United States Environmental Protection Agency

Office of Water Regulations and Standards Washington, DC 20460

Water

June, 1985

EPA

Environmental Profiles and Hazard Indices for Constituents of Municipal Sludge: Polychlorinated Biphenyls

PCB's

p. 3-2 Index 1 Values should read:
typical at 500 mt/ha = 0.10; worst at 500 mt/ha = 0.54

p. 3-5 Index 4 Values should read:
typical at 500 mt/ha = 0.010; worst at 500 mt/ha = 0.054

p. 3-6 Index 5 Values should read:
Animal-typical at 500 mt/ha = 0.21; worst at 500 mt/ha = 1.1
human-typical at 500 mt/ha = 0.37; worst at 500 mt/ha = 2.0

p. 3-8 Index 7 Values should read:
typical at 500 mt/ha = 0.075; worst at 500 mt/ha = 0.40

p. 3-12 should read:

Index 9 Values

Group	Sludge Concentration	Sludge Application Rate (mt/ha)			
		0	5	50	500
Toddler	Typical	16	110	960	900
	Worst	16	570	5500	5100
Adult	Typical	47	310	2600	2500
	Worst	47	1600	15000	14000

p. 3-14 should read:

Index 10 Values

Group	Sludge Concentration	Sludge Application Rate (mt/ha)			
		0	5	50	500
Toddler	Typical	16	590	5600	5200
	Worst	16	3300	32000	30000
Adult	Typical	47	1200	11000	11000
	Worst	47	6700	65000	61000

p. 3-18 should read:

Index 13 Values

Group	Sludge Concentration	Sludge Application Rate (mt/ha)			
		0	5	50	500
Toddler	Typical	27	3500	9000	9000
	Worst	27	20000	54000	51000
Adult	Typical	47	7300	20000	19000
	Worst	47	42000	110000	110000

PREFACE

This document is one of a series of preliminary assessments dealing with chemicals of potential concern in municipal sewage sludge. The purpose of these documents is to: (a) summarize the available data for the constituents of potential concern, (b) identify the key environmental pathways for each constituent related to a reuse and disposal option (based on hazard indices), and (c) evaluate the conditions under which such a pollutant may pose a hazard. Each document provides a scientific basis for making an initial determination of whether a pollutant, at levels currently observed in sludges, poses a likely hazard to human health or the environment when sludge is disposed of by any of several methods. These methods include landspreading on food chain or nonfood chain crops, distribution and marketing programs, landfilling, incineration and ocean disposal.

These documents are intended to serve as a rapid screening tool to narrow an initial list of pollutants to those of concern. If a significant hazard is indicated by this preliminary analysis, a more detailed assessment will be undertaken to better quantify the risk from this chemical and to derive criteria if warranted. If a hazard is shown to be unlikely, no further assessment will be conducted at this time; however, a reassessment will be conducted after initial regulations are finalized. In no case, however, will criteria be derived solely on the basis of information presented in this document.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(Continued)

SECTION 1

INTRODUCTION

This preliminary data profile is one of a series of profiles dealing with chemical pollutants potentially of concern in municipal sewage sludges. Polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs) were initially identified as being of potential concern when sludge is landspread (including distribution and marketing), placed in a landfill, incinerated or ocean disposed.* This profile is a compilation of information that may be useful in determining whether PCBs pose an actual hazard to human health or the environment when sludge is disposed of by these methods.

The focus of this document is the calculation of "preliminary hazard indices" for selected potential exposure pathways, as shown in Section 3. Each index illustrates the hazard that could result from movement of a pollutant by a given pathway to cause a given effect (e.g., sludge → soil → plant uptake → animal uptake → human toxicity). The values and assumptions employed in these calculations tend to represent a reasonable "worst case"; analysis of error or uncertainty has been conducted to a limited degree. The resulting value in most cases is indexed to unity; i.e., values >1 may indicate a potential hazard, depending upon the assumptions of the calculation.

The data used for index calculation have been selected or estimated based on information presented in the "preliminary data profile", Section 4. Information in the profile is based on a compilation of the recent literature. An attempt has been made to fill out the profile outline to the greatest extent possible. However, since this is a preliminary analysis, the literature has not been exhaustively perused.

The "preliminary conclusions" drawn from each index in Section 3 are summarized in Section 2. The preliminary hazard indices will be used as a screening tool to determine which pollutants and pathways may pose a hazard. Where a potential hazard is indicated by interpretation of these indices, further analysis will include a more detailed examination of potential risks as well as an examination of site-specific factors. These more rigorous evaluations may change the preliminary conclusions presented in Section 2, which are based on a reasonable "worst case" analysis.

The preliminary hazard indices for selected exposure routes pertinent to landspreading and distribution and marketing, landfilling, incineration and ocean disposal practices are included in this profile. The calculation formulae for these indices are shown in the Appendix. The indices are rounded to two significant figures.

---

* Listings were determined by a series of expert workshops convened during March-May, 1984 by the Office of Water Regulations and Standards (OWRS) to discuss landspreading, landfilling, incineration, and ocean disposal, respectively, of municipal sewage sludge.

SECTION 2

PRELIMINARY CONCLUSIONS FOR POLYCHLORINATED BIPHENYLS IN MUNICIPAL SEWAGE SLUDGE

The following preliminary conclusions have been derived from the calculation of "preliminary hazard indices", which represent conservative or "worst case" analyses of hazard. The indices and their basis and interpretation are explained in Section 3. Their calculation formulae are shown in the Appendix.

I. LANDSPREADING AND DISTRIBUTION-AND-MARKETING

A. Effect on Soil Concentration of Polychlorinated Biphenyls

Landspreading of sludge may result in increased concentrations of PCBs in soil (see Index 1).

B. Effect on Soil Biota and Predators of Soil Biota

Conclusions for the effect of landspreading on soil biota and predators of soil biota were not drawn because index values could not be calculated due to lack of data (see Indices 2 and 3).

C. Effect on Plants and Plant Tissue Concentration

Landspreading of sludge is not expected to result in soil concentrations of PCBs that are phytotoxic (see Index 4). The concentrations of PCBs in plant tissues may be expected to increase due to plant uptake of PCBs from sludge-amended soils (see Index 5). Conclusion for the plant concentration permitted by phytotoxicity was not drawn because index values could not be calculated due to lack of data (see Index 6).

D. Effect on Herbivorous Animals

Landspreading of sludge is not expected to result in plant tissue concentrations of PCBs that pose a toxic threat to herbivorous animals (see Index 7). The inadvertent ingestion of sludge-amended soil is not expected to result in dietary concentrations of PCBs that pose a toxic threat to grazing animals (see Index 8).

E. Effect on Humans

The consumption of crops grown on sludge-amended soils may result in an increased potential of cancer risk to humans due to PCBs (see Index 9). The consumption of animal products derived from animals feeding on crops grown in sludge-amended soils may result in an increased potential of cancer risk to humans due to PCBs (see Index 10). The consumption of animal products derived from animals that inadvertently ingest sludge-amended soil may result in an increased potential of cancer risk to human due to PCBs (see Index 11). The inadvertent ingestion of sludge-amended soil by humans may result in an increased potential of cancer risk due to PCBs (see Index 12). The aggregate amount of PCBs in the human diet due to landspreading of sludge may result in an increased potential of cancer risk to humans (see Index 13).

II. LANDFILLING

Landfilling of sludge may result in increased concentrations of PCBs in groundwater at the well (see Index 1). Landfilling of sludge may result in an increased potential of cancer risk to humans due to consumption of groundwater contaminated with PCBs (see Index 2).

III. INCINERATION

The incineration of sludge may result in air concentrations of PCBs that exceed background levels (see Index 1). Incineration of sludge may result in concentrations of PCBs in air that increase the potential of cancer risk to humans (see Index 2).

IV. OCEAN DISPOSAL

Ocean disposal of sludge may result in increased concentrations of PCBs in seawater around the disposal site after initial mixing (see Index 1). The concentration of PCBs in seawater around the disposal site may increase above background levels over a 24-hour period (see Index 2). Ocean disposal of sludge may result in concentrations of PCBs in the tissues of aquatic life that jeopardize their marketability when high-PCB sludge is disposed of at a high rate at a typical disposal site. Where poor site conditions exist, and when typical sludge is disposed of at a high rate, or when high-PCB sludge is disposed of at high and low rates, a threat to aquatic life may exist (see Index 3). Ocean disposal of sludge may be expected to result in an increased potential of cancer risk to humans except possibly when typical sludge is disposed of at a typical site with typical conditions and when seafood intake is typical (see Index 4).

SECTION 3

PRELIMINARY HAZARD INDICES FOR POLYCHLORINATED BIPHENYLS IN MUNICIPAL SEWAGE SLUDGE

I. LANDSPREADING AND DISTRIBUTION-AND-MARKETING

A. Effect on Soil Concentration of Polychlorinated Biphenyls

1. Index of Soil Concentration (Index 1)

a. **Explanation** - Calculates concentrations in μg/g DW of pollutant in sludge-amended soil. Calculated for sludges with typical (median, if available) and worst (95 percentile, if available) pollutant concentrations, respectively, for each of four applications. Loadings (as dry matter) are chosen and explained as follows:

0 mt/ha — No sludge applied. Shown for all indices for purposes of comparison, to distinguish hazard posed by sludge from preexisting hazard posed by background levels or other sources of the pollutant.

5 mt/ha — Sustainable yearly agronomic application; i.e., loading typical of agricultural practice, supplying ~50 kg available nitrogen per hectare.

50 mt/ha — Higher single application as may be used on public lands, reclaimed areas or home gardens.

500 mt/ha — Cumulative loading after 100 years of application at 5 mt/ha/year.

b. **Assumptions/Limitations** - Assumes pollutant is incorporated into the upper 15 cm of soil (i.e., the plow layer), which has an approximate mass (dry matter) of 2×10^3 mt/ha and is then dissipated through first order processes which can be expressed as a soil half-life.

c. **Data Used and Rationale**

i. **Sludge concentration of pollutant (SC)**

Typical — 4 μg/g DW
Worst — 23 μg/g DW

PCB concentrations in sludges of 16 U.S. cities range from <0.01 to 23.1 μg/g DW with a median of 4 μg/g DW. (Furr et al., 1976). Clevenger et al. (1983) in a summary of sludge analyses from 74 cities in Missouri reported that maximum and median PCB concentrations were 2.9 and 0.99 μg/g DW, respectively. Although manufacturers phased out all PCB production from 1976 to 1979, sludge concentration data reported by Furr et al. (1976) were selected for present analysis due to the representation of several U.S. cities. (See Section 4, p. 4-1.)

ii. **Background concentration of pollutant in soil (BS)** = 0.01 μg/g DW

PCB concentration in rice-growing soils of the United States ranged from not detected (N.D.) to 1.13 μg/g DW with the mean concentration being 0.01 μg/g DW (Carey et al., 1980). Since the data reported for cropland soils in 37 states (Carey et al., 1979a) and for 5 cities of the United States (Carey et al., 1979b) were also in a similar range, 0.01 μg/g DW was selected as the soil background concentration. The most recent data available were used here since the production and use of PCBs has dropped since 1975. (See Section 4, p. 4-2.)

iii. **Soil half-life of pollutant ($t_{\frac{1}{2}}$)** = 6 years

Although most of the PCBs have <1 year half-life in sediments, it can be as high as 16 years, depending on the amount of chlorine in the PCBs (Fries, 1982). All the PCBs found in the environment are 42 to 60 percent chlorine (by weight) (World Health Organization (WHO), 1976). Thus, Aroclor 1254, which has 54 percent chlorine (by weight), was chosen to represent half-life for PCBs. (See Section 4, p. 4-12.)

d. **Index 1 Values (μg/g DW)**

Sludge Concentration	Sludge Application Rate (mt/ha) 0	5	50	500
Typical	0.010	0.020	0.11	0.18
Worst	0.010	0.067	0.57	0.62

e. **Value Interpretation** - Value equals the expected concentration in sludge-amended soil.

f. **Preliminary Conclusion** - Landspreading of sludge may result in increased concentrations of PCBs in soil.

B. Effect on Soil Biota and Predators of Soil Biota

1. Index of Soil Biota Toxicity (Index 2)

a. **Explanation** - Compares pollutant concentrations in sludge-amended soil with soil concentration shown to be toxic for some soil organism.

b. **Assumptions/Limitations** - Assumes pollutant form in sludge-amended soil is equally bioavailable and toxic as form used in study where toxic effects were demonstrated.

c. **Data Used and Rationale**

i. **Concentration of pollutant in sludge-amended soil (Index 1)**

See Section 3, p. 3-2.

ii. **Soil concentration toxic to soil biota (TB)** - Data not immediately available.

d. **Index 2 Values** - Values were not calculated due to lack of data.

e. **Value Interpretation** - Value equals factor by which expected soil concentration exceeds toxic concentration. Value >1 indicates a toxic hazard may exist for soil biota.

f. **Preliminary Conclusion** - Conclusion was not drawn because index values could not be calculated.

2. Index of Soil Biota Predator Toxicity (Index 3)

a. **Explanation** - Compares pollutant concentrations expected in tissues of organisms inhabiting sludge-amended soil with food concentration shown to be toxic to a predator on soil organisms.

b. **Assumptions/Limitations** - Assumes pollutant form bioconcentrated by soil biota is equivalent in toxicity to form used to demonstrate toxic effects in predator. Effect level in predator may be estimated from that in a different species.

c. **Data Used and Rationale**

i. **Concentration of pollutant in sludge-amended soil (Index 1)**

See Section 3, p. 3-2.

ii. **Uptake factor of pollutant in soil biota (UB)** - Data not immediately available.

iii. **Feed concentration toxic to predator (TR) =** 5 µg/g DW

For a 39-week period, feed concentration of 2 µg/g of PCBs did not have any effect on chickens, whereas 5 µg/g reduced the egg production in some cases (Stendell, 1976). 20 µg/g feed concentration caused effects on chickens dependent on PCB type. It is assumed that data are given in dry weight basis. (See Section 4, p. 4-16.)

d. **Index 3 Values** - Values were not calculated due to lack of data.

e. **Value Interpretation** - Values equals factor by which expected concentration in soil biota exceeds that which is toxic to predator. Value > 1 indicates a toxic hazard may exist for predators of soil biota.

f. **Preliminary Conclusion** - Conclusion was not drawn because index values could not be calculated.

C. Effect on Plants and Plant Tissue Concentration

1. **Index of Phytotoxic Soil Concentration (Index 4)**

a. **Explanation** - Compares pollutant concentrations in sludge-amended soil with the lowest soil concentration shown to be toxic for some plants.

b. **Assumptions/Limitations** - Assumes pollutant form in sludge-amended soil is equally bioavailable and toxic as form used in study where toxic effects were demonstrated.

c. **Data Used and Rationale**

i. **Concentration of pollutant in sludge-amended soil (Index 1)**

See Section 3, p. 3-2.

ii. Soil concentration toxic to plants (TP) = 10 μg/g DW

Strek et al. (1981) reported that growth reduction of soybeans and beets was not significant when PCB concentration was 100 μg/g in soil. However, Webber and Mrozek (1979) observed 10 and 27 percent growth reduction in soybeans when PCB concentrations were 10 and 100 μg/g, respectively. Strek et al. (1981) also reported significant growth reduction for corn plants at 100 μg/g. As a conservative approach, TP is assumed to be 10 μg/g. It is assumed that data are given in dry weight basis. (See Section 4, p. 4-13.)

d. **Index 4 Values**

Sludge Concentration	Sludge Application Rate (mt/ha) 0	5	50	500
Typical	0.0010	0.0020	0.011	0.018
Worst	0.0010	0.0067	0.057	0.062

e. **Value Interpretation** - Value equals factor by which soil concentration exceeds phytotoxic concentration. Value > 1 indicates a phytotoxic hazard may exist.

f. **Preliminary Conclusion** - Landspreading of sludge is not expected to result in soil concentrations of PCBs that are phytotoxic.

2. **Index of Plant Concentration Caused by Uptake (Index 5)**

a. **Explanation** - Calculates expected tissue concentrations, in μg/g DW, in plants grown in sludge-amended soil, using uptake data for the most responsive plant species in the following categories: (1) plants included in the U.S. human diet; and (2) plants serving as animal feed. Plants used vary according to availability of data.

b. **Assumptions/Limitations** - Assumes an uptake factor that is constant over all soil concentrations. The uptake factor chosen for the human diet is assumed to be representative of all crops (except fruits) in the human diet. The uptake factor chosen for the animal diet is assumed to be representative of all crops in the animal diet. See also Index 6 for consideration of phytotoxicity.

c. **Data Used and Rationale**

i. **Concentration of pollutant in sludge-amended soil (Index 1)**

See Section 3, p. 3-2.

ii. **Uptake factor of pollutant in plant tissue (UP)**

Animal Diet:
Corn plant
3.7 μg/g tissue DW (μg/g soil DW)$^{-1}$

Human Diet:
Carrot root
2.1 μg/g tissue DW (μg/g soil DW)$^{-1}$

Webber et al. (1983) reported that PCB uptake by corn plants grown in sludge-amended soils ranged from 0.247 to 3.7 μg/g tissue DW (μg/g soil DW)$^{-1}$. Connor (1984) reported data from various sources on uptake in carrot root. Uptake factors ranged from 0.02 to 0.5 μg/g tissue WW (μg/g soil WW)$^{-1}$. Uptake decreased with increasing degree of chlorination. Assuming, as Connor has, that soil dry weight is approximately one-half of soil wet weight, and that carrot is 12% dry matter (USDA., 1975), the carrot values should be adjusted by a factor of 0.5/0.12 = 4.2, to give a range of 0.083 to 2.1 μg/g tissue DW (μg/g soil DW)$^{-1}$. The higher value for each plant tissue was selected as the conservative estimate. (See Section 4, p. 4-14.)

d. **Index 5 Values (μg/g DW)**

Diet	Sludge Concentration	Sludge Application Rate (mt/ha) 0	5	50	500
Animal	Typical	0.037	0.074	0.40	0.68
	Worst	0.037	0.25	2.1	2.3
Human	Typical	0.021	0.042	0.23	0.38
	Worst	0.021	0.14	1.2	1.3

e. **Value Interpretation** - Value equals the expected concentration in tissues of plants grown in sludge-amended soil. However, any value exceeding the value of Index 6 for the same or a similar plant species may be unrealistically high because it would be precluded by phytotoxicity.

f. **Preliminary Conclusion** - The concentrations of PCBs in plant tissues may be expected to increase due to plant uptake of PCBs from sludge-amended soils.

3. **Index of Plant Concentration Permitted by Phytotoxicity (Index 6)**

a. **Explanation** - The index value is the maximum tissue concentration, in µg/g DW, associated with phytotoxicity in the same or similar plant species used in Index 5. The purpose is to determine whether the plant tissue concentrations determined in Index 5 for high applications are realistic, or whether such concentrations would be precluded by phytotoxicity. The maximum concentration should be the highest at which some plant growth still occurs (and thus consumption of tissue by animals is possible) but above which consumption by animals is unlikely.

b. **Assumptions/Limitations** - Assumes that tissue concentration will be a consistent indicator of phytotoxicity.

c. **Data Used and Rationale**

i. **Maximum plant tissue concentration associated with phytotoxicity (PP)** - Data not immediately available.

d. **Index 6 Values (µg/g DW)** - Values were not calculated due to lack of data.

e. **Value Interpretation** - Value equals the maximum plant tissue concentration which is permitted by phytotoxicity. Value is compared with values for the same or similar plant species given by Index 5. The lowest of the two indices indicates the maximal increase that can occur at any given application rate.

f. **Preliminary Conclusion** - Conclusion was not drawn because index values could not be calculated.

D. **Effect on Herbivorous Animals**

1. **Index of Animal Toxicity Resulting from Plant Consumption (Index 7)**

a. **Explanation** - Compares pollutant concentrations expected in plant tissues grown in sludge-amended soil with feed concentration shown to be toxic to wild or domestic herbivorous animals. Does not consider direct contamination of forage by adhering sludge.

b. **Assumptions/Limitations** - Assumes pollutant form taken up by plants is equivalent in toxicity to form used to demonstrate toxic effects in animal. Uptake or toxicity in specific plants or animals may be estimated from other species.

c. **Data Used and Rationale**

i. **Concentration of pollutant in plant grown in sludge-amended soil (Index 5)**

The pollutant concentration values used are those Index 5 values for an animal diet (see Section 3, p. 3-6).

ii. **Feed concentration toxic to herbivorous animal (TA)** = 5.0 μg/g DW

No data were immediately available on PCB toxicity to grazing animals. PCB concentration of 5 μg/g reduced the egg production of chickens (Stendell, 1976) and 2.5 to 5 μg/g feed concentration affected rhesus monkeys (Allen and Norback, 1976). Due to lack of data, the above information was used in developing toxicity levels for herbivorous animals. (See Section 4, p. 4-16.)

d. **Index 7 Values**

Sludge Concentration	Sludge Application Rate (mt/ha) 0	5	50	500
Typical	0.0074	0.015	0.079	0.14
Worst	0.0074	0.050	0.42	0.46

e. **Value Interpretation** - Value equals factor by which expected plant tissue concentration exceeds that which is toxic to animals. Value > 1 indicates a toxic hazard may exist for herbivorous animals.

f. **Preliminary Conclusion** - Landspreading of sludge is not expected to result in plant tissue concentrations of PCBs that pose a toxic threat to herbivorous animals.

2. **Index of Animal Toxicity Resulting from Sludge Ingestion (Index 8)**

a. **Explanation** - Calculates the amount of pollutant in a grazing animal's diet resulting from sludge adhesion to forage or from incidental ingestion of sludge-amended soil and compares this with the dietary toxic threshold concentration for a grazing animal.

b. **Assumptions/Limitations** - Assumes that sludge is applied over and adheres to growing forage, or that sludge constitutes 5 percent of dry matter in the grazing animal's diet, and that pollutant form in sludge is equally bioavailable and toxic as form used to demonstrate toxic effects. Where no sludge is applied (i.e., 0 mt/ha), assumes diet is 5 percent soil as a basis for comparison.

c. **Data Used and Rationale**

i. **Sludge concentration of pollutant (SC)**

Typical	4 μg/g DW
Worst	23 μg/g DW

See Section 3, p. 3-1.

ii. **Fraction of animal diet assumed to be soil (GS) = 5%**

Studies of sludge adhesion to growing forage following applications of liquid or filter-cake sludge show that when 3 to 6 mt/ha of sludge solids is applied, clipped forage initially consists of up to 30 percent sludge on a dry-weight basis (Chaney and Lloyd, 1979; Boswell, 1975). However, this contamination diminishes gradually with time and growth, and generally is not detected in the following year's growth. For example, where pastures amended at 16 and 32 mt/ha were grazed throughout a growing season (168 days), average sludge content of forage was only 2.14 and 4.75 percent, respectively (Bertrand et al., 1981). It seems reasonable to assume that animals may receive long-term dietary exposure to 5 percent sludge if maintained on a forage to which sludge is regularly applied. This estimate of 5 percent sludge is used regardless of application rate, since the above studies did not show a clear relationship between application rate and initial contamination, and since adhesion is not cumulative yearly because of die-back.

Studies of grazing animals indicate that soil ingestion, ordinarily <10 percent of dry weight of diet, may reach as high as 20 percent for cattle and 30 percent for sheep during winter months when forage is reduced (Thornton and

Abrams, 1983). If the soil were sludge-amended, it is conceivable that up to 5 percent sludge may be ingested in this manner as well. Therefore, this value accounts for either of these scenarios, whether forage is harvested or grazed in the field.

iii. **Feed concentration toxic to herbivorous animal (TA)** = 5.0 μg/g DW

See Section 3, p. 3-8.

d. **Index 8 Values**

Sludge Concentration	Sludge Application Rate (mt/ha) 0	5	50	500
Typical	0.0	0.040	0.040	0.040
Worst	0.0	0.23	0.23	0.23

e. **Value Interpretation** - Value equals factor by which expected dietary concentration exceeds toxic concentration. Value > 1 indicates a toxic hazard may exist for grazing animals.

f. **Preliminary Conclusion** - The inadvertent ingestion of sludge-amended soil is not expected to result in a dietary concentration of PCBs that poses a toxic threat to grazing animals.

E. Effect on Humans

1. **Index of Human Cancer Risk Resulting from Plant Consumption (Index 9)**

a. **Explanation** - Calculates dietary intake expected to result from consumption of crops grown on sludge-amended soil. Compares dietary intake with the cancer risk-specific intake (RSI) of the pollutant.

b. **Assumptions/Limitations** - Assumes that all crops are grown on sludge-amended soil and that all those considered to be affected take up the pollutant at the same rate. Divides possible variations in dietary intake into two categories: toddlers (18 months to 3 years) and individuals over 3 years old.

c. **Data Used and Rationale**

i. **Concentration of pollutant in plant grown in sludge-amended soil (Index 5)**

The pollutant concentration values used are those Index 5 values for a human diet (see Section 3, p. 3-6).

ii. **Daily human dietary intake of affected plant tissue (DT)**

Toddler	74.5 g/day
Adult	205 g/day

The intake value for adults is based on daily intake of crop foods (excluding fruit) by vegetarians (Ryan et al., 1982); vegetarians were chosen to represent the worst case. The value for toddlers is based on the FDA Revised Total Diet (Pennington, 1983) and food groupings listed by the U.S. EPA (1984a). Dry weights for individual food groups were estimated from composition data given by the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) (1975). These values were composited to estimate dry-weight consumption of all non-fruit crops.

iii. **Average daily human dietary intake of pollutant (DI)**

Toddler	0.2526 μg/day
Adult	0.7578 μg/day

The four-year average of total relative daily PCB intake for fiscal (FY) 1975 through FY 78 is 0.0108 μg/g body weight/day (FDA, 1979). Since adequate data were not immediately available to determine daily dietary intake, it was conservatively assumed to be equal to the total daily PCB intake. The adult DI value was estimated assuming an average adult weighs 70 kg. DI for toddlers was assumed to be 1/3 of adult value. (See Section 4, p. 4-4.)

iv. **Cancer potency** = 4.34 $(mg/kg/day)^{-1}$

The potency value of 4.34 $(mg/kg/day)^{-1}$ was derived from data resulting from studies in which rats ingesting PCBs developed hepatocellular carcinomas and neoplastic nodules (U.S. EPA, 1980). (See Section 4, p. 4-6.)

v. **Cancer risk-specific intake (RSI)** = 0.0161 µg/day

The RSI is the pollutant intake value which results in an increase in cancer risk of 10^{-6} (1 per 1,000,000). The RSI is calculated from the cancer potency using the following formula:

$$RSI = \frac{10^{-6} \times 70 \text{ kg} \times 10^{3} \text{ µg/mg}}{\text{Cancer potency}}$$

d. **Index 9 Values**

Group	Sludge Concentration	Sludge Application Rate (mt/ha) 0	5	50	500
Toddler	Typical	110	210	1100	1800
	Worst	110	670	5600	6000
Adult	Typical	310	580	2900	4900
	Worst	310	1800	15000	17000

e. **Value Interpretation** - Value >1 indicates a potential increase in cancer risk of > 10^{-6} (1 per 1,000,000). Comparison with the null index value at 0 mt/ha indicates the degree to which any hazard is due to sludge application, as opposed to pre-existing dietary sources.

f. **Preliminary Conclusion** - The consumption of crops grown on sludge-amended soils may result in an increased potential of cancer risk to humans due to PCBs.

2. **Index of Human Cancer Risk Resulting from Consumption of Animal Products Derived from Animals Feeding on Plants (Index 10)**

a. **Explanation** - Calculates human dietary intake expected to result from pollutant uptake by domestic animals given feed grown on sludge-amended soil (crop or pasture land) but not directly contaminated by adhering sludge. Compares expected intake with RSI.

b. **Assumptions/Limitations** - Assumes that all animal products are from animals receiving all their feed from sludge-amended soil. Assumes that all animal products consumed take up the pollutant at the highest rate observed for muscle of any commonly consumed species or at the rate observed for beef liver or dairy products (whichever is higher).

Divides possible variations in dietary intake into two categories: toddlers (18 months to 3 years) and individuals over 3 years old.

c. **Data Used and Rationale**

i. **Concentration of pollutant in plant grown in sludge-amended soil (Index 5)**

The pollutant concentration values used are those Index 5 values for an animal diet (see Section 3, p. 3-6).

ii. **Uptake factor of pollutant in animal tissue (UA)** = 5.7 μg/g tissue DW (μg/g feed DW)$^{-1}$

The uptake factor in tissues of animals feeding on plants was derived from data available for cattle. The highest uptake factors for cattle are reported to be 5.7 in milk fat (Fries et al., 1973) and 5.5 in body fat (Connor, 1984). (See Section 4, p. 4-18.) The uptake factor of pollutant in animal tissue (UA) used is assumed to apply to all animal fats.

iii. **Daily human dietary intake of affected animal tissue (DA)**

Toddler	43.7 g/day
Adult	88.5 g/day

The fat intake values presented, which comprise meat, fish, poultry, eggs and milk products, are derived from the FDA Revised Total Diet (Pennington, 1983), food groupings listed by the U.S. EPA (1984a) and food composition data given by USDA (1975). Adult intake of meats is based on males 25 to 30 years of age and that for milk products on males 14 to 16 years of age, the age-sex groups with the highest daily intake. Toddler intake of milk products is actually based on infants, since infant milk consumption is the highest among that age group (Pennington, 1983).

iv. **Average daily human dietary intake of pollutant (DI)**

Toddler	0.2526 μg/day
Adult	0.7578 μg/day

See Section 3, p. 3-11.

v. **Cancer risk-specific intake** (RSI) = 0.0161 μg/day

See Section 3, p. 3-12.

d. **Index 10 Values**

Group	Sludge Concentration	Sludge Application Rate (mt/ha) 0	5	50	500
Toddler	Typical	590	1200	6200	10000
	Worst	590	3900	33000	35000
Adult	Typical	1200	2400	12000	21000
	Worst	1200	7800	66000	72000

e. **Value Interpretation** - Same as for Index 9.

f. **Preliminary Conclusion** - The consumption of animal products derived from animals feeding on crops grown in sludge-amended soils may result in an increased potential of cancer risk to humans due to PCBs.

3. **Index of Human Cancer Risk Resulting from Consumption of Animal Products Derived from Animals Ingesting Soil (Index 11)**

a. **Explanation** - Calculates human dietary intake expected to result from consumption of animal products derived from grazing animals incidentally ingesting sludge-amended soil. Compares expected intake with RSI.

b. **Assumptions/Limitations** - Assumes that all animal products are from animals grazing sludge-amended soil, and that all animal products consumed take up the pollutant at the highest rate observed for muscle of any commonly consumed species or at the rate observed for beef liver or dairy products (whichever is higher). Divides possible variations in dietary intake into two categories: toddlers (18 months to 3 years) and individuals over 3 years old.

c. **Data Used and Rationale**

i. **Animal tissue** = Cattle (milk fat)

See Section 3, p. 3-13.

ii. **Sludge concentration of pollutant (SC)**

Typical	4 μg/g DW
Worst	23 μg/g DW

See Section 3, p. 3-1.

iii. **Background concentration of pollutant in soil (BS)** = 0.01 μg/g DW

See Section 3, p. 3-2.

iv. **Fraction of animal diet assumed to be soil (GS)** = 5%

See Section 3, p. 3-9.

v. **Uptake factor of pollutant in animal tissue (UA)** = 5.7 μg/g tissue DW (μg/g feed DW)$^{-1}$

See Section 3, p. 3-13.

vi. **Daily human dietary intake of affected animal tissue (DA)**

Toddler	39.4 g/day
Adult	82.4 g/day

The affected tissue intake value is assumed to be from the fat component of meat only (beef, pork, lamb, veal) and milk products (Pennington, 1983). This is a slightly more limited choice than for Index 10. Adult intake of meats is based on males 25 to 30 years of age and the intake for milk products on males 14 to 16 years of age, the age-sex groups with the highest daily intake. Toddler intake of milk products is actually based on infants, since infant milk consumption is the highest among that age group (Pennington, 1983).

vii. **Average daily human dietary intake of pollutant (DI)**

Toddler	0.2526 μg/day
Adult	0.7578 μg/day

See Section 3, p. 3-11.

viii. **Cancer risk-specific intake (RSI)** = 0.0161 μg/day

See Section 3, p. 3-12.

d. **Index 11 Values**

Group	Sludge Concentration	Sludge Application Rate (mt/ha) 0	5	50	500
Toddler	Typical	23	2800	2800	2800
	Worst	23	16000	16000	16000
Adult	Typical	62	5900	5900	5900
	Worst	62	34000	34000	34000

e. **Value Interpretation** - Same as for Index 9.

f. **Preliminary Conclusion** - The consumption of animal products derived from animals that inadvertently ingest sludge-amended soil may result in an increased potential of cancer risk to humans due to PCBs.

4. **Index of Human Cancer Risk from Soil Ingestion (Index 12)**

a. **Explanation** - Calculates the amount of pollutant in the diet of a child who ingests soil (pica child) amended with sludge. Compares this amount with RSI.

b. **Assumptions/Limitations** - Assumes that the pica child consumes an average of 5 g/day of sludge-amended soil. If the RSI specific for a child is not available, this index assumes the RSI for a 10 kg child is the same as that for a 70 kg adult. It is thus assumed that uncertainty factors used in deriving the RSI provide protection for the child, taking into account the smaller body size and any other differences in sensitivity.

c. **Data Used and Rationale**

i. **Concentration of pollutant in sludge-amended soil (Index 1)**

See Section 3, p. 3-2.

ii. **Assumed amount of soil in human diet (DS)**

Pica child	5 g/day
Adult	0.02 g/day

The value of 5 g/day for a pica child is a worst-case estimate employed by U.S. EPA's Exposure Assessment Group (U.S. EPA, 1983a). The value of 0.02 g/day for an adult is an estimate from U.S. EPA, 1984a.

iii. **Average daily human dietary intake of pollutant (DI)**

Toddler 0.2526 μg/day
Adult 0.7578 μg/day

See Section 3, p. 3-11.

iv. **Cancer risk-specific intake (RSI)** = 0.0161 μg/day

See Section 3, p. 3-12.

d. **Index 12 Values**

Group	Sludge Concentration	Sludge Application Rate (mt/ha) 0	5	50	500
Toddler	Typical	19	22	49	72
	Worst	19	37	190	210
Adult	Typical	47	47	47	47
	Worst	47	47	48	48

e. **Value Interpretation** - Same as for Index 9.

f. **Preliminary Conclusion** - The inadvertent ingestion of sludge-amended soil by humans may result in an increased potential of cancer risk due to PCBs.

5. **Index of Aggregate Human Cancer Risk (Index 13)**

a. **Explanation** - Calculates the aggregate amount of pollutant in the human diet resulting from pathways described in Indices 9 to 12. Compares this amount with RSI.

b. **Assumptions/Limitations** - As described for Indices 9 to 12.

c. **Data Used and Rationale** - As described for Indices 9 to 12.

d. **Index 13 Values**

Group	Sludge Concentration	Sludge Application Rate (mt/ha) 0	5	50	500
Toddler	Typical	700	4100	10000	15000
	Worst	700	21000	54000	58000
Adult	Typical	1500	8700	21000	32000
	Worst	1500	43000	120000	120000

e. **Value Interpretation** - Same as for Index 9.

f. **Preliminary Conclusion** - The aggregate amount of PCBs in the human diet due to landspreading of sludge may result in an increased potential of cancer risk to humans.

II. LANDFILLING

A. Index of Groundwater Concentration Resulting from Landfilled Sludge (Index 1)

1. **Explanation** - Calculates groundwater contamination which could occur in a potable aquifer in the landfill vicinity. Uses U.S. EPA's Exposure Assessment Group (EAG) model, "Rapid Assessment of Potential Groundwater Contamination Under Emergency Response Conditions" (U.S. EPA, 1983b). Treats landfill leachate as a pulse input, i.e., the application of a constant source concentration for a short time period relative to the time frame of the analysis. In order to predict pollutant movement in soils and groundwater, parameters regarding transport and fate, and boundary or source conditions are evaluated. Transport parameters include the interstitial pore water velocity and dispersion coefficient. Pollutant fate parameters include the degradation/decay coefficient and retardation factor. Retardation is primarily a function of the adsorption process, which is characterized by a linear, equilibrium partition coefficient representing the ratio of adsorbed and solution pollutant concentrations. This partition coefficient, along with soil bulk density and volumetric water content, are used to calculate the retardation factor. A computer program (in FORTRAN) was developed to facilitate computation of the analytical solution. The program predicts pollutant concentration as a function of time and location in both the unsaturated and saturated zone. Separate computations and parameter estimates are required for each zone. The prediction requires evaluations of four dimensionless input values and subsequent evaluation of the result, through use of the computer program.

2. **Assumptions/Limitations** - Conservatively assumes that the pollutant is 100 percent mobilized in the leachate and that all leachate leaks out of the landfill in a finite period and undiluted by precipitation. Assumes that all soil and aquifer properties are homogeneous and isotropic throughout each zone; steady, uniform flow occurs only in the vertical direction throughout the unsaturated zone, and only in the horizontal (longitudinal) plane in the saturated zone; pollutant movement is considered only in direction of groundwater flow for the saturated zone; all pollutants exist in concentrations that do not significantly affect water movement; for organic chemicals, the background concentration in the soil profile or aquifer prior to release from the source is assumed to be zero; the pollutant source is a pulse input; no dilution of the plume occurs by recharge from outside the source area; the leachate is undiluted by aquifer flow within the saturated zone; concentration in the saturated zone is attenuated only by dispersion.

3. **Data Used and Rationale**

a. **Unsaturated zone**

i. **Soil type and characteristics**

(a) **Soil type**

Typical	Sandy loam
Worst	Sandy

These two soil types were used by Gerritse et al. (1982) to measure partitioning of elements between soil and a sewage sludge solution phase. They are used here since these partitioning measurements (i.e., K_d values) are considered the best available for analysis of metal transport from landfilled sludge. The same soil types are also used for nonmetals for convenience and consistency of analysis.

(b) **Dry bulk density (P_{dry})**

Typical	1.53 g/mL
Worst	1.925 g/mL

Bulk density is the dry mass per unit volume of the medium (soil), i.e., neglecting the mass of the water (CDM, 1984a).

(c) **Volumetric water content (θ)**

Typical	0.195 (unitless)
Worst	0.133 (unitless)

The volumetric water content is the volume of water in a given volume of media, usually expressed as a fraction or percent. It depends on properties of the media and the water flux estimated by infiltration or net recharge. The volumetric water content is used in calculating the water movement through the unsaturated zone (pore water velocity) and the retardation coefficient. Values obtained from CDM, 1984a.

(d) Fraction of organic carbon (f_{oc})

Typical	0.005 (unitless)
Worst	0.0001 (unitless)

Organic content of soils is described in terms of percent organic carbon, which is required in the estimation of partition coefficient, K_d. Values, obtained from R. Griffin (1984) are representative values for subsurface soils.

ii. Site parameters

(a) Landfill leaching time (LT) = 5 years

Sikora et al. (1982) monitored several sludge entrenchment sites throughout the United States and estimated time of landfill leaching to be 4 or 5 years. Other types of landfills may leach for longer periods of time; however, the use of a value for entrenchment sites is conservative because it results in a higher leachate generation rate.

(b) Leachate generation rate (Q)

Typical	0.8 m/year
Worst	1.6 m/year

It is conservatively assumed that sludge leachate enters the unsaturated zone undiluted by precipitation or other recharge, that the total volume of liquid in the sludge leaches out of the landfill, and that leaching is complete in 5 years. Landfilled sludge is assumed to be 20 percent solids by volume, and depth of sludge in the landfill is 5 m in the typical case and 10 m in the worst case. Thus, the initial depth of liquid is 4 and 8 m, and average yearly leachate generation is 0.8 and 1.6 m, respectively.

(c) **Depth to groundwater (h)**

Typical	5 m
Worst	0 m

Eight landfills were monitored throughout the United States and depths to groundwater below them were listed. A typical depth to groundwater of 5 m was observed (U.S. EPA, 1977). For the worst case, a value of 0 m is used to represent the situation where the bottom of the landfill is occasionally or regularly below the water table. The depth to groundwater must be estimated in order to evaluate the likelihood that pollutants moving through the unsaturated soil will reach the groundwater.

(d) **Dispersivity coefficient (α)**

Typical	0.5 m
Worst	Not applicable

The dispersion process is exceedingly complex and difficult to quantify, especially for the unsaturated zone. It is sometimes ignored in the unsaturated zone, with the reasoning that pore water velocities are usually large enough so that pollutant transport by convection, i.e., water movement, is paramount. As a rule of thumb, dispersivity may be set equal to 10 percent of the distance measurement of the analysis (Gelhar and Axness, 1981). Thus, based on depth to groundwater listed above, the value for the typical case is 0.5 and that for the worst case does not apply since leachate moves directly to the unsaturated zone.

iii. **Chemical-specific parameters**

(a) **Sludge concentration of pollutant (SC)**

Typical	4 mg/kg DW
Worst	23 mg/kg DW

See Section 3, p. 3-1.

(b) **Soil half-life of pollutant ($t_{\frac{1}{2}}$)** = 2190 days

See Section 3, p. 3-2.

(c) **Degradation rate (μ)** = 0.000316 day^{-1}

The unsaturated zone can serve as an effective medium for reducing pollutant concentration through a variety of chemical and biological decay mechanisms which transform or attenuate the pollutant. While these decay processes are usually complex, they are approximated here by a first-order rate constant. The degradation rate is calculated using the following formula:

$$\mu = \frac{0.693}{t_{\frac{1}{2}}}$$

(d) Organic carbon partition coefficient (K_{oc}) = 320,000 mL/g

The organic carbon partition coefficient is multiplied by the percent organic carbon content of soil (f_{oc}) to derive a partition coefficient (K_d), which represents the ratio of absorbed pollutant concentration to the dissolved (or solution) concentration. The equation (K_{oc} x f_{oc}) assumes that organic carbon in the soil is the primary means of adsorbing organic compounds onto soils. This concept serves to reduce much of the variation in K_d values for different soil types. The value of K_{oc} is from Hassett et al. (1983). Among the PCBs for which K_{oc} values are reported (Hassett et al., 1983), only PCB 1248 and PCB 1260 are common in the environment (WHO, 1976). Choice of K_{oc} for PCB 1248 is conservative.

b. Saturated zone

i. Soil type and characteristics

(a) Soil type

Typical	Silty sand
Worst	Sand

A silty sand having the values of aquifer porosity and hydraulic conductivity defined below represents a typical aquifer material. A more conductive medium such as sand transports the plume more readily and with less dispersion and therefore represents a reasonable worst case.

(b) Aquifer porosity (Ø)

Typical	0.44 (unitless)
Worst	0.389 (unitless)

Porosity is that portion of the total volume of soil that is made up of voids (air) and water. Values corresponding to the above soil types are from Pettyjohn et al. (1982) as presented in U.S. EPA (1983b).

(c) **Hydraulic conductivity of the aquifer (K)**

Typical	0.86 m/day
Worst	4.04 m/day

The hydraulic conductivity (or permeability) of the aquifer is needed to estimate flow velocity based on Darcy's Equation. It is a measure of the volume of liquid that can flow through a unit area or media with time; values can range over nine orders of magnitude depending on the nature of the media. Heterogenous conditions produce large spatial variation in hydraulic conductivity, making estimation of a single effective value extremely difficult. Values used are from Freeze and Cherry (1979) as presented in U.S. EPA (1983b).

(d) **Fraction of organic carbon (f_{oc}) =** 0.0 (unitless)

Organic carbon content, and therefore adsorption, is assumed to be 0 in the saturated zone.

ii. **Site parameters**

(a) **Average hydraulic gradient between landfill and well (i)**

Typical	0.001 (unitless)
Worst	0.02 (unitless)

The hydraulic gradient is the slope of the water table in an unconfined aquifer, or the piezometric surface for a confined aquifer. The hydraulic gradient must be known to determine the magnitude and direction of groundwater flow. As gradient increases, dispersion is reduced. Estimates of typical and high gradient values were provided by Donigian (1985).

(b) **Distance from well to landfill ($\Delta \ell$)**

Typical	100 m
Worst	50 m

This distance is the distance between a landfill and any functioning public or private water supply or livestock water supply.

(c) **Dispersivity coefficient (α)**

Typical 10 m
Worst 5 m

These values are 10 percent of the distance from well to landfill ($\Delta\ell$), which is 100 and 50 m, respectively, for typical and worst conditions.

(d) **Minimum thickness of saturated zone (B)** = 2 m

The minimum aquifer thickness represents the assumed thickness due to preexisting flow; i.e., in the absence of leachate. It is termed the minimum thickness because in the vicinity of the site it may be increased by leachate infiltration from the site. A value of 2 m represents a worst case assumption that preexisting flow is very limited and therefore dilution of the plume entering the saturated zone is negligible.

(e) **Width of landfill (W)** = 112.8 m

The landfill is arbitrarily assumed to be circular with an area of 10,000 m^2.

iii. **Chemical-specific parameters**

(a) Degradation rate (μ) = 0 day^{-1}

Degradation is assumed not to occur in the saturated zone.

(b) **Background concentration of pollutant in groundwater (BC)** = 0 µg/L

It is assumed that no pollutant exists in the soil profile or aquifer prior to release from the source.

4. **Index Values** - See Table 3-1.

5. **Value Interpretation** - Value equals the maximum expected groundwater concentration of pollutant, in µg/L, at the well.

6. **Preliminary Conclusion** - Landfilling of sludge may result in increased concentrations of PCBs in groundwater at the well.

B. **Index of Human Cancer Risk Resulting from Groundwater Contamination (Index 2)**

1. **Explanation** - Calculates human exposure which could result from groundwater contamination. Compares exposure with cancer risk-specific intake (RSI) of pollutant.

2. **Assumptions/Limitations** - Assumes long-term exposure to maximum concentration at well at a rate of 2 L/day.

3. **Data Used and Rationale**

   a. **Index of groundwater concentration resulting from landfilled sludge (Index 1)**

      See Section 3, p. 3-26.

   b. **Average human consumption of drinking water (AC)** = 2 L/day

      The value of 2 L/day is a standard value used by U.S. EPA in most risk assessment studies.

   c. **Average daily human dietary intake of pollutant (DI)** = 0.7578 μg/day

      See Section 3, p. 3-11.

   d. **Cancer potency** = 4.34 $(mg/kg/day)^{-1}$

      See Section 3, p. 3-11.

   e. **Cancer risk-specific intake (RSI)** = 0.0161 μg/day

      See Section 3, p. 3-12.

4. **Index 2 Values** - See Table 3-1.

5. **Value Interpretation** - Value >1 indicates a potential increase in cancer risk of 10^{-6} (1 in 1,000,000). The null index value should be used as a basis for comparison to indicate the degree to which any risk is due to landfill disposal, as opposed to preexisting dietary sources.

6. **Preliminary Conclusion** - Landfilling of sludge may result in an increased potential of cancer risk to humans due to consumption of groundwater contaminated with PCBs.

TABLE 3-1. INDEX OF GROUNDWATER CONCENTRATION RESULTING FROM LANDFILLED SLUDGE (INDEX 1) AND INDEX OF HUMAN CANCER RISK RESULTING FROM GROUNDWATER CONTAMINATION (INDEX 2)

	Condition of Analysis[a,b,c]							
Site Characteristics	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Sludge concentration	T	W	T	T	T	T	W	N
Unsaturated Zone								
Soil type and characteristics[d]	T	T	W	NA	T	T	NA	N
Site parameters[e]	T	T	T	W	T	T	W	N
Saturated Zone								
Soil type and characteristics[f]	T	T	T	T	W	T	W	N
Site parameters[g]	T	T	T	T	T	W	W	N
Index 1 Value (μg/L)	0.092	0.53	0.099	0.11	0.30	0.33	130	0
Index 2 Value	59	110	59	61	85	88	17000	47

[a]T = Typical values used; W = worst-case values used; N = null condition, where no landfill exists, used as basis for comparison; NA = not applicable for this condition.

[b]Index values for combinations other than those shown may be calculated using the formulae in the Appendix.

[c]See Table A-1 in Appendix for parameter values used.

[d]Dry bulk density (P_{dry}), volumetric water content (θ), and fraction of organic carbon (f_{oc}).

[e]Leachate generation rate (Q), depth to groundwater (h), and dispersivity coefficient (α).

[f]Aquifer porosity ($\emptyset$) and hydraulic conductivity of the aquifer (K).

[g]Hydraulic gradient (i), distance from well to landfill ($\Delta \ell$), and dispersivity coefficient (α).

III. INCINERATION

A. Index of Air Concentration Increment Resulting from Incinerator Emissions (Index 1)

1. **Explanation** - Shows the degree of elevation of the pollutant concentration in the air due to the incineration of sludge. An input sludge with thermal properties defined by the energy parameter (EP) was analyzed using the BURN model (Camp Dresser and McKee, Inc. (CDM), 1984a). This model uses the thermodynamic and mass balance relationships appropriate for multiple hearth incinerators to relate the input sludge characteristics to the stack gas parameters. Dilution and dispersion of these stack gas releases were described by the U.S. EPA's Industrial Source Complex Long-Term (ISCLT) dispersion model from which normalized annual ground level concentrations were predicted (U.S. EPA, 1979). The predicted pollutant concentration can then be compared to a ground level concentration used to assess risk.

2. **Assumptions/Limitations** - The fluidized bed incinerator was not chosen due to a paucity of available data. Gradual plume rise, stack tip downwash, and building wake effects are appropriate for describing plume behavior. Maximum hourly impact values can be translated into annual average values.

3. Data Used and Rationale

   a. Coefficient to correct for mass and time units (C) = 2.78×10^{-7} hr/sec x g/mg

   b. Sludge feed rate (DS)

      i. Typical = 2660 kg/hr (dry solids input)

      A feed rate of 2660 kg/hr DW represents an average dewatered sludge feed rate into the furnace. This feed rate would serve a community of approximately 400,000 people. This rate was incorporated into the U.S. EPA-ISCLT model based on the following input data:

      EP = 360 lb H_2O/mm BTU
      Combustion zone temperature - 1400°F
      Solids content - 28%
      Stack height - 20 m
      Exit gas velocity - 20 m/s
      Exit gas temperature - 356.9°K (183°F)
      Stack diameter - 0.60 m

ii. **Worst** = 10,000 kg/hr (dry solids input)

A feed rate of 10,000 kg/hr DW represents a higher feed rate and would serve a major U.S. city. This rate was incorporated into the U.S. EPA-ISCLT model based on the following input data:

EP = 392 lb H_2O/mm BTU
Combustion zone temperature - 1400°F
Solids content - 26.6%
Stack height - 10 m
Exit gas velocity - 10 m/s
Exit gas temperature - 313.8°K (105°F)
Stack diameter - 0.80 m

c. **Sludge concentration of pollutant (SC)**

Typical	4 mg/kg DW
Worst	23 mg/kg DW

See Section 3, p. 3-1.

d. **Fraction of pollutant emitted through stack (FM)**

Typical	0.05 (unitless)
Worst	0.20 (unitless)

These values were chosen as best approximations of the fraction of pollutant emitted through stacks (Farrell, 1984). No data was available to validate these values; however, U.S. EPA is currently testing incinerators for organic emissions.

e. **Dispersion parameter for estimating maximum annual ground level concentration (DP)**

Typical	3.4 $\mu g/m^3$
Worst	16.0 $\mu g/m^3$

The dispersion parameter is derived from the U.S. EPA-ISCLT short-stack model.

f. **Background concentration of pollutant in urban air (BA)** = 0.00741 $\mu g/m^3$

The BA value presented here is the average of ten urban air concentrations reported by Bidleman (1981) and National Academy of Sciences (NAS) (1979). If the data were given as a range, the average of the minimum and maximum value was used. (See Section 4, pp. 4-3 and 4-4.)

4. **Index 1 Values**

Fraction of Pollutant Emitted Through Stack	Sludge Concentration	Sludge Feed Rate (kg/hr DW)[a] 0	2660	10,000
Typical	Typical	1.0	1.1	2.2
	Worst	1.0	1.4	7.9
Worst	Typical	1.0	1.3	5.8
	Worst	1.0	2.6	29

[a] The typical (3.4 μg/m^3) and worst (16.0 μg/m^3) dispersion parameters will always correspond, respectively, to the typical (2660 kg/hr DW) and worst (10,000 kg/hr DW) sludge feed rates.

5. **Value Interpretation** - Value equals factor by which expected air concentration exceeds background levels due to incinerator emissions.

6. **Preliminary Conclusion** - The incineration of sludge may result in air concentrations of PCBs that exceed background levels.

B. **Index of Human Cancer Risk Resulting from Inhalation of Incinerator Emissions (Index 2)**

1. **Explanation** - Shows the increase in human intake expected to result from the incineration of sludge. Ground level concentrations for carcinogens typically were developed based upon assessments published by the U.S. EPA Carcinogen Assessment Group (CAG). These ambient concentrations reflect a dose level which, for a lifetime exposure, increases the risk of cancer by 10^{-6}.

2. **Assumptions/Limitations** - The exposed population is assumed to reside within the impacted area for 24 hours/day. A respiratory volume of 20 m^3/day is assumed over a 70-year lifetime.

3. **Data Used and Rationale**

a. **Index of air concentration increment resulting from incinerator emissions (Index 1)**

See Section 3, p. 3-29.

b. **Background concentration of pollutant in urban air (BA)** = 0.00741 μg/m^3

See Section 3, p. 3-28.

c. **Cancer potency** = 4.34 $(mg/kg/day)^{-1}$

See Section 3, p. 3-11.

d. **Exposure criterion (EC)** = 0.000806 $\mu g/m^3$

A lifetime exposure level which would result in a 10^{-6} cancer risk was selected as ground level concentration against which incinerator emissions are compared. The risk estimates developed by CAG are defined as the lifetime incremental cancer risk in a hypothetical population exposed continuously throughout their lifetime to the stated concentration of the carcinogenic agent. The exposure criterion is calculated using the following formula:

$$EC = \frac{10^{-6} \times 10^3 \ \mu g/mg \times 70 \ kg}{\text{Cancer potency} \times 20 \ m^3/day}$$

4. **Index 2 Values**

Fraction of Pollutant Emitted Through Stack	Sludge Concentration	Sludge Feed Rate (kg/hr DW)[a]		
		0	2660	10,000
Typical	Typical	9.2	9.8	20
	Worst	9.2	13	73
Worst	Typical	9.2	12	53
	Worst	9.2	24	260

[a] The typical (3.4 $\mu g/m^3$) and worst (16.0 $\mu g/m^3$) dispersion parameters will always correspond, respectively, to the typical (2660 kg/hr DW) and worst (10,000 kg/hr DW) sludge feed rates.

5. **Value Interpretation** - Value >1 indicates a potential increase in cancer risk of $>10^{-6}$ (1 per 1,000,000). Comparison with the null index value at 0 kg/hr DW indicates the degree to which any hazard is due to sludge incineration, as opposed to background urban air concentration.

6. **Preliminary Conclusion** - Incineration of sludge may result in concentrations of PCBs in air that increase the potential of cancer risk to humans.

IV. OCEAN DISPOSAL

For the purpose of evaluating pollutant effects upon and/or subsequent uptake by marine life as a result of sludge disposal, two types of mixing were modeled. The initial mixing or dilution shortly after dumping of a single load of sludge represents a high, pulse concentration to which organisms may be exposed for short time periods but which could be repeated frequently; i.e., every time a recently dumped plume is encountered. A subsequent additional degree of mixing can be expressed by a further dilution. This is defined as the average dilution occurring when a day's worth of sludge is dispersed by 24 hours of current movement and represents the time-weighted average exposure concentration for organisms in the disposal area. This dilution accounts for 8 to 12 hours of the high pulse concentration encountered by the organisms during daylight disposal operations and 12 to 16 hours of recovery (ambient water concentration) during the night when disposal operations are suspended.

A. Index of Seawater Concentration Resulting from Initial Mixing of Sludge (Index 1)

1. **Explanation** - Calculates increased concentrations in µg/L of pollutant in seawater around an ocean disposal site assuming initial mixing.

2. **Assumptions/Limitations** - Assumes that the background seawater concentration of pollutant is unknown or zero. The index also assumes that disposal is by tanker and that the daily amount of sludge disposed is uniformly distributed along a path transversing the site and perpendicular to the current vector. The initial dilution volume is assumed to be determined by path length, depth to the pycnocline (a layer separating surface and deeper water masses), and an initial plume width defined as the width of the plume four hours after dumping. The seasonal disappearance of the pycnocline is not considered.

3. **Data Used and Rationale**

   a. **Disposal conditions**

	Sludge Disposal Rate (SS)	Sludge Mass Dumped by a Single Tanker (ST)	Length of Tanker Path (L)
Typical	825 mt DW/day	1600 mt WW	8000 m
Worst	1650 mt DW/day	3400 mt WW	4000 m

The typical value for the sludge disposal rate assumes that 7.5 x 10^6 mt WW/year are available for dumping from a metropolitan coastal area. The conversion to dry weight assumes 4 percent solids by weight. The worst-case value is an arbitrary doubling of the typical value to allow for potential future increase.

The assumed disposal practice to be followed at the model site representative of the typical case is a modification of that proposed for sludge disposal at the formally designated 12-mile site in the New York Bight Apex (City of New York, 1983). Sludge barges with capacities of 3400 mt WW would be required to discharge a load in no less than 53 minutes traveling at a minimum speed of 5 nautical miles (9260 m) per hour. Under these conditions, the barge would enter the site, discharge the sludge over 8180 m and exit the site. Sludge barges with capacities of 1600 mt WW would be required to discharge a load in no less than 32 minutes traveling at a minimum speed of 8 nautical miles (14,816 m) per hour. Under these conditions, the barge would enter the site, discharge the sludge over 7902 m and exit the site. The mean path length for the large and small tankers is 8041 m or approximately 8000 m. Path length is assumed to lie perpendicular to the direction of prevailing current flow. For the typical disposal rate (SS) of 825 mt DW/day, it is assumed that this would be accomplished by a mixture of four 3400 mt WW and four 1600 mt WW capacity barges. The overall daily disposal operation would last from 8 to 12 hours. For the worst-case disposal rate (SS) of 1650 mt DW/day, eight 3400 mt WW and eight 1600 mt WW capacity barges would be utilized. The overall daily disposal operation would last from 8 to 12 hours. For both disposal rate scenarios, there would be a 12 to 16 hour period at night in which no sludge would be dumped. It is assumed that under the above described disposal operation, sludge dumping would occur every day of the year.

The assumed disposal practice at the model site representative of the worst case is as stated for the typical site, except that barges would dump half their load along a track, then turn around and dispose of the balance along the same track in order to prevent a barge from dumping outside of the site. This practice would effectively halve the path length compared to the typical site.

b. Sludge concentration of pollutant (SC)

Typical	4 mg/kg DW
Worst	23 mg/kg DW

See Section 3, p. 3-1.

c. **Disposal site characteristics**

	Depth to pycnocline (D)	Average current velocity at site (V)
Typical	20 m	9500 m/day
Worst	5 m	4320 m/day

Typical site values are representative of a large, deep-water site with an area of about 1500 km^2 located beyond the continental shelf in the New York Bight. The pycnocline value of 20 m chosen is the average of the 10 to 30 m pycnocline depth range occurring in the summer and fall; the winter and spring disappearance of the pycnocline is not considered and so represents a conservative approach in evaluating annual or long-term impact. The current velocity of 11 cm/sec (9500 m/day) chosen is based on the average current velocity in this area (CDM, 1984b).

Worst-case values are representative of a near-shore New York Bight site with an area of about 20 km^2. The pycnocline value of 5 m chosen is the minimum value of the 5 to 23 m depth range of the surface mixed layer and is therefore a worst-case value. Current velocities in this area vary from 0 to 30 cm/sec. A value of 5 cm/sec (4320 m/day) is arbitrarily chosen to represent a worst-case value (CDM, 1984c).

4. **Factors Considered in Initial Mixing**

When a load of sludge is dumped from a moving tanker, an immediate mixing occurs in the turbulent wake of the vessel, followed by more gradual spreading of the plume. The entire plume, which initially constitutes a narrow band the length of the tanker path, moves more-or-less as a unit with the prevailing surface current and, under calm conditions, is not further dispersed by the current itself. However, the current acts to separate successive tanker loads, moving each out of the immediate disposal path before the next load is dumped.

Immediate mixing volume after barge disposal is approximately equal to the length of the dumping track with a cross-sectional area about four times that defined by the draft and width of the discharging vessel (Csanady, 1981, as cited in NOAA, 1983). The resulting plume is initially 10 m deep by 40 m wide (O'Connor and Park, 1982, as cited in NOAA, 1983). Subsequent spreading of plume band width occurs at an average rate of approximately 1 cm/sec (Csanady et al., 1979, as cited in NOAA, 1983). Vertical mixing is limited by the depth of the pycnocline or ocean floor, whichever is shallower. Four hours after disposal, therefore, average plume width (W) may be computed as follows:

W = 40 m + 1 cm/sec x 4 hours x 3600 sec/hour x 0.01 m/cm = 184 m = approximately 200 m

Thus the volume of initial mixing is defined by the tanker path, a 200 m width, and a depth appropriate to the site. For the typical (deep water) site, this depth is chosen as the pycnocline value of 20 m. For the worst (shallow water) site, a value of 10 m was chosen. At times the pycnocline may be as shallow as 5 m, but since the barge wake causes initial mixing to at least 10 m, the greater value was used.

5. **Index 1 Values (μg/L)**

Disposal Conditions and Site Characteristics	Sludge Concentration	Sludge Disposal Rate (mt DW/day) 0	825	1650
Typical	Typical	0.0	0.0080	0.0080
	Worst	0.0	0.046	0.046
Worst	Typical	0.0	0.068	0.068
	Worst	0.0	0.39	0.39

6. **Value Interpretation** - Value equals the expected increase in PCBs concentration in seawater around a disposal site as a result of sludge disposal after initial mixing.

7. **Preliminary Conclusion** - Ocean disposal of sludge may result in increased concentrations of PCBs in seawater around the disposal site after initial mixing.

B. **Index of Seawater Concentration Representing a 24-Hour Dumping Cycle (Index 2)**

1. **Explanation** - Calculates increased effective concentrations in μg/L of pollutant in seawater around an ocean disposal site utilizing a time weighted average (TWA) concentration. The TWA concentration is that which would be experienced by an organism remaining stationary (with respect to the ocean floor) or moving randomly within the disposal vicinity. The dilution volume is determined by the tanker path length and depth to pycnocline or, for the shallow water site, the 10 m effective mixing depth, as before, but the effective width is now determined by current movement perpendicular to the tanker path over 24 hours.

2. **Assumptions/Limitations** - Incorporates all of the assumptions used to calculate Index 1. In addition, it is assumed that organisms would experience high-pulsed sludge concentrations for 8 to 12 hours per day and then experience recovery (no exposure to sludge) for 12 to 16 hours per day. This situation can be expressed by the use of a TWA concentration of sludge constituent.

3. **Data Used and Rationale**

   See Section 3, pp. 3-31 to 3-33.

4. **Factors Considered in Determining Subsequent Additional Degree of Mixing (Determination of TWA Concentrations)**

   See Section 3, p. 3-35.

5. **Index 2 Values (μg/L)**

Disposal Conditions and Site Characteristics	Sludge Concentration	Sludge Disposal Rate (mt DW/day) 0	825	1650
Typical	Typical	0.0	0.0022	0.0043
	Worst	0.0	0.012	0.025
Worst	Typical	0.0	0.019	0.038
	Worst	0.0	0.11	0.22

6. **Value Interpretation** - Value equals the effective increase in PCBs concentration expressed as a TWA concentration in seawater around a disposal site experienced by an organism over a 24-hour period.

7. **Preliminary Conclusion** - The concentration of PCBs in seawater around the disposal site may increase above background levels over a 24-hour period.

C. **Index of Hazard to Aquatic Life (Index 3)**

1. **Explanation** - Compares the effective increased concentration of pollutant in seawater around the disposal site (Index 2) expressed as a 24-hour TWA concentration with the marine ambient water quality criterion of the pollutant, or with another value judged protective of marine aquatic life. For PCBs, this value is the criterion that will protect the marketability of edible marine aquatic organisms.

2. **Assumptions/Limitations** - In addition to the assumptions stated for Indices 1 and 2, assumes that all of the released pollutant is available in the water column to move through predicted pathways (i.e., sludge to seawater

to aquatic organism to man). The possibility of effects arising from accumulation in the sediments is neglected since the U.S. EPA presently lacks a satisfactory method for deriving sediment criteria.

3. **Data Used and Rationale**

a. **Concentration of pollutant in seawater around a disposal site (Index 2)**

See Section 3, p. 3-35.

b. **Ambient water quality criterion (AWQC)** = 0.030 µg/L

Water quality criteria for the toxic pollutants listed under Section 307(a)(1) of the Clean Water Act of 1977 were developed by the U.S. EPA under Section 304(a)(1) of the Act. These criteria were derived by utilization of data reflecting the resultant environmental impacts and human health effects of these pollutants if present in any body of water. The criteria values presented in this assessment are excerpted from the ambient water quality criteria document for PCBs.

The 0.030 µg/L value chosen as the criterion to protect saltwater organisms is expressed as a 24-hour average concentration (U.S. EPA, 1980). This concentration, the saltwater final residue value, was derived by using the FDA action level for marketability for human consumption of PCBs in edible fish and shellfish (5 mg/kg), the geometric mean of normalized bioconcentration factor (BCF) values (10,400) for aquatic species tested, and the 16 percent lipid content of marine species. This value will also protect against acute toxic effects which occur only at concentrations of PCBs above 10 µg/L. Chronic toxicity effects were observed among marine fish species at PCB concentrations as low as 0.14 µg/L.

4. **Index 3 Values**

Disposal Conditions and Site Characteristics	Sludge Concentration	Sludge Disposal Rate (mt DW/day)		
		0	825	1650
Typical	Typical	0.0	0.072	0.14
	Worst	0.0	0.42	0.83
Worst	Typical	0.0	0.64	1.3
	Worst	0.0	3.7	7.3

5. **Value Interpretation** - Value equals the factor by which the expected seawater concentration increase in PCBs exceeds the marine water quality criterion. A value >1 indicates that a tissue residue hazard may exist for aquatic life. Even for values approaching 1, a PCB residue in tissue hazard may exist, thus jeopardizing the marketability of edible saltwater organisms. The criterion value of 0.030 μg/L is probably too high because it is based on bioconcentration factors measured in laboratory studies, but field studies apparently produce factors at least 10 times higher for fish (U.S. EPA, 1980).

6. **Preliminary Conclusion** - Ocean disposal of sludge may result in concentrations of PCBs in the tissue of aquatic life that jeopardize their marketability when high-PCB sludge is disposed of at a high rate at a typical disposal site. Where poor site conditions exist, and when typical sludge is disposed of at a high rate, or when high-PCB sludge is disposed of at high and low rates, a threat to aquatic life may exist.

D. **Index of Human Cancer Risk Resulting from Seafood Consumption (Index 4)**

1. **Explanation** - Estimates the expected increase in human pollutant intake associated with the consumption of seafood, a fraction of which originates from the disposal site vicinity, and compares the total expected pollutant intake with the cancer risk-specific intake (RSI) of the pollutant.

2. **Assumptions/Limitations** - In addition to the assumptions listed for Indices 1 and 2, assumes that the seafood tissue concentration increase can be estimated from the increased water concentration by a bioconcentration factor. It also assumes that, over the long term, the seafood catch from the disposal site vicinity will be diluted to some extent by the catch from uncontaminated areas.

3. **Data Used and Rationale**

a. **Concentration of pollutant in seawater around a disposal site (Index 2)**

See Section 3, p. 3-35.

Since bioconcentration is a dynamic and reversible process, it is expected that uptake of sludge pollutants by marine organisms at the disposal site will reflect TWA concentrations, as quantified by Index 2, rather than pulse concentrations.

b. Dietary consumption of seafood (QF)

Typical	14.3 g WW/day
Worst	41.7 g WW/day

Typical and worst-case values are the mean and the 95th percentile, respectively, for all seafood consumption in the United States (Stanford Research Institute (SRI) International, 1980).

c. Fraction of consumed seafood originating from the disposal site (FS)

For a typical harvesting scenario, it was assumed that the total catch over a wide region is mixed by harvesting, marketing and consumption practices, and that exposure is thereby diluted. Coastal areas have been divided by the National Marine Fishery Service (NMFS) into reporting areas for reporting on data on seafood landings. Therefore it was convenient to express the total area affected by sludge disposal as a fraction of an NMFS reporting area. The area used to represent the disposal impact area should be an approximation of the total ocean area over which the average concentration defined by Index 2 is roughly applicable. The average rate of plume spreading of 1 cm/sec referred to earlier amounts to approximately 0.9 km/day. Therefore, the combined plume of all sludge dumped during one working day will gradually spread, both parallel to and perpendicular to current direction, as it proceeds down-current. Since the concentration has been averaged over the direction of current flow, spreading in this dimension will not further reduce average concentration; only spreading in the perpendicular dimension will reduce the average. If stable conditions are assumed over a period of days, at least 9 days would be required to reduce the average concentration by one-half. At that time, the original plume length of approximately 8 km (8000 m) will have doubled to approximately 16 km due to spreading.

It is probably unnecessary to follow the plume further since storms, which would result in much more rapid dispersion of pollutants to background concentrations are expected on at least a 10-day frequency (NOAA, 1983). Therefore, the area impacted by sludge disposal (AI, in km^2) at each disposal site will be considered to be defined by the tanker path length (L) times the distance of current movement (V) during 10 days, and is computed as follows:

$$AI = 10 \times L \times V \times 10^{-6}\ km^2/m^2 \qquad (1)$$

To be consistent with a conservative approach, plume dilution due to spreading in the perpendicular direction to current flow is disregarded. More likely, organisms exposed to the plume in the area defined by equation 1 would experience a TWA concentration lower than the concentration expressed by Index 2.

Next, the value of AI must be expressed as a fraction of an NMFS reporting area. In the New York Bight, which includes NMFS areas 612-616 and 621-623, deep-water area 623 has an area of approximately 7200 km^2 and constitutes approximately 0.02 percent of the total seafood landings for the Bight (CDM, 1984b). Near-shore area 612 has an area of approximately 4300 km^2 and constitutes approximately 24 percent of the total seafood landings (CDM, 1984c). Therefore the fraction of all seafood landings (FS_t) from the Bight which could originate from the area of impact of either the typical (deep-water) or worst (near-shore) site can be calculated for this typical harvesting scenario as follows:

For the typical (deep water) site:

$$FS_t = \frac{AI \times 0.02\%}{7200\ km^2} = \qquad (2)$$

$$\frac{[10 \times 8000\ m \times 9500\ m \times 10^{-6}\ km^2/m^2] \times 0.0002}{7200\ km^2} = 2.1 \times 10^{-5}$$

For the worst (near shore) site:

$$FS_t = \frac{AI \times 24\%}{4300\ km^2} = \qquad (3)$$

$$\frac{[10 \times 4000\ m \times 4320\ m \times 10^{-6}\ km^2/m^2] \times 0.24}{4300\ km^2} = 9.6 \times 10^{-3}$$

To construct a worst-case harvesting scenario, it was assumed that the total seafood consumption for an individual could originate from an area more limited than the entire New York Bight. For example, a particular fisherman providing the entire seafood diet for himself or others could fish habitually within a single NMFS reporting area. Or, an individual could have a preference for a particular species which is taken only over a more limited area, here assumed arbitrarily to equal an NMFS reporting area. The fraction of consumed seafood (FS_w) that could originate from the area of impact under this worst-case scenario is calculated as follows:

For the typical (deep water) site:

$$FS_w = \frac{AI}{7200\ km^2} = 0.11 \qquad (4)$$

For the worst (near shore) site:

$$FS_w = \frac{AI}{4300\ km^2} = 0.040 \qquad (5)$$

d. **Bioconcentration factor of pollutant (BCF)** = 31,200 L/kg

The value chosen is the weighted average BCF of PCBs for the edible portion of all freshwater and estuarine aquatic organisms consumed by U.S. citizens (U.S. EPA, 1980). The weighted average BCF is derived as part of the water quality criteria developed by the U.S. EPA to protect human health from the potential carcinogenic effects of PCBs induced by ingestion of contaminated water and aquatic organisms. The weighted average BCF is calculated by adjusting the mean normalized BCF (steady-state BCF corrected to 1 percent lipid content) to the 3 percent lipid content of consumed fish and shellfish. It should be noted that lipids of marine species differ in both structure and quantity from those of freshwater species. Although a BCF value calculated entirely from marine data would be more appropriate for this assessment, no such data are presently available.

e. **Average daily human dietary intake of pollutant (DI)** = 0.7578 μg/day

See Section 3, p. 3-11.

f. **Cancer potency** = 4.34 $(mg/kg/day)^{-1}$

See Section 3, p. 3-11.

g. **Cancer risk-specific intake (RSI)** = 0.0161 μg/day

See section 3, p. 3-12.

4. **Index 4 Values**

Disposal Conditions and Site Characteristics	Sludge Concentration[a]	Seafood Intake[a,b]	Sludge Disposal Rate (mt DW/day) 0	825	1650
Typical	Typical	Typical	47	47	47
	Worst	Worst	47	160	270
Worst	Typical	Typical	47	52	57
	Worst	Worst	47	400	760

[a] All possible combinations of these values are not presented. Additional combinations may be calculated using the formulae in the Appendix.

[b] Refers to both the dietary consumption of seafood (QF) and the fraction of consumed seafood originating from the disposal site (FS). "Typical" indicates the use of the typical-case values for both of these parameters; "worst" indicates the use of the worst-case values for both.

5. **Value Interpretation** - Value equals factor by which the expected intake exceeds the RSI. A value >1 indicates a possible human health threat. Comparison with the null index value at 0 mt/day indicates the degree to which any hazard is due to sludge disposal, as opposed to pre-existing dietary sources.

6. **Preliminary Conclusion** - Ocean disposal of sludge may be expected to result in an increased potential of cancer risk to humans, except possibly when typical sludge is disposed of at a typical site with typical conditions, and when seafood intake is typical.

SECTION 4

PRELIMINARY DATA PROFILE FOR POLYCHLORINATED BIPHENYLS IN MUNICIPAL SEWAGE SLUDGE

I. OCCURRENCE

Manufacturers phased out all PCB production from 1976 to 1979, with diminished use since 1971. Use of PCBs still continues, however, under restricted conditions.

A. Sludge

1. Frequency of Detection

PCBs observed in influent and effluent from 40 POTWs, but not in sludge	U.S. EPA, 1982a (pp. 38 to 42)
PCBs not observed in influents, effluents, or sludge of 10 POTWs	U.S. EPA, 1982b (p. 5-50)
The analysis for PCBs done in EPA's survey of 50 POTWs is questionable due to detection limits used.	Clarkson et al., 1985

2. Concentration

2570 ng/g (WW) AR-1254 in digested sludge from Denver. 751 ng/g (WW) AR-1254 in waste-activated sludge from Denver	Baxter et al., 1983a (p. 315)
Summary of PCB sludge analysis from 74 cities in Missouri (µg/g DW):	Clevenger et al., 1983 (p. 1471)

Min.	Max.	Mean	Median
0.11	2.9	1.1	0.99

<0.01 to 23.1 µg/g (DW) (median 4 ppm) in sludges of 16 U.S. cities	Furr et al., 1976 (pp. 684 and 686)
Arochlor 1254 not found in Chicago municipal sludge; mean levels of PCBs in 4 Ontario treatment plants ranged from 74 to 1122 µg/L using iron, lime, or alum treatments.	Jones and Lee, 1977 (p. 52)
200 to 1700 µg/g (DW) in Indiana sludge	Pal et al., 1980 (p. 50)

B. Soil - Unpolluted

1. Frequency of Detection

1.1% detection in rice growing soils of U.S. (1972 data)	Carey et al., 1980 (p. 25)
0.1% detection of PCBs in 1483 cropland soil samples from 37 states (1972 data)	Carey et al., 1979a (p. 212)
N.D. to 3.9% detection in 380 samples from soils from 5 U.S. cities, 1971	Carey et al., 1979b (p. 19)
0 to 5.9% detection in 5 USAF base soils	Lang et al., 1979 (p. 231)

2. Concentration

<625 ng/g PCBs in control and sludge amended soil	Baxter et al., 1983a (p. 315)
N.D. to 1.13 μg/g (DW) in rice growing soils of U.S.	Carey et al., 1980 (p. 25)
0.80 to 1.49 μg/g (DW) PCBs for the 2 detected samples in 1483 cropland soil samples from 37 states	Carey et al., 1979a (p. 212)
N.D. to 3.30 μg/g (DW) range from 380 samples from 5 U.S. cities, 1971	Carey et al., 1979b (p. 19)
PCBs not detected in residential and non-use area soils from six USAF bases	Lang et al., 1979 (p. 231)
N.D. to 4.33 μg/g (DW) (mean 0.29 μg/g) in soils from golf course (1976 data)	
2×10^{-7} to 2×10^{-3} μg/g in top 1 cm of soil	NAS, 1979 (p. 56)
<0.1 to 43 ng/g (DW) PCBs in agricultural soils in southern Florida	Requejo et al., 1979 (p. 933)
<1 to 33 ng/g (DW) PCBs in soils of Everglades National Park	

C. Water - Unpolluted

1. Frequency of Detection

0 to 7.7% in major U.S. drainage basins (1974 data)	Dennis, 1976 (p. 188)

2. **Concentration**

a. **Freshwater**

No PCBs detected in filtered water samples of the upper Great Lakes, 1974 (detection limit = 0.1 μg/L)	Glooschenko et al., 1976 (p. 63)
0.1 μg/L to 3.0 μg/L median residue levels in major U.S. river basins (1971 to 1974 data)	NAS, 1979 (p. 28)
0.8 to 5.0 ng/L in Lake Superior from 1972 to 1976 9 to 31 ng/L in Lake Michigan 1.0 to 3.0 ng/L in Lake Ontario 5.0 to 7.0 ng/L in Lake Huron 27.0 ng/L in Lake Erie	
N.D. to 0.7 μg/L in the major drainage basins of the U.S. (1974 data)	Dennis, 1976 (p. 188)

b. **Seawater**

<0.9 to 3.6 ng/L in Sargasso Sea 1.8 ng/L in Gulf of Mexico 0.3 to 0.5 ng/L in California Current 0.8 ng/L in New England continental shelf 1.1 to 5.9 ng/L in California coastal waters	NAS, 1979 (p. 46-47)

c. **Drinking Water**

3.0 μg/L PCBs in Winnebago, IL water supply 0.1 μg/L PCBs in Sellersberg, IN water supply	NAS, 1977 (p. 756)

D. **Air**

1. **Frequency of Detection**

100% at suburban locations in FL, MS, CO (1975 data)	Kutz and Yang, 1976 (p. 182)

2. **Concentration**

a. **Urban**

4.4 ng/m^3 Columbia, NC 7.1 ng/m^3 Boston, MA (1978 data)	Bidleman, 1981 (p. 623)

Kingston, RI, 1973 to 1975 1 to 15 ng/m^3	NAS, 1979 (p. 20)
La Jolla, CA, 1974 0.5 to 14 ng/m^3	
Vineyard Sound, MA, 1973 4 to 5 ng/m^3	
Univ., RI, 1973 2.1 to 5.8 ng/m^3	
Providence, RI, 1973 9.4 ng/m^3	
Chicago, IL, 1975 to 1976 3.6 to 11.0 ng/m^3	
Jacksonville, FL, 1976 3 to 36 ng/m^3	
Milwaukee, WI, 1978 2.7 ng/m^3	
100 ng/m^3 average for 3 suburban locations (1975 data)	Kutz and Yang, 1976 (p. 182)

b. **Rural**

Organ Pipe National Park, 1974 0.02 to 0.41 ng/m^3	NAS, 1979 (p. 20)
Hayes, KS, 1974 0.03 ng/m^3	
Lake Michigan, 1976 to 1978 0.57 to 1.6 ng/m^3	
Northwest Territories, 1974 0.002 to 0.07 ng/m^3	

E. **Food**

1. **Total Average Intake**

Total relative daily intakes (µg/kg body weight/day) — FDA, 1979 (Attachment G)

FY75	FY76	FY77	FY78
0.0000	0.0000	0.0164	0.0269

2. **Concentration**

No PCBs detected in food crops from 1483 sites in 37 states, 1972 — Carey et al., 1979a (p. 221)

Frequency and range of PCBs in food groups based on 20 composite groups sampled detection limit (0.005 µg/g) (FY78 data)	FDA, 1979 (Attachment E)

Food Group	Frequency
Dairy	--
Meat and fish	6/20
Grains and cereals	--
Potatoes	--
Leafy vegetables	--
Legumes	2/20
Root vegetables	--
Garden fruit	--
Fruit	--
Oils and fats	2/20
Sugars	--
Beverages	--

Range of concentrations: 0.006 to 0.050 µg/g

Comparisons of PCBs as Arochlor 1254 in health and traditional foods (µg/g)	Appledorf et al., 1973 (p. 243)

Food Product	Health Food	Traditional Food
Milk	0.00	0.00
Cashews	5.00	0.00
Whole wheat cereal	1.50	0.00
Pecans	4.00	0.00
Pancake mix	5.00	5.00
Almonds	5.00	4.00
Rice cereal	4.00	4.00
Brazil nut	2.50	0.00

N.D. to 4.99 µg/g in milk fat from Ohio farms, 1973	Willet, 1980 (p. 1963)
Trace to 1.78 µg/g in milk fat from Ohio farms, 1974	

II. HUMAN EFFECTS

A. Ingestion

1. Carcinogenicity

a. Qualitative Assessment

PCBs are reported to be animal carcinogens and are probable human carcinogens.	U.S. EPA, 1984b (pp. 31 to 45) U.S. EPA, 1980 (p. C-62 to C-86)
11 out of 33 deaths among "Yusho" (contaminated rice oil) patients who had died by 1979 resulted from malignancies involving various body sites.	U.S. EPA, 1984b (p. 31)

b. Potency

Cancer potency: 4.34 $(mg/kg/day)^{-1}$ The potency value of 4.34 $(mg/kg/day)^{-1}$ was derived from studies in which rats ingesting PCBs developed hepatocellular carcinomas and neoplastic nodules.	U.S. EPA, 1980 (p. C-117)

c. Effects

Hepatocellular carcinomas and neoplastic nodules in mice and rats	U.S. EPA, 1980 (p. C-64 and C-67)
Malignant neoplasms in "Yusho" patients ingesting Kanechlor 400.	U.S. EPA, 1980 (p. C-72)

2. Chronic Toxicity

a. ADI

Studies of chronic duration involving oral levels sufficiently low to generate reliable no-observed-adverse-effect levels (NOAEL) or lowest-observed-adverse-effect level (LOAEL) were not found in the literature; hence, estimating a maximum oral dose tolerable for chronic exposure is not possible.	U.S. EPA, 1984b (p. 42)

Insufficient low-exposure data for the more toxic Aroclors precluded estimation of a maximum tolerated dose for subchronic oral exposure to PCBs.	U.S. EPA, 1984b (p. 41)

b. **Effects**

Symptoms observed in "Yusho" patients included increased eye discharge, and swelling of upper eyelids, acneform eruptions and follicular accentuation, and pigmentation of the skin. Other symptoms included dermatologic problems, swelling, jaundice, numbness of limbs, spasms, hearing and vision problems, and gastrointestinal disturbances.	U.S. EPA, 1980 (p. C-48)

3. **Absorption Factor**

Chlorobiphenyl isomers administered orally to rodents at levels up to 100 mg/kg of body weight for lower chlorinated compounds and up to 5 mg/kg for the higher chlorinated compounds were rapidly adsorbed. Absorption up to 90% was reported.	WHO, 1976 (p. 44)

4. **Existing Regulations**

The ambient water quality criteria for PCBs for the protection of humans from increased risk of cancer over the lifetime is 0.079 ng/L at the 10^{-6} level.	U.S. EPA, 1980 (p. C-117)

B. **Inhalation**

1. **Carcinogenicity**

a. **Qualitative Assessment**

No studies of carcinogenicity of PCBs related to inhalation exposure have been found in the available literature.	U.S. EPA, 1984b (p. 43)

b. **Potency**

Cancer potency 4.34 $(mg/kg/day)^{-1}$. This estimate has been calculated from the data reported for ingestion assuming 100% absorption for both the ingestion and inhalation route.

c. **Effects**

Data not immediately available.

2. **Chronic Toxicity**

a. **Inhalation Threshold or MPIH**

Occupational exposure limits recommended by the American Conference of Governmental and Industrial Hygienists (ACGIH) for Aroclor 1254 are a threshold limit value (TLV) of 0.5 mg/m^3 and a short-term exposure limit (STEL) of 1 mg/m^3. For Aroclor 1242, the recommended TLV is 1, and the STEL is 2 mg/m^3.	U.S. EPA, 1984b (p. 38)

b. **Effects**

Studies on the effect of PCB inhalation are scarce. In one study, rats, mice, rabbits, and guinea pigs were exposed to Aroclor 1242 or 1254 vapors for 5 days a week for several weeks at concentrations ranging from 1.5 to 8.6 mg/m^3. At these concentrations, Aroclor 1254 produced liver enlargement in rats.	WHO, 1976 (p. 53)

3. **Absorption Factor**

Very high absorption from inhalation exposure has been reported, but absorption factors were not quantitated.	U.S. EPA, 1984b (p. 7)

4. **Existing Regulations**

The National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH) criterion is 1.0 $\mu g/m^3$ for 10 hours/day, 40 hours/week exposure.	U.S. EPA, 1984b (p. 38)

III. PLANT EFFECTS

A. Phytotoxicity

See Table 4-1.

B. Uptake

See Table 4-2.

0.002 to 0.040 $\mu g/g$ in plants	NAS, 1979 (p. 56)

IV. DOMESTIC ANIMAL AND WILDLIFE EFFECTS

A. Toxicity

See Table 4-3.

B. Uptake

0.02 to 0.4 μg/g in wildlife 0.002 to 0.1 μg/g in livestock	NAS, 1979 (p. 56)
Aroclor 1260 levels in feedlot steers exposed to PCBs in backrub oil: 3.0 to 36.0 μg/g, liver 1.8 to 7.5 μg/g, kidney 1.3 to 8.6 μg/g, spleen 2.0 to 26.0 μg/g, heart 1.4 to 26.0 μg/g, muscle 1.9 to 8.5 μg/g, lung 170 to 1900 μg/g, fat	Osheim et al., 1982 (p. 717)
See Table 4-5.	
500 ng/g (WW) AR-1254 in fat of cattle on control and sludge-amended plots, sludge-amended and control soils <625 ng/g PCB	Baxter et al., 1983a (p. 316) 1983b (p. 318)
PCB concentrations in fatty tissues of sows overwintered for two seasons on sludge-amended plots.	Hansen et al., 1981 (p. 1015)

Estimated PCB Residues in the Soils Amended for 8 Years with Sewage Sludge	Eight-Year Sludge Application Rate	Fat Concentration (ng/g fat basis)
1.62 ± 0.29 μg/g DW	Control	39 ± 9
1.88 ± 0.27 μg/g DW	126 mt/ha	106 ± 64
2.13 ± 0.51 μg/g DW	252 mt/ha	191 ± 97
2.81 ± 0.25 μg/g DW	504 mt/ha	389 ± 118

V. AQUATIC LIFE EFFECTS

A. Toxicity

1. Freshwater

a. Acute

Acute toxicity values for invertebrate and fish species range from 2.0 µg/L to 2400 µg/L.	U.S. EPA, 1980 (p. B-14)

b. Chronic

Chronic toxicity values for invertebrate and fish species range from 0.2 µg/L to 15 µg/L.	U.S. EPA, 1980 (p. B-16)
Final residue value is 0.014 µg/L based on the lowest maximum permissible tissue concentration (0.64 mg/kg) while the geometric mean of whole-body and BCFs for salmonids is 45,000.	U.S. EPA, 1980 (p. B-10)

2. Saltwater

a. Acute

Acute toxicity values for invertebrate species range from 10.2 to 60 µg/L.	U.S. EPA, 1980 (p. B-3)

b. Chronic

Chronic toxicity occurred among fish species at concentrations as low as 0.14 µg/L.	U.S. EPA, 1980 (p. B-5)
Final saltwater residue value is 0.030 µg/L based on FDA action level of 5.0 mg/kg for marketability for human consumption of PCBs in edible fish and shellfish, the geometric mean of normalized BCF values (400), and the 16% lipid content of saltwater species.	U.S. EPA, 1980 (p. B-9)

B. Uptake

The weighted average BCF for the edible portion of all freshwater and estuarine aquatic organisms consumed by U.S. citizens is 31,200.	U.S. EPA, 1980 (p. C-12)

VI. SOIL BIOTA EFFECTS

Data not immediately available.

VII. PHYSICOCHEMICAL DATA FOR ESTIMATING FATE AND TRANSPORT

Composition of chlorinated biphenyls — NAS, 1979 (p. 146)

Empirical Formula	Molecular Weight	Percent Chlorine	No. of Isomers
$C_{12}H_{10}$	154	0	1
$C_{12}H_9Cl$	188.5	19	3
$C_{12}H_8Cl_2$	223	32	12
$C_{12}H_7Cl_3$	257.5	41	24
$C_{12}H_6Cl_4$	292	49	42
$C_{12}H_5Cl_5$	326.5	54	46
$C_{12}H_4Cl_6$	361	59	42
$C_{12}H_3Cl_7$	395.5	63	24
$C_{12}H_2Cl_8$	430	66	12
$C_{12}HCl_9$	464.5	69	3
$C_{12}Cl_{10}$	499	71	1

Solubility of PCBs dependent on isomer — NAS, 1979 (p. 154)

Monochorobiphenyl	1.19 to 5.90 mg/L
Dichlorobiphenyl	0.08 to 1.88 mg/L
Trichlorobiphenyl	7.8×10^{-2} to 8.5×10^{-2} mg/L
Tetrachlorobiphenyl	3.4×10^{-2} to 1.8×10^{-3} mg/L
Pentachlorobiphenyl	2.2×10^{-2} to 3.1×10^{-2} mg/L
Hexachlorobiphenyl	8.8×10^{-2} mg/L
Octachlorobiphenyl	0.7×10^{-2} mg/L
Decachlorobiphenyl	1.5×10^{-2} mg/L
Aroclor 1242	0.24 mg/L
Aroclor 1248	5.40×10^{-2} mg/L
Aroclor 1254	1.20×10^{-2} mg/L
Aroclor 1260	0.30×10^{-2} mg/L

Vapor pressure of Aroclors: — NAS, 1979 (p. 155)

Aroclor	VP to 20°C, mm/Hg
1242	9.0×10^{-4}
1248	8.3×10^{-4}
1254	1.8×10^{-4}
1260	0.9×10^{-4}

0.01 to 0.08 ppm water solubility 10^{-3} to 10^{-6} mm Hg at 25°C vapor pressure	Webber and Mrozek, 1979 (p. 412)
Entry of PCBs into the environment	WHO, 1976 (p. 28)

Route	Percentage of Annual Production	PCB type (% chlorination)
Vaporization from plasticizers	4.5	48-60
Vaporization during incineration	1	42
Leaks and disposal of industrial fluids	13	42-60
Destruction by incineration	9	mainly 42
Disposal in dumps and landfills	52.5	42-60
Net increase in current usage	20	42-54

Organic carbon partition coefficient	Hassett et al., 1983
PCB 1221 6,600 mL/g PCB 1248 320,000 mL/g PCB 1260 7,700,000 mL/g PCB 1016 210,000 mL/g	
Long-term studies on the half-life of PCBs in field soils are not available.	Fries, 1982 (p. 18)
Most PCBs have half-life of <1 year in sediments Aroclor 1254 has half-life of 6 years Trichlorobiphenyl = 16 years Pentachlorobiphenyl = 11 years	

TABLE 4-1. PHYTOTOXICITY OF POLYCHOLORINATED BIPHENYLS

Plant/tissue	Chemical Form Applied	Soil Type	Control Tissue Concentration (μg/g DW)	Soil Concentration (μg/g DW)	Application Rate (kg/ha)	Experimental Tissue Concentration (μg/g DW)	Effects	References
Soybean/whole	PCB	lakeland sand	NR[a]	10	NA[b]	NR	10% growth reduction	Webber and Mrozek, 1979 (pp. 414 and 415)
Soybean/whole	PCB	lakeland sand	NR	100	NA	NR	Up to 27% growth reduction root growth reduction significant	
Corn/plant	PCB	lakeland sand	NR	100	NA	NR	Significant growth reduction	Strek et al., 1981 (p. 291)
Soybeans, beets/ plant	PCB	lakeland sand	NR	0-1,000	NA	NR	Significant growth reduction at 1,000 μg/g; NS[c] at 100 μg/g	Strek et al., 1981 (p. 290)
Fescue/plant	PCB	lakeland sand	NR	1,000	NA	NR	16% growth reduction	Webber and Mrozek, 1979 (p. 414)
Soybean/plant	PCB	sandy loam	NR	2-3	NA	NR	Growth reduction NS	Fries and Marrow, 1981 (p. 757)

[a] NR = Not reported.
[b] NA = Not applicable.
[c] NS = Not significant.

TABLE 4-2. UPTAKE OF POLYCHLORINATED BIPHENYLS BY PLANTS

Plant/tissue	Soil Type	Chemical Form Applied	Range of Soil Concentration (μg/g)	Range of Tissue Concentration (μg/g)	Uptake[a] Factor	References
Carrot/root	NR[b]	2-PCB	NR	NR	0.19[d]	Connor, 1984 (p. 48)
Carrot/root	NR	4-PCB	NR	NR	0.06-0.12[d]	
Carrot/root	NR	6-PCB	NR	NR	0.02-0.12[d]	
Carrot/root	NR	Light PCB	NR	NR	0.3-0.5[d]	
Carrot/root	NR	Heavy PCB	NR	NR	0.03-0.04[d]	
Lettuce/head	NR	PCB	NR	NR	<0.03[d]	
Soybean/plant	NR	PCB	NR	NR	0.01-0.11[d]	
Oats/plant	clay loam	PCB-sludge	0.013	0.026	2.0	Webber et al., 1983 (pp. 191 to 193)
Corn/plant	varied	PCB-sludge	0.009-0.215	0.033-0.053	0.247-3.67	
Beet/top	lakeland sand	PCB	20	0.815	0.041[c]	Strek et al., 1981 (p. 292)
Sorghum/top	lakeland sand	PCB	20	0.068	0.003[c]	
Peanut/top	lakeland sand	PCB	20	0.473	0.024[c]	
Corn/top	lakeland sand	PCB	20	0.002	0.001[c]	
Corn/leaves	agric.	PCB	92-144 μg/L in sludge	0.045-0.081	<1	Pal et al., 1980 (p. 80)
Carrot/root	agric.	PCB	100	7-16	0.16 or less	Pal et al., 1980 (p. 79)

TABLE 4-2. (continued)

Plant/tissue	Soil Type	Chemical Form Applied	Range of Soil Concentration (μg/g)	Range of Tissue Concentration (μg/g)	Uptake[a] Factor	References
Carrot/plant	acid	PCB	0.05-0.5	0	0	Pal et al., 1980 (p. 79)
Carrot/plant	acid	PCB	5	0.081	0.16	
Radish/plant	acid	PCB	0.05-0.5	0	0	
Radish/root	brown sand	PCB	0.2	0.01	0.02	
Radish/plant	acid	PCB	5	0.025	0.005	
Sugarbeet/leaf	agric.	PCB	0.24	.007	0.03	
Sugarbeet/root	agric.	PCB	0.24	.004	0.07	
Sugarbeet/plant	brown	PCB	0.3	0.01-0.15	0.01-0.5	Pal et al., 1980 (p. 80)
Soybean/sprout	sandy	PCB	100	0.15	0.002	
Soybean/plant	sandy loam	PCB	0-3	NR	0	Fries and Marrow, 1981 (p. 757)

[a] Tissue concentration/soil concentration; dry weight/dry weight unless otherwise specified.
[b] NR = Not reported.
[c] Fresh weight/dry weight.
[d] Fresh weight/fresh weight.

TABLE 4-3. TOXICITY OF POLYCHLORINATED BIPHENYLS TO DOMESTIC ANIMALS AND WILDLIFE

Species (N)[a]	Chemical Form Fed	Feed Concentration (µg/g)	Water Concentration (mg/L)	Daily Intake (mg/kg)	Duration of Study	Effects	References
Mouse	PCBs	300-500	NR[b]	NR	NR	Liver change	NAS, 1979 (p. 123)
Rat	PCBs	100-500	NR	NR	NR	Liver change; minimal reproductive changes	
Dog	PCBs	100	NR	NR	NR	Liver change, reduced growth	
Rhesus monkey	PCBs Aroclor 1248	2.5-5.0	NR	NR	2-4 months	Skin changes; lethal to nursing young; reproductive dysfunctions	Allen and Norbak, 1976 (p. 43)
Chicken	PCBs	2	NR	NR	9-39 weeks	No adverse effect	Stendell, 1976 (p. 263)
Chicken	PCBs	20	NR	NR	9 weeks	Effect dependent on PCB type	
Chicken	PCBs	5	NR	NR	39 weeks	Reduced egg production	
Chicken	PCBs	50	NR	NR	39 weeks	Lethal	Stendell, 1976 (p. 265)
Mink	PCBs[c]	10-30	NR	NR	NR	Lethal	Stendell, 1976 (p. 263)
Mink	PCBs[c]	1	NR	NR	NR	Reduced reproductive success	Stendell, 1976 (p. 265)
Mink	PCBs[c]	3.57	NR	NR	NR	No reproduction, breeders died	
Mink	PCBs[c]	0.64	NR	NR	NR	Some death, no young survival	

TABLE 4-3. (continued)

Species (N)[a]	Chemical Form Fed	Feed Concentration (μg/g)	Water Concentration (mg/L)	Daily Intake (mg/kg)	Duration of Study	Effects	References
Pheasant	PCBs	NR	NR	50-200	NR	Reduced egg production	NAS, 1979 (p. 172)
Rat	PCBs	100	NR	NR	1 year	Survived	Allen and Norback, 1976 (p. 43)
Rat	PCBs	1,000	NR	NR	6-8 weeks	Lethal to study population due to widespread hepatic degeneration	
Rats (20)	PCBs	500	NR	NR	8 months	15% mortality	U.S. EPA, 1980 (p. C-33)
Rats (20)	PCBs	20-100	NR	NR	8 months	No mortality	
Rat	PCB 1242	100	NR	3.9-6.6	10 months	No signs of overt toxification; hepatic changes were noted	U.S. EPA, 1980 (p. C-38)

[a] N = Number of animals tested.
[b] NR = Not reported.
[c] From contaminated meat.

TABLE 4-4. UPTAKE OF POLYCHLORINATED BIPHENYLS BY DOMESTIC ANIMALS AND WILDLIFE

Species	Chemical Form Fed	Range of Feed Concentrations (N)[a] (µg/g DW)	Tissue Analyzed	Range of Tissue Concentration (µg/g DW)	Uptake Factor[b]	References
Cattle	PCB	NR[c]	Milk fat	NR	4.5-4.9	Connor, 1984 (p. 48)
Cattle	PCB 1254	NR	Body fat	NR	3.5-5.5	
Cattle	PCB 1254	0.22-12.4 (4)	Milk fat	1.0-60.9	4.2-4.9	Fries, 1982 (p. 15)
Ring dove	PCB	0-28 (3)	Body fat	0-1632	55.2-92.1	McArthur et al., 1983 (p. 345)
Cow	PCB	12.4 (9)	Milk fat	56.6-70.6	4.6-5.7	Fries et al., 1973 (p. 118-119)
Cow	PCB	12.4 (9)	Body fat	25.3-60.2	2.04-4.9	

[a] N = Number of feed rates.
[b] Uptake factor = Tissue concentration/feed concentration.
[c] NR = Not reported.

SECTION 5

REFERENCES

Abramowitz, M., and I. A. Stegun. 1972. Handbook of Mathematical Functions. Dover Publications, New York, NY.

Allen, J. R., and D. H. Norback. 1976. Pathological Responses of Primates to Polychlorinated Biphenyl Exposure. In: Conference Proceedings, National Conference on Polychlorinated Biphenyls.

Appledorf, H., W. B. Wheller, and J. A. Koburger. 1973. Health Foods Versus Traditional Foods: A Comparison. J. Milk Food Technol. 36(4):242-244.

Baxter, J.C., M. Aquilar, and K. Brown. 1983a. Heavy Metals and Persistent Organics at a Sewage Sludge Disposal Site. J. Environ. Qual. 12(3):311-316.

Baxter, J. C., D. E. Johnson, and E. W. Kienholz. 1983b. Heavy Metals and Persistent Organics Content in Cattle Exposed to Sewage Sludge. J. Environ. Qual. 12(3):316-319.

Bertrand, J. E., M. C. Lutrick, G. T. Edds, and R. L. West. 1981. Metal Residues in Tissues, Animal Performance and Carcass Quality with Beef Steers Grazing Pensacola Bahiagrass Pastures Treated with Liquid Digested Sludge. J. Ani. Sci. 53:1.

Bidleman, T.F. 1981. Interlaboratory Analyses of High Molecular Weight Organochlorines in Ambient Air. Atmospheric Environ. 15:619-624.

Boswell, F. C. 1975. Municipal Sewage Sludge and Selected Element Applications to Soil: Effect on Soil and Fescue. J. Environ. Qual. 4(2):267-273.

Camp Dresser and McKee, Inc. 1984a. Development of Methodologies for Evaluating Permissible Contaminant Levels in Municipal Wastewater Sludges. Draft. Office of Water Regulations and Standards, U. S. EPA, Washington, D.C.

Camp Dresser and McKee, Inc. 1984b. Technical Review of the 106-Mile Ocean Disposal Site. Prepared for U.S. EPA under Contract No. 68-01-6403. Annandale, VA. January.

Camp Dresser and McKee, Inc. 1984c. Technical Review of the 12-Mile Sewage Sludge Disposal Site. Prepared for U.S. EPA under Contract No. 68-01-6403. Annandale, VA. May.

Carey, A. E., P. Douglas, H. Tai, W. G. Mitchell, and G. B. Wiersma. 1979a. Pesticide Residue Concentrations in Soils of Five United States Cities, 1971 - Urban Soils Monitoring Program. Pest. Monit. J. 13(1):17-22.

Carey, A., J. A. Gowen, H. Tai, W. G. Mitchell, and G. B. Wiersma. 1979b. Pesticide Residue Levels in Soils and Crops from 37 States, 1972. Pest. Monit. J. 12(4):209-229.

Carey, A., H. S. Yang, G. B. Wiersma, H. Tai, R. A. Maxey, and A. E. Dupry. 1980. Residual Concentrations of Propanil, TCAB and Other Pesticides in Rice-Growing Soils in the United States, 1972. Pest. Monit. J. 13(1):23-25.

Chaney, R. L., and C. A. Lloyd. 1979. Adherence of Spray-Applied Liquid Digested Sewage Sludge to Tall Fescue. J. Environ. Qual. 8:3.

City of New York Department of Environmental Protection. 1983. A Special Permit Application for the Disposal of Sewage Sludge from Twelve New York City Water Pollution Control Plants at the 12-Mile Site. New York, NY. December.

Clarkson, C., G. Fricke, E. Lomnitz, and T. O'Farrell. 1985. Comparative Analysis of Municipal Sludges. BioCycle. January/February, 1985.

Clevenger, T. E., D. D. Hemphill, K. Roberts, and W. A. Mullins. 1983. Chemical Composition and Possible Mutagenicity of Municipal Sludges. Journal Water Poll. Control Fed. 55(12):1470-1475.

Connor, M. S. 1984. Monitoring Sludge-Amended Agricultural Soils. BioCycle. January/February:47-51.

Dennis, D. S. 1976. Polychlorinated Biphenyls in the Surface Waters and Bottom Sediments of the Major Drainage Basins of the United States. In: Conference Proceedings, National Conference on Polychlorinated Biphenyls.

Donigian, A. S. 1985. Personal Communication. Anderson-Nichols & Co., Inc. Palo Alto, CA. May.

Farrell, J. B. 1984. Personal Communication. Water Engineering Research Laboratory, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Cincinnati, OH. December.

Food and Drug Administration. 1979. Compliance Program Report of Findings FY78 Total Diet Studies - Adult (7305.003).

Freeze, R. A., and J. A. Cherry. 1979. Groundwater. Prentice-Hall, Inc., Englewood Cliffs, NJ.

Fries, G. F. 1982. Potential Polychlorinated Biphenyl Residues in Animal Products from Application of Contaminated Sewage Sludge to Land. J. Environ. Qual. 11(1):14-20.

Fries, G. F., and G. S. Marrow. 1981. Chlorobiphenyl Movement from Soil to Soybean Plant. J. Agric. Food Chem. 29(4):757-579.

Fries, G. F., G. S. Marrow, and C. H. Gordon. 1973. Long-Term Studies of Residue Retention and Excretion by Cows Fed a Polychlorinated Biphenyl (Aroclor 1254). J. Agric. Food Chem. 21(1):117-121.

Furr, A. K., A. W. Lawrence, and S. S. Tong. 1976. Multi-Element and Chlorinated Hydrocarbon Analysis of Municipal Sewage Sludges of American Cities. Environ. Sci. Technol. 10(7):683-687.

Gelhar, L. W., and G. J. Axness. 1981. Stochastic Analysis of Macrodispersion in 3-Dimensionally Heterogenous Aquifers. Report No. H-8. Hydrologic Research Program, New Mexico Institute of Mining and Technology, Soccorro, NM.

Gerritse, R. G., R. Vriesema, J. W. Dalenberg, and H. P. DeRoos. 1982. Effect of Sewage Sludge on Trace Element Mobility in Soils. J. Environ. Qual. 2:359-363.

Glooshenko, W., W. M. Strachan, and R. C. J. Sampson. 1976. Residues in Water. Pest. Monit. J. 10(2):61-67.

Griffin, R. A. 1984. Personal Communication to U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, ECAO - Cincinnati, OH. Illinois State Geological Survey.

Hansen, L. G. et al. 1981. Polychlorinated Biphenyl Pesticide and Heavy Metal Residues in Swine Foraging on Sewage Sludge-Amended Soils. J. Agric. Food Chem. 19(5):1012-1013.

Hassett, J. J., W. L. Banwart, W. L., and R. A. Griffin. 1983. Correlation of Compound Properties with Sorption Characteristics of Non-Polar Compounds by Soils and Sediments: Concepts and Limitations. Chapter 15. In: The Environment and Solid Waste Characterization, Treatment and Disposal - Proc. 4th Oak Ridge National Laboratory Life Science Symposium, October 4, 1981, Gatlinburg, TN. C. W. Francis and I. Auerbach (eds.), Ann Arbor Science Pub.

Jones, R. A., and G. F. Lee. 1977. Chemical Agents of Potential Health Significance for Land Disposal of Municipal Wastewater Effluents and Sludges. In: Sagik and Sorber (eds.), Risk Assessment and Health Effects of Land Application of Municipal Wastewater and Sludges. San Antonio, TX. Center for Applied Research and Technology, Univ. of Texas.

Kutz, F. W., and S. C. Yang. 1976. A Note on Polychlorinated Biphenyls in Air. In: Conference Proceedings, National Conference on Polychlorinated Biphenyls.

Lang, J. T., L. C. Rodringuez, and J. M. Livingston. 1979. Organochlorine Pesticide Residues in Soils from Six U.S. Air Force Bases, 1975-76. Pest. Monit. J. 12(4):230-233.

McArthur, M. C. B., G. A. Fox, D. B. Peakall, and B. J. Philogene. 1983. Ecological Significance of Behavioral and Hormonal Abnormalities in Breeding Ring Doves Fed an Organocline Chemical Mixture. Arch. Environ. Cont. Toxicol. 12:343-353.

National Academy of Sciences. 1977. Drinking Water and Health. National Review Council Safe Drinking Water Committee. NAS, Washington, D.C.

National Academy of Sciences. 1979. Polychlorinated Biphenyls. National Review Council Committee on the Assessment of Polychlorinated Biphenyls in the Environment. NAS, Washington, D.C.

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. 1983. Northeast Monitoring Program 106-Mile Site Characterization Update. NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-F/NEC-26. U.S. Department of Commerce National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. August.

Osheim, D. L., P. F. Ross, and H. A. Nelson. 1982. PCB Residues in Feedlot Steers: II. Tissue Levels. Bull. Environ. Cont. Toxicol. 28:716-717.

Pal, D., J. B. Webber, and M. R. Overcash. 1980. Fate of Polychlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) in Soil Plant Systems. Residue Review. 74:45-98.

Pennington, J. A. T. 1983. Revision of the Total Diet Study Food Lists and Diets. J. Am. Diet. Assoc. 82:166-173.

Pettyjohn, W. A., D. C. Kent, T. A. Prickett, H. E. LeGrand, and F. E. Witz. 1982. Methods for the Prediction of Leachate Plume Migration and Mixing. U.S. EPA Municipal Environmental Research Laboratory, Cincinnati, OH.

Requejo, A. G., R. H. West, P. G. Hatcher, and P. A. McGillivary. 1979. Polychlorinated Biphenyls and Chlorinated Pesticides in Soils of the Everglades National Park and Adjacent Agricultural Areas. Environ. Sci. Technol. 13(8):931-935.

Ryan, J. A., H. R. Pahren, and J. B. Lucas. 1982. Controlling Cadmium in the Human Food Chain: A Review and Rationale Based on Health Effects. Environ. Res. 28:251-302.

Sikora, L. J., W. D. Burge, and J. E. Jones. 1982. Monitoring of a Municipal Sludge Entrenchment Site. J. Environ. Qual. 2(2):321-325.

Stanford Research Institute International. 1980. Seafood Consumption Data Analysis. Final Report, Task 11. Prepared for U.S. EPA under Contract No. 68-01-3887. Menlo Park, CA.

Stendell, R. C. 1976. Summary of Recent Information Regarding Effects of PCBs on Bird and Mammals. In: Conference Proceedings, National Conference on Polychlorinated Biphenyls.

Strek, H. J. et al. 1981. Reduction of Polychlorinated Biphenyl Toxicity and Uptake of Carbon-14 Activitiy by Plants Through the Use of Activated Carbon. J. Agric. Food Chem. 29:288-293.

Thornton, I., and P. Abrams. 1983. Soil Ingestion - A Major Pathway of Heavy Metals into Livestock Grazing Contaminated Land. Sci. Total Environ. 28:287-294.

U.S. Department of Agriculture. 1975. Composition of Foods. Agricultural Handbook No. 8. Washington, D.C.

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. 1977. Environmental Assessment of Subsurface Disposal of Municipal Wastewater Treatment Sludge: Interim Report. EPA/530/SW-547. Municipal Environmental Research Laboratory, Cincinnati, OH.

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. 1979. Industrial Source Complex (ISC) Dispersion Model User Guide. EPA 450/4-79-30. Vol. 1. Office of Air Quality Planning and Standards, Research Triangle Park, NC. December.

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. 1980. Ambient Water Quality Criteria for Polychlorinated Biphenyls. EPA 440/5-80-068. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Washington, D.C.

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. 1982a. Fate of Priority Pollutants in Publicly-Owned Treatment Works. EPA 440/1-82/303. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Washington, D.C.

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. 1982b. Test Methods for Evaluating Solid Waste - Physical/Chemical Methods. SW-846. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Washington, D.C.

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. 1983a. Assessment of Human Exposure to Arsenic: Tacoma, Washington. Internal Document. OHEA-E-075-U. Office of Health and Environment Assessment, Washington, D.C July 19.

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. 1983b. Rapid Assessment of Potential Groundwater Contamination Under Emergency Response Conditions. EPA/600-8-83-030.

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. 1984a. Air Quality Criteria for Lead. External Review Draft. EPA 600/8-83-028B. Environmental Criteria and Assessment Office, Research Triangle Park, NC. September.

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. 1984b. Health Effect Assessment for Polychlorinated Biphenyls. Final Draft. ECAO-CIN-H004. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Cincinnati, OH.

Webber, J. B., and E. Mrozek. 1979. Polychlorinated Biphenyls, Phytotoxicity, Absorption, and Translocation by Plants, and Inactivation by Activated Carbon. Bull. Environ. Contam. Toxicol. 23:412-417.

Webber, M. D., H. D. Monteith, and D. G. M. Corneau. 1983. Assessment of Heavy Metals and PCBs at Sludge Application Sites. J. WPCF. 55(2):187-195.

Willet, L. B. 1980. Polychlorinated Biphenyls from Dairy Farms: Consequences in Market Milk. J. Dairy Sci. 63:1961-1965.

World Health Organization. 1976. Polychlorinated Biphenyls and Terphenyls: Environmental Health Criteria. Geneva.

APPENDIX

PRELIMINARY HAZARD INDEX CALCULATIONS FOR POLYCHLORINATED BIPHENYLS IN MUNICIPAL SEWAGE SLUDGE

I. LANDSPREADING AND DISTRIBUTION-AND-MARKETING

A. Effect on Soil Concentration of Polychlorinated Biphenyls

1. Index of Soil Concentration (Index 1)

a. Formula

$$CS_s = \frac{(SC \times AR) + (BS \times MS)}{AR + MS}$$

$$CS_r = CS_s \left[1 + 0.5^{(1/t_{\frac{1}{2}})} + 0.5^{(2/t_{\frac{1}{2}})} + \ldots + 0.5^{(n/t_{\frac{1}{2}})}\right]$$

where:

CS_s = Soil concentration of pollutant after a single year's application of sludge (μg/g DW)
CS_r = Soil concentration of pollutant after the yearly application of sludge has been repeated for n + 1 years (μg/g DW)
SC = Sludge concentration of pollutant (μg/g DW)
AR = Sludge application rate (mt/ha)
MS = 2000 mt ha/DW = assumed mass of soil in upper 15 cm
BS = Background concentration of pollutant in soil (μg/g DW)
$t_{\frac{1}{2}}$ = Soil half-life of pollutant (years)
n = 99 years

b. Sample calculation

CS_s is calculated for AR = 0, 5, and 50 mt/ha only

$$0.020 \ \mu g/g \ DW = \frac{(4 \ \mu g/g \ DW \times 5 \ mt/ha) + (0.01 \ \mu g/g \ DW \times 2000 \ mt/ha)}{(5 \ mt/ha \ DW + 2000 \ mt/ha \ DW)}$$

CS_r is calculated for AR = 5 mt/ha applied for 100 years

$$0.18 \ \mu g/g \ DW = 0.020 \ \mu g/g \ DW \left[1 + 0.5^{(1/6)} + 0.5^{(2/6)} + \ldots + 0.5^{(99/6)}\right]$$

B. Effect on Soil Biota and Predators of Soil Biota

1. Index of Soil Biota Toxicity (Index 2)

a. Formula

$$\text{Index 2} = \frac{I_1}{TB}$$

where:

I_1 = Index 1 = Concentration of pollutant in sludge-amended soil (μg/g DW)
TB = Soil concentration toxic to soil biota (μg/g DW)

b. Sample calculation - Values were not calculated due to lack of data.

2. Index of Soil Biota Predator Toxicity (Index 3)

a. Formula

$$\text{Index 3} = \frac{I_1 \times UB}{TR}$$

where:

I_1 = Index 1 = Concentration of pollutant in sludge-amended soil (μg/g DW)
UB = Uptake factor of pollutant in soil biota (μg/g tissue DW [μg/g soil DW]$^{-1}$)
TR = Feed concentration toxic to predator (μg/g DW)

b. Sample calculation - Values were not calculated due to lack of data.

C. Effect on Plants and Plant Tissue Concentration

1. Index of Phytotoxic Soil Concentration (Index 4)

a. Formula

$$\text{Index 4} = \frac{I_1}{TP}$$

where:

I_1 = Index 1 = Concentration of pollutant in sludge-amended soil (μg/g DW)
TP = Soil concentration toxic to plants (μg/g DW)

b. **Sample calculation**

$$0.0020 = \frac{0.020\ \mu g/g\ DW}{10\ \mu g/g\ DW}$$

2. **Index of Plant Concentration Caused by Uptake (Index 5)**

a. **Formula**

Index 5 = I_1 x UP

where:

I_1 = Index 1 = Concentration of pollutant in sludge - amended soil (μg/g DW)
UP = Uptake factor of pollutant in plant tissue (μg/g tissue DW [μg/g soil DW]$^{-1}$)

b. **Sample Calculation**

0.074 μg/g DW = 0.020 μg/g DW x

3.7 μg/g tissue DW (μg/g soil DW)$^{-1}$

3. **Index of Plant Concentration Increment Permitted by Phytotoxicity (Index 6)**

a. **Formula**

Index 6 = PP

where:

PP = Maximum plant tissue concentration associated with phytotoxicity (μg/g DW)

b. **Sample calculation** - Values were not calculated due to lack of data.

D. **Effect on Herbivorous Animals**

1. **Index of Animal Toxicity Resulting from Plant Consumption (Index 7)**

a. **Formula**

$$\text{Index 7} = \frac{I_5}{TA}$$

where:

I_5 = Index 5 = Concentration of pollutant in plant grown in sludge-amended soil (μg/g DW)

TA = Feed concentration toxic to herbivorous animal (μg/g DW)

b. Sample calculation

$$0.015 = \frac{0.074\ \mu g/g\ DW}{5\ \mu g/g\ DW}$$

2. Index of Animal Toxicity Resulting from Sludge Ingestion (Index 8)

a. Formula

If AR = 0; Index 8 = 0

$$\text{If AR} \neq 0;\ \text{Index 8} = \frac{SC \times GS}{TA}$$

where:

AR = Sludge application rate (mt DW/ha)
SC = Sludge concentration of pollutant (μg/g DW)
GS = Fraction of animal diet assumed to be soil
TA = Feed concentration toxic to herbivorous animal (μg/g DW)

b. Sample calculation

If AR = 0; Index 8 = 0

$$\text{If AR} \neq 0;\quad 0.040 = \frac{4\ \mu g/g\ DW \times 0.05}{5\ \mu g/g\ DW}$$

E. Effect on Humans

1. Index of Human Cancer Risk Resulting from Plant Consumption (Index 9)

a. Formula

$$\text{Index 9} = \frac{(I_5 \times DT) + DI}{RSI}$$

where:

I_5 = Index 5 = Concentration of pollutant in plant grown in sludge-amended soil (μg/g DW)
DT = Daily human dietary intake of affected plant tissue (g/day DW)
DI = Average daily human dietary intake of pollutant (μg/day)
RSI = Cancer risk-specific intake (μg/day)

b. Sample calculation (toddler)

$$210 = \frac{(0.042\ \mu g/g\ DW \times 74.5\ g/day) + 0.2526\ \mu g/day}{0.0161\ \mu g/day}$$

2. **Index of Human Cancer Risk Resulting from Consumption of Animal Products Derived from Animals Feeding on Plants (Index 10)**

a. Formula

$$\text{Index 10} = \frac{(I_5 \times UA \times DA) + DI}{RSI}$$

where:

I_5 = Index 5 = Concentration of pollutant in plant grown in sludge-amended soil (μg/g DW)
UA = Uptake factor of pollutant in animal tissue (μg/g tissue DW [μg/g feed DW]$^{-1}$)
DA = Daily human dietary intake of affected animal tissue (g/day DW) (milk products and meat, poultry, eggs, fish)
DI = Average daily human dietary intake of pollutant (μg/day)
RSI = Cancer risk-specific intake (μg/day)

b. Sample calculation (toddler)

$$1200 = [(0.074\ \mu g/g\ DW \times 5.7\ \mu g/g\ tissue\ DW\ [\mu g/g\ feed\ DW]^{-1} \times 43.7\ g/day\ DW) + 0.2526\ \mu g/day] \div 0.0161\ \mu g/day$$

3. **Index of Human Cancer Risk Resulting from Consumption of Animal Products Derived from Animals Ingesting Soil (Index 11)**

a. Formula

$$\text{If } AR = 0;\ \text{Index 11} = \frac{(BS \times GS \times UA \times DA) + DI}{RSI}$$

$$\text{If } AR \neq 0;\ \text{Index 11} = \frac{(SC \times GS \times UA \times DA) + DI}{RSI}$$

where:

AR = Sludge application rate (mt DW/ha)
BS = Background concentration of pollutant in soil (μg/g DW)
SC = Sludge concentration of pollutant (μg/g DW)
GS = Fraction of animal diet assumed to be soil

UA = Uptake factor of pollutant in animal tissue (μg/g tissue DW [μg/g feed DW]$^{-1}$)
DA = Daily human dietary intake of affected animal tissue (g/day DW) (milk products and meat only)
DI = Average daily human dietary intake of pollutant (μg/day)
RSI = Cancer risk-specific intake (μg/day)

b. **Sample calculation (toddler)**

$$2800 = [(4\ \mu g/g\ DW \times 0.05 \times 5.7\ \mu g/g\ tissue\ DW\ [\mu g/g\ feed\ DW]^{-1} \times 39.4\ g/day\ DW) + 0.2526\ \mu g/day] \div 0.0161\ \mu g/day$$

4. **Index of Human Cancer Risk Resulting from Soil Ingestion (Index 12)**

a. **Formula**

$$\text{Index 12} = \frac{(I_1 \times DS) + DI}{RSI}$$

where:

I_1 = Index 1 = Concentration of pollutant in sludge-amended soil (μg/g DW)
DS = Assumed amount of soil in human diet (g/day)
DI = Average daily human dietary intake of pollutant (μg/day)
RSI = Cancer risk-specific intake (μg/day)

b. **Sample calculation (toddler)**

$$22 = \frac{(0.020\ \mu g/g\ DW \times 5\ g/day) + 0.2526\ \mu g/day}{0.0161\ \mu g/day}$$

5. **Index of Aggregate Human Cancer Risk (Index 13)**

a. **Formula**

$$\text{Index 13} = I_9 + I_{10} + I_{11} + I_{12} - (\frac{3DI}{RSI})$$

where:

I_9 = Index 9 = Index of human cancer risk resulting from plant consumption (unitless)
I_{10} = Index 10 = Index of human cancer risk resulting from consumption of animal products derived from animals feeding on plants (unitless)

I_{11} = Index 11 = Index of human cancer risk resulting from consumption of animal products derived from animals ingesting soil (unitless)

I_{12} = Index 12 = Index of human cancer risk resulting from soil ingestion (unitless)

DI = Average daily human dietary intake of pollutant (μg/day)

RSI = Cancer risk-specific intake (μg/day)

b. Sample calculation (toddler)

$$4100 = (210 + 1200 + 2800 + 22) - \left(\frac{3 \times 0.2526\ \mu g/day}{0.0161\ \mu g/day}\right)$$

II. LANDFILLING

A. Procedure

Using Equation 1, several values of C/C_o for the unsaturated zone are calculated corresponding to increasing values of t until equilibrium is reached. Assuming a 5-year pulse input from the landfill, Equation 3 is employed to estimate the concentration vs. time data at the water table. The concentration vs. time curve is then transformed into a square pulse having a constant concentration equal to the peak concentration, C_u, from the unsaturated zone, and a duration, t_o, chosen so that the total areas under the curve and the pulse are equal, as illustrated in Equation 3. This square pulse is then used as the input to the linkage assessment, Equation 2, which estimates initial dilution in the aquifer to give the initial concentration, C_o, for the saturated zone assessment. (Conditions for B, minimum thickness of unsaturated zone, have been set such that dilution is actually negligible.) The saturated zone assessment procedure is nearly identical to that for the unsaturated zone except for the definition of certain parameters and choice of parameter values. The maximum concentration at the well, C_{max}, is used to calculate the index values given in Equations 4 and 5.

B. Equation 1: Transport Assessment

$$\frac{C(\chi,t)}{C_o} = \frac{1}{2}\left[\exp(A_1)\ \text{erfc}(A_2) + \exp(B_1)\ \text{erfc}(B_2)\right] = P(\chi,t)$$

Requires evaluations of four dimensionless input values and subsequent evaluation of the result. $\text{Exp}(A_1)$ denotes the exponential of A_1, e^{A_1}, where $\text{erfc}(A_2)$ denotes the complimentary error function of A_2. $\text{Erfc}(A_2)$ produces values between 0.0 and 2.0 (Abramowitz and Stegun, 1972).

where:

$$A_1 = \frac{\chi}{2D^*} [V^* - (V^{*2} + 4D^* \times \mu^*)^{\frac{1}{2}}]$$

$$A_2 = \frac{\chi - t\ (V^{*2} + 4D^* \times \mu^*)^{\frac{1}{2}}}{(4D^* \times t)^{\frac{1}{2}}}$$

$$B_1 = \frac{\chi}{2D^*} [V^* + (V^{*2} + 4D^* \times \mu^*)^{\frac{1}{2}}]$$

$$B_2 = \frac{\chi + t\ (V^{*2} + 4D^* \times \mu^*)^{\frac{1}{2}}}{(4D^* \times t)^{\frac{1}{2}}}$$

and where for the unsaturated zone:

C_o = SC x CF = Initial leachate concentration (μg/L)
SC = Sludge concentration of pollutant (mg/kg DW)
CF = 250 kg sludge solids/m^3 leachate =

$$\frac{PS \times 10^3}{1 - PS}$$

PS = Percent solids (by weight) of landfilled sludge = 20%
t = Time (years)
χ = h = Depth to groundwater (m)
D^* = α x V^* (m^2/year)
α = Dispersivity coefficient (m)

$$V^* = \frac{Q}{\Theta \times R} \text{ (m/year)}$$

Q = Leachate generation rate (m/year)
Θ = Volumetric water content (unitless)

$$R = 1 + \frac{P_{dry}}{\Theta} \times K_d = \text{Retardation factor (unitless)}$$

P_{dry} = Dry bulk density (g/mL)
K_d = f_{oc} x K_{oc} (mL/g)
f_{oc} = Fraction of organic carbon (unitless)
K_{oc} = Organic carbon partition coefficient (mL/g)

$$\mu^* = \frac{365 \times \mu}{R} \text{ (years)}^{-1}$$

μ = Degradation rate (day^{-1})

and where for the saturated zone:

C_o = Initial concentration of pollutant in aquifer as determined by Equation 2 (μg/L)
t = Time (years)
χ = $\Delta\ell$ = Distance from well to landfill (m)
D^* = α x V^* (m^2/year)
α = Dispersivity coefficient (m)

$$V^* = \frac{K \times i}{\emptyset \times R} \text{ (m/year)}$$

K = Hydraulic conductivity of the aquifer (m/day)

i = Average hydraulic gradient between landfill and well (unitless)

$\emptyset$ = Aquifer porosity (unitless)

$$R = 1 + \frac{P_{dry}}{\emptyset} \times K_d = \text{Retardation factor} = 1 \text{ (unitless)}$$

since $K_d = f_{oc} \times K_{oc}$ and f_{oc} is assumed to be zero for the saturated zone.

C. Equation 2. Linkage Assessment

$$C_o = C_u \times \frac{Q \times W}{365\ [(K \times i) \div \emptyset] \times B}$$

where:

C_o = Initial concentration of pollutant in the saturated zone as determined by Equation 1 (µg/L)

C_u = Maximum pulse concentration from the unsaturated zone (µg/L)

Q = Leachate generation rate (m/year)

W = Width of landfill (m)

K = Hydraulic conductivity of the aquifer (m/day)

i = Average hydraulic gradient between landfill and well (unitless)

$\emptyset$ = Aquifer porosity (unitless)

B = Thickness of saturated zone (m) where:

$$B \geq \frac{Q \times W \times \emptyset}{K \times i \times 365} \text{ and } B \geq 2$$

D. Equation 3. Pulse Assessment

$$\frac{C(\chi,t)}{C_o} = P(\chi,t) \text{ for } 0 \leq t \leq t_o$$

$$\frac{C(\chi,t)}{C_o} = P(\chi,t) - P(\chi,t - t_o) \text{ for } t > t_o$$

where:

t_o (for unsaturated zone) = LT = Landfill leaching time (years)

t_o (for saturated zone) = Pulse duration at the water table (χ = h) as determined by the following equation:

$$t_o = [\ \int_0^\infty C\, dt] \div C_u$$

$$P(\chi,t) = \frac{C(\chi,t)}{C_o} \text{ as determined by Equation 1}$$

E. Equation 4. Index of Groundwater Concentration Resulting from Landfilled Sludge (Index 1)

1. Formula

$$\text{Index 1} = C_{max}$$

where:

C_{max} = Maximum concentration of pollutant at well = maximum of $C(\Delta\ell,t)$ calculated in Equation 1 (μg/L)

2. Sample Calculation

0.53 μg/L = 0.53 μg/L

F. Equation 5. Index of Human Cancer Risk Resulting from Groundwater Contamination (Index 2)

1. Formula

$$\text{Index 2} = \frac{(I_1 \times AC) + DI}{RSI}$$

where:

I_1 = Index 1 = Index of groundwater concentration resulting from landfilled sludge (μg/L)
AC = Average human consumption of drinking water (L/day)
DI = Average daily human dietary intake of pollutant (μg/day)
RSI = Cancer risk-specific intake (μg/day)

2. Sample Calculation

$$113 = \frac{(0.53\ \mu g/L \times 2\ L/day) + 0.7578\ \mu g/day}{0.0161\ \mu g/day}$$

III. INCINERATION

A. Index of Air Concentration Increment Resulting from Incinerator Emissions (Index 1)

1. Formula

$$\text{Index 1} = \frac{(C \times DS \times SC \times FM \times DP) + BA}{BA}$$

where:

C = Coefficient to correct for mass and time units (hr/sec x g/mg)

DS = Sludge feed rate (kg/hr DW)
SC = Sludge concentration of pollutant (mg/kg DW)
FM = Fraction of pollutant emitted through stack (unitless)
DP = Dispersion parameter for estimating maximum annual ground level concentration ($\mu g/m^3$)
BA = Background concentration of pollutant in urban air ($\mu g/m^3$)

2. **Sample Calculation**

$$1.067 = [(2.78 \times 10^{-7} \text{ hr/sec} \times \text{g/mg} \times 2660 \text{ kg/hr DW} \times 4 \text{ mg/kg DW} \times 0.05 \times 3.4 \ \mu g/m^3) + 0.00741 \ \mu g/m^3] \div 0.00741 \ \mu g/m^3$$

B. **Index of Human Cancer Risk Resulting from Inhalation of Incinerator Emissions (Index 2)**

1. **Formula**

$$\text{Index 2} = \frac{[(I_1 - 1) \times BA] + BA}{EC}$$

where:

I_1 = Index 1 = Index of air concentration increment resulting from incinerator emissions (unitless)
BA = Background concentration of pollutant in urban air ($\mu g/m^3$)
EC = Exposure criterion ($\mu g/m^3$)

2. **Sample Calculation**

$$9.8 = \frac{[(1.067 - 1) \times 0.00741 \ \mu g/m^3] + 0.00741 \ \mu g/m^3}{0.000806 \ \mu g/m^3}$$

IV. OCEAN DISPOSAL

A. **Index of Seawater Concentration Resulting from Initial Mixing of Sludge (Index 1)**

1. **Formula**

$$\text{Index 1} = \frac{SC \times ST \times PS}{W \times D \times L}$$

where:

SC = Sludge concentration of pollutant (mg/kg DW)
ST = Sludge mass dumped by a single tanker (kg WW)
PS = Percent solids in sludge (kg DW/kg WW)

W = Width of initial plume dilution (m)
D = Depth to pycnocline or effective depth of mixing for shallow water site (m)
L = Length of tanker path (m)

2. **Sample Calculation**

$$0.0080\ \mu g/L = \frac{4\ mg/kg\ DW \times 1600000\ kg\ WW \times 0.04\ kg\ DW/kg\ WW \times 10^3\ \mu g/mg}{200\ m \times 20\ m \times 8000\ m \times 10^3\ L/m^3}$$

B. **Index of Seawater Concentration Representing a 24-Hour Dumping Cycle (Index 2)**

1. **Formula**

$$\text{Index 2} = \frac{SS \times SC}{V \times D \times L}$$

where:

SS = Daily sludge disposal rate (kg DW/day)
SC = Sludge concentration of pollutant (mg/kg DW)
V = Average current velocity at site (m/day)
D = Depth to pycnocline or effective depth of mixing for shallow water site (m)
L = Length of tanker path (m)

2. **Sample Calculation**

$$0.00217\ \mu g/L = \frac{825000\ kg\ DW/day \times 4\ mg/kg\ DW \times 10^3\ \mu g/mg}{9500\ m/day \times 20\ m \times 8000\ m \times 10^3\ L/m^3}$$

C. **Index of Hazard to Aquatic Life (Index 3)**

1. **Formula**

$$\text{Index 3} = \frac{I_2}{AWQC}$$

where:

I_2 = Index 2 = Index of seawater concentration representing a 24-hour dumping cycle (μg/L)
AWQC = Criterion expressed as an average concentration to protect the marketability of edible marine organisms (μg/L)

2. **Sample Calculation**

$$0.072 = \frac{0.00217\ \mu g/L}{0.030\ \mu g/L}$$

D. Index of Human Cancer Risk Resulting from Seafood Consumption (Index 4)

1. Formula

$$\text{Index 4} = \frac{(I_2 \times BCF \times 10^{-3}\ kg/g \times FS \times QF) + DI}{RSI}$$

where:

I_2 = Index 2 = Index of seawater concentration representing a 24-hour dumping cycle (μg/L)
QF = Dietary consumption of seafood (g WW/day)
FS = Fraction of consumed seafood originating from the disposal site (unitless)
BCF = Bioconcentration factor of pollutant (L/kg)
DI = Average daily human dietary intake of pollutant (μg/day)
RSI = Cancer risk-specific intake (μg/day)

2. Sample Calculation

$$47.1 = \frac{(0.0022\ \mu g/L \times 31200\ L/kg \times 10^{-3}\ kg/g \times 0.000021 \times 14.3\ g\ WW/day) + 0.7578\ \mu g/day}{0.0161\ \mu g/day}$$

TABLE A-1. INPUT DATA VARYING IN LANDFILL ANALYSIS AND RESULT FOR EACH CONDITION

Input Data	Condition of Analysis 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Sludge concentration of pollutant, SC (μg/g DW)	4	23	4	4	4	4	23	N[a]
Unsaturated zone								
Soil type and characteristics								
Dry bulk density, P_{dry} (g/mL)	1.53	1.53	1.925	NA[b]	1.53	1.53	NA	N
Volumetric water content, θ (unitless)	0.195	0.195	0.133	NA	0.195	0.195	NA	N
Fraction of organic carbon, f_{oc} (unitless)	0.005	0.005	0.0001	NA	0.005	0.005	NA	N
Site parameters								
Leachate generation rate, Q (m/year)	0.8	0.8	0.8	1.6	0.8	0.8	1.6	N
Depth to groundwater, h (m)	5	5	5	0	5	5	0	N
Dispersivity coefficient, α (m)	0.5	0.5	0.5	NA	0.5	0.5	NA	N
Saturated zone								
Soil type and characteristics								
Aquifer porosity, $\emptyset$ (unitless)	0.44	0.44	0.44	0.44	0.389	0.44	0.389	N
Hydraulic conductivity of the aquifer, K (m/day)	0.86	0.86	0.86	0.86	4.04	0.86	4.04	N
Site parameters								
Hydraulic gradient, i (unitless)	0.001	0.001	0.001	0.001	0.001	0.02	0.02	N
Distance from well to landfill, $\Delta\ell$ (m)	100	100	100	100	100	50	50	N
Dispersivity coefficient, α (m)	10	10	10	10	10	5	5	N

TABLE A-1. (continued)

Results	Condition of Analysis 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Unsaturated zone assessment (Equations 1 and 3)								
Initial leachate concentration, C_o (μg/L)	1000	5750	1000	1000	1000	1000	5750	N
Peak concentration, C_u (μg/L)	0.328	1.89	13.5	1000	0.328	0.328	5750	N
Pulse duration, t_o (years)	13300	13300	338	5.00	13300	13300	5.00	N
Linkage assessment (Equation 2)								
Aquifer thickness, B (m)	126	126	126	253	23.8	6.32	2.38	N
Initial concentration in saturated zone, C_o (μg/L)	0.328	1.89	13.5	1000	0.328	0.328	5750	N
Saturated zone assessment (Equations 1 and 3)								
Maximum well concentration, C_{max} (μg/L)	0.0918	0.528	0.0989	0.109	0.302	0.328	133	N
Index of groundwater concentration resulting from landfilled sludge, Index 1 (μg/L) (Equation 4)	0.0918	0.528	0.0989	0.109	0.302	0.328	133	0
Index of human cancer risk resulting from groundwater contamination, Index 2 (unitless) (Equation 5)	58.5	113	59.4	60.6	84.6	87.9	16600	47.1

[a]N = Null condition, where no landfill exists; no value is used.
[b]NA = Not applicable for this condition.