

US EPA ARCHIVE DOCUMENT

Use of Solid-Phase Microextraction (SPME) to Investigate the Pacific Sound Resources Site Cap



Region 10—Ravi Sanga



Seattle District—Mandy Michalsen PhD,
John Wakeman, and Leanna Woods Poon



University of Texas— Danny Reible PhD, Xiaoxia Lu

Objectives



- Illustrate preparation & use of Solid-Phase Microextraction (SPME) technique
- Answer specific questions regarding the remedial cap:
 - Do PAHs in sediment porewater currently exceed Ambient Water Quality Standards (AWQS)?
 - Are there upwelling trends suggesting groundwater advection and future cap failure?
 - What is the nature of cap recontamination, if any?
 - What does porewater imply for benthic toxicity?

Why Measure Porewater?

- To compare near-surface porewater to AWQS, required by Second PSR Five-Year Review that suggested based on increase in NAPL in wells along shoreline could indicate NAPL migration into adjacent Puget Sound
- To determine gradients in cap or in nearshore groundwater zones
- (Procedurally) to ascertain “non-steady state” adjustments for slow-to-uptake PAHs due to diffusion limitation in SPME device
- To gain an understanding of bioavailability of PAHs

Sampling Strategy for PSR (1)


- *Prior Studies:*
 - EPA Diver Survey to ascertain sediment penetration
 - Univ. of Texas (UT) Calibration Study to develop fiber association constants
- Prepare SMPEs in pushpoint devices
 - Use both **1000/1071** μm and **210/230** μm polydimethylsiloxane (PDMS) coated fibers (for nonequilibrium corrections)
 - Confirm fibers are free of PAH
 - Insert into push-point sampler
- Deploy and retrieve SMPEs using divers
- Clip fiber lengths, extract into acetonitrile
- Analyze with HPLC-FD



Solid Phase Microextraction (SPME) Sampler



A) SPME Fiber Close - up



B) Complete SPME Device



C) Insertion into Sediment

Sampling Strategy for PSR (2)

- SPME Deployment


SPME lengths (feet)	# Deployed in Sediment	# Deployed in Surface Water	# of Blanks (shipping and retrieval)
3	15	0	2
2	1	0	0
1	8	3	0

- 7 day equilibration period before recovery


- Subsamples collected immediately – Intervals:

Target Depth (cm)	Sample intervals (cm)
0 – 10	3 – 5 and 5 – 7
10 – 20	13 – 15 and 15 – 17
20 – 24	53 – 55 and 55 – 57
27 - 30	70 – 72 and 72 – 74

Interpretation Logic




Surface Water Sampling Locations




Surface Water LPAH

LPAH in 3 Surface Water-Deployed SPMEs, ng/L, (n=4 for each)




Surface Water HPAH (1)

Fluoranthene & Pyrene in Surface Water Deployed SPMEs (n=4)



Surface Water HPAH (2)


Other HPAHs in Surface Water Deployed SPMES (n=4)




Surface Water Conclusions

- Elliott Bay has higher HPAHs in surface water than a nearby ambient Puget Sound station
- No AWQS were exceeded
 - Elliott Bay surface water results are suitable comparators to the SPME results

Cap SPME Locations




Cap SPME Results Compared to AWQS



Maximum Chrysene Stations: AWQC 18 ng/L


Station 4	Chrysene
depth (cm)	ng/L
Surface Water	0.152
4	0.576
6	0.641
14	0.361
16	0.251
54	0.162
56	3.672
71	0.297
73	0.305



Station 19	Chrysene
depth (cm)	ng/L
Surface Water	0.152
4	10.592
6	3.126
14	3.604
16	2.25


Station 11	Chrysene
depth (cm)	ng/L
Surface Water	0.152
4	5.68
6	0.405
14	0.389
16	6.442
54	0.779
56	0.49
71	0
73	0

Maximum Phenanthrene & Pyrene Stations




LPAH in Station 2

Compared to Surface Water (ng/L)




LPAH in Station 19


Compared to Surface Water (ng/L)




HPAH(1) in Station 2 Compared to Surface Water




HPAH(1) in Station 19 Compared to Surface Water



Four More HPAH in Station 2 Compared to Surface Water



Four More HPAH in Station 19 Compared to Surface Water



Conclusions for PSR Cap

- All compounds below AWQS
 - SPMEs capable of very low levels of resolution
 - Chrysene
 - Maximum concentration at 59% of the AWQS; apparently related to incoming sediment (not deep upwelling)
 - Most other compounds in porewater :
 - 1-4 orders of magnitude below AWQS
 - Surface water was below AWQS
 - Near-surface cap (4 - 6 cm) were higher than surface water but below AWQS
- No *upward* trend
 - Thus, no evidence of a bottom-up contamination
 - Possible top-down contamination pattern from incoming sediment
 - Trend is not critical at this time given the magnitude of dissolved PAH

Why Use Passive Samplers?

Measuring Bioavailability without SPME

- Prediction of toxicity – from EPA (2003) and EPA (2007):
 - Use Equilibrium Partitioning (EqP) to determine concentration
 - Calculate the ratios of individual PAHs to their Final Chronic Values (“Toxicity Units”, TU)
 - Add these to determine Σ TU
 - Compare to a Σ TU of 1.0 – the probable effect level using the narcosis model
- Caveats:
 - EqP overestimates toxicity by c 100x.
 - Also, “black carbon” adjusted EqP tends to underpredict toxicity (Gschwend, et al. 2010)

Why Use Passive Samplers?

Measuring Bioavailability with SPME

- SPME measures porewater directly
 - SPMEs are better benthic toxicity estimators than bulk sediment PAH
 - Usually, results are within a factor of 2, as opposed to 100 for EqP alone
- Total Toxicity of all surface stations are far below 1.0
 - Stations with highest sediment surface concentrations evaluated on next slide
- Other passive samplers are quite comparable to SPME (the main differences are the logistics of deployment – SPME are better for penetrating a cap)

Toxicity Units Calculation, Stations 2 and 19

<i>Sampler 2, 4 cm</i>	ng/L	FCV	TU	Uncertainty Adjusted TU	<i>Sampler 19, 4 cm</i>	ng/L	FCV	TU	Uncertainty Adjusted TU
Naphthalene	14.792	193500	7.64E-05	7.64E-05	Naphthalene	116.03	193500	6.00E-04	6.00E-04
2-MNP	69.644	72160	9.65E-04	9.65E-04	2-MNP	12.197	72160	1.69E-04	1.69E-04
Fluorene	10.597	39300	2.70E-04	2.70E-04	Fluorene	0	39300	0.00E+00	0.00E+00
Acenaphthene	31.036	306900	1.01E-04	1.01E-04	Acenaphthene	11.865	306900	3.87E-05	3.87E-05
Phenanthrene	134.153	19130	7.01E-03	7.01E-03	Phenanthrene	14.372	19130	7.51E-04	7.51E-04
Anthracene	18.42	20730	8.89E-04	8.89E-04	Anthracene	12.331	20730	5.95E-04	5.95E-04
Fluoranthene	41.794	7109	5.88E-03	5.88E-03	Fluoranthene	57.033	7109	8.02E-03	8.02E-03
Pyrene	23.519	10110	2.33E-03	2.33E-03	Pyrene	31.408	10110	3.11E-03	3.11E-03
Chrysene	4.263	2042	2.09E-03	2.09E-03	Chrysene	10.592	2042	5.19E-03	5.19E-03
B[a]A	1.964	22270	8.82E-05	8.82E-05	B[a]A	3.119	22270	1.40E-04	1.40E-04
B[b]F	4.141	677.4	6.11E-03	1.22E-02	B[b]F	2.355	677.4	3.48E-03	6.95E-03
B[k]F	1.566	641.5	2.44E-03	4.88E-03	B[k]F	0.744	641.5	1.16E-03	2.32E-03
B[a]P	2.02	957.3	2.11E-03	4.22E-03	B[a]P	0.76	957.3	7.94E-04	1.59E-03
TU Sum			0.030	0.041	TU Sum			0.024	0.029

Questions?