistent with the equivalent carbon (EC) ranges~~ose~~ defined by *Total Petroleum Hydrocarbon Working Group Series Volume 3, Selection of Representative TPH Fractions Based on Fate and Transport Considerations* (TPHCWG, 1997) and *Provisional Peer-Reviewed Toxicity Values for Complex Mixtures of Aliphatic and Aromatic Hydrocarbons Final* (EPA 2009). The physical/chemical properties for the fractions are given in Table D-3 (TPHCWG 1997). The toxicity values for the aliphatic and aromatic hydrocarbon fractions were obtained from *Provisional Peer-Reviewed Toxicity Values for Complex Mixtures of Aliphatic and Aromatic Hydrocarbons Final* (EPA 2009) and *Development of Fraction Specific Reference Doses (RfD) and Reference Concentrations (RfC) for Total Petroleum Hydrocarbons (TPH)* (TPHCWG 1997b) in accordance with Memorandum *Human Health Toxicity Values in Superfund Risk Assessment* (EPA 2003). The toxicity values are summarized in Table D-4 and the associated noncarcinogenic critical effects/targets are provided in Table D-5. Additional guidance on the evaluation of the carcinogenic polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons is provided later in this appendix.

Ethanol

When a fuel containing ethanol (E10) is released to the environment, the Department may require that ethanol be included as a COC for the site investigation/RECAP assessment. In general, the assessment of ethanol shall include the collection of a groundwater sample from the most heavily impacted area. If warranted by site conditions, the department may require additional sampling to characterize the distribution of ethanol with in the AOI. When a fuel containing greater than 10% ethanol (e.g., E15, E20, E85, E95) is released to the environment, the Department may require that additional COC (e.g. methane) be addressed during site investigation/evaluation.

Analytical Methods

The analytical methods suggested for the identification and quantitation of the designated hydrocarbon fractions include the Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection's VPH/EPH (volatile petroleum hydrocarbons/extractable petroleum hydrocarbon) Method ~~(http://www.state.ma.us/dep/bwsc/vph_eph.htm)~~ and the Texas Commission on Environmental Quality Method 1006 ~~(http://www.tnrcc.state.tx.us/permitting/analysis.htm#5035)~~. When requesting these analyses, the data user must specify that the carbon ranges to be reported match those defined in this appendix. Alternate analytical methods such as EPA Method 1664 and 9071 (or equivalent method) are required for the characterization of heavier petroleum hydrocarbon release (~~>~~ $C_{>35}$)~~found in Table D-1, and that the results be reported on a "wet-weight" basis~~.

~~The analytical methods that shall be used for the quantitation of TPH-GRO (C_6 – C_{10}) (purgeable), TPH-DRO (C_{10} – C_{28}) (extractable), and TPH-ORO (> C_{28}) (extractable) (ASTM 1739-95) hydrocarbon mixtures include: (1) SW846 Method 8015B (modified-extraction/GC-FID); (2) more current EPA method; or (3) Texas Commission on Environmental Quality Method 1005 (htpp://www.tnrcc.state.tx.us/permitting/analysis.htm#5035).~~ For the analysis of PAH constituents, EPA SW846 Method 8310 or EPA SW846 Method 8270 may be used. The most recent version of these analytical methods, in accordance with the most recent revision of SW-846, shall be used. An EPA Method shall be used for the identification and quantitation of ethanol. It is the Submitter's responsibility that the method chosen will achieve SQL that are acceptable under the RECAP based on site-specific conditions, the COC present, and method-specific limitations. Data shall be obtained from a laboratory accredited by the State of Louisiana (or a laboratory exempt from accreditation) and shall meet the requirements presented in Section 2.2.

It will be necessary for releases currently being regulated under prior promulgated versions of RECAP to transition to compliance with the RECAP 2018. Unless otherwise approved by the Department, an Area of Concern (AOC) currently being regulated under prior promulgated versions of RECAP may continue to comply with that specific version of RECAP until the current task/phase of the evaluation has been completed and approved by the Department. However, any further evaluation of the AOC shall be conducted in accordance with the requirements set forth in the 2018 version of RECAP unless otherwise approved by the Department.

~~If TPH fractionation data and TPH mixture data have both been collected at an AOI and the two data sets yield different conclusions concerning management of the AOI, then management decisions shall be based on the fractionation data since the fractionation method yields more specific information regarding the TPH constituents present and thus more accurately characterizes site conditions.~~

~~Site investigation data collected in accordance with the methods specified in RECAP June 2000 prior to the promulgation of RECAP 2003 shall be considered acceptable for use under the RECAP.~~

Additive Health Effects*~~TPH Fraction and Indicator Approach~~*

~~***Note****: The indicator constituents **and** TPH fractions shall be identified and quantitated at **all** sites where petroleum hydrocarbons have been released.*~~

1. ~~***Indicator Constituents****. The indicator constituents shall be identified and quantitated as individual constituents using appropriate analytical methods. The indicator constituent(s) for petroleum-impacted soils are identified in Table D-1. (Note: benzo[j]fluorene, benzo[ghi]perylene, dibenz[ah]acridine, dibenz[aj]acridine, 7H-dibenzo[cg]carbazole, dibenz[ae]pyrene, dibenzo[ah]pyrene, dibenzo[ai]pyrene, and 3-methylchloanthrene are included as analytes for some EPA methods. These PAHs are not used as indicator constituents for the TPH Fraction and Indicator Approach. Therefore, it is not required that these constituents be evaluated. These constituents will be evaluated as components of the aromatic TPH fractions.)*~~

   ~~*The AOIC and/or CC for each indicator constituent detected at the AOI shall be compared to the appropriate RS. (Refer to Section 2.8 for guidance on determining the AOIC and/or compliance concentration).*~~

2. ~~***Hydrocarbon Fractions (or Hydrocarbon Mixtures)****. The TPH Fraction and Indicator Approach hydrocarbon fractions shall be identified and quantitated using an appropriate analytical method (refer to the previous page for suggested analytical methods). In lieu of identifying and quantitating the hydrocarbon fractions designated by the TPH Fraction and Indicator Approach, TPH-GRO (C_6-C_{10}), TPH-DRO (C_{10}-C_{28}) (extractable), and/or TPH-ORO (C_{28}-$C_{>35}$) (extractable) hydrocarbon mixtures may be identified and quantitated using an appropriate analytical method (refer to the previous page for suggested analytical methods). The hydrocarbon fractions and hydrocarbon mixtures that shall be identified and quantitated for different types of petroleum releases are presented in Table D-1.*~~

   ~~*The AOIC and/or CC detected for each hydrocarbon fraction or hydrocarbon mixture at the AOI shall be compared to the limiting SS or RS.*~~

   In accordance with EPA risk assessment guidance, each component shall be addressed as an individual COC of the mixture and the noncarcinogenic risk-based RS shall be adjusted to account for additive health effects based on: 1) health target/critical effect (i.e., mode of action) that serves as the basis for the RfD and/or RfC for each petroleum component; and 2) the site-specific combination of petroleum components under evaluation at the release site (EPA 1986; EPA 1989; EPA 2000). Refer to Table D-5 for the health targets/critical effects for the noncarcinogenic components. Refer to Section 2.5.2 for additional guidance on additivity.

Soil Saturation

The petroleum hydrocarbon concentration in soil shall not exceed: 1) a total sum of 5,800 mg/kg for aliphatics C_5-C_{10} and aromatics $C_{>8}$-C_{10}; 2) a total sum of 13,000 mg/kg for aliphatics $C_{>10}$-C_{16} and aromatics $C_{>10}$-C_{21}; and 3) a total sum of 30,000 mg/kg for aliphatics $C_{>16}$-C_{35} (and higher) and aromatics $C_{>21}$-C_{35} without Department approval (Fussel, et. al. 1981). Residual ~~The total concentration of petroleum hydrocarbons present in each impacted medium at an AOI shall be less than or equal to 10,000 ppm. The total petroleum hydrocarbon concentration shall be determined by summing the AOIC or compliance concentration for each aliphatic and aromatic hydrocarbon fraction detected in the medium of concern at the AOs~~~~I~~oil saturation points are known to vary depending on site-specific conditions (e.g., soil type, composition of the petroleum mixture, etc.) (Alaska, 2006; Brost and Devaull 2000; Fussel, et. al. 1981; Ohio EPA, 2010; Sanders 2009). Therefore, a concentration of petroleum hydrocarbons in soil greater than the $Soil_{sat}$ RECAP standards presented above may be considered acceptable if the following conditions are met: 1) the submitter demonstrates that NAPL is not present in the most heavily impacted soils within the AOI; 2) no other aesthetic or environmental concerns are identified based on site-specific conditions; and 3) the Department concurs with the findings and recommendations. Any variance in the applicability of the $Soil_{sat}$ is subject to Department approval and is contingent upon land use, the pathways of concern, characteristics of the soil and groundwater under evaluation, resource aesthetics, and other site-specific conditions.

Note: Corrective action for aesthetic considerations is not reimbursable by the Motor Fuels Trust Fund.~~ or by summing the AOIC or compliance concentration for each hydrocarbon mixture detected in the medium of concern at the AOI.~~

~~**Odors/Aesthetics**~~

~~The Submitter may be required to remediate to petroleum hydrocarbon concentrations that are lower than the concentrations specified by this Program if compliance with MO-1, MO-2, or MO-3 RS results in a visual or odor nuisance that compromises the aesthetic value and/or land use of the site. For example, for a release of diesel fuel in an industrial area, where all the indicator constituents for petroleum-impacted soils are met and the TPH-DRO hydrocarbon concentration is less than or equal to the RS but a constant, objectionable odor is evident, the submitter may recommend and complete excavation of the affected soils to aesthetically acceptable concentrations. This new clean up goal would be governed by the aesthetic appearance and odor of the soil only, **not a revised risk-based RS**. The Submitter should determine the aesthetic concentration and propose a plan to address the soils in an appropriate manner.~~

~~**SS and RS for TPH-GRO, TPH-DRO, and TPH-ORO**~~

~~For the generation of SS and RS for TPH-GRO, TPH-DRO, and TPH-ORO for Tables 1, 2, and 3, the aliphatic or aromatic fraction with the most protective RfD was used to represent the entire TPH mixture [gasoline (TPH-GRO), diesel (TPH-DRO), and oil (TPH-ORO)] was represented. TPH-GRO is represented by the RfD for Aromatics $C_{>8}$-~~

~~C_{12} (RfD_o of 0.04 mg/kg-d); RfD_i of 0.06 mg/kg-d). TPH-DRO is represented by the RfD for Aromatics $C_{>10}$-C_{21} (RfD_o of 0.03 mg/kg-d; RfD_i of 0.06 mg/kg-d). TPH-ORO is represented by the RfD (RfD_o of 0.03 mg/kg-d) for Aromatics $C_{>16}$-C_{35}.~~

~~Adjusting TPH RS for Additivity~~

~~The critical effects/target organs for the TPH-related constituents are presented in Table D-4. When adjusting for additive health effects, the TPH fractions and mixtures should be treated as **individual** constituents. It should be noted that: 1) the RfD for aliphatic fractions $C_{>8}$-C_{10}, $C_{>10}$-C_{12}, and $C_{>12}$-C_{16} account for additive health effects and therefore, for the purposes of adjusting for additivity, these three fractions should be treated as one fraction – not three fractions; 2) the RfD for aromatic fractions $C_{>8}$-C_{10}, $C_{>10}$-C_{12}, and $C_{>12}$-C_{16} account for additive health effects and therefore, for the purposes of adjusting for additivity, these three fractions should be treated as one fraction – not three fractions; and 3) the RfD for aromatic fractions $C_{>16}$-C_{21} and $C_{>21}$-C_{35} account for additivity and therefore, for the purposes of adjusting for additivity, these two fractions should be treated as one fraction – not two fractions. For additional guidance on adjusting RS to account for additive health effects refer to Appendix G.~~

~~Additivity Example: Gasoline release – adjusting the $Soil_i$ to account for additive health effects:~~

~~COC present:~~ ~~ethylbenzene, toluene, aliphatics $C_{>6}$-C_8, aliphatics $C_{>8}$-C_{10}, aliphatics $C_{>10}$-C_{12}, aromatics $C_{>8}$-C_{10} and aromatics $C_{>10}$-C_{12}~~

~~Targets:~~ ~~Liver (L): 3 COC (ethylbenzene, toluene, aliphatics $C_{>8}$-C_{12})~~
~~Kidney (K): 3 COC (ethylbenzene, toluene, aliphatics $C_{>6}$-C_8)~~
~~Body weight (BW): 1 COC (aromatics $C_{>8}$-C_{12})~~

~~Adjustment of $Soil_i$:~~

~~COC~~	~~Table 3 $Soil_i$~~	~~Appendix H Worksheet 5 $Soil_i$~~	~~Target~~	~~Adjusted $Soil_i$~~
~~Ethylbenzene~~	~~13,000~~		~~K,L~~	~~13,000/3 = **4333**~~
~~Toluene~~	~~83,000~~		~~K,L~~	~~83,000/3 = **27,666**~~
~~Aliphatics $C_{>6}$-C_8~~	~~**10,000**~~	~~82,800~~	~~K~~	~~82,800/3 = 27,333 (27,333 > 10,000 so use **10,000**)~~
~~Aliphatics $C_{>8}$-C_{10}~~	~~8800~~		~~L~~	~~8800/3 = **2933**~~
~~Aliphatics $C_{>10}$-C_{12}~~	~~**10,000**~~	~~18,600~~	~~L~~	~~18,600/3 = **6200**~~
~~Aromatics $C_{>8}$-C_{10}~~	~~5,000~~		~~BW~~	~~**5000**~~

~~Aromatics $C_{>10}$-C_{12}~~	~~**10,000**~~	~~10,100~~	~~BW~~	~~**10,000**~~

~~Note: Additivity does not apply to a Soil$_i$ RS based on an analytical quantitation limit, a Department-approved background level, or the 10,000 mg/kg cap. It should be noted that the sum of residual TPH fraction concentrations remaining in soil shall not exceed 10,000 mg/kg.~~

Table D-1 Petroleum Components/Constituents of Concern [1]

ALIPHATIC HYDROCARBONS	AROMATIC HYDROCARBONS
Low Carbon Range Petroleum Hydrocarbons [1]	
Aliphatic Fraction C_5-C_8 [2]	Benzene
	Toluene
	Ethylbenzene
	Xylene
Medium Carbon Range Petroleum Hydrocarbons [1]	
Aliphatic Fraction $C_{>8}$-C_{10} [2]	Aromatic Fraction $C_{>8}$-C_{10} [2]
Aliphatic Fraction $C_{>10}$-C_{12} [2]	Aromatic Fraction $C_{>10}$-C_{12} [2]
Aliphatic Fraction $C_{>12}$-C_{16} [2]	Aromatic Fraction $C_{>12}$-C_{16} [2]
	Aromatic Fraction $C_{>16}$-C_{21} [2]
	Naphthalene
	2-Methylnaphthalene
High Carbon Range Petroleum Hydrocarbons [1,3~~2~~]	
Aliphatic Fraction $C_{>16}$-C_{35} [2]	Aromatic Fraction $C_{>21}$-C_{35} [2]
	Benzo[a]anthracene
	Benzo[a]pyrene
	Benzo[b]fluoranthene
	Benzo[k]fluoranthene
	Chrysene
	Dibenzo[a,h]anthrancene
	Indeno[1,2,3-cd]pyrene

[1] *Provisional Peer-Reviewed Toxicity Values for Complex Mixtures of Aliphatic and Aromatic Hydrocarbons Final* (EPA 2009).

[2] Equivalent carbon number range as defined in TPHCWG, 1997a.

[32]Hydrocarbons $C_{>35}$ shall be addressed on a site-specific basis.

Table D-2 Petroleum Components of Various Petroleum Mixtures~~Table D-1~~

~~Indicator Compounds, Hydrocarbon Fractions[1] and Hydrocarbon Mixtures~~

Component [1]~~Indicator Compound~~	~~g~~Gasoline	JP-4	JP-5	JP-7	~~jet fuel[2] (~~JP-8~~)~~	Kerosene	Diesel~~,~~ Light fuel oil~~s~~	~~H~~Heavy fuel oil~~s~~	Crude oil	~~H~~Highly refined base oils	~~used~~ ~~M~~motor ~~oil~~, oil ~~L~~lubricating oil	Unknown
Benzene	X	X							X [2]			X
Toluene	X	X							X [2]			X
Ethylbenzene	X	X							X [2]			X
Xylene	X	X							X [2]			X
~~Acenaphthene~~				~~X~~	~~X~~	~~X~~		~~X~~		~~X~~		
~~Acenaphthylene~~				~~X~~	~~X~~	~~X~~		~~X~~		~~X~~		
~~Anthracene~~				~~X~~	~~X~~	~~X~~		~~X~~		~~X~~		
~~Benzo(a)pyrene~~cPAH[3]							X	X	X		X	X
~~Chrysene~~				~~X~~	~~X~~	~~X~~		~~X~~		~~X~~		
~~Dibenz(a,h)anthracene~~				~~X~~	~~X~~	~~X~~		~~X~~		~~X~~		
~~Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene~~				~~X~~	~~X~~	~~X~~		~~X~~		~~X~~		
~~Benzo(k)fluoranthene~~				~~X~~	~~X~~	~~X~~		~~X~~		~~X~~		
~~Benzo(b)fluoranthene~~				~~X~~	~~X~~	~~X~~		~~X~~		~~X~~		
~~Benzo(a)anthracene~~				~~X~~	~~X~~	~~X~~		~~X~~		~~X~~		
~~Fluoranthene~~				~~X~~	~~X~~	~~X~~		~~X~~		~~X~~		
~~Fluorene~~				~~X~~	~~X~~	~~X~~		~~X~~		~~X~~		
Naphthalene [4]							X	X	X		X	X
2-Methylnaphthalene [4]							X	X	X		X	X
~~Phenanthrene~~				~~X~~	~~X~~	~~X~~		~~X~~		~~X~~		
~~Pyrene~~				~~X~~	~~X~~	~~X~~		~~X~~		~~X~~		
Lead (inorganic)	X[5~~4~~]											X[5~~4~~]
Metals											X[6]	X[5]
Ethanol [7]												
Methyl tertbutyl ether	X[5~~4~~]											X[5~~4~~]
1,2-Dibromoethane	X[5]											
1,2-Dichloroethane	X[5]											
Methyl ethyl ketone	X[5~~4~~]											X[5~~4~~]
Methyl isobutyl ketone	X[5~~4~~]											X[5~~4~~]
Aliphatic Fraction~~s~~ $C_{5>6}$ - C_8	X[~~5~~]	X	X		X	X[~~7~~]			X[~~6~~]			X[~~6~~]
Aliphatic Fraction~~s~~ $C_{>8}$ - C_{10}	X[~~5~~]	X	X	X	X	X[~~7~~]			X[~~6~~]			X[~~6~~]
Aliphatic Fraction~~s~~ $C_{>10}$ - C_{12}	X	X	X	X	X	X[~~7~~]	X[~~8~~]		X[~~6~~]			X[~~6~~]
Aliphatic Fraction~~s~~ $C_{>12}$ - C_{16}		X	X	X	X	X[~~7~~]	X[~~8~~]		X[~~6~~]	X[~~9~~]	X	X[~~6~~]
Aliphatic Fraction~~s~~ $C_{>16}$ - C_{35}			X	X	X		X[~~8~~]	X[~~9~~]	X[~~6~~]	X[~~6~~]	X[~~10~~]	X[~~6~~]
Aromatic Fraction~~s~~ $C_{>8}$ - C_{10}	X[~~5~~]	X	X	X	X	X[~~7~~]			X[~~6~~]			X[~~6~~]
Aromatic Fraction~~s~~ $C_{>10}$ - C_{12} [4]		X	X	X	X	X[~~7~~]	X[~~8~~]		X[~~6~~]			X[~~6~~]
Aromatic Fraction~~s~~ $C_{>12}$ - C_{16} [4]		X	X	X	X	X[~~7~~]	X[~~8~~]		X[~~6~~]	~~X~~[~~6~~]	X	X[~~6~~]
Aromatic Fraction~~s~~ $C_{>16}$ - C_{21}			X	X	X		X[~~8~~]	X[~~9~~]	X[~~6~~]	~~X~~[~~6~~]	X	X[~~6~~]
Aromatic Fraction~~s~~ $C_{>21}$ - C_{35}					~~X~~			X[~~9~~]	X[~~6~~]	~~X~~[~~6~~]	X[~~10~~]	X[~~6~~]
~~TPH-GRO (C_6 – C_{10})~~	~~X[11]~~	~~X[6]~~	~~X[11]~~			~~X[11]~~				~~X[6]~~		

~~TPH-DRO C_{10} – C_{28} [12]~~		~~X [6]~~	~~X [13]~~	~~X [13]~~	~~X [13]~~	~~X [13]~~	~~X [13]~~			~~X [6]~~		
~~TPH-ORO $C_{>28}$ [12]~~		~~X [6]~~			~~X [14]~~	~~X [14]~~	~~X [14]~~	~~X [14]~~		~~X [6]~~		
Petroleum Hydrocarbons $C_{>35}$								X	X	X	X	X

[1] ~~ASTM (1995) and~~ *TPH Criteria Working Group* *Series Volume 2* (1998); *Toxicological Profile for Total Petroleum Hydrocarbons* (ATSDR 1999); *Provisional Peer-Reviewed Toxicity Values for Complex Mixtures of Aliphatic and Aromatic Hydrocarbons Final* (EPA 2009); under certain site-specific conditions, the Department may require that additional components ~~indicator constituents~~ be identified for evaluation; for petroleum mixtures not identified in Table D-2~~1~~, ~~indicator compounds and~~ hydrocarbon ranges and individual constituents shall be identified by the Submitter and approved by the Department.

[2] The inclusion of BTEX as COC for crude oil releases shall be determined by the Department based on the age of the release and the degree of weathering at the time of investigation/remediation activities; BTEX generally are not COC for older, weathered crude oil releases.

[3] Carcinogenic PAHs are benzo[a]anthracene, benzo[a]pyrene, benzo[b]fluoranthene, benzo[k]fluoranthene, chrysene, dibenzo[ah]anthracene, and indeno[1,2,3-cd]pyrene.

[4] In the determination of the AOIC and/or the CC, the concentration of naphthalene (EC = 11.69) shall be subtracted from the concentration of the aromatic $C_{>10}$ - C_{12} fraction and the concentration of 2-methylnaphthalene (EC=12.84) shall be subtracted from the concentration of the aromatic $C_{>12}$ - C_{16} fraction.

~~[2] For JP-7 (C_{10}-C_{17}), the hydrocarbon fractions shall include aliphatic and aromatic $C_{>8}$-C_{10}, $C_{>10}$-C_{12}, $C_{>12}$-C_{16}, and $C_{>16}$-C_{35}. For JP-5, the indicator compounds shall include benzene, toluene, ethylbenzene, and xylene and the hydrocarbon fractions shall include aliphatic and aromatic $C_{>8}$-C_{10}, $C_{>10}$-C_{12}, $C_{>12}$-C_{16}, and $C_{>16}$-C_{35}.~~

~~[3] Applies to oils formulated with highly refined base oils including hydraulic fluids (Mineral oil based hydraulic fluids, *Toxicological Profile for Mineral Oil Hydraulic Fluids, Organophosphate Ester Hydraulic Fluids, and Polyalphaolefin Hydraulic Fluids*, ATSDR 1994), motor oils, industrial oils, and automatic transmission fluid-type oils (i.e., severely refined base oils).~~

[5] ~~4~~ When known or suspected to be present.

[6] Metals shall be identified as COC for releases of used motor oil.

[7] When a fuel containing ethanol (E10 or a greater percentage of ethanol) is released to the environment, the Department may require that ethanol be included as a COC. ~~5 TPH-GRO may be used instead of Aliphatics C>6 – C8, Aliphatics C>8 – C10, and Aromatics C>8 – C10.~~

~~6 TPH-GRO, TPH-DRO, and TPH-ORO may be used instead of Aliphatics C>6 – C8, Aliphatics C>8 – C10, Aliphatics C>10 – C12, Aliphatics C>12 – C16, Aliphatics C>16 – C35, Aromatics C>8 – C10, Aromatics C>10 – C12, Aromatics C>12 – C16, Aromatics C>16 – C21, and Aromatics C>21 – C35.~~

~~7 TPH-GRO and TPH-DRO may be used instead of Aliphatics C>6 – C8, Aliphatics C>8 – C10, Aliphatics C>10 – C12, Aliphatics C>12 – C16, Aliphatics C>16 – C35, Aromatics C>8 – C10, Aromatics C>10 – C12, Aromatics C>12 – C16, Aromatics C>16 – C21, and Aromatics C>21 – C35.~~

~~8 TPH-DRO may be used instead of Aliphatics C>10 – C12, Aliphatics C>12 – C16, Aliphatics C>16 – C35, Aromatics C>10 – C12, Aromatics C>12 – C16, Aromatics C>16 – C21, and Aromatics C>21 – C35.~~

~~9 TPH-DRO and TPH-ORO may be used instead of Aliphatics C>10 – C12, Aliphatics C>12 – C16, Aliphatics C>16 – C35, Aromatics C>10 – C12, Aromatics C>12 – C16, Aromatics C>16 – C21, and Aromatics C>21 – C35.~~

~~10 TPH-ORO may be used instead of Aliphatics C>16 – C35 and Aromatics C>21 – C35.~~

~~11 Aliphatics C>6 – C8, Aliphatics C>8 – C10, and Aromatics C>8 – C10 may be used instead of TPH-GRO.~~

~~12 Extractable.~~

~~13 Aliphatics C>10 – C12, Aliphatics C>12 – C16, Aliphatics C>16 – C35, Aromatics C>10 – C12, Aromatics C>12 – C16, Aromatics C>16 – C21, and Aromatics C>21 – C35 may be used instead of TPH-DRO.~~

~~14 Aliphatics C>16 – C35 and Aromatics C>21 – C35 may be used instead of TPH-ORO.~~

Table D-3 Chemical-Specific Parameters for Hydrocarbon Fractions ~~Table D-2 Hydrocarbon Fractions~~

~~Physical/Chemical Properties for Hydrocarbon Fractions~~ [1]

Fraction	Boiling Point (°C)	Molecular Weight (g/mole)	Solubility (mg/l)	Vapor Pressure (mm Hg~~atm~~)	Henry's Law Constant (unitless~~cm³/cm³~~)	~~log~~ Koc (ml/g)
C_5-C_6 Aliphatics	5.1E+01	8.1E+01	3.6E+01	2.7E+02~~3.5E-01~~	3.3E+01	~~2.9E+00~~7.94E+02
$C_{>6}$-C_8 Aliphatics	9.6E+01	1.0E+02	5.4E+00	4.8E+01~~6.3E-02~~	5.0E+01	~~3.6E+00~~3.98E+03
$C_{>8}$-C_{10} Aliphatics	1.5E+02	1.3E+02	4.3E-01	4.8E+00~~6.3E-03~~	8.0E+01	~~4.5E+00~~3.16E+04
$C_{>10}$-C_{12} Aliphatics	2.0E+02	1.6E+02	3.4E-02	4.8E-01~~6.3E-04~~	1.2E+02	~~5.4E+00~~2.51E+05
$C_{>12}$-C_{16} Aliphatics	2.6E+02	2.0E+02	7.6E-04	3.7E-02~~4.8E-05~~	5.2E+02	~~6.7E+00~~5.01E+06
$C_{>16}$-C_{21} Aliphatics	3.2E+02	2.7E+02	1.3E-06	8.4E-04~~1.1E-06~~	4.9E+03	~~8.8E+00~~6.31E+08
$C_{>8}$-C_{10} Aromatics	1.5E+02	1.2E+02	6.5E+01	4.8E+01~~6.3E-03~~	4.8E-01	~~3.2E+00~~1.58E+03
$C_{>10}$-C_{12} Aromatics	2.0E+02	1.3E+02	2.5E+01	4.8E-01~~6.3E-04~~	1.4E-01	~~3.4E+00~~2.51E+03
$C_{>12}$-C_{16} Aromatics	2.6E+02	1.5E+02	5.8E+00	3.7E-02~~4.8E-05~~	5.3E-02	~~3.7E+00~~5.01E+03
$C_{>16}$-C_{21} Aromatics	3.2E+02	1.9E+02	6.5E-01	8.4E-04~~1.1E-06~~	1.3E-02	~~4.2E+00~~1.58E+04
$C_{>21}$-C_{35} Aromatics	3.4E+02	2.4E+02	6.6E-03	3.3E-07~~4.4E-10~~	6.7E-04	~~5.1E+00~~1.26E+05

[1]TPH Criteria Working Group, 1997~~a~~.

Fraction	Diffusivity in Air (DI_a) (cm^2/s)	Diffusivity in Water (DI_w) (cm^2/s)	Dermal Permeability Coefficient – Water (K_p) (cm/hr)	Dermal Absorption Factor – Soil (ABS) (unitless)
C_5-C_6 Aliphatics	7.3E-02	8.2E-06	2.0E-01	0
$C_{>6}$-C_8 Aliphatics	7.3E-02	8.2E-06	2.0E-01	0
$C_{>8}$-C_{10} Aliphatics	5.1E-02	6.8E-06	1.7E+00	0
$C_{>10}$-C_{12} Aliphatics	5.1E-02	6.8E-06	1.7E+00	0.1
$C_{>12}$-C_{16} Aliphatics	5.1E-02	6.8E-06	1.7E+00	0.1
$C_{>16}$-C_{21} Aliphatics	6.2E-02	7.2E-06	2.0E+00	0.1
$C_{>8}$-C_{10} Aromatics	5.6E-02	8.1E-06	6.9E-02	0
$C_{>10}$-C_{12} Aromatics	5.6E-02	8.1E-06	6.9E-02	0.1
$C_{>12}$-C_{16} Aromatics	5.6E-02	8.1E-06	6.9E-02	0.1
$C_{>16}$-C_{21} Aromatics	5.6E-02	8.1E-06	6.9E-02	0.1

$C_{>21}$-C_{35} Aromatics	2.8E-02	7.2E-06	3.1E-01	0.1

EPA 2015

:

Table D-4 Toxicity Values

~~Table D-3 1~~

~~Petroleum Hydrocarbon Fraction-Specific~~

~~Chronic Reference Doses~~

~~Carbon Range[2]~~	~~Oral RfD (mg/kg-day)~~	~~Inhalation RfD (mg/kg-day)~~	~~Target Organ/ Critical Effect~~
~~Aliphatics $C_{>6}$-C_8 [3]~~	~~5.0~~	~~5.3~~	~~kidney~~
~~Aliphatics $C_{>8}$-C_{16}~~	~~0.1~~	~~0.3~~	~~liver, hematological system~~
~~Aliphatics $C_{>16}$-C_{35}~~	~~2.0~~	~~NA [4]~~	~~liver~~
~~Aromatics $C_{>8}$-C_{16}~~	~~0.04~~	~~0.06~~	~~decreased body weight~~
~~Aromatics $C_{>16}$-C_{35}~~	~~0.03~~	~~NA~~	~~kidney~~

~~[1]TPHCWG, 1997b.~~

~~[2]Equivalent carbon number range as defined in TPHCWG, 1997a.~~

~~[3]If the n-hexane concentration is < 53% (as in commercial hexane) a RfD of 5.0 mg/kg-d shall be used. If the n-hexane concentration is > 53%, a composition-weighted RfD shall be developed using 0.06 mg/kg-d for the n-hexane portion and 2.0 mg/kg-d for the remainder of the mass.~~

~~[4]NA = Not Available.~~

ALIPHATIC HYDROCARBONS			AROMATIC HYDROCARBONS				
Low Carbon Range Petroleum Hydrocarbons [1]							
Component	Oral RfD (mg/kg-day)	Inhalation RfC (mg/m^3)	Component	Oral RfD (mg/kg-day)	Inhalation RfC (mg/m^3)	Oral CSF ($(mg/kg\text{-}day)^{-1}$)	IUR ($(ug/m^3)^{-1}$)
Aliphatic Fraction C_5-C_8 [2,3]	5.0E+00 [4]	6.0E-01[1]	Benzene [5]	4.0E-03	3.0E-02	5.5E-02	7.8E-06
			Toluene [5]	8.0E-02	5.0E+00	NA	NA
			Ethylbenzene [5]	1.0E-01	1.0E+00	NA	NA
			Xylene [5]	2.0E-01	1.0E-01	NA	NA
Medium Carbon Range Petroleum Hydrocarbons [1]							
Aliphatic Fraction $C_{>8}$-C_{10} [2]	1.0E-01[4]	1.0E-01[1]	Aromatic Fraction $C_{>8}$-C_{10} [2]	4.0E-02 [4]	1.0E-01[1]	NA	NA
Aliphatic Fraction $C_{>10}$-C_{12} [2]	1.0E-01 [4]	1.0E-01[1]	Aromatic Fraction $C_{>10}$-C_{12} [2]	4.0E-02 [4]	1.0E-01[1]	NA	NA
Aliphatic Fraction	1.0E-01 [4]	1.0E-01[1]	Aromatic Fraction	4.0E-02 [4]	1.0E-01[1]	NA	NA

$C_{>12}$-C_{16} [2]			$C_{>12}$-C_{16} [2]				
			Aromatic Fraction $C_{>16}$-C_{21} [2]	3.0E-02 [4]	1.0E-01[1]	NA	NA
			Naphthalene [5]	2.0E-02	3.0E-03	NA	NA
			2-Methylnaphthalene[5]	4.0E-03	NA	NA	NA
High Carbon Range Petroleum Hydrocarbons [1]							
Aliphatic Fraction $C_{>16}$-C_{35} [2]	3.0E+00 [1]	NA	Aromatic Fraction [2] $C_{>21}$-C_{35}	4E-02 [1]	NA	NA	NA
			Benz[a]anthracene [6]	NA	NA	1.0E-01	6.0E-05
			Benzo[a]pyrene [5]	3.0E-04	2.0E-06	1.0E+00	6.0E-04
			Benzo[b]fluoranthene[6]	NA	NA	1.0E-01	6.0E-05
			Benzo[k]fluoranthene[6]	NA	NA	1.0E-02	6.0E-06
			Chrysene [6]	NA	NA	1.0E-03	6.0E-07
			Dibenzo[a,h]anthra-cene[6]	NA	NA	1.0E+00	6.0E-04
			Indeno[1,2,3-cd] pyrene[6]	NA	NA	1.0E-01	6.0E-05

Miscellaneous Components				
Component	Oral RfD (mg/kg-day)	Inhalation RfC (mg/m^3)	Oral CSF ($(mg/kg\text{-}day)^{-1}$)	IUR ($(ug/m3)^{-1}$)
Methyl tert-butyl ether	NA	3.0E+00 [5]	1.8E-03 [7]	NA
Methyl ethyl ketone [5]	6.0E-01	5.0E+00	NA	NA
Methyl isobutyl ketone	8.0E-02 [7]	3.0E+00 [5]	NA	NA
1,2-Dibromoethane [5]	9.0E-03	9.0E-03	2.0E+00	6.0E-04
1,2-Dichloroethane	NA	7.0E-03 [9]	9.1E-02 [5]	2.6E-05 [5]
Ethanol	5.7E+01 [10]	NA	NA	NA

NA = Toxicity Values are not available; refer to Section 2.4.1.

[1]*Provisional Peer-Reviewed Toxicity Values for Complex Mixtures of Aliphatic and Aromatic Hydrocarbons Final* (EPA 2009).

[2]Equivalent carbon number range as defined in TPHCWG, 1997a.

[3]If the n-hexane concentration is < 53% (as in commercial hexane) a RfC of 6.0 E-01 mg/m^3 shall be used. If the n-hexane concentration is > 53%, a RfC of 7.0E-01mg/m^3(critical effect peripheral neuropathy) shall be used (EPA 2009).

[4]TPHCWG 1997b.~~3~~

~~3~~[5]Integrated Risk Information System , EPA 2018~~7~~.

[6]EPA. 1993. *Provisional Guidance for Quantitative Risk Assessment of Polycyclic Aromatic Hydrocarbons* (EPA/600/R-93/089).

[7]This toxicity value does not comply with Section 2.4.1; therefore it shall not be used for risk-based standards. This toxicity value shall only be used for GW_{3DW}, $GW_{3\text{-}NDW}$, $Soil_{GW3DW}$ and $Soil_{GW3NDW}$.

[8]Health Effects Assessment Summary Tables, EPA 2018~~7~~.

~~3~~[9]Provisional Peer-Reviewed Toxicity Value, EPA 2018~~7~~.

[10]Florida Department of Environmental Protection, Division of Waste Management. 2005.

~~Table D-4~~

~~Critical Effects for the Assessment of Additive Health Effects for Petroleum Hydrocarbon Releases~~ [1]

~~CONSTITUENT~~	~~CAS #~~	~~TARGET ORGAN(S)/CRITICAL EFFECT(S)~~ [2]
~~Gasoline:~~		
~~Benzene~~	~~71-43-2~~	~~Bone marrow toxicity (lymphocytopenia)~~ [3]
~~Ethyl benzene~~	~~100-41-4~~	~~Liver toxicity; Kidney toxicity; Fetal effects (skeletal abnormalities)~~
~~Toluene~~	~~108-88-3~~	~~Liver effects (change in weight); Kidney effects (change in weight); Central nervous system effects (decreased concentration-response relationship); Nasal cavity (degeneration of epithelium)~~
~~Xylene (mixed)~~	~~1330-20-7~~	~~Central nervous system effects (impaired motor coordination); Decreased body weight; Increased mortality~~
~~Aliphatics C_6-C_8~~	~~NA~~[4]	~~Kidney effects~~
~~Aliphatics $C_{>8}$-C_{16}~~	~~NA~~	~~Liver effects; Hematological system effects~~
~~Aromatics $C_{>8}$-C_{16}~~	~~NA~~	~~Decreased body weight~~
~~TPH-GRO~~	~~NA~~	~~Kidney effects; Liver effects; Hematological system effects; Decreased body weight~~
~~Diesel:~~		
~~Acenaphthene~~	~~83-32-9~~	~~Liver toxicity~~
~~Anthracene~~	~~120-12-7~~	~~No observed effects~~
~~Fluoranthene~~	~~206-44-0~~	~~Kidney effects; Liver effects~~
~~Fluorene~~	~~86-73-7~~	~~Hematological effects~~
~~Naphthalene~~	~~91-20-3~~	~~Decreased body weight; Nasal cavity effects~~
~~Pyrene~~	~~129-00-0~~	~~Kidney effects~~
~~Aliphatics $C_{>8}$-C_{16}~~	~~NA~~	~~Liver effects; Hematological system effects~~
~~Aliphatics $C_{>16}$-C_{35}~~	~~NA~~	~~Liver effects~~
~~Aromatics $C_{>8}$-C_{16}~~	~~NA~~	~~Decreased body weight~~
~~Aromatics $C_{>16}$-C_{35}~~	~~NA~~	~~Kidney effects~~
~~TPH-DRO~~	~~NA~~	~~Kidney effects; Liver effects; Hematological system effects; Decreased body weight~~
~~**Oil (used motor oil, lubricating oil):**~~		
~~Acenaphthene~~	~~83-32-9~~	~~Liver toxicity~~
~~Anthracene~~	~~120-12-7~~	~~No observed effects~~
~~Fluoranthene~~	~~206-44-0~~	~~Kidney effects; Liver effects~~
~~Fluorene~~	~~86-73-7~~	~~Hematological effects~~

~~Naphthalene~~	~~91-20-3~~	~~Decreased body weight; Nasal cavity effects~~
~~Pyrene~~	~~129-00-0~~	~~Kidney effects~~
~~Aliphatics $C_{>16}$-C_{35}~~	~~NA~~	~~Liver effects~~
~~Aromatics $C_{>16}$-C_{35}~~	~~NA~~	~~Kidney effects~~
~~TPH-ORO~~	~~NA~~	~~Kidney effects; Liver effects~~
~~**Additives:**~~		
~~Methyl ethyl ketone~~	~~78-93-3~~	~~Fetal effects (decreased birth weight)~~
~~Methyl isobutyl ketone~~	~~108-10-1~~	~~NA~~
~~MTBE (methyl tert-butyl ether)~~	~~1634-04-4~~	~~Liver effects; Kidney; Ocular effects~~

~~[1]**Data were obtained from EPA's Integrated Risk Information System and Health Effects Assessment Summary Tables; includes target organs/critical effects for the ingestion and inhalation routes of exposure (where available).**~~

~~[2]**The target organs/critical effects on which the reference dose(s) is based.**~~

~~[3]**NCEA; RAIS June 2003.**~~

~~[4]**Not applicable or not available.**~~

Table D-5 Petroleum Components Noncarcinogenic Critical Effects/Targets ~~TABLE D-5~~

~~Petroleum Components~~

~~Noncarcinogenic Critical Effects/Targets~~

Component	Noncarcinogenic Critical Effect/Target
Low Carbon Range Petroleum Mixtures	
Aliphatics C_5—C_8	Nasal effects [1]; kidney [2~~2~~]
Toluene	Neurological system, kidney [3~~3~~]
Ethylbenzene	Liver, kidney, fetus [3~~3~~]
Xylene	Neurological system, decreased body weight, increased mortality [3~~3~~]
Medium Carbon Range Petroleum Mixtures	
Aliphatic $C_{>8}$-C_{16}	Nasal effects; adrenal gland [1]; liver, hematological system [2~~2~~]
Aromatics $C_{>8}$-C_{16}~~21~~	Decreased body weight [1,2~~2~~]

Aromatics $C_{>16}$-C_{21}	Decreased body weight [1]; kidney[2]
Naphthalene	Nasal effects, decreased body weight [3~~3~~]
2-Methylnaphthalene	Lung [3~~3~~]
High Carbon Range Petroleum Mixtures	
Aliphatics $C_{>16}$-C_{35}	Laxative effects [1~~2~~]
Aromatics $C_{>21}$-C_{35}	Kidney, liver, hematological system [1~~2~~]

Miscellaneous Components	Noncarcinogenic Critical Effect/Target
Methyl ethyl ketone	Fetal effects (decreased body weight, skeletal effects) [3]
Methyl isobutyl ketone	Fetal effects (decreased body weight, skeletal effects, increased mortality), liver, kidney, lethargy [3]
Methyl tert-butyl ether	Liver, kidney, periocular tissue [3]
Ethanol	Fetal effects (developmental effects) [4]

~~[1]Critical effects/targets for toluene, ethylbenzene, xylene, naphthalene, and 2-methylnaphthalene applicable to MO-1 and Appendix G RECAP Standards; critical effects/targets for site-specific MO-2 and MO-3 RS shall be based on the most current RfD and RfC.~~

[1~~2~~]~~*Provisional Peer-Reviewed Toxicity Values for Complex Mixtures of Aliphatic and Aromatic Hydrocarbons Final* (EPA 2009).~~

[2]TPHCWG 1997b

[3~~3~~]*Integrated Risk Information System* (EPA 2017~~3~~).

[4]Florida Department of Environmental Protection, Division of Waste Management. 2005.

References

~~American Society for Testing and Materials. 1995. Standard Guide for Risk-Based Corrective Action Applied at Petroleum Release Sites. Designation ASTM E 1739 -95.~~

Alaska Statement of Cooperation Working Group. 2006. *Maximum Allowable Concentration, Residual Saturation, and Free-Product Mobility: Technical Background Document and Recommendations.* Prepared by Geosphere, Inc. and CH2MHill.

ATSDR. 1999. *Toxicological Profile for Total Petroleum Hydrocarbons.*

Brost, Edward, J. and George E. DeVaull. 2000. *Non-Aqueous Phase Liquid (NAPL) Mobility Limits in Soil*. American Petroleum Institute Soil and Groundwater Research Bulletin No. 9.

EPA. 1986. *Guidelines for the Health Risk Assessment of Chemical Mixtures*. Fed. Reg. 51(185):34014–34025.

EPA. 1989. Risk Assessment Guidance for Superfund Volume I. Human Health Evaluation Manual (Part A). U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Washington, DC. EPA540189002.

EPA. 2000. Supplementary Guidance for Conducting Health Risk Assessment of Chemical Mixtures. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Risk Assessment Forum, Washington, DC. EPA/630/R-00/002.

EPA. 2003. Memorandum *Human Health Toxicity Values in Superfund Risk Assessments*. OSWER directive 9285.7-53.

EPA. 2009. *Provisional Peer-Reviewed Toxicity Values for Complex Mixtures of Aliphatic and Aromatic Hydrocarbons Final.*

EPA. 2018~~7~~. *Integrated Risk Information System.*

EPA. 2018~~7~~. *Provisional Peer-Reviewed Toxicity Value Database.*

EPA. 2018~~7~~. Mid-Atlantic Regional Screening Level Summary Table.

Florida Department of Environmental Protection, Division of Waste Management. 2005. Technical Report: Development of Cleanup Target Levels (CTLs) for Chapter 62-777, F.A.C. Final. Prepared by Center for Environmental and Human Toxicology, University of Florida, Gainesville Florida.

Fussell, D.R., H. Godjen, P. Hayward, R.H., Lilie, A. Marco, and C. Panisi. 1981. *Revised Inland Oil Spill Clean-up Manual*. Conservation of Clean Air and Water – Europe, Den Haag, The Netherlands. CONCAWE Report 7/81.

Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection. 2003. *Updated Petroleum Hydrocarbon Fraction Toxicity Values for the VPH/EPH/APH Methodology*.

Ohio EPA-DERR. 2010. *Guidance for Assessing Petroleum Hydrocarbon in Soil. Final.*

Sanders, Paul. 2009. *Residual Saturation Values for No. 2 Fuel Oil, Diesel, and Heavier TPH Products.* Bureau of Environmental Evaluation and Risk Assessment, Division of Remediation Management and Response, New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection. Protocol for Addressing Extractable Petroleum Hydrocarbons, August 2010.

Total Petroleum Hydrocarbon Criteria Working Group Series (Potter, Thomas and Simmons, Katherine) 1998. Volume 2 *Composition of Petroleum Mixtures.*

~~Total Petroleum Hydrocarbon Criteria Working Group Series (Potter, Thomas and Simmons, Katherine) 1998. Volume 2 Composition of Petroleum Mixtures (http://www.aehs.com/)~~

Total Petroleum Hydrocarbon Criteria Working Group Series, (John B. Gustafson, Ph.D.; Joan Griffith Tell, Ph.D. and Doug Orem). 1997a~~a~~. Volume 3 *Selection of Representative TPH Fractions Based on Fate and Transport Considerations* ~~(http://www.aehs.com/)~~

~~Total Petroleum Hydrocarbon Criteria Working Group Series (D.A. Edwards, Ph.D.; M.D. Andriot, Ph.D.; M.A. Amoruso, Ph.D.; A.C. Tummey; C.J. Bevan, Ph.D.; A. Tveit, Ph.D.; L.A. Hayes, MS, MLS; S.H. Youngren, Ph.D.; and D.V. Nakles, Ph.D.) 1997b. Volume 4 Development of Fraction Specific Reference Doses (RfD) and Reference Concentrations (RfC) for Total Petroleum Hydrocarbons (TPH) (http://www.aehs.com/)~~

~~Total Petroleum Hydrocarbon Criteria Working Group Series (Vorhees, Donna and Weisman, Wade) 1997c. Volume 5 Human Health Risk-Based Evaluation of Petroleum Contaminated Sites: Implementation of the Working Group Approach (http://www.aehs.com/)~~

U.S. EPA (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency).

Total Petroleum Hydrocarbon Criteria Working Group Series (D.A. Edwards, Ph.D.; M.D. Andriot, Ph.D.; M.A. Amoruso, Ph.D.; A.C. Tummey; C.J. Bevan, Ph.D.; A. Tveit, Ph.D.; L.A. Hayes, MS, MLS; S.H. Youngren, Ph.D.; and D.V. Nakles, Ph.D.) 1997b. Volume 4 *Development of Fraction Specific Reference Doses (RfD) and Reference Concentrations (RfC) for Total Petroleum Hydrocarbons (TPH).*

~~POLYCYCLIC AROMATIC HYDROCARBONS~~

~~GUIDELINES FOR ASSESSING~~ D2.0 CARCINOGENIC POLYCYCLIC AROMATIC HYDROCARBONS

~~**Carcinogens. Cancer Slope Factors.**~~ Seven Polycyclic Aromatic Hydrocarbons (PAH) constituents have been assigned a weight of evidence judgment~~s~~ of Group B2, probable human carcinogen. These~~se constituents~~ carcinogenic PAH (cPAH) ~~include~~ are benzo[a]pyrene, benz[a]anthracene, benzo[b]fluoranthene, benzo[k]fluoranthene, chrysene, dibenz[a,h]anthracene, and indeno[1,2,3-cd]pyrene. An oral cancer slope factor and inhalation unit risk are~~is~~ currently available only for benzo[a]pyrene. The remaining ~~carcinogenic~~ cPAH shall be assessed using the benzo[a]pyrene oral cancer slope factor~~s~~ and inhalation unit risk values adjusted ~~developed~~ based on the~~ir~~ ~~respective~~ "estimated order of potential potency" of the cPAH relative to the potency of benzo[a]pyrene. ~~These relative potency factors ies should be applied are only applicable to the assessment of carcinogenic hazards associated with oral exposure to the ingestion of cPAH (*Provisional Guidance for Quantitative Risk Assessment of Polycyclic Aromatic Hydrocarbons*, EPA 1993).~~

The SS and MO-1 RS for cPAH in Tables 1, 2, and 3 are based on the potency factors listed in Table D-6 below. Screening standards and MO-1 RS for COC not listed in RECAP (Tables 1-3 and Appendix G) and site-specific MO-2 and MO-3 RS shall be developed using the most current toxicity information available. SS and MO-1 RS in Tables 1, 2, and 3 and Appendix G MO-2 RS are regulatory standards and cannot be re-calculated using revised toxicity information. These standards can only be revised through formal regulatory procedures.

Table D-6 Carcinogenic PAH Relative Potency Factors and Oral Slope Factors

cPAH~~Constituent~~	Relative Potency Factor[1]	Oral Slope Factor[2] (mg/kg-day)$^{-1}$	Inhalation Unit Risk (ug/m^3)$^{-1}$
~~b~~Benzo[a]pyrene	1.0	1.0~~7.3~~E+~~-~~00 [2~~3~~]	6.0E-04 [2]
~~b~~Benz[a]anthracene	0.1	1.0~~7.3~~E-01 [3]	6.0E-05 [4]
B~~b~~enzo[b]fluoranthene	0.1	1.0~~7.3~~E-01 [3]	6.0E-05 [4]
~~b~~Benzo[k]fluoranthene	0.01	1.0~~7.3~~E-02 [3]	6.0E-06 [4]
~~c~~Chrysene	0.001	1.0~~7.3~~E-03 [3]	6.0E-07 [4]
~~d~~Dibenz[a,h]anthracene	1.0	1.0~~7.3~~E+~~-~~00 [3]	6.0E-04 [4]
~~i~~Indeno[1,2,3-cd]pyrene	0.1	1.0~~7.3~~E-01 [3]	6.0E-05 [4]

[1] *Provisional Guidance for Quantitative Risk Assessment of Polycyclic Aromatic Hydrocarbons* (EPA/600/R-93/089), EPA 1993.

[2] Integrated Risk Information System, EPA 2017.
[3] 1.00E+00 (mg/kg-day)$^{-1}$ x relative potency factor.
[4~~2~~] 6.0E-04~~7.3E+00~~ (ug/m^3~~mg/kg-day~~)$^{-1}$ x relative potency factor~~EPA Region 6 Human Health Medium-Specific Screening Levels~~.
~~[3] Integrated Risk Information System, EPA 2013.~~

~~:~~

~~**Noncarcinogens.** Surrogate RfD have been assigned to the following noncarcinogenic PAH constituents based on similarities in chemical structure and physiological activity:~~

~~**Constituent**~~	~~**RfD$_o$**~~	~~**RfD$_i$**~~	~~**Reference**~~	~~**Surrogate**~~
~~acenaphthylene~~	~~6E-02~~	~~NA[1]~~	~~IRIS[2]~~	~~acenaphthene~~
~~2-methylnaphthalene~~	~~2E-02~~	~~8.6E-04~~	~~IRIS~~	~~naphthalene~~
~~phenanthrene~~	~~3E-01~~	~~NA~~	~~IRIS~~	~~anthracene~~

~~[1]Not available.~~
~~[2]Integrated Risk Information System, EPA.~~

Non-Industrial Land Use~~Potency Adjustments for Early-Life Exposure to cPAH~~. The cPAHs have been determined to have a mutagenic mechanism of action (MOA) for carcinogenesis, therefore, age-dependent adjustment factors (ADAFs) should be used to develop cancer slope factors that address differential potency in early life stages. Therefore, when assessing early-life exposure for the cPAHs for land uses involving multiple age receptors (e.g., nonindustrial), ~~,~~ default ADAFs shall be applied~~ to the benzo[a]pyrene oral slope factor before applying the relative potency factors~~. Refer to Section 2.4.1 of the main test of the document and EPA 2005 and EPA 2006 ~~D.5~~ for additional guidance on addressing mutagens.

Analytical Methods. For the analysis of PAH constituents, EPA SW846 Method 8310 or EPA SW846 Method 8270 may be used. The most recent version of these analytical methods, in accordance with the most recent revision of SW-846, shall be used. It is the Submitter's responsibility that the method chosen will achieve SQL that are acceptable under the RECAP based on site-specific conditions, the COC present, and method-specific limitations. Data shall be obtained from a laboratory accredited by the State of Louisiana (or a laboratory exempt from accreditation) and shall meet the requirements presented in Section 2.2.

References

EPA. 1993. Provisional Guidance for Quantitative Risk Assessment of Polycyclic Aromatic Hydrocarbons (EPA/600/R-93/089).

EPA. 2005. *Supplemental Guidance for Assessing Susceptibility from Early-Life Exposure to Carcinogens*. (EPA/630/R-03/033F).

EPA. 2006. *Implementation of the Cancer Guidelines and Accompanying Supplemental Guidance – Science Policy Council Cancer Guidelines Implementation Workgroup Communication II: Performing Risk Assessments that include Carcinogens Described in the Supplemental Guidance as having a Mutagenic Mode of Action*. Memorandum, June 14, 2006.

EPA. 2018~~7~~. *Integrated Risk Information System.*

~~LEAD~~

~~GUIDELINES FOR ASSESSING~~ D3~~3~~.0 INORGANIC LEAD

Risk-based standards for ~~Health risks associated with exposure to~~ inorganic lead in soil are developed ~~not assessed using the traditional risk assessment methodology based on the use of toxicity values (RfD, RfC, SF). Rather, lead exposure is assessed using~~ the Integrated Exposure Uptake Biokinetic Model (IEUBK) for nonindustrial land use ~~(pub. #9285.7-15-2, PB93-963511)~~ and~~or~~ the Adult Lead ~~Cleanup Level~~ Model (ALM) for commercial/industrial land use.

The IEUBK model is a pharmacokinetic model that integrates exposure from lead in air, water, soil, dust, diet, and paint. This model estimates blood lead levels associated with exposure under a residential scenario (child receptor) to determine an acceptable soil lead concentration for residential land use. Based on the IEUBK model and current exposure data, EPA's recommended soil lead level for residential land use is 400 mg/kg. ~~Using standard EPA default parameters recommended in the Guidance Manual for IEUBK Model for Lead in Children (EPA 1994), the resulting soil concentration for lead is 400 mg/kg for a residential land use scenario. According to EPA guidance, it is expected that a soil lead concentration of 400 mg/kg will limit the probability that blood lead levels will exceed 10 ug/dl to no more than 5 percent for a child receptor under a residential exposure scenario.~~ In accordance with this recommendation~~ EPA guidelines~~, the SO $Soil_{SSni}$, MO-1 $Soil_{ni}$, and MO-2 ~~risk-based~~ $Soil_{ni}$ for lead have~~s~~ been set at 400 mg/kg. ~~The value of 400 mg/kg is based on an assumed outdoor air concentration of 0.10 ug/m^3 and a drinking water concentration of 4 ug/l (EPA 1994).~~ The final non-industrial RS applied at the AOI shall also consider $Soil_{GW}$~~ and $Soil_{sat}$~~.

~~For non-industrial land use scenarios, lead~~ Risk-based soil standards for commercial and industrial land use scenarios were derived by EPA ~~exposure should be assessed~~ using the Adult Lead Model. ~~in accordance with *Recommendations for the Technical Review Workgroup for Lead for an Interim Approach to Assessing Risks Associated with Adult Exposures to Lead in Soil* (TRWR; EPA 20031996).~~ This model focuses on estimating fetal blood lead concentrations in pregnant women exposed to lead contaminated soils in a commercial/industrial setting. EPA's application of the ALM in conjunction with current lead exposure data yielded a recommended soil lead level for commercial/industrial land use of 800 mg/kg. In accordance with ~~—~~this recommendation~~EPA guidelines~~, the ~~the Adult Lead Model and standard EPA default parameters recommended by EPA Region VI were used to develop the~~ SO $Soil_{SSi}$, MO-1 $Soil_i$, and MO-2 $Soil_i$ for lead have been set at~~of~~ ~~1,400~~ 800 mg/kg~~ for lead~~. The final industrial RS applied at the AOI shall also consider $Soil_{GW}$~~ and $Soil_{sat}$~~. ~~The adult lead model and default assumptions are presented below.~~

Site-specific ~~exposure~~ data may be used under MO-3 for the assessment of lead exposure for residential and industrial land use scenarios. ~~Under MO-2, site-specific data may be~~

~~used for the exposure concentration model inputs for air, drinking water, and soil/dust.~~ In the absence of site-specific data, EPA default values shall be used.

Lead-Based Paint Sources. Remediation of soil impacted by lead-based paint is governed by the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) regulations, EPA regulations, and the Louisiana state air regulations (LAC 33.III Chapter 28 §2811).

~~9Adult Lead Exposure Model[1] – Commercial/Industrial Land Use~~

$$Soili(\mu g/g) = \frac{([PbB95\ fetal/(Rx(GSD_i)^{1.645})]) - PbB0)xAT_{s,d}}{BKSF\,x(IR_{s+d}\,xAF_{s,d}\,xEF_{s,d})}$$

Parameter	Definition (units)	Default[2]
PbB_{95} fetal	95th Percentile PbB in Fetus (µg/dL)	10
R	Mean Ratio of Fetal to Maternal PbB	0.9
GSD_i	Individual Geometric Standard Deviation	1.82.3
PbB0	Baseline Blood Lead Value (µg/dL)	2.01.7
BKSF	Biokinetic Slope Factor (µg/dL per µg/day)	0.4
IR_{s+d}	Soil Ingestion Rate (including soil-derived indoor dust) (g/day)	0.05
IR_d	Dust Ingestion Rate (g/day)	0
K_{sd}	Ratio of Concentration in Dust to that in Soil	0.7
$EF_{s,d}$	Soil Exposure Frequency (same for soil and dust) (days/yr)	219
EF_d	Dust Exposure Frequency (days/yr)	219
$AF_{s,d}$	Absolute Absorption Fraction (same for soil and dust)of Lead in Soil	0.12
AF_d	Absolute Absorption Fraction of Lead in Dust	0.12
$AT_{s,d}$	Averaging Time (same for soil and dust) (days)	365

References

EPA. 1994. *Guidance Manual for the IEUBK Model for Lead in Children*. OSWER #9285.7-15-1. PB93-963510. February 1994.

EPA. 1994. *Technical Support Document: Parameters and Equations Used in the Integrated Exposure Uptake Biokinetic Model for Lead in Children*. OSWER #9285.7-22/ PB94-963505. EPA/R-94/040. December 1994.

EPA. 2003. *Recommendations of the Technical Review Workgroup for Lead for an Approach to Assessing Risks Associated with Adult Exposures to Lead in Soil. Final* (December 1996)- January 2003 (EPA-540-R-03-001).

EPA. 2017. *Lead at Superfund Sites: Frequent Questions from Risk Assessors on the Adult Lead Methodology.*

EPA. 2017. *Update to the Adult Lead Methodology's Default Baseline Blood Lead Concentrations and Geometric Standard Deviation Parameters and the Integrated Exposure Uptake Biokinetic Model's Default Maternal Blood Lead Concentration at Birth Variable.* OLEM Directive 9285.6-56. May 17, 2017.

EPA. *Regional Screening Levels for Chemical Contaminants at Superfund Sites.* November~~June~~ 2017.

[1]Recommendations for the Technical Review Workgroup for Lead for an Interim Approach to Assessing Risks Associated with Adult Exposures to Lead in Soil EPA 540-R-03-001(TRWR; EPA 20031996);. Memorandum Transmittal of Update of the Adult Lead Methodology's Default Baseline Blood Lead Concentration and Geometric Standard Deviation Parameters. EPA June 26, 2009. OSWER 9200.2-

~~82; EPA Addressing Lead at Superfund Sites, Frequent Questions from Risk Assessors on the Adult Lead Methodology, Implementing the NHANES Update in the Adult Lead Model (EPA 2012).~~

~~[2] EPA Region VI, 2003.~~

~~POLYCHLORINATED DIBENZODIOXINS AND DIBENZOFURANS GUIDELINES FOR ASSESSING POLYCHLORINATED DIBENZODIOXINS AND DIBENZOFURANS~~D44.0 2,3,7,8-TETRACHLORODIBENZO-P-DIOXIN AND DIOXIN-LIKE COMPOUNDS

2,3,7,8-Tetrachlorodibenzo-*p*-dioxin (TCDD) and Dioxin-Like Compounds (DLC~~s~~), including polychlorinated dibenzo-*p*-dioxins (PCDD~~s~~), polychlorinated dibenzofurans (PCDF~~s~~), and polychlorinated biphenyls (PCB~~s~~), are structurally and toxicologically related halogenated dicyclic aromatic hydrocarbons. The Toxicity Equivalence Factor (TEF) Methodology, a component mixture method, shall be used to evaluate the risks associated with exposure to these mixtures using TCDD as the index chemical. Toxicity equivalent factors are consensus estimates of compound-specific toxicity/potency relative to the toxicity of TCDD. The TEF shall be used for all effects mediated through aryl hydrocarbon receptor binding by the DLCs including cancer and noncancer effects. ~~-of TCDD and DLCs for human health and ecological risk assessments.~~

To apply TEFs to an environmental mixture of DLC~~s~~, each individual compound's AOIC, CC, or exposure concentration is multiplied by its specific TEF, yielding the individual PCDD, PCDF, or PCB concentration that is equivalent to a concentration of TCDD. These TCDD equivalent concentrations are then summed to yield the total TCDD toxic equivalent (TEQ) AOIC or CC:

~~Polychlorinated dibenzodioxins (PCDD) and dibenzofurans (PCDF) shall be evaluated using Toxic Equivalency Factors (TEF) that indicate an order of magnitude estimate of the toxicity of a specific congener relative to the most toxic congener, 2,3,7,8-tetrachlorodibenzo-p-dioxin (TCDD). The TEF values in combination with site characterization data shall be used to calculate a toxic equivalent concentration (TEQ) in each medium of concern using the equation and TEF values presented below. The TEQ for each medium shall be compared to the SS or RS for TCDD.~~

Total TEQ AOIC or CC = $\sum_{n1} [PCDD_i \times TEF_i] + \sum_{n2} [PCDF_i \times TEF_i] + \sum_{n3} [PCB_i \times TEF_i]$~~.~~

where:

Parameter	Definition
Total TEQ AOIC or CC	Total Toxic Eequivalent Ceoncentration AOIC or CC
PCDD	Concentration of PCDD congener in medium
PCDF	Concentration of PCDF in congener in medium
PCB	Concentration of PCB congener in medium
TEF	Congener-specific toxic equivalent factor (refer to Table D-10).

~~The TEF that shall be used to calculate the TEQ are as follows:~~

The Total TEQ AOIC, CC, or exposure concentration shall be compared to the medium-specific RS for TCDD.

Table D-7~~0~~ Human~~UMAN~~ Health~~EALTH~~ Toxicity~~OXICITY~~ Equivalent~~QUIVALENT~~ Factors~~ACTORS~~ (TEF) ~~1~~

Congener	TEF [1,2~~1~~]
Polychlorinated Dibenzo-p-Dioxins	
2,3,7,8-TCDD	1
1,2,3,7,8-PentaCDD	~~0.~~1
1,2,3,4,7,8-HexaCDD	0.1
1,2,3,6,7,8-HexaCDD	0.1
1,2,3,7,8,9-HexaCDD	0.1
1,2,3,4,6,7,8-HeptaCDD	0.01
OctaCDD	0.0003~~1~~
Polychlorinated Dibenzof~~F~~urans	
2,3,7,8-TetraCDF	0.1
1,2,3,7,8-PentaCDF	0.03~~5~~
2,3,4,7,8-PentaCDF	0.3~~5~~
1,2,3,4,7,8-HexaCDF	0.1
1,2,3,6,7,8-HexaCDF	0.1
1,2,3,7,8,9-HexaCDF	0.1
2,3,4,6,7,8-HexaCDF	0.1
1,2,3,4,6,7,8-HeptaCDF	0.01
1,2,3,4,7,8,9-HeptaCDF	0.01
OctaCDF	0.0003~~1~~
Non-Ortho Substituted Polychlorinated Biphenyls	
PCB 77 3,3',4,4'-TetraCB	0.0001
PCB 81 3,4,4',5-TetraCB	0.0003
PCB 126 3,3',4,4',5-PeCB	0.1
PCB 169 3,3',4,4',5,5'-HxCB	0.03
Mono-Ortho Substituted Polychlorinated Biphenyls ~~0.00003~~	
PCB 105 2,3,3',4,4'-PeCB	0.00003
PCB 114 2,3,4,4',5-PeCB	0.00003
PCB 118 2,3',4,4',5-PeCB	0.00003
PCB 123 2',3,4,4',5-PeCB	0.00003
PCB 156 2,3,3',4,4',5-HxCB	0.00003
PCB 157 2,3,3',4,4',5'-HxCB	0.00003
PCB 167 2,3',4,4',5,5'-HxCB	0.00003
PCB 189 2,3,3',4,4',5,5'-HpCB	0.00003

~~[1]*Toxic Equivalency Factors (TEFs) for PCBs, PCDDs, PCDFs for Humans and Wildlife*. Van den Berg, Martin, et.al. Environmental Health Perspectives, Volume 106; Number 12, December 1998; Federal Register, May 18, 2000, Volume 65, Number 97, Page 31696.~~

[1]*The 2005 World Health Organization Re-evaluation of Human and Mammalian Toxic Equivalency Factors for Dioxins and Dioxin-like Compounds (*Martin van den Berg, Linda S. Birnbaum, Michael Denison, Mike De Vito, William Farland, Mark Feeley, Heidelore Fiedler, Helen Hakansson, Annika Hanberg, Laurie Haws, Martin Rose, Stephen Safe, Dieter Schrenk, Chiharu Tohyama, Angelika Tritscher, Jouko Tuomisto, Mats Tysklind, Nigel Walker, and Richard E. Peterson); *Recommended Toxicity Equivalence Factors (TEFs) for Human Health Risk Assessments of 2,3,7,8-Tetrachlorodibenzo-p-dioxin and Dioxin-Like Compounds* EPA/100/R-10/005. EPA 2010.~~; EPA Mid-atlantic Regional Screening Levels User's Guide November 2012.~~

[2]For the Toxicity Equivalence Factor (TEF) Methodology, the most current TEF recommended by EPA shall be used to evaluate the risks associated with exposure to mixtures of TCDD and DLC for human health and ecological risk assessments.

~~The Total TEQ AOIC, CC, or exposure concentration shall be compared to the medium-specific RS for TCDD.~~

~~1.; Based on a THQ of 0.1.2~~

References

EPA. 2008. *Framework for Application of the Toxicity Equivalence Methodology for Polychlorinated Dioxins, Furans, and Biphenyls in Ecological Risk Assessment* EPA/100/R-08/004.

EPA. 2009. *National Primary Drinking Water Standards*. EPA 816-F-09-004, May 2009

EPA. 2010. *Recommended Toxicity Equivalence Factors (TEFs) for Human Health Risk Assessments of 2,3,7,8-Tetrachlorodibenzo-p-dioxin and Dioxin-Like Compounds* EPA/100/R-10/005.

EPA. 2012. *EPA's Reanalysis of Key Issues Related to Dioxin Toxicity and Response to NAS Comments, Volume 1*. In Support of Summary Information on the Integrated Risk Information System (IRIS) EPA/600/R-10/038F.

EPA. 2013. *Use of Dioxin TEFs in Calculating Dioxin TEQs at CERCLA and RCRA Sites*.

EPA 2017. *Risk Assessment for Dioxin at Superfund Sites. Toxicity Values for Dioxin* (online).

D5.0 POLYCHLORINATED BIPHENYLS (PCBs)

Polychlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) are a class of chemical compounds comprised of 209 congeners with varying degrees of chlorination. PCBs are generally released to the environment as commercial mixtures which are referred to as Aroclors (ATSDR 2000).

In general, PCB methods analyze for either Aroclor mixtures or individual PCB congeners. Analytical methods for Aroclors are often based on the comparison of PCB patterns in environmental samples with those of technical/commercial mixtures. However, degradation and weathering processes can result in a final pattern of PCBs in environmental and biological media that differs significantly from the original commercial formulation. Consequently, the Aroclor method may not accurately measure the presence of PCBs in environmental or biological media (EPA 2005). Analytical methods for individual PCB congeners are considered to be more accurate measures of the presence of PCBs in environmental and biological media. Also, since the toxicity of PCBs is congener-specific, these methods provide the best and most scientifically defensible basis for evaluating exposure and health risks associated with PCBs in the environment (EPA 2005). Before the selection of an analytical method, site-specific factors, project objectives, data quality objectives, and the intended end use of the data shall be considered. Depending on site-specific conditions, the use of the Aroclor method may be considered appropriate during the initial phases of investigation to determine the presence or absence of PCBs. Congener analysis is considered to be appropriate when weathering and biotransformation have occurred and when lower reporting limits are required (Bernhard et. al. 2001). The analytical protocol selected for the evaluation of PCB-impacted media shall be justified based on site-specific conditions and is subject to Department approval.

The evaluation of congener-specific data shall include an assessment of: 1) the Total TEQ Concentration for the 12 dioxin-like PBC congeners (refer to Section D4.0) and 2) the total PCB concentration (the sum of the concentrations detected for the 209 congeners minus the sum of the concentrations for the 12 dioxin-like congeners) (EPA 2013).

References

ATSDR. 2000. *Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry Toxicological Profile for Polychlorinated Biphenyls.*

Bernhard, Teresa and Steve Petron. 2001. *Analysis of PBC Congeners vs. Aroclors in Ecological Risk Assessment.* Issue Paper.

EPA. 2005. *Memorandum: Response to Ecological Risk Assessment Forum Request for Information on the Benefits of PCB Congener-Specific Analyses*. David Cleverly. NCEA-C-1315. ERASC-002F.

EPA. 2017. *Integrated Risk Information System Polychlorinated Biphenyls*.

~~**NON-TRADITIONAL PARAMETERS**~~

D67.0 -NON-TRADITIONAL PARAMETERS

Non-traditional parameters include those constituents or physical/chemical parameters (e.g. chlorides, sulfates, pH, temperature, etc.) for which toxicity data are not available and thus cannot be evaluated using traditional risk assessment/RECAP methods. Non-traditional parameters shall be evaluated under MO-2 or MO-3. RS for these constituents (or physical/chemical parameters) shall consider, where appropriate and feasible, protection of human health, ecological receptors, livestock, crops, and vegetation; prevention of constituent migration and cross-media transfer; protection of beneficial uses of the medium of concern; protection of above ground and subsurface structures; and protection of resource aesthetics. Where appropriate, an environmental fate and transport analysis may be required by the Department to evaluate potential future impacts to health and/or the environment. An ecological checklist (RECAP Form 118) shall be completed to evaluate the need for an ecological risk assessment.

The evaluation of these parameters is highly dependent on professional judgement and all proposed RS shall be subject to Department approval. It is recommended that a workplan be submitted to the Department for approval prior to managing an AOI impacted by a non-traditional constituent or other parameter that may produce adverse environmental effects. A RS proposed for a non-traditional parameter shall be accompanied by appropriate supporting documentation and references. A RS for a non-traditional parameter shall not result in soil that exhibits hazardous waste characteristics of ignitability, corrosivity, or reactivity as defined in the Hazardous Waste Regulations (LAC 33:V). Prior to the development and application of a RS for a non-traditional parameter, the impacted medium under investigation shall be in declining conditions (i.e., the constituent mass is not increasing, the source of the release has been mitigated, and the area of constituent concentrations likely to be of concern is not expanding).

Non-traditional parameters shall be evaluated in accordance with the guidelines presented below as may be applicable.

1. Identify all available Applicable or Relevant and Appropriate Requirements (ARAR) (e.g., secondary MCL). Of the available ARAR, select the ARAR that is most appropriate for the evaluation of site-specific conditions and health and environmental concerns identified at the AOI. Where appropriate, consider the beneficial use of the medium of concern (e.g., groundwater used for irrigation);

2. Consider the protection of resource aesthetics (i.e., soil saturation level, water solubility, odor thresholds, taste, visual, etc.);

3. Consider all environmental fate and transport pathways especially those relating to exposure to human or ecological receptors and constituent migration and cross-media transfer;

4. Consider protection of vegetation (e.g., native surface cover) and/or the ability to grow crops;

5. Consider the Department-approved background concentration in accordance with Section 2.5.3.9~~13~~ (e.g., for the evaluation of cross-media transfer, the naturally-occurring background chloride concentration of a receiving surface water body may be used as the SS or RS for the evaluation of chloride in a Groundwater 3 zone);

6. Based on the information obtained in steps 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 identify a RS that adequately addresses the health and/or environmental concerns at the AOI;

7. Determine the AOIC or CC in accordance with Section 2.3~~8~~; and

8. Compare the AOIC to the RS:

   If the AOIC is less than or equal to the RS, then typically no further action at this time shall be required for the medium of concern.

   If the AOIC is greater than the RS, then the AOI shall be further evaluated under a higher tier or the medium of concern shall be remediated to the RS.

If the SS or RS is less than the analytical quantitation limit, then a Department-approved quantitation limit shall serve as the SS or RS.