Human Health Risk Assessment





Undeveloped Stony Creek Floodplain

Noblesville, Indiana

May 14, 2009

ENVIRON

Presentation Overview

1. Introduction
2. Exposure Assessment
3. Toxicity Assessment
4. Risk Characterization
5. Conclusions and questions

Site Location



HHRA Goals and Approach

- Purpose: to evaluate potential human health risks from exposure to study area soil
- Streamlined approach
  - Concentrations of PCBs in soil are compared to a site specific risk-based closure level (RBC)
  - RBC calculated using IDEM equations, reflecting study area uses and updates to USEPA guidance
  - Consistent with HHRAs conducted for James Place and Wellington Northeast
  - Cancer risks and hazard quotients also calculated and compared to benchmarks of acceptable risk and hazard

Sampling Overview

- Soil samples collected in 2006-2008
  - SCSIP Rounds 2, 3 and 4 focused on land immediately adjacent to residential properties; not intended to characterize entire study area
  - The more comprehensive 2008 floodplain soil sampling conducted in accordance with USEPA-approved Risk Assessment Work Plan
- HHRA primarily relies on the 2008 floodplain soil sampling program

2008 Soil Sampling Program

- 37 surface (0-0.5 ft) soil samples from CEA, 8 from Island Area
- Collected with hand auger from transects spaced every 100 m perpendicular to the creek
- High sample density near creek, low density far from creek



Analysis Overview

- All 45 soil samples analyzed for PCB homologues (USEPA Method 690) by Alpha Analytical
- Subset of 10 also analyzed for PCB Aroclors (modified USEPA Method 8082) by Heritage Analytical

Analyte	Det. Freq.	Mean Conc. mg/kg	95% UCL Conc. mg/kg	Min. Det. Conc. mg/kg	Max. Det. Conc. mg/kg
Total PCBs (Homologues)	45 / 45	2.5	5.2	0.0098	41.3
Total PCBs (Aroclors)	7 / 10	1.1	1.5	0.31	2.7

Chemical Characterization: PCBs in Soil (mg/kg)



Exposure Assessment: Scenarios

- Use of study area influenced by
  - Conservation easement prohibitions
  - Flooding
  - Dense vegetation
  - Surrounding land use
- Most plausible users are children from abutting properties
- Adults (e.g., residents, utility maintenance workers) also plausible, but their exposure intensity is lower than that of children
- Hunting not plausible in study area, but possible on adjacent parcel
  - Deer are herbivorous
  - Plants do not significantly take up PCBs
  - Therefore, human exposure to PCBs from consumption of game negligible



Conceptual Site Model for the Human Health Risk Assessment

Key:

- ● Complete exposure pathway evaluated in the risk assessment.
- ○ Incomplete exposure pathway

[a] Surface soil exposure at depths from 0 to <0.5 feet below ground surface.

ENVIRON

Future Use

- Zoned as FH (Flood Hazard)
- CEA is compensatory wetland leased by city of Noblesville for 50 years
- Future use unlikely to be significantly different from current use



Exposure Assumptions

- Pathways
  - Incidental ingestion of soil
  - Dermal contact with soil
  - Inhalation of windblown particulates
- Exposure frequency
  - 1 day/week, 8.5 months/year = 37 days/year
- Skin surface area seasonal- and age-weighted
- Exposure point concentration
  - 95% UCL = 5.2 mg/kg
- Toxicity criteria from USEPA IRIS
  - Cancer slope factor = 2.0 $(mg/kg\text{-}day)^{-1}$
  - Noncancer reference dose = 0.00002 mg/kg-day




ENVIRON

Table 2. Site-Specific Exposure Assumptions for the Recreational Scenario
Undeveloped Floodplain of Stony Creek
Noblesville, Indiana

	Parameter	Value	Units	Notes
C_{sscn}	Risk-based concentration, recreational noncancer	34	mg/kg	See equations below (IDEM 2006)
C_{ssrc}	Risk-based concentration, recreational cancer	43	mg/kg	See equations below (IDEM 2006)
THQ	Target hazard quotient	1	unitless	IDEM draft policy
TR	Target risk	1.00E-05	unitless	IDEM draft policy
RFD_o	Reference dose, oral	2.0E-05	mg/kg-d	USEPA 2008 - Aroclor 1254
RFD_i	Reference dose, inhalation	NA	mg/kg-d	No inhalation RfC is available
SF_o	Cancer slope factor, oral	2.0	$(mg/kg\text{-}d)^{-1}$	USEPA 2008 - PCBs
SF_i	Cancer slope factor, inhalation	2.0	$(mg/kg\text{-}d)^{-1}$	USEPA 2008 - PCBs
$IngR_{ras}$	Ingestion rate, ages 7 to 16	100	mg/d	USEPA 2002a
$IngR_{rcs}$	Ingestion rate, ages 2 to 7	200	mg/d	USEPA 2002a
$IngF_{adj}$	Ingestion Factor Soil, age adjusted	67	mg-yr/kg-d	See equations below (IDEM 2006)
M_{ras}	Soil to skin adherence factor, ages 7 to 16	0.2	$mg/cm^2\text{-}d$	USEPA 2004 - children playing in wet soil (CTE)
M_{rcs}	Soil to skin adherence factor, ages 2 to 7	0.2	$mg/cm^2\text{-}d$	USEPA 2004 - children playing in wet soil (CTE)
ABS	Skin absorption factor	0.14	unitless	USEPA 2004 - PCBs
SA_{rcs}	Skin surface area exposed, ages 2 to 7	1,052	cm^2	USEPA 2004 - seasonally-weighted (see text)
SA_{ras}	Skin surface area exposed, ages 7 to 16	1,971	cm^2	USEPA 2004 - seasonally-weighted (see text)
SFS_{adj}	Skin Factor Soil, age adjusted	98	mg-yr/kg-d	See equations below (IDEM 2006)
VF	Volatilization factor	NA	m^3/kg	PCBs are not volatile
PEF	Particulate emission factor	1.06E+10	m^3/kg	See Table 3
$InhR_{rca}$	Inhalation rate, ages 2 to 7	8.3	m^3/d	USEPA 2002b - ages 3 to 6
$InhR_{raa}$	Inhalation rate, ages 7 to 16	12.3	m^3/d	USEPA 2002b - average of ages 6 to 15
$InhF_{adj}$	Inhalation Factor, age adjusted	3.6	$m^3\text{-}yr/kg\text{-}d$	IDEM 2006
BW_c	Body weight, ages 2 to 7	17	kg	USEPA 2002b
BW_a	Body weight, ages 7 to 16	42	kg	USEPA 2002b
EF_r	Exposure frequency	37	d/yr	1 day/week, 8.5 months/yr
ED_r	Exposure duration, ages 7 to 16	9	yr	by definition
ED_{ch}	Exposure duration, ages 2 to 7	5	yr	by definition
AT_n	Averaging time, noncancer	14	yr	USEPA 2002a
AT_c	Averaging time, cancer	70	yr	USEPA 2002a

cm: centimeter
d: day
IDEM: Indiana Department of Environmental Management
kg: kilogram
mg: milligram
PCB: polychlorinated biphenyl
RME: reasonable maximum exposure
yr: year
m: meter

Risk Characterization

- Noncancer RBC = 34 mg/kg
- Cancer RBC = 43 mg/kg
- EPC (5.2 mg/kg) << RBC (34 mg/kg)

- Hazard index (0.2) < IDEM & USEPA benchmark of 1
- Cancer risk (1×10^{-6}) < IDEM RISC benchmark of 10^{-5}

Uncertainty Analysis

- Data evaluation
  - Used most recent and representative data set
  - More intensive sampling near creek overestimates EPC
  - 95% UCL is ~5-fold higher than SWAC
- Exposure assessment
  - Exposure frequency highly individual
  - Given difficult access (flooding, dense vegetation) and legal restrictions within CEA, 37 days/year likely conservative
  - Concentrations in Island Area < residential RBC of 3.8 mg/kg

    Thus, a resident could use the island portion of his property as frequently and in the same manner as his lawn and still not encounter significant risk

Uncertainty Analysis (cont'd)

- Toxicity Assessment
  - Noncancer hazards not likely underestimated, given that RfD incorporates uncertainty factor of 300
  - Cancer risks not likely underestimated, given use of upper-bound CSF
- Risk Characterization
  - Standard USEPA and IDEM methodologies employed
  - Consistent with guidance
  - Multiple layers of conservatism may overestimated risks by several orders of magnitude

HHRA Conclusions

- **Concentrations << RBC**
  - **Excess lifetime cancer risk = 1 in 1,000,000**
  - **Hazard index = 0.2**
- **Conservative assumptions compensate for unavoidable uncertainty**
  - **Risks likely overestimated by several orders of magnitude**
- **No further evaluation warranted; no remediation needed based on human health risks**
- **Questions/discussion**