

DATA COLLECTION FOR THE HAZARDOUS WASTE IDENTIFICATION RULE

SECTION 12.0 ECOLOGICAL EXPOSURE FACTORS

Work Assignment Managers and Technical Direction:

Prepared by:

Stephen M. Kroner David A. Cozzie U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Office of Solid Waste Washington, DC 20460

Center for Environmental Analysis Research Triangle Institute 3040 Cornwallis Road Research Triangle Park, NC 27709-2194 Under Contract No. 68-W-98-085

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Office of Solid Waste Washington, DC 20460

October 1999

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

A number of individuals have been involved with the collection of ecological exposure factor data. David Cozzie and Stephen Kroner of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Solid Waste, provided overall technical direction and review throughout this work.

Steve Beaulieu of Research Triangle Institute was the task leader for this work. He developed the methodology regarding the collection of ecological exposure factors data. Other Research Triangle Institute Staff member who contributed to this report include: Jennifer Drake, Aimée Harmon, Joan McLean, and Andrea Thomas; Kathy Restivo, who performed the editorial review; and Sharon Pressley, who provided publication support.

DISCLAIMER

The work presented in this document has been funded by the United States Environmental Protection Agency. Mention of trade names or commercial products does not constitute endorsement or recommendation for use by the Agency.

Table of Contents

Section	n			Page
12.0	Ecolo	gical Expo	osure Factors	12-1
	12.1	Paramet	ers Collected	12-6
	12.2	Data So	urces	12-6
	12.3	Methodo	ology	12-9
		12.3.1	Receptor Body Weights	12-9
		12.3.2	Food Ingestion Rates	12-10
		12.3.3	Water Ingestion Rates	12-11
		12.3.4	Consumption Rate of Surficial Soil/Sediment	12-12
		12.3.5	Maximum/Minimum Dietary Preferences	12-13
		12.3.6	Home Range Size	12-15
		12.3.7	Data Entry and Data Processing Quality Assurance/	
			Quality Control	12-17
	12.4	Results		12-17
	12.5	Reference	ces	12-18
Appen	dix A			12-22
Appen	dix B			12-33
Appen	dix C			12-42

Tables

Number

Page

12-1	Exposure Data Sources for Terrestrial Wildlife Receptors
12-2	Parameters Collected 12-7
12-3	Empirical Coefficients Used to Calculate Food Ingestion Rates 12-11
12-4	Prey Categories
12-5	Farm Food Chain Codes for Wildlife Diet Items 12-15

US EPA ARCHIVE DOCUMENT

12.0 Ecological Exposure Factors

Ecological exposure factors are used in the ecological exposure module of the Hazardous Waste Identification Rule (HWIR) modeling system to calculate the total exposure dose (in mg/kg/d) to a suite of receptors that consume contaminated media and food items within their respective habitats. The ecological exposure module calculates exposure doses based on media and food concentration inputs generated by other modules. The ecological exposure module requires the following inputs:

- # <u>Aquatic food web module</u>-Contaminant concentrations in the aquatic food web.
- # <u>Source module</u>-Contaminant concentrations in surface impoundment water.
- # <u>Surface water module</u>-Contaminant concentrations in surface water and sediment.
- # <u>Terrestrial food web module</u>-Contaminant concentrations in the terrestrial food web (including vegetation, prey items, and soil).
- # <u>Ecoexposure module</u>–Receptor-specific values for body weight, ingestion rates, and prey preferences.
- # <u>Site layout inputs</u>–Site-specific input on habitats, receptors, waterbodies, and prey present at a site.

The ecological exposure module calculates the exposure dose for 57 terrestrial receptor species as they occur in any of 11 ecological habitats. Table 12-1 lists the HWIR terrestrial wildlife receptors. These receptors are representative of mammals, birds, reptiles, and amphibians. Section 13.0 provides additional discussion about the selection of receptors and their respective habitats.

Exposure to the ecological receptors may occur through the following ingestion pathways:

- # Ingestion of soil or sediment
- # Ingestion of aquatic and terrestrial vegetation
- # Ingestion of aquatic and terrestrial prey items
- # Ingestion of surface water.

Species	Scientific Name	References
Alligator snapping turtle	Macroclemys temminckii	Lane and Mitchell, 1997; Conant and Collins, 1991
American kestrel	Falco sparverius	Terres, 1980; U.S. EPA, 1993; Lane and Fischer, 1997; Stokes and Stokes, 1996
American robin	Turdus migratorius	Terres, 1980; U.S. EPA, 1993; Stokes and Stokes, 1996
American woodcock	Scolopax minor	Terres, 1980; U.S. EPA, 1993; Stokes and Stokes, 1996
Bald eagle	Haliaeetus leucocephalus	Terres, 1980; U.S. EPA, 1993; Stokes and Stokes, 1996
Beaver	Castor canadensis	Stokes and Stokes, 1986; Whitaker, 1997; Jenkins and Busher, 1979
Belted kingfisher	Ceryle alcyon	Terres, 1980; U.S. EPA, 1993; Stokes and Stokes, 1996
Black bear	Ursus americanus	Schaefer and Sargent, 1990; Stokes and Stokes, 1986; Whitaker, 1997
Black-tailed jackrabbit	Lepus californicus	Whitaker, 1997; Sample et al., 1997; MacMahon, 1985
Bullfrog	Rana catesbeiana	Conant and Collins, 1991; U.S. EPA, 1993; Martof et al., 1980; Behler and King, 1979
Burrowing owl	Speotyto cunicularia	Terres, 1980; Sample et al., 1997; Stokes and Stokes, 1996
Canada goose	Branta canadensis	Terres, 1980; U.S. EPA, 1993; Niering, 1985; Stokes and Stokes, 1996
Cerulean warbler	Dendroica cerulea	Evans and Fischer, 1997; Terres, 1980; Stokes and Stokes, 1996
Cooper's hawk	Accipiter cooperi	Terres, 1980; Sample et al., 1997; Stokes and Stokes, 1996
Coyote	Canis latrans	Bekoff, 1977; Sample et al, 1997; Whitaker, 1997; Stokes and Stokes, 1986
Deer mouse	Peromyscus maniculatus	Whitaker, 1997; U.S. EPA, 1993; Stokes and Stokes, 1986
Eastern cottontail rabbit	Sylvilagus floridanus	Stokes and Stokes, 1986; Chapman et al., 1980; Whitaker, 1997; U.S. EPA, 1993
Eastern newt	Notophthalmus viridescens	Martof et al., 1980; U.S. EPA, 1993; Conant and Collins, 1991; Niering, 1985; Behler and King, 1979

Table 12-1. Exposure Data Sources for Terrestrial Wildlife Receptors

Species	Scientific Name	References
Eastern box turtle	Terrapene carolina	Martof et al., 1980; U.S. EPA, 1993; Sutton and Sutton, 1985; Conant and Collins, 1991
Flatwoods salamander	Ambystoma cingulatum	Palis, 1997; Martof et al., 1980; Conant and Collins, 1991; Behler and King, 1979
Gopher frog	Rana capito	Palis and Fischer, 1997; Conant and Collins, 1991; Behler and King, 1979
Great blue heron	Ardea herodias	Terres, 1980; U.S. EPA, 1993; Stokes and Stokes, 1996; Niering, 1985
Great Basin pocket mouse	Perognathus parvus	Whitaker, 1997; Sample et al., 1997
Green heron	Butorides virescens	Terres, 1980; Sample et al., 1997; Stokes and Stokes, 1996; Niering, 1985
Green frog	Rana clamitans melanotar	Martof et al., 1980; U.S. EPA, 1993; Conant and Collins, 1991; Niering, 1985; Behler and King, 1979
Herring gull	Larus argentatus	Terres, 1980; U.S. EPA, 1993; Stokes and Stokes, 1996
Kit fox	Vulpes velox	McGrew, 1979; Sample et al., 1997; MacMahon, 1985; Whitaker, 1997
Least weasel	Mustela nivalis	Whitaker, 1997; Stokes and Stokes, 1986; Sample et al., 1997
Lesser scaup	Aythya affinis	Terres, 1980; U.S. EPA, 1993; Stokes and Stokes, 1996
Little brown bat	Myotis lucifugus	Whitaker, 1997; Sample et al., 1997.
Loggerhead shrike	Lanius ludovicianus	Hall et al., 1997; Terres, 1980; Stokes and Stokes, 1996
Long-tailed weasel	Mustela frenata	Sutton and Sutton, 1985; Sample et al., 1997; Stokes and Stokes, 1996
Mallard	Anas platyrhynchos	Terres, 1980; U.S. EPA, 1993; Stokes and Stokes, 1996; Niering, 1985
Marsh wren	Cistothorus palustris	Terres, 1980; U.S. EPA, 1993; Stokes and Stokes, 1996; Niering, 1985
Meadow vole	Microtus pennsylvanicus	Whitaker, 1997; U.S. EPA, 1993; Stokes and Stokes, 1986
Mink	Mustela vison	Niering, 1985; U.S. EPA, 1993; Whitaker, 1997; Stokes and Stokes,1986

Table 12-1. (continued)

(continued)

Species	Scientific Name	References
Mule deer	Odocoileus hemionus	Whitaker, 1997; Sample et al., 1997; Anderson and Wallmo, 1984; Whitney, 1985
Muskrat	Ondatra zibethicus	Niering, 1985; U.S. EPA, 1993; Stokes and Stokes, 1986; Willner et al., 1980; Whitaker, 1997
Northern water snake	Nerodia sipedon	Martof et al., 1980; U.S. EPA, 1993; Conant and Collins, 1991; Niering, 1985; Behler and King, 1979
Northern bobwhite	Colinus virginianus	Terres, 1980; U.S. EPA, 1993; Stokes and Stokes, 1996
Osprey	Pandion haliaetus	Terres, 1980; U.S. EPA, 1993; Stokes and Stokes, 1996
Painted turtle	Chrysemys picta	Niering, 1985; U.S. EPA, 1993; Conant and Collins, 1991; Behler and King, 1979
Pine vole	Microtus pinetorum	Whitaker, 1997; Sample et al., 1997
Prairie vole	Microtus ochrogaster	Whitaker, 1997; U.S. EPA, 1993
Raccoon	Procyon lotor	Lotze and Andersen, 1979; U.S. EPA, 1993; Whitaker, 1997; Stokes and Stokes, 1986
Racer	Coluber constrictor	Behler and King, 1979; U.S. EPA, 1993; Conant and Collins, 1991; Martof et al., 1980
Red fox	Vulpes vulpes	Whitaker, 1997; U.S. EPA, 1993; Stokes and Stokes, 1986
Red-tailed hawk	Buteo jamaicensis	Terres, 1980; U.S. EPA, 1993; Stokes and Stokes, 1996
River otter	Lutra canadensis	Whitaker, 1997; U.S. EPA, 1993; Niering, 1985; Stokes and Stokes, 1986
Short-tailed shrew	Blarina brevicauda	Whitaker, 1997; U.S. EPA, 1993; Stokes and Stokes, 1986
Short-tailed weasel	Mustela erminea	King, 1983; Sample et al., 1997; Whitaker, 1997
Snapping turtle	Chelydra serpentina	Martof et al., 1980; U.S. EPA, 1993; Behler and King, 1979; Conant and Collins, 1991
Southern hognose snake	Heterodon simus	Behler and King, 1979; Jordan, 1998; Martoff et al., 1980; Conant and Collins, 1991
Spotted sandpiper	Actitis macularia	Terres, 1980; U.S. EPA, 1993; Stokes and Stokes, 1996
Tree swallow	Tachycineta bicolor	Terres, 1980; Sample et al., 1997; Stokes and Stokes, 1996

Table 12-1. (continued)

(continued)

Species	Scientific Name	References
Western meadowlark	Sturnella neglecta	Terres, 1980; Sample et al., 1997; Stokes and Stokes, 1996
White-tailed deer	Odocoileus virginianus	Whitaker, 1997; Stokes and Stokes, 1986; Smith, 1991

 Table 12-1. (continued)

The pathways through which each receptor species may be exposed were determined by the species' dietary preferences. For example, strict herbivores are exposed through ingestion of vegetation but not through ingestion of animal prey items; species whose diet includes animal prey are exposed through prey ingestion, and so on. Exposures through ingestion of soil, sediment, and surface water was determined by the documented foraging and feeding behavior of each species.

The generalized equation for calculating ecological exposure dose is the following:

$$Dose_{rec} = \left[\frac{(CR_{food} \bullet FoodConc_{HabRange}) + (CTssAve_{HabRange} \bullet CR_{food} \bullet CRfrac_{soil}) + ConcWaterTotAve_{HabRange} \bullet CR_{water}\right]}{BodyWt_{Rec}}$$

$$\bullet AreaFrac_{HabRange}$$
(12-1)

where

CR _{food}	=	consumption rate of food
FoodConc _{HabRange}	=	effective concentration in all food items, weighted by prey preferences
CtssAve _{HabRange}	=	average contaminant concentration in surficial soil in a home range
CRfrac _{soil}	=	soil dietary fraction for each receptor
ConcWaterTotAve _{HabRange}	=	total average concentration in water for each home range
CR _{water}	=	consumption rate of water
BodyWt _{Rec}	=	receptor body weight
AreaFrac _{HabRange}	=	fraction of the receptor's home range comprised by the habitat.

12.1 Parameters Collected

The variables used in the HWIR ecological risk assessment are shown in Table 12-2, along with the data source and notes on whether the variable is represented by a distribution or a fixed value. The body weight and ingestion rate parameters are characterized by fixed values; dietary composition, or the amount of each food item eaten, is characterized by a uniform distribution between reported minimum and maximum values. In addition, the variable PreyType is addressed in this section. While no data collection was required for this parameter, prey items were assigned to nine prey categories (PreyType) for use in the ecological exposure module.

In general, the ecological exposure factors are for the mean adult body weight for the species; male and female weights are combined, and juvenile body weights are not considered. Although some data are reported by age or sex, not enough of these data exist to develop exposure factors for juveniles or for males versus females for an adequate number of species. Moreover, age- or sex-specific uptake factors and toxicological benchmarks are not available for ecological receptors. Therefore, consumption rates and prey preferences were estimated for average adults only.

Dietary composition for each receptor species varies depending on habitat. For example, raccoons are assumed to eat a variety of vegetation and animal prey wherever they occur; however, when they occur in waterbody margin habitats, aquatic prey are included in their dietary composition. In an upland forest or a residential habitat, only terrestrial prey are included.

12.2 Data Sources

The following documents were the principal data sources for the ecological exposure factors used in the HWIR analysis:

- # U.S. EPA (Environmental Protection Agency). 1993. Wildlife Exposure Factors Handbook. EPA/600/R-93/187. Office of Research and Development, Washington, DC. December.
- # Sample, B.E., M.S. Alpin, R.A. Efroymson, G.W. Suter, and C.J.E. Welsh. 1997. *Methods and Tools for Estimation of the Exposure of Terrestrial Wildlife to Contaminants*. ORNL/TM-13391, Office of Environmental Policy and Assistance. Oak Ridge National Laboratory, Oak Ridge, TN. October.
- # U.S. Army Corps of Engineers' *Species Profile Series*. Various authors and publication dates.
- # American Society of Mammalogists' *Mammalian Species Series*. Various authors and publication dates.

Variable Name	Description	Principal Data Sources	Distribution/Fixed Value
BodyWt_rec	Body weight for each receptor	U.S. EPA, 1993; Sample et al., 1997; American Society of Mammalogists, ^a U.S. Army Corps of Engineers ²	Fixed (mean)
CR_food	Food consumption rate for each receptor	U.S. EPA, 1993	Fixed (for mean body weight)
CR_water	Water consumption rate for each receptor	U.S. EPA, 1993	Fixed (for mean body weight)
CRfrac_sed	Percentage of food consumption consisting of sediment	U.S. EPA, 1993	Fixed
CRfrac_soil	Percentage of food consumption consisting of soil	U.S. EPA, 1993	Fixed
MinPreyPref_HabRange	Minimum dietary preference for food items found in home range	U.S. EPA, 1993; Sample et al., 1997; American Society of Mammalogists, ^a U.S. Army Corps of Engineers ^b	Minimum, uniform distribution assumed
MaxPreyPref_HabRange	Maximum dietary preference for food items found in home range	U.S. EPA, 1993; Sample et al., 1997; American Society of Mammalogists, ^a U.S. Army Corps of Engineers ^b	Maximum, uniform distribution assumed
AreaFrac _{HabRange} ^c	Home range size	U.S. EPA, 1993; Sample et al., 1997; American Society of Mammalogists, ^a U.S. Army Corps of Engineers ^b	Fixed

^a The American Society of Mammalogists' *Mammalian Species Series* comprises individually published monographs on single species. Authors and dates of publication vary for each species.

^b The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers' *Species Profile Series* comprises individually published monographs on single species. Authors and dates of publication vary for each species.

^c Home range size data were used in the site layout data processing step to calculate AreaFrac_{HabRange}. Although home range size is not a variable used directly by the ecological exposure module, these data were collected from the same sources as other species-specific exposure factors and are documented in this section.

Table 12-2 indicates the principal data source for each parameter. For species-specific body weight, dietary composition, and home range size, the primary source of data was the *Wildlife Exposure Factors Handbook* (the *Handbook*) (U.S. EPA, 1993). The *Handbook* is the best available compendium of information relevant to ecological exposure. It includes exposure factors for 34 species of mammals, birds, amphibians, and reptiles. All species included in the *Handbook* (U.S. EPA, 1993) have been included in the HWIR exposure factor database, with the exception of the harbor seal, which inhabits estuarine and marine habitats not addressed in the HWIR analysis. In addition, algorithms for estimating ingestion rates based on body weight were taken from the *Handbook* (U.S. EPA, 1993).

Similar data for an additional 15 species of birds and mammals (Black-tailed jackrabbit, burrowing owl, Cooper's hawk, coyote, Great Basin pocket mouse, green heron, kit fox, little brown bat, least weasel, long-tailed weasel, short-tailed weasel, mule deer, pine vole, tree swallow, and western meadowlark) were taken from Sample et al. (1997). The species addressed in Sample et al. (1997) were chosen by the authors specifically to complement those in the *Handbook* (U.S. EPA, 1993), and thus provide complementary data.

The American Society of Mammalogists' *Mammalian Species Series* provided additional prey preference, home range size, and body weight data on seven of the species in the *Handbook* (U.S. EPA, 1993) and Sample et al. (1997), and provided primary data for an additional two mammals (beaver and white-tailed deer).

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers' *Species Profile Series* provided data on eight additional species – one mammal, two reptiles, two amphibians, and three birds. These species profiles are part of a study of wildlife species on military reservations in the southeastern United States and, therefore, emphasize species found in that region. Of the receptors selected from this source, however, only the amphibians and reptiles (alligator snapping turtle, southern hognose snake, gopher frog and flatwoods salamander) are restricted to the southeastern United States. Because data on herpetofauna are generally scarce, these four species are included in the receptor list, although they are included in the exposure analysis only at sites located within their respective areas of distribution.

Additional sources were identified to supplement the prey preference data from the principal sources. The dietary information in the *Handbook* (U.S. EPA, 1993) and Sample et al. (1997) consists of reported food items from field studies. Thus, the data reflect the dietary composition of a single or a few individuals at particular study sites, in some cases over a relatively short time period. The exposure assessment for the HWIR analysis, on the other hand, is based on hypothetical food webs intended to reflect all of the receptor species' potential dietary items. As such, the prey preference data required by the ecological exposure module should reflect the potential food intake for the species in all habitats and regions where it occurs. Therefore, more generalized dietary composition data were taken from numerous field guides and wildlife encyclopedias (e.g., several of the National Audubon Society field guides and the Peterson field guides; Terres, 1980; Martof et al., 1980). All references used to collect ecological exposure data are listed in Table 12-1 and in the reference section (Section 12.5).

Soil and sediment ingestion data were taken from the *Handbook* (U.S. EPA, 1993) and from several additional references, each with data on one or a few species. See Section 12.3.4 for further discussion of these data sources.

12.3 Methodology

Methods for developing exposure factors from wildlife data extracted from various sources are detailed in the Handbook (U.S. EPA, 1993). Those methods were followed substantially in the HWIR analysis. Based on information in the Handbook (U.S. EPA, 1993) and in the other sources listed previously, a database was developed containing all available data relevant to ecological exposures for the 57 selected receptor species. Most of the data were extracted from the Handbook (U.S. EPA, 1993) and from Sample et al. (1997). Both the Handbook (U.S. EPA, 1993) and Sample et al. (1997) are compilations of data from many different references and, therefore, include multiple values for each species for a particular data category (e.g., multiple body weights for otter). In some cases, the reported values are the mean of the data collected for a single study; in other cases, the reported values reflect a single measurement. In all cases, all reported values were entered into the database, including means, minima, and maxima. Single reported values were entered as mean values. Data collected from additional sources were treated in the same manner. These data were then processed to generate the appropriate inputs for the module. The following subsections document the data processing methods for each ecological exposure parameter. Section 12.3.6 addresses the quality assurance and quality control (QA/QC) of data collection and processing.

12.3.1 Receptor Body Weights

Data on the body weights of individual receptor species were taken from several primary sources that represent a compilation of the results of many separate studies. The primary sources used included the following:

- # U.S. EPA (1993)
- # Sample et al. (1997)
- # American Society of Mammalogists' *Mammalian Species Series*
- # U.S. Army Corps of Engineers' Species Profile Series.

Values were collected and assembled in the ecological exposure database. Then, a mean value was calculated so that a single datum represented body weight for each species. When data from multiple studies were reported in a single reference (e.g., the *Handbook* [U.S. EPA, 1993]), the geometric mean of the adult body weights from each study was calculated. In some cases, body weight data were presented separately for males and females. In this instance, the average of the geometric means for males and females was used. Body weights collected from field guides generally consisted of average adult values. Body weights identifiable as juvenile or preadult weights were not included in the species average. The mean body weights represent data from multiple local investigations as well as from national or regional averages. They are assumed to collectively represent a national mean.

The following assumptions are inherent in this manipulation of body weight data:

- # Some reported data are accompanied by an indication of the age of the individual studied; age data are relevant to body weights. In some cases, an age in months or years is reported, while in others a life stage such as fledgling, juvenile, or subadult is reported. These data were standardized in the database to indicate adults for individuals that have reached sexual maturity and juveniles for all other ages. In addition, larvae were distinguished from juveniles of the adult phase for salamanders (including efts), and tadpoles were distinguished from juvenile frogs.
- # Individual body weights were derived to represent receptors nationally. This derivation was generally based on local scale data from studies distributed throughout the United States. For some species, however, only one or a few reported body weights were available.
- # A single value is assumed to represent both males and females.

12.3.2 Food Ingestion Rates

Food and water consumption rates were calculated for each receptor species using Nagy's (1987) allometric equations as reported in the *Handbook* (U.S. EPA, 1993). The equations correlate food and water intake to body weight in free-living wildlife species. Separate regression equations were used for mammals, birds, and herpetofauna. The equations and associated values follow.

Food ingestion rate

$$Y = aWt^{b}$$
(12-2)

where

Y = food ingestion rate, g DW/d

- Wt = representative body weight of receptor species, g WW
- a = empirical coefficient
- b = empirical coefficient.

Mean adult body weights were estimated as described in Section 12.3.1. The values used in the HWIR analysis for the empirical coefficients a and b, as presented in the *Handbook* (U.S. EPA, 1993), are presented in Table 12-3.

The following assumptions are inherent in the derivation of the receptor species' food ingestion rates:

The estimations were based on average, gender-neutral body weights and do not account for differences in size, season, habitat, or activity level.

Species Group/Subgroup	a	b
Birds	0.64	0.651
Mammals	0.23	0.822
Herpetofauna	0.012	0.773

Table 12-3. Empirical Coefficients Used to Calculate Food Ingestion Rates

Source: U.S. EPA, 1993.

The regression statistics used for herpetofauna were derived from data on iguanid lizards (family *Iguanidae*) only and are not recommended for use with other reptiles or amphibians (U.S. EPA, 1993). Lacking any other data for food ingestion rates in amphibians and reptiles, however, this estimation methodology was used for all herpetofauna in the HWIR analysis.

12.3.3 Water Ingestion Rates

Receptor species' consumption rates for water also were derived based on body weights. Calder and Braun (1983), as cited in the *Handbook* (U.S. EPA, 1993), developed an equation for drinking water ingestion for birds. This equation is presented in Equation 12-3.

Water ingestion rate for birds

$$WI = 0.059 \cdot Wt^{0.67}$$
(12-3)

where

WI = drinking water ingestion, L/d

Wt = representative body weight of receptor species, kg.

This equation was derived based on a data set representing 21 species with a body weight range of 11 to 3,150 g. Birds, in general, drink less water than mammals of equivalent body weight. Calder and Braun (1983) developed a parallel equation for mammals, as shown in Equation 12-4.

Drinking water ingestion for mammals

$$WI = 0.099 \cdot Wt^{0.90}$$
(12-4)

where

- WI = drinking water ingestion, L/d
- Wt = representative body weight of receptor species, kg.

No similar allometric equation is available for relating body weight to drinking water ingestion for reptiles and amphibians. Therefore, a default value of 0.0001 was used for water ingestion in all herpetofauna.

The following assumptions are inherent in the derivation of the receptor species drinking water ingestion rates:

- # The estimations were based on average, gender-neutral body weights and do not account for differences in size, season, habitat, or activity level.
- # Additional sources of water, including water derived from ingested food, were not accounted for. Depending on dietary composition, some species derive more water from food items than do others.

12.3.4 Consumption Rate of Surficial Soil/Sediment

Consumption rates for surficial soil and sediment were taken from the *Handbook* (U.S. EPA, 1993) and the following additional references:

- # Arthur and Gates (1988)
- # Arthur and Alldredge (1979)
- # Beyer et al. (1994)
- # Mayoh and Zach (1986).

Sediment and soil ingestion rates were reported as a fraction of the total dietary ingestion. The fractions were applied to the ingestion rates estimated as described in Section 12.3.2. The values were reported as sediment/soil ingestion rates, without distinguishing what proportion was sediment versus soil. The ecological exposure module, however, uses discreet constituent concentrations in soil and sediment. Therefore, receptor species were assigned soil or sediment ingestion as a function of their feeding patterns. Those species feeding entirely on terrestrial prey and food items were assumed to consume soil, and the reported sediment/soil ingestion rate was applied entirely to soil. Those receptors feeding on aquatic prey and food items, or on a combination of aquatic and terrestrial prey and food items, were assumed to ingest only sediment.

For those species for which sediment/soil ingestion rates were not available, the reported ingestion rate of the most similar species was used. Similarity was based first on faunal class (i.e., mammal, bird, reptile, amphibian), second on size, and third on feeding behavior. Data were available for only two species of herpetofauna, the eastern box turtle and the painted turtle. Therefore, small herpetofauna with mixed diets (e.g., frogs, salamanders) were given the same

rate as the eastern box turtle, and larger herpetofauna that eat a significant proportion of fish (e.g., snapping turtles and aquatic snakes) were given the same rate as the painted turtle.

The following assumptions are inherent in the derivation of the receptor species' surficial soil/sediment ingestion rates:

- # Soil and sediment ingestion were treated as mutually exclusive because the data do not specify which medium was reported. Many receptors probably ingest a combination of soil and sediment (e.g., raccoon).
- # Data on soil ingestion were lacking for most receptor species; therefore, available values were used for species expected to have a similar diet and feeding behavior.

12.3.5 Maximum/Minimum Dietary Preferences

The ecological exposure module includes an algorithm to construct a unique, randomly selected diet for each receptor species at each site where it occurs. This algorithm reflects the variability in receptor species' dietary composition. Dietary preference data required by the ecological exposure model includes a list of potential diet items for each species and the maximum and minimum proportion of the species' diet that each item can comprise. Diet items are categorized as one of 17 types of prey recognized by the HWIR modeling system. The prey categories are shown in Table 12-4.

Table 12-4. Prey Categories

For example, prey preference data on the Eastern box turtle are as follows:

Diet Item	Percentage of Diet
Worms	3 to 60
Forage	13 to 39
Fruits	5 to 33
Other invertebrates	8 to 22
Small herpetofauna	0 to 10
Small mammals	0 to 10

Information on receptor species' dietary composition comes from a wide range of data sources and is of two general types. Some data consist of reported quantities of certain items eaten by particular individuals in a localized or site-specific study. These data consist of measured stomach contents, nest or burrow contents, or counts of items observed to be eaten during a particular time span. The principal sources for this type of data are the *Handbook* (U.S. EPA, 1993) and Sample et al. (1997). The second type of information consists of qualitative reports of items documented to be eaten. These reports reflect a compilation of observations and measurements for the species in general and are reported as descriptions of the species' potential diet. The principal sources of this type of data are the Army Corps of Engineers' *Species Profile Series*, the American Society of Mammalogists' *Mammalian Species Series*, and the various field guides and handbooks listed in Table 12-1.

The HWIR exposure analysis required data on the full range of potential diet items across all habitats where each species could occur. In addition, the HWIR analysis required quantified data – maxima and minima. Therefore, the two general types of data for each receptor were combined, and dietary profiles were developed for each receptor species. The profiles include each documented diet item for each species, whether the item was reported in a quantitative or qualitative form. Maximum and minimum values were generated for each item through a subjective process implemented by project ecologists. In this process, the qualitative information was evaluated, and an estimated dietary fraction was assigned to each item. Then, all reported and estimated dietary fractions were compared, and the minimum and maximum values were identified for each diet item.

The assignment of estimated dietary fractions was made by a single ecologist to maintain consistency in interpreting qualitative descriptions. In addition, certain decision rules were followed for all assignments. References to a diet item that implied a single most significant component, such as "primary food source," "bulk of the diet," and "consumes mostly," were assigned a minimum of 50 percent dietary composition. Items that are of secondary importance but that would always make up at least some portion of the diet were assigned a minimum of 10 percent. Descriptions implying occasional sources of food were given a minimum of zero (thus indicating that some individuals under some circumstances do not consume the item at all) and a maximum of 25 percent. A few species have relatively limited diets and eat only one diet item. For example, the cerulean warbler eats insects almost exclusively. In these cases, the exclusive diet item (insects) was assigned a minimum of 95 percent and a maximum of 100 percent. The quantified dietary profiles were entered into the exposure factor database as maximum and minimum values for each prey category.

The different data sources report vegetative dietary constituents in various terms ranging from a list of food items by species name to general categories such as seeds and nuts or vegetation. Consequently, the data for vegetation constituents were standardized in the database using terms recognized by the exposure module and coded according to farm food chain codes for compatibility with the farm food chain and terrestrial food web modules. Table 12-5 shows the food categories most frequently reported in the literature and their respective farm food chain codes.

Farm Food Chain Code	Dietary Items Included
Forage	Forbs, grass(es), other plant(s), plant(s), shrubs, terrestrial plants, trees, unclassified plant(s), unidentified plant(s), vegetation, woody plants
Silage	Crops, corn
Grains	Seeds, nuts
Exposed fruit	Fruits, fruits/seeds (reported as a single item)
Exposed vegetation	Fern(s), fungi, fungus, cactus, dicot shoots, monocot shoots
Root	Root

Table 12-5. Farm Food Chain Codes for Wildlife Diet Items

Assumptions inherent in the processing of these data include the following:

- # Data from a variety of sources were collected and combined to represent receptor species' diets; therefore, the values used were intended to be representative of the species throughout their range and habitat types.
- # Qualitative diet information was subjectively interpreted and given numeric values. These values were combined with site- or study-specific quantitative data to derive maximum and minimum values.
- When fish were a reported dietary item, the fish's trophic level was included for use in the aquatic food web module. When the fish species name was reported, its trophic level was extracted from trophic level analyses in EPA's Great Lakes Study (U.S. EPA, 1995). In all other cases, the trophic level for fish prey was assumed to be T3 or T4 based on the size of the predator (receptor species). Small receptors were assumed to eat T3 fish. For large receptors, it was assumed that 50 percent of the fish they eat are T3 and 50 percent are T4. None of the primary exposure data sources included information on the trophic level of prey items.

12.3.6 Home Range Size

Home range, or territory size, was used to estimate the proportion of the diet taken from the potentially contaminated area. For species with very small territories (e.g., mice, voles), the entire home range is likely to fall within the contaminated area. For larger or wider ranging species (e.g., the bald eagle), much of a receptor's diet could come from outside the contaminated area. The variable used in the ecological exposure module to reflect the proportion of a receptor's diet taken from the contaminated area is AreaFrac_{HabRange}. Home range size data were used in the site layout data processing step to calculate AreaFrac_{HabRange} by dividing the

species' home range area by the area of the species' habitat located on a site. A detailed discussion of the AreaFrac_{HabRange} variable is presented in the documentation of the ecological exposure module.

Home range data were available for all but 10 of the 57 receptor species and were found primarily in the Handbook (U.S. EPA, 1993), Sample et al. (1997), the Army Corps of Engineers' Species Profile Series, and the American Society of Mammalogists' Mammalian Species Series. Species for which no data were available were assigned the home range size of a similar species with similar feeding habits. Various metrics are reported in the literature for the size of the area used by a receptor. These metrics include feeding or foraging radius, feeding or foraging distance, and home range or territory size. In most cases (particularly, the *Handbook* [U.S. EPA, 1993]), the terminology for area size was discussed and defined. In other sources, when no definition of terms was provided, judgments were made based on the context of the data and comparison with other reports on the same species. In most cases, the size of the area used by a species for foraging and feeding was reported in hectares or acres and referred to as the home range or territory. When a linear distance was reported, it was assumed to represent a radius. When a radius was reported, it was assumed to describe a circular area around a nest or some essential physical feature. All home range size data were entered into the exposure factors database, and the midpoint between the minimum and maximum values was calculated for each species. The home ranges were assumed to be circular.

In the site layout processing step, receptor species' home ranges were placed within delineated habitats where the species occur. Section 13.0 provides a full description of habitat delineation and placement of home ranges. As explained in Section 13.0, home range placement proved inordinately resource-intensive. Therefore, a binning approach was adopted to reduce the number of home ranges that required placement in the HWIR geographic information system (GIS). Using this approach, each receptor's average home range size was assigned to one of four bins. Each bin comprised a range of home range sizes, as follows:

- # Bin 1 Home range = or $<100,000 \text{ m}^2$
- # Bin 2 Home range >100,000 m^2 and <1 million m^2
- **#** Bin 3 Home range = or >1 million m^2 , and <10 million m^2
- # Bin 4 Home range = or >10 million m².

Because receptor exposure dose, as calculated in the ecological exposure module, is adjusted based on the proportion of the home range that falls within the contaminated area, the binning approach potentially underestimates the exposure dose for receptors at the low end of each range. For example, the eastern newt has an average home range size of 91 m²; however, because it falls within Bin 1, its home range is assumed to be 100,000 m². Thus, the proportion of the eastern newt's diet taken from contaminated habitat will be calculated as the proportion of the 100,000-m² home range that falls within the contaminated area. Obviously, in certain cases, this will be a significantly smaller proportion of the diet than would be estimated if the true mean home range size (91 m²) were used.

The following assumptions are inherent in the processing of home range size data:

- # Calculated averages were assumed to reflect the home range size for a species in all of the habitats where it occurs, while available data may come from a single habitat type. In fact, habitat type and quality affect foraging distance. For example, a white-tailed deer may cover a larger area when foraging in a forest than when feeding in a crop field.
- # Average home range sizes also were assumed to reflect all regions of the United States and year-round food availability. Some reported home range data were for particular regions and seasons; no attempt was made to distinguish home range size by region or season.

12.3.7 Data Entry and Data Processing Quality Assurance/Quality Control

The QA/QC functions for data collection of ecological exposure factors consist of ensuring that data have been interpreted and extracted correctly (i.e., Technical QA/QC) and verifying that data have been entered correctly (i.e., data entry QA/QC). Detailed QA records are maintained by the project QA Officer (QAO).

12.3.7.1 <u>Technical Quality Assurance/Quality Control</u>. The sources used to obtain the exposure factor data are considered to be authoritative references and, therefore, data extracted from them are assumed to be of high quality. Data extracted from primary literature sources have been reviewed by senior ecologists to determine the quality of the exposure factors. Methods for extracting and combining data (e.g., calculating mean values) as well as the assumptions used for interpreting and standardizing data (e.g., assigning age data as adult or juvenile or assigning food types to farm food chain categories) were developed with the oversight and review of senior ecologists.

12.3.7.2 Data Entry Quality Assurance/Quality Control. Entry of raw data into the exposure factors database was checked against the source by a staff member other than the one who entered the data. At least 50 percent of entries from each source were checked. All data processing, such as calculation of means, was checked by a staff member other than the one who performed the calculation or set up the calculation spreadsheet. A QA check of at least 10 percent of the results of the spreadsheet macros used to manipulate data was made against the original spreadsheets.

12.4 Results

Tables presenting the ecological exposure data used in the HWIR modeling system are presented in the appendixes to this section. Appendix 12A includes the following tables:

- # Table A12-1 Mean body weights by receptor
- # Table A12-2 Food ingestion rates for mean body weight by receptor
- # Table A12-3 Water ingestion rates for mean body weight by receptor
- # Table A12-4 Soil ingestion rates as a fraction of total ingestion
- # Table A12-5 Sediment ingestion rates as a fraction of total ingestion.

Appendix 12B includes prey preference tables:

- # Table B12-1 Minimum prey preferences
- # Table B12-2 Maximum prey preferences.

Appendix 12C includes receptor home ranges and assignments to size bins.

12.5 References

Anderson, Allen E., and Olof C. Wallmo. 1984. *Odocoileus hemionus*. In: *Mammalian Species*. Volume 219 pp. 1-9. The American Society of Mammalogists.

Arthur, W. J., and A. W. Alldredge. 1979. Soil ingestion by mule deer in northcentral Colorado. *Journal of Range Management*, 32(1):67-71. January.

- Arthur, W. John, III, and Robert J. Gates. 1988. Trace element intake via soil ingestion in pronghorns and in black-tailed jackrabbits. *Journal of Range Management*, 41(2):162-166. March.
- Behler, John L., and F. Wayne King. 1979. Field guide to North American reptiles and amphibians. In: *National Audobon Society*. Alfred A. Knopf, Inc., New York, NY.
- Bekoff, Marc. 1977. *Canis latrans*. In: *Mammalian Species*. Volume 79 pp. 1-9. The American Society of Mammalogists.
- Beyer, W. Nelson, Erin E. Connor, and Sarah Gerould. 1994. Estimates of soil ingestion by wildlife. *Journal of Wildlife Management*, 58(2):375-382.
- Calder, William A., III, and Eldon J. Braun. 1983. Scaling of osmotic regulation in mammals and birds. *American Journal of Physiology*, 244(13):R601-R606.
- Chapman, Joseph A., J. Gregory Hockman, and C. Ojeda. 1980. *Sylvilagus floridanus*. In: *Mammalian Species*. Volume 136 pp. 1-8. The American Society of Mammalogists.
- Conant, Roger, and Joseph T. Collins. 1991. A field guide to reptiles and amphibians:
 eastern/central North America. In: *The Peterson Field Guide Series*. R.T.Peterson (ed.).
 3rd Edition. Houghton Mifflin Company, Boston, MA.
- Evans, Darrell E. and Richard A. Fischer. 1997. Species Profile: Cerulean Warbler (Dendroica cerulea) on Military Installations in the Southeastern United States. SERDP-97-12.
 Headquarters, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Strategic Environmental Research and Development Program, Waterways Experiment Station, Vicksburg, MS. October.

- Hall, Stephen P. and Harry E. LeGrand, Jr., and Richard A. Fischer. 1997. Species Profile: Loggerhead Shrike (Lanius ludovicianus) on Military Installations in the Southeastern United States. SERDP-97-8. Headquarters, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Strategic Environmental Research and Development Program, Waterways Experiment Station, Vicksburg, MS. September.
- Jenkins, Stephen H., and Peter E. Busher. 1979. *Castor canadensis*. In: *Mammalian Species*. Volume 120 pp. 1-8. The American Society of Mammalogists.
- King, C. M. 1983. <u>Mustela erminea</u>. Mammalian Species. American Society of Mammologists 195:(1-8).
- Lane, John J. and Richard A. Fischer. 1997. Species Profile: Southeastern American Kestrel (Falco sparverius paulus) on Military Installations in the Southeastern United States. SERDP-97-4. Headquarters, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Strategic Environmental Research and Development Program, Waterways Experiment Station, Vicksburg, MS. August.
- Lane, John J. and Wilma A. Mitchell. 1997. Species Profile: Alligator Snapping Turtle (Macroclemys temminckii) on Military Installations in the Southeastern United States. SERDP-97-9. Headquarters, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Strategic Environmental Research and Development Program, Waterways Experiment Station, Vicksburg, MS. September.
- Lotze, Joerg Henner, and Sydney Anderson. 1979. *Procyon lotor*. In: *Mammalian Species*. Volume 119 pp. 1-8. The American Society of Mammalogists.
- MacMahon, James A. 1985. Deserts. In: *The Audobon Society Nature Guides*. Alfred A. Knopf, Inc., New York, NY.
- Martof, Bernard S., William M. Palmer, Joseph R. Bailey, and Julian R. Harrison, III . 1980. *Amphibians and Reptiles of the Carolinas and Virginia*. The University of North Carolina Press, Chapel Hill, NC.
- Mayoh, Keith R., and Reto Zach. 1986. Grit ingestion by nestling tree swallows and house wrens. *Canadian Journal of Zoololgy*, 64:2090-2093.
- McGrew, John C. 1979. *Vulpes macrotis*. In: *Mammalian Species*. Volume 123 pp. 1-6. The American Society of Mammalogists.
- Nagy, K. A. 1987. Field metabolic rate and food requirement scaling in mammals and birds. *Ecological Monographs*, 57(2):111-128.
- Niering, William A. 1985. Wetlands. In: *The Audubon Society Nature Guides*. Alfred A. Knopf, Inc., New York, NY.

- Palis, John G. 1997. Species Profile: Flatwoods Salamander (Ambystoma cingulatum) on Military Installations in the Southeastern United States. SERDP-97-6. Headquarters, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Strategic Environmental Research and Development Program, Waterways Experiment Station, Vicksburg, MS. August.
- Palis, John G. and Richard A. Fischer. 1997. Species Profile: Gopher Frog (Rana capito spp.) on Military Installations in the Southeastern United States. SERDP-97-5. Headquarters, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Strategic Environmental Research and Development Program, Waterways Experiment Station, Vicksburg, MS. August.
- Sample, B. E., M. S. Aplin, R. A. Efroymson, G. W. Suter II, and C. J. E. Welsh. 1997. *Methods and Tools for Estimation of the Exposure of Terrestrial Wildlife to Contaminants*. ORNL/TM-13391. Office of Environmental Policy and Assistance, U.S. Department of Energy. Oak Ridge National Laboratory, Oak Ridge, TN. October.
- Schaefer, Joe, and Mary Sargent. 1990. *The Florida Black Bear: A Threatened Species*. SS-WIS-25. Cooperative Urban Wildlife Program, Gainseville, FL. December. pp. 1-3.
- Smith, Winston Paul. 1991. *Odocoileus virginianus*. In: *Mammalian Species*. Volume 388 pp. 1-13. The American Society of Mammalogists.
- Stokes, Donald, and Lillian Stokes. 1996. Stokes field guide to birds. Eastern region. In: *Stokes Field Guides*. 1st Edition. Little, Brown and Company, Boston, MA.
- Stokes, Donald W., and Lillian Q. Stokes. 1986. A guide to animal tracking and behavior. In: *Stokes Nature Guides*. Little, Brown & Company, Boston, MA.
- Sutton, A. and M. Sutton. 1985. *The Audubon Society Nature Guides: Eastern Forests*. Alfred A. Knopf, Inc. New York.
- Terres, John K. 1980. *The Audubon Society Encyclopedia of North American Birds*. Alfred A. Knopf, Inc., New York, NY.
- U.S. EPA (Environmental Protection Agency). 1993. *Wildlife Exposure Factors Handbook. Volumes I and II.* EPA/600/R-93/187. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Health and Environmental Assessment and Office of Research and Development, Washington, DC. December.
- Whitaker, John O., Jr. 1997. Field guide to North American mammals. In: *National Audobon Society*. 2nd Edition. Alfred A. Knopf, Inc., New York, NY.
- Whitney, Stephen. 1985. Western forests. In: *The Audubon Society Nature Guides*. Alfred A. Knopf, Inc., New York, NY.

Willner, Gale R., George A. Feldhamer, Elizabeth E. Zucker, and Joseph A. Chapman. 1980. Ondatra zibethicus. In: Mammalian Species. Volume 141 pp. 1-8. The American Society of Mammalogists.

12-22

Receptor Index	Receptor Species	BodyWt _{Rec}
1	Alligator snapping turtle	50.40
2	American kestrel	0.12
3	American robin	0.08
4	American woodcock	0.18
5	Bald eagle	3.75
6	Beaver	19.31
7	Belted kingfisher	0.15
8	Black bear	128.87
9	Black-tailed jackrabbit	2.42
10	Bullfrog	0.25
11	Burrowing owl	0.15
12	Canada goose	3.00
13	Cerulean warbler	0.01
14	Cooper's hawk	0.40
15	Coyote	13.13
16	Deer mouse	0.02
17	Eastern box turtle	0.38
18	Eastern cottontail rabbit	1.23
19	Eastern newt	0.0019
20	Flatwoods salamander	0.01
21	Gopher frog	0.08
22	Great Basin pocket mouse	0.02
23	Great blue heron	2.23
24	Green frog	0.05
25	Green heron	0.23
26	Herring gull	1.09
27	Kit fox	1.80
28	Least weasel	0.04
29	Lesser scaup	0.79
30	Little brown bat	0.01
31	Loggerhead shrike	0.05
32	Long-tailed weasel	0.19
33	Mallard duck	1.17
34	Marsh wren	0.01

Table A12-1. Mean Adult Body Weight (kg)

(continued)

Receptor Index	Receptor Species	BodyWt _{Rec}
35	Meadow vole	0.02
36	Mink	0.99
37	Mule deer	75.47
38	Muskrat	0.87
39	Northern bobwhite	0.19
40	Northern water snake	0.21
41	Osprey	1.60
42	Painted turtle	0.24
43	Pine vole	0.03
44	Prairie vole	0.04
45	Raccoon	5.69
46	Racer	0.11
47	Red fox	4.53
48	Red-tailed hawk	1.13
49	River otter	8.66
50	Short-tailed shrew	0.02
51	Short-tailed weasel	0.20
52	Snapping turtle	5.30
53	Southern hognose snake	0.10
54	Spotted sandpiper	0.04
55	Tree swallow	0.02
56	Western meadowlark	0.11
57	White-tailed deer	69.42

Table A12-1. (continued)

Receptor Index	Receptor Species	CR_Food (kg/d)
1	Alligator snapping turtle	0.248392807
2	American kestrel	0.160014682
3	American robin	0.120888454
4	American woodcock	0.207666045
5	Bald eagle	1.513123336
6	Beaver	2.621892065
7	Belted kingfisher	0.183744055
8	Black bear	12.48200449
9	Black-tailed jackrabbit	0.475099567
10	Bullfrog	0.004096787
11	Burrowing owl	0.187439243
12	Canada goose	1.30757959
13	Cerulean warbler	0.02981205
14	Cooper's hawk	0.355253735
15	Coyote	1.909463688
16	Deer mouse	0.009077418
17	Eastern box turtle	0.005700299
18	Eastern cottontail rabbit	0.27196086
19	Eastern newt	9.51517E-05
20	Flatwoods salamander	0.000255469
21	Gopher frog	0.001772645
22	Great Basin pocket mouse	0.008361252
23	Great blue heron	1.078449041
24	Green frog	0.00116785
25	Green heron	0.243079785
26	Herring gull	0.67742977
27	Kit fox	0.372758523
28	Least weasel	0.01659417
29	Lesser scaup	0.550033474
30	Little brown bat	0.0046952
31	Loggerhead shrike	0.087441114
32	Long-tailed weasel	0.058386436
33	Mallard duck	0.708936302
34	Marsh wren	0.033176452
		(continued)

Table A12-2. Food Ingestion Rates (kg/d)

		CR_Food
Receptor Index	Receptor Species	(kg/d)
35	Meadow vole	0.009540003
36	Mink	0.228566447
37	Mule deer	8.040044205
38	Muskrat	0.205703435
39	Northern bobwhite	0.218028771
40	Northern water snake	0.003571425
41	Osprey	0.869573494
42	Painted turtle	0.003968804
43	Pine vole	0.011191669
44	Prairie vole	0.016839896
45	Raccoon	0.960555042
46	Racer	0.002234702
47	Red fox	0.796543538
48	Red-tailed hawk	0.693371005
49	River otter	1.356369499
50	Short-tailed shrew	0.041573385
51	Short-tailed weasel	0.061644676
52	Snapping turtle	0.043527849
53	Southern hognose snake	0.002027705
54	Spotted sandpiper	0.081895713
55	Tree swallow	0.051673845
56	Western meadowlark	0.14887844
57	White-tailed deer	7.506086944

Table A12-2.	(continued)
--------------	-------------

		CR_Water
Receptor Index	Receptor Species	(kg/d)
1	Alligator snapping turtle	0.0001
2	American kestrel	0.014166462
3	American robin	0.0106153
4	American woodcock	0.018525548
5	Bald eagle	0.143038505
6	Beaver	1.421709
7	Belted kingfisher	0.01633306
8	Black bear	7.848463546
9	Black-tailed jackrabbit	0.219072515
10	Bullfrog	0.0001
11	Burrowing owl	0.016671212
12	Canada goose	0.123082469
13	Cerulean warbler	0.002513012
14	Cooper's hawk	0.03219212
15	Coyote	1.00470962
16	Deer mouse	0.002875184
17	Eastern box turtle	0.0001
18	Eastern cottontail rabbit	0.118937762
19	Eastern newt	0.0001
20	Flatwoods salamander	0.0001
21	Gopher frog	0.0001
22	Great Basin pocket mouse	0.002627773
23	Great blue heron	0.10094522
24	Green frog	0.0001
25	Green heron	0.021784632
26	Herring gull	0.06255424
27	Kit fox	0.167970671
28	Least weasel	0.005565697
29	Lesser scaup	0.050482516
30	Little brown bat	0.001396978
31	Loggerhead shrike	0.007606022
32	Long-tailed weasel	0.022065817
33	Mallard duck	0.065550484
34	Marsh wren	0.002805356
		(continued)

Table A12-3. Water Ingestion Rates (L/d)

Receptor Index	Receptor Species	CR_Water (kg/d)
35	Meadow vole	0.003035989
36	Mink	0.098324597
37	Mule deer	4.848776906
38	Muskrat	0.087608857
39	Northern bobwhite	0.019477652
40	Northern water snake	0.0001
41	Osprey	0.080884208
42	Painted turtle	0.0001
43	Pine vole	0.003615987
44	Prairie vole	0.005655997
45	Raccoon	0.473518678
46	Racer	0.0001
47	Red fox	0.385752341
48	Red-tailed hawk	0.064069741
49	River otter	0.690896135
50	Short-tailed shrew	0.003538614
51	Short-tailed weasel	0.023417551
52	Snapping turtle	0.0001
53	Southern hognose snake	0.0001
54	Spotted sandpiper	0.007110049
55	Tree swallow	0.004426346
56	Western meadowlark	0.013152825
57	White-tailed deer	4.497336296

 Table A12-3. (continued)

.

Receptor Index	Receptor Species	CRfrac_soil
2	American kestrel	1
3	American robin	1
4	American woodcock	10.4
8	Black bear	2.8
9	Black-tailed jackrabbit	6.3
11	Burrowing owl	1
12	Canada goose	8.2
13	Cerulean warbler	0
14	Cooper's hawk	1
15	Coyote	2.8
16	Deer mouse	2
18	Eastern cottontail rabbit	6.3
22	Great Basin pocket mouse	2
27	Kit fox	2.8
28	Least weasel	1
30	Little brown bat	0
31	Loggerhead shrike	1
32	Long-tailed weasel	2.8
35	Meadow vole	2.4
37	Mule deer	6.8
39	Northern bobwhite	9.3
43	Pine vole	2.4
44	Prairie vole	2.4
46	Racer	1
47	Red fox	2.8
48	Red-tailed hawk	1
50	Short-tailed shrew	1
51	Short-tailed weasel	2.8
53	Southern hognose snake	1
55	Tree swallow	1
56	Western meadowlark	0
57	White-tailed deer	6.8

Table A12-4. Soil Ingestion Rates (percent of total ingestion)

Receptor Index	Receptor Species	CRfrac_sed
1	Alligator snapping turtle	5.9
5	Bald eagle	5.9
6	Beaver	3.3
7	Belted kingfisher	5.9
10	Bullfrog	4.5
17	Eastern box turtle	4.5
19	Eastern newt	4.5
20	Flatwoods salamander	4.5
21	Gopher frog	4.5
23	Great blue heron	9.4
24	Green frog	4.5
25	Green heron	9.4
26	Herring gull	5.9
29	Lesser scaup	3.3
38	Mallard duck	3.3
34	Marsh wren	0
36	Mink	9.4
38	Muskrat	3.3
40	Northern water snake	5.9
41	Osprey	5.9
42	Painted turtle	5.9
45	Raccoon	9.4
49	River otter	9.4
52	Snapping turtle	5.9
54	Spotted sandpiper	10.4

T 11 140 F				• • •
Table A12-5.	Sediment Ingestion	Rates (percer	nt of total	ingestion)
	8			

DOCUMENT EPA ARCHIVE SN

Section 12.0

	orms	ther invertebrates	nall mammals	erbivorous vertebrates	mnivorous vertebrates	nall birds	enthic filter feeders	3 Fish	4 Fish	quatic plants	xposed fruits	xposed vegetables	Jrage	rains	oots	lage	bil	ediment	ater	nall herpetofauna
	M	0	S	Η	0	S	B	Ĥ	Ě	Ā	É	Ĥ	Ŧ	Ŀ	R	S	Š	Ň	8	S
Numprey Numreceptor	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
1 Alligator snapping turtle	-999	0	0	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	0	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	0.2
2 American kestrel	0	0.25	0	-999	-999	0	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	0.01	-999	-999	0.02
3 American robin	0.15	0.08	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	0.07	-999	0	-999	-999	-999	0.01	-999	-999	-999
4 American woodcock	0.6	0.01	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	0	-999	-999	-999	0.01	-999	-999	-999
5 Bald eagle	-999	0	0.1	0	0	0.02	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	0.01	-999	-999	0
6 Beaver	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	0.2	-999	0.01	-999	0.01	-999	-999	-999
7 Belted kingfisher	-999	0.2	0	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	0	-999	-999	-999	0.01	-999	-999	0
8 Black bear	-999	0.3	0.01	0	0	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	0.3	0	0.05	-999	0	0	0.01	-999	-999	0
9 Black-tailed jackrabbit	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	0.9	-999	-999	-999	0.01	-999	-999	-999
10 Bullfrog	-999	0.1	0	-999	-999	0	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	0	-999	-999	-999	0.01	-999	-999	0.05
11 Burrowing owl	-999	0.01	0.09	-999	-999	0	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	0.01	-999	-999	0
12 Canada goose	-999	0	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	0.2	0.2	0	0.2	0.01	-999	-999	-999
13 Cerulean warbler	-999	0.95	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	0.01	-999	-999	-999
14 Cooper's hawk	-999	-999	0.15	-999	-999	0.29	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	0.01	-999	-999	-999
15 Coyote	-999	0.01	0.05	0	0	0.03	-999	-999	-999	-999	0.05	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	0.01	-999	-999	0
16 Deer mouse	-999	0.07	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	0.01	0	0	0.12	-999	-999	0.01	-999	-999	-999
17 Eastern box turtle	0.03	0.08	0	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	0.05	0	0.13	-999	-999	-999	0.01	-999	-999	0
18 Eastern cottontail	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	0.17	-999	-999	0	0.01	-999	-999	-999
19 Eastern newt	0	0.1	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	0.05
20 Flatwoods salamander	-999	0.95	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	0.01	-999	-999	-999
21 Gopher frog	-999	0	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	0.01	-999	-999	0
22 Great Basin pocket mouse	-999	0.2	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	0	0.2	-999	-999	0.01	-999	-999	-999

 Table B12-1a.
 Minimum Prey Preferences in Terrestrial Habitats (percent of diet)

(continued)

Ecological Exposure Factors

12-31

SN

	12-	
_	32	
~		
		22 Careet 1 lass 1
U		23 Great blue r
		24 Green Irog
\mathbf{U}		25 Green heron
		20 Herring gui
_		27 Kit IOX 28 Least week
		20 Least wease 29 Lesser scam
-		30 Little brown
>		31 Loggerhead
		32 Long-tailed
		33 Mallard duc
_		34 Marsh wren
\mathbf{O}		35 Meadow vo
\sim		36 Mink
		37 Mule deer
-		38 Muskrat
		39 Northern bo
		40 Northern wa
		41 Osprey
		42 Painted turt
		43 Pine vole
•••		44 Prairie vole
		45 Raccoon

					1	able	D12-1	la. (l	onun	ucu)										
	Worms	Other invertebrates	Small mammals	Herbivorous vertebrates	Omnivorous vertebrates	Small birds	Benthic filter feeders	T3 Fish	T4 Fish	Aquatic plants	Exposed fruits	Exposed vegetables	Forage	Grains	Roots	Silage	Soil	Sediment	Water	Small herpetofauna
23 Great blue heron	-999	0.02	0.03	-999	-999	0	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	0.01	-999	-999	-999	0.01	-999	-999	0.04
24 Green frog	0.15	0.02	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	0.01	-999	-999	-999	0.01	-999	-999	0
25 Green heron	0	0.01	0	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	0	-999	-999	-999	0.01	-999	-999	0.01
26 Herring gull	0	0.1	0.05	-999	-999	0.01	-999	-999	-999	-999	0	-999	0	-999	-999	-999	0.01	-999	-999	0
27 Kit fox	-999	0	0.25	0.2	0.2	0	-999	-999	-999	-999	0	-999	0	-999	-999	-999	0.01	-999	-999	0
28 Least weasel	-999	0	0.5	-999	-999	0	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	0.01	-999	-999	-999
29 Lesser scaup	-999	0.1	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	0	-999	0	0.1	-999	-999	0.01	-999	-999	-999
30 Little brown bat	-999	0.95	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999
31 Loggerhead shrike	-999	0.24	0.28	-999	-999	0.28	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	0.01	-999	-999	0
32 Long-tailed weasel	0	0	0.14	0	0	0	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	0.01	-999	-999	-999
33 Mallard duck	-999	0.1	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	0	-999	0	0.5	0	0	0.01	-999	-999	-999
34 Marsh wren	-999	0.95	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	0.01	-999	-999	-999
35 Meadow vole	-999	0.01	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	0.01	0	0.5	0	0.01	0	0.01	-999	-999	-999
36 Mink	-999	0	0.1	0.1	-999	0	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	0.01	-999	-999	0.02
37 Mule deer	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	0.1	0	0.5	0	-999	0	0.01	-999	-999	-999
38 Muskrat	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	0	0.02	0	0	-999	0.01	-999	-999	0
39 Northern bobwhite	-999	0	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	0	-999	0	0.21	-999	-999	0.01	-999	-999	-999
40 Northern water snake	-999	0	0	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	0.14
41 Osprey	-999	-999	0	-999	-999	0	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	0.01	-999	-999	0
42 Painted turtle	-999	0	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	0.01	-999	-999	-999
43 Pine vole	-999	0	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	0	0	0.25	0	0.25	-999	0.01	-999	-999	-999
44 Prairie vole	-999	0	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	0	0	0.5	0	0.1	-999	0.01	-999	-999	-999
45 Raccoon	0	0	0	-999	-999	0	-999	-999	-999	-999	0.25	-999	0.1	0	0	0	0.01	-999	-999	0
46 Racer	-999	0.1	0.1	-999	-999	0	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	0.01	-999	-999	0.1
47 Red fox	-999	0	0.1	0	0	0	-999	-999	-999	-999	0.1	-999	0	-999	-999	-999	0.01	-999	-999	-999
48 Red-tailed hawk	0	0	0.1	0	0	0	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	0.01	-999	-999	0

Table R12-19 (continued)

Ecological Exposure Factors 0

(continued)

Table B12-1a. (continued)

	Worms	Other invertebrates	Small mammals	Herbivorous vertebrates	Omnivorous vertebrates	Small birds	Benthic filter feeders	T3 Fish	T4 Fish	Aquatic plants	Exposed fruits	Exposed vegetables	Forage	Grains	Roots	Silage	Soil	Sediment	Water	Small herpetofauna
49 River otter	-999	0	0	-999	-999	0	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	0.01	-999	-999	0
50 Short-tailed shrew	0.25	0.1	0	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	0	0	-999	-999	-999	-999	0.01	-999	-999	-999
51 Short-tailed weasel	-999	0	0.5	-999	-999	0	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	0.01	-999	-999	0
52 Snapping turtle	0	0.1	0	-999	-999	0	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	0.01	-999	-999	0
53 Southern hognose snake	-999	-999	0	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	0.01	-999	-999	0.5
54 Spotted sandpiper	-999	0.5	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	0.01	-999	-999	-999
55 Tree swallow	-999	0.5	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	0	-999	0	-999	-999	-999	0.01	-999	-999	-999
56 Western meadowlark	-999	0.5	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	0	-999	-999	0.01	-999	-999	-999
57 White-tailed deer	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	0.1	0	0.5	0	-999	0	0.01	-999	-999	-999

-999 denotes a null value. The species does not consume the particular receptor.

12-33

	Worms	Other Invertebrates	Small Mammals	Herbivorous Vertebrates	Omnivorous Vertebrates	Small Birds	Benthic Filter Feeders	T3 Fish	T4 Fish	Aquatic Plants	Exposed Fruits	Exposed Vegetables	Forage	Grains	Roots	Silage	Soil	Sediment	Water	Small Herpetofauna
Numprey	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
lumreceptor																				
1 Alligator Snapping Turtle	-999	0	0	-999	-999	-999	0.2	0.2	0.2	0	0	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	0.01	0.01	0.2
2 American Kestrel	0	0.25	0	-999	-999	0	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	0.01	-999	-999	0.02
3 American Robin	0.15	0.08	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	0.07	-999	0	-999	-999	-999	0.01	-999	-999	-999
4 American Woodcock	0.6	0.01	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	0	-999	-999	-999	0.01	-999	-999	-999
5 Bald Eagle	-999	0	0.1	0	0	0.02	-999	0.25	0.25	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	0.01	0.01	0.01	0
6 Beaver	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	0.1	-999	-999	0.2	-999	0.01	-999	0.01	0.01	0.01	-999
7 Belted Kingfisher	-999	0.2	0	-999	-999	-999	0	0.5	-999	-999	-999	-999	0	-999	-999	-999	0.01	0.01	0.01	0
8 Black Bear	-999	0.3	0.01	0	0	-999	0	0	0	-999	0.3	0	0.05	-999	0	0	0.01	0.01	0.01	0
9 Black-Tailed Jack Rabbit	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	0.9	-999	-999	-999	0.01	-999	-999	-999
10 Bull Frog	-999	0.1	0	-999	-999	0	0.05	0	-999	0	-999	-999	0	-999	-999	-999	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.05
11 Burrowing Owl	-999	0.01	0.09	-999	-999	0	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	0.01	-999	-999	0
12 Canada Goose	-999	0	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	0	-999	-999	0.2	0.2	0	0.2	0.01	0.01	0.01	-999
13 Cerulean Warbler	-999	0.95	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	0.01	-999	-999	-999
14 Cooper's Hawk	-999	-999	0.15	-999	-999	0.29	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	0.01	-999	-999	-999
15 Coyote	-999	0.01	0.05	0	0	0.03	-999	-999	-999	-999	0.05	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	0.01	-999	-999	0
16 Deer Mouse	-999	0.07	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	0.01	0	0	0.12	-999	-999	0.01	-999	-999	-999
17 Eastern Box Turtle	0.03	0.08	0	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	0.05	0	0.13	-999	-999	-999	0.01	-999	-999	0
18 Eastern Cotton Tail	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	0.17	-999	-999	0	0.01	-999	-999	-999
19 Eastern Newt	0	0.1	-999	-999	-999	-999	0	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	0.01	0.01	0.05
20 Flatwoods Salamander	-999	0.95	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	0.01	0.01	0.01	-999
21 Gopher Frog	-999	0	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	0.01	0.01	0.01	0

 Table B12-1b.
 Minimum Prey Preferences in Waterbody Margin and Wetland Habitats (percent of diet)

(continued)

Table B12-1b. (continued)

	Worms	Other Invertebrates	Small Mammals	Herbivorous Vertebrates	Omnivorous Vertebrates	Small Birds	Benthic Filter Feeders	T3 Fish	T4 Fish	Aquatic Plants	Exposed Fruits	Exposed Vegetables	Forage	Grains	Roots	Silage	Soil	Sediment	Water	Small Herpetofauna
22 Great Basin Pocket Mouse	-999	0.2	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	0	0.2	-999	-999	0.01	-999	-999	-999
23 Great Blue Heron	-999	0.02	0.03	-999	-999	0	0	0.05	0.05	0.01	-999	-999	0.01	-999	-999	-999	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.04
24 Green Frog	0.15	0.02	-999	-999	-999	-999	0	0	-999	0.01	-999	-999	0.01	-999	-999	-999	0.01	0.01	0.01	0
25 Green Heron	0	0.01	0	-999	-999	-999	-999	0.4	-999	0	-999	-999	0	-999	-999	-999	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01
26 Herring Gull	0	0.1	0.05	-999	-999	0.01	0.1	0.05	0.05	0	0	-999	0	-999	-999	-999	0.01	0.01	0.01	0
27 Kit Fox	-999	0	0.25	0.2	0.2	0	-999	-999	-999	-999	0	-999	0	-999	-999	-999	0.01	-999	-999	0
28 Least Weasel	-999	0	0.5	-999	-999	0	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	0.01	-999	-999	-999
29 Lesser Scaup	-999	0.1	-999	-999	-999	-999	0	-999	-999	0	0	-999	0	0.1	-999	-999	0.01	0.01	0.01	-999
30 Little Brown Bat	-999	0.95	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999
31 Loggerhead Shrike	-999	0.24	0.28	-999	-999	0.28	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	0.01	-999	-999	0
32 Long-Tailed Weasel	0	0	0.14	0	0	0	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	0.01	-999	-999	-999
33 Mallard Duck	-999	0.1	-999	-999	-999	-999	0	0	-999	0	0	-999	0	0.5	0	0	0.01	0.01	0.01	-999
34 Marsh Wren	-999	0.95	-999	-999	-999	-999	0	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	0.01	-999	0.01	-999
35 Meadow Vole	-999	0.01	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	0.01	0	0.5	0	0.01	0	0.01	-999	-999	-999
36 Mink	-999	0	0.1	0.1	-999	0	-999	0	0	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.02
37 Mule Deer	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	0.1	0	0.5	0	-999	0	0.01	-999	-999	-999
38 Muskrat	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	0	0	-999	0.12	-999	0	0.02	0	0	-999	0.01	0.01	0.01	0
39 Northern Bobwhite	-999	0	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	0	-999	0	0.21	-999	-999	0.01	-999	-999	-999
40 Northern Water Snake	-999	0	0	-999	-999	-999	0	0.5	0.3	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	0.01	0.01	0.14
41 Osprey	-999	-999	0	-999	-999	0	-999	0.25	0.25	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	0.01	0.01	0.01	0
42 Painted Turtle	-999	0	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	0	-999	0.5	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	0.01	0.01	0.01	-999
43 Pine Vole	-999	0	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	0	0	0.25	0	0.25	-999	0.01	-999	-999	-999
44 Prairie Vole	-999	0	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	0	0	0.5	0	0.1	-999	0.01	-999	-999	-999
45 Raccoon	0	0	0	-999	-999	0	0	0	0	-999	0.25	-999	0.1	0	0	0	0.01	0.01	0.01	0
46 Racer	-999	0.1	0.1	-999	-999	0	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	0.01	-999	-999	0.1

(continued)

Ecological Exposure Factors

12-35

Table B12-1b. (continued)

	Worms	Other Invertebrates	Small Mammals	Herbivorous Vertebrates	Omnivorous Vertebrates	Small Birds	Benthic Filter Feeders	T3 Fish	T4 Fish	Aquatic Plants	Exposed Fruits	Exposed Vegetables	Forage	Grains	Roots	Silage	Soil	Sediment	Water	Small Herpetofauna
47 Red Fox	-999	0	0.1	0	0	0	-999	-999	-999	-999	0.1	-999	0	-999	-999	-999	0.01	-999	-999	-999
48 Red-Tailed Hawk	0	0	0.1	0	0	0	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	0.01	-999	-999	0
49 River Otter	-999	0	0	-999	-999	0	0	0.25	0.25	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	0.01	0.01	0.01	0
50 Short-Tailed Shrew	0.25	0.1	0	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	0	0	-999	-999	-999	-999	0.01	-999	-999	-999
51 Short-Tailed Weasel	-999	0	0.5	-999	-999	0	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	0.01	-999	-999	0
52 Snapping Turtle	0	0.1	0	-999	-999	0	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	0.01	0.01	0.01	0
53 Southern Hognose Snake	-999	-999	0	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	0.01	-999	-999	0.5
54 Spotted Sandpiper	-999	0.5	-999	-999	-999	-999	0	0	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	0.01	0.01	0.01	-999
55 Tree Swallow	-999	0.5	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	0	-999	0	-999	-999	-999	0.01	-999	-999	-999
56 Western Meadow Lark	-999	0.5	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	0	-999	-999	0.01	-999	-999	-999
57 White-Tailed Deer	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	-999	0	0.1	0	0.5	0	-999	0	0.01	-999	-999	-999

-999 denotes a null value. The species does not consume the particular receptor.

12-36

DOCUMENT

EPA ARCHIVE

SN

	r																			
	Worms	Other Invertebrates	Small Mammals	Herbivorous Vertebrates	Omnivorous Vertebrates	Small Birds	Benthic Filter Feeders	T3 Fish	T4 Fish	Aquatic Plants	Exposed Fruits	Exposed Vegetables	Forage	Grains	Roots	Silage	Soil	Sediment	Water	Small Herpetofauna
Numprey	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
Jumreceptor																				
1 Alligator snapping turtle	0	0.1	0.1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.8
2 American kestrel	0.05	0.51	0.51	0	0	0.3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.01	0	0	0.49
3 American robin	0.27	0.93	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.92	0	0.24	0	0	0	0.01	0	0	0
4 American woodcock	1	0.16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.11	0	0	0	0.01	0	0	0
5 Bald eagle	0	0.1	0.34	0.34	0.34	0.53	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.01	0	0	0.1
6 Beaver	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.9	0	0.1	0	0.01	0	0	0
7 Belted kingfisher	0	0.71	0.1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.1	0	0	0	0.01	0	0	0.27
8 Black bear	0	0.5	0.1	0.1	0.1	0	0	0	0	0	0.5	0.1	0.3	0	0.05	0.05	0.01	0	0	0.1
9 Black-tailed jack rabbit	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0.01	0	0	0
10 Bull frog	0	0.64	0.1	0	0	0.1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.1	0	0	0	0.01	0	0	0.26
11 Burrowing owl	0	0.9	0.68	0	0	0.1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.01	0	0	0.1
12 Canada goose	0	0.1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0.37	1	0.01	0	0	0
13 Cerulean warbler	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.01	0	0	0
14 Cooper's hawk	0	0	0.71	0	0	0.85	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.01	0	0	0
15 Coyote	0	0.1	0.73	0.2	0.2	0.28	0	0	0	0	0.2	0	0	0	0	0	0.01	0	0	0.1
16 Deer mouse	0	0.58	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.46	0.1	0.41	0.65	0	0	0.01	0	0	0
17 Eastern box turtle	0.6	0.22	0.1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.33	0.1	0.39	0	0	0	0.01	0	0	0.1
18 Eastern cotton tail	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0.25	0.01	0	0	0
19 Eastern newt	0.5	0.87	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.11
20 Flatwoods salamander	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.01	0	0	0
21 Gopher frog	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.01	0	0	1
22 Great basin pocket mouse	0	0.25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.14	0.85	0	0	0.01	0	0	0
23 Great blue heron	0	0.09	0.23	0	0	0.02	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.63	0	0	0	0.01	0	0	0.23
																			(coni	tinued)

Table B12-2a. Maximum Prey Preferences in Terrestrial Habitats (percent of diet)

12-37

12-38

DOCUMENT

ARCHIVE

EPA

SN

_ _____

Table B12-2a. (continued)

	Worms	Other Invertebrates	Small Mammals	Herbivorous Vertebrates	Omnivorous Vertebrates	Small Birds	Benthic Filter Feeders	T3 Fish	T4 Fish	Aquatic Plants	Exposed Fruits	Exposed Vegetables	Forage	Grains	Roots	Silage	Soil	Sediment	Water	Small Herpetofauna
24 Green frog	0.25	0.76	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.11	0	0	0	0.01	0	0	0.04
25 Green heron	0.21	0.84	0.05	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.03	0	0	0	0.01	0	0	0.1
26 Herring gull	0.1	0.38	0.78	0	0	0.3	0	0	0	0	0.1	0	0.16	0	0	0	0.01	0	0	0.02
27 Kit fox	0	0.1	0.94	0.94	0.94	0.1	0	0	0	0	0.1	0	0.1	0	0	0	0.01	0	0	0.1
28 Least weasel	0	0.1	1	0	0	0.1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.01	0	0	0
29 Lesser scaup	0	0.69	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.1	0	0.1	1	0	0	0.01	0	0	0
30 Little brown bat	0	1.2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
31 Loggerhead shrike	0	0.96	0.76	0	0	0.76	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.01	0	0	0.25
32 Long-tailed weasel	0.1	0.1	0.82	0.25	0.25	0.25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.01	0	0	0
33 Mallard duck	0	0.6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.24	0	0.1	1	0.1	0.25	0.01	0	0	0
34 Marsh wren	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.01	0	0	0
35 Meadow vole	0	0.05	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.2	0.1	1	0.25	0.34	0.25	0.01	0	0	0
36 Mink	0	0.63	0.43	0.43	0	0.33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.01	0	0	0.39
37 Mule deer	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.25	0.6	0.94	0.1	0	0.1	0.01	0	0	0
38 Muskrat	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.1	0.81	0.1	0.1	0	0.01	0	0	0.1
39 Northern bobwhite	0	0.36	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.25	0	0.25	0.92	0	0	0.01	0	0	0
40 Northern water snake	0	0.25	0.12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.83
41 Osprey	0	0	1	0	0	0.1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.01	0	0	0.05
42 Painted turtle	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.01	0	0	0
43 Pine vole	0	0.1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.1	0.1	0.96	0.21	0.5	0	0.01	0	0	0
44 Prairie vole	0	0.25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.25	0.1	1	0.25	0.25	0	0.01	0	0	0
45 Raccoon	0.1	0.9	0.35	0	0	0.19	0	0	0	0	0.86	0	0.66	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.01	0	0	0.25
46 Racer	0	0.64	0.62	0	0	0.08	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.01	0	0	0.67
47 Red fox	0	0.25	0.92	0.1	0.1	0.46	0	0	0	0	0.5	0	0.1	0	0	0	0.01	0	0	0
48 Red-tailed hawk	0.1	0.25	0.9	0.25	0.25	0.25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.01	0	0	0.25
																			(con	tinued)

Table B12-2a. (continued)

	Worms	Other Invertebrates	Small Mammals	Herbivorous Vertebrates	Omnivorous Vertebrates	Small Birds	Benthic Filter Feeders	T3 Fish	T4 Fish	Aquatic Plants	Exposed Fruits	Exposed Vegetables	Forage	Grains	Roots	Silage	Soil	Sediment	Water	Small Herpetofauna
49 River otter	0	0.25	0.25	0	0	0.25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.01	0	0	0.25
50 Short-tailed shrew	0.5	0.5	0.1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.1	0.25	0	0	0	0	0.01	0	0	0
51 Short-tailed weasel	0	0.25	0.8	0	0	0.25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.01	0	0	0.25
52 Snapping turtle	0.1	0.25	0.25	0	0	0.1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.01	0	0	0.45
53 Southern hognose snake	0	0	0.25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.01	0	0	1
54 Spotted sandpiper	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.01	0	0	0
55 Tree swallow	0	0.78	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.25	0	0.25	0	0	0	0.01	0	0	0
56 Western meadow lark	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.25	0	0	0.01	0	0	0
57 White-tailed deer	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.4	0.25	1	0.78	0	0.78	0.01	0	0	0

Shaded values are not real values; they were entered to make the sum of the MaxPreyPref greater than1.

The species for which these values were entered do not occur in these (terrestrial) habitats, and were used as placeholders in this table. The little brown bat does occur in terrestrial habitats but eats only one prey item (invertebrates).

0 denotes a null value. The species does not consume the particular prey item.

-

12-39

DOCUMENT ARCHIVE EPA SN

12-40

	Worms	Other Invertebrates	Small Mammals	Herbivorous Vertebrates	Omnivorous Vertebrates	Small Birds	Benthic Filter Feeders	T3 Fish	T4 Fish	Aquatic Plants	Exposed Fruits	Exposed Vegetables	Forage	Grains	Roots	Silage	Soil	Sediment	Water	Small Herpetofauna
Numprey	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
Numreceptor																				
1 Alligator snapping turtle	0	0.1	0.1	0	0	0	0.6	0.6	0.6	0.2	0.2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.01	0.01	0.6
2 American kestrel	0.05	0.51	0.51	0	0	0.3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.01	0	0	0.49
3 American robin	0.27	0.93	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.92	0	0.24	0	0	0	0.01	0	0	0
4 American woodcock	1	0.16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.11	0	0	0	0.01	0	0	0
5 Bald eagle	0	0.1	0.34	0.34	0.34	0.53	0	0.74	0.74	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.1
6 Beaver	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.9	0	0	0.9	0	0.1	0	0.01	0.01	0.01	0
7 Belted kingfisher	0	0.41	0.1	0	0	0	0.1	1	0	0	0	0	0.1	0	0	0	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.27
8 Black bear	0	0.5	0.1	0.1	0.1	0	0.05	0.3	0.3	0	0.5	0.1	0.3	0	0.05	0.05	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.1
9 Black-tailed jackrabbit	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0.01	0	0	0
10 Bull frog	0	0.64	0.1	0	0	0.1	0.2	0.1	0	0.1	0	0	0.1	0	0	0	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.26
11 Burrowing owl	0	0.9	0.68	0	0	0.1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.01	0	0	0.1
12 Canada goose	0	0.1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.2	0	0	1	1	0.37	1	0.01	0.01	0.01	0
13 Cerulean warbler	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.01	0	0	0
14 Cooper's hawk	0	0	0.71	0	0	0.85	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.01	0	0	0
15 Coyote	0	0.1	0.73	0.2	0.2	0.28	0	0	0	0	0.2	0	0	0	0	0	0.01	0	0	0.1
16 Deer mouse	0	0.58	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.46	0.1	0.41	0.65	0	0	0.01	0	0	0
17 Eastern box turtle	0.6	0.22	0.1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.33	0.1	0.39	0	0	0	0.01	0	0	0.1
18 Eastern cottontail rabbit	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0.25	0.01	0	0	0
19 Eastern newt	0.5	0.87	0	0	0	0	0.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.01	0.01	0.11
20 Flatwoods salamander	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.01	0.01	0.01	0
21 Gopher frog	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.01	0.01	0.01	1
22 Great basin pocket mouse	0	0.25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.14	0.85	0	0	0.01	0	0	0
23 Great blue heron	0	0.09	0.23	0	0	0.02	0.09	0.98	0.98	0.33	0	0	0.33	0	0	0	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.23

Table B12-2b. Maximum Prey Preferences in Waterbody Margin and Wetland Habitats (percent of diet)

Ecological Exposure Factors

Table B12-2b. (continued)

	Worms	Other Invertebrates	Small Mammals	Herbivorous Vertebrates	Omnivorous Vertebrates	Small Birds	Benthic Filter Feeders	T3 Fish	T4 Fish	Aquatic Plants	Exposed Fruits	Exposed Vegetables	Forage	Grains	Roots	Silage	Soil	Sediment	Water	Small Herpetofauna
24 Green frog	0.25	0.46	0	0	0	0	0.07	0.07	0	0.11	0	0	0.11	0	0	0	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.04
25 Green heron	0.21	0.24	0.05	0	0	0	0	0.9	0	0.03	0	0	0.03	0	0	0	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.1
26 Herring gull	0.1	0.38	0.78	0	0	0.3	0.38	0.73	0.73	0.16	0.1	0	0.16	0	0	0	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.02
27 Kit fox	0	0.1	0.94	0.94	0.94	0.1	0	0	0	0	0.1	0	0.1	0	0	0	0.01	0	0	0.1
28 Least weasel	0	0.1	1	0	0	0.1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.01	0	0	0
29 Lesser scaup	0	0.69	0	0	0	0	0.25	0	0	0.1	0.1	0	0.1	1	0	0	0.01	0.01	0.01	0
30 Little brown bat	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
31 Loggerhead shrike	0	0.96	0.76	0	0	0.76	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.01	0	0	0.25
32 Long-tailed weasel	0.1	0.1	0.82	0.25	0.25	0.25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.01	0	0	0
33 Mallard duck	0	0.6	0	0	0	0	0.1	0.1	0	0.1	0.24	0	0.1	1	0.1	0.25	0.01	0.01	0.01	0
34 Marsh wren	0	1	0	0	0	0	0.05	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.01	0	0.01	0
35 Meadow vole	0	0.05	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.2	0.1	1	0.25	0.34	0.25	0.01	0	0	0
36 Mink	0	0.63	0.43	0.43	0	0.33	0	0.9	0.9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.39
37 Mule deer	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.25	0.6	0.94	0.1	0	0.1	0.01	0	0	0
38 Muskrat	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.5	0.1	0	0.91	0	0.1	0.81	0.1	0.1	0	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.1
39 Northern bobwhite	0	0.36	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.25	0	0.25	0.92	0	0	0.01	0	0	0
40 Northern water snake	0	0.25	0.12	0	0	0	0.05	0.75	0.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.01	0.01	0.53
41 Osprey	0	0	0.05	0	0	0.1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.05
42 Painted turtle	0	0.25	0	0	0	0	0	0.13	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.01	0.01	0.01	0
43 Pine vole	0	0.1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.1	0.1	0.96	0.21	0.5	0	0.01	0	0	0
44 Prairie vole	0	0.25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.25	0.1	1	0.25	0.25	0	0.01	0	0	0
45 Raccoon	0.1	0.9	0.35	0	0	0.19	0.25	0.23	0.23	0	0.86	0	0.66	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.25
46 Racer	0	0.64	0.62	0	0	0.08	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.01	0	0	0.67
47 Red fox	0	0.25	0.92	0.1	0.1	0.46	0	0	0	0	0.5	0	0.1	0	0	0	0.01	0	0	0
48 Red-tailed hawk	0.1	0.25	0.9	0.25	0.25	0.25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.01	0	0	0.25

Ecological Exposure Factors

Table B12-2b. (continued)

	Worms	Other Invertebrates	Small Mammals	Herbivorous Vertebrates	Omnivorous Vertebrates	Small Birds	Benthic Filter Feeders	T3 Fish	T4 Fish	Aquatic Plants	Exposed Fruits	Exposed Vegetables	Forage	Grains	Roots	Silage	Soil	Sediment	Water	Small Herpetofauna
49 River otter	0	0.25	0.25	0	0	0.25	0.1	0.94	0.94	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.25
50 Short-tailed shrew	0.5	0.5	0.1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.1	0.25	0	0	0	0	0.01	0	0	0
51 Short-tailed weasel	0	0.25	0.8	0	0	0.25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.01	0	0	0.25
52 Snapping turtle	0.1	0.25	0.25	0	0	0.1	0.25	0.84	0.84	0.25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.25
53 Southern hognose snake	0	0	0.25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.01	0	0	1
54 Spotted sandpiper	0	1	0	0	0	0	0.25	0.25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.01	0.01	0.01	0
55 Tree swallow	0	0.78	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.25	0	0.25	0	0	0	0.01	0	0	0
56 Western meadowlark	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.25	0	0	0.01	0	0	0
57 White-tailed deer	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.25	0.4	0.25	1	0.78	0	0.78	0.01	0	0	0

 \ast 0 denotes a null value. The species does not consume the particular prey item.

Receptor Index	Receptor Species	Home Range (min) m ²	Home Range (max)m ²	Home Range (midpt) m ²
Receptor muck	Bin 1 :hr =/<100.000 m^2	(11111) 111	(mux)m	(intept) in
19	Eastern newt	28	153	91
20	Flatwoods salamander	100	100	100
21	Gopher frog ¹	7	200	104
24	Green frog	7	200	104
10	Bullfrog	1	400	201
35	Meadow vole	2	830	416
44	Prairie vole	73	980	527
16	Deer mouse	140	1,280	710
38	Muskrat	480	1,700	1,090
28	Least weasel	8,000	8,000	8,000
34	Marsh wren	156	2,600	1,378
54	Spotted sandpiper	2,500	2,500	2,500
30	Little brown bat	2,549	2,549	2,549
3	American robin	1,100	8,400	4,750
50	Short-tailed shrew	300	18,000	9,150
22	Great basin pocket mouse	500	24,000	12,250
40	Northern water snake ²	18,000	30,000	24,000
53	Southern hognose snake ²	18,000	30,000	24,000
46	Racer	18,000	30,000	24,000
17	Eastern box turtle	4,600	52,000	28,300
43	Pine vole	310	68,800	34,555
18	Eastern cottontail rabbit	8,000	78,000	43,000
42	Painted turtle ³	2,400	83,800	43,100
52	Snapping turtle	2,400	83,800	43,100
7	Belted kingfisher ⁴	6,000	84,000	45,000
25	Green heron ⁴	6,000	84,000	45,000
31	Loggerhead shrike ⁴	6,000	84,000	45,000
23	Great blue heron	6,000	84,000	45,000
56	Western meadowlark	12,000	130,000	71,000
	Bin 2: hr >100,000 and <1 millio	on m ²		
39	Northern bobwhite	36,000	186,000	111,000
51	Short-tailed weasel	20,000	250,000	135,000
6	Beaver	164,084	164,084	164,084
9	Black-tailed jackrabbit	162,000	202,000	182,000
13	Cerulean warbler ⁵	20,000	600,000	310,000
55	Tree swallow	20,000	600,000	310,000
32	Long-tailed weasel	50,000	1,210,000	630,000
4	American woodcock	3,000	1,712,000	857,500
29	Lesser scaup	890,000	890,000	890,000
				(continued)

Table C12-1. Receptor Home Ranges and Bins

12-43

Receptor Index	Receptor Species	Home Range (min) m ²	Home Range (max)m ²	Home Range (midpt) m ²
	Bin 3: hr = or >1 million and <10 million m ²			
11	Burrowing owl	400	4,810,000	2,405,200
2	American kestrel	97,000	5,000,000	2,548,500
57	White-tailed deer	590,000	8,040,000	4,315,000
33	Mallard duck	380,000	14,400,000	7,390,000
27	Kit fox	2,600,000	13,700,000	8,150,000
14	Cooper's hawk	180,000	18,000,000	9,090,000
	Bin 4: hr >10 million m ²			
37	Mule deer	1,286,800	21,227,200	11,257,000
48	Red-tailed hawk	600,000	24,650,000	12,625,000
47	Red fox	570,000	34,200,000	17,385,000
26	Herring gull ⁶	18,300,000	18,800,000	18,550,000
41	Osprey ⁶	18,300,000	18,800,000	18,550,000
5	Bald eagle	18,300,000	18,800,000	18,550,000
1	Alligator snapping turtle	180,000	38,480,000	19,330,000
45	Raccoon	53,000	49,460,000	24,756,500
36	Mink	78,000	78,540,000	39,309,000
15	Coyote	14,300,000	68,000,000	41,150,000
8	Black bear	79	177,000,000	88,500,040
12	Canada goose	1,800,000	1,029,220,000	515,510,000
49	River otter	2,950,000	19,113,450,000	9,558,200,000

Table C12-1. (continued)

¹ no data available. Home range data for the green frog used.

² no data available. Home range data for the racer used.

³ no data available. Home range data for the snapping turtle used.

⁴ no data available. Home range data for the great blue heron used.

⁵ no data available. Home range data for the tree swallow used.

⁶ no data available. Home range data for the bald eagle used.