

US EPA ARCHIVE DOCUMENT

A Discussion with the FIFRA Scientific Advisory Panel Regarding
the Terrestrial and Aquatic Level II Refined Risk Assessment Models
(Version 2.0)

Meeting Scheduled for
March 30 - April 2, 2004

March 4, 2004

Environmental Fate and Effects Division
Office of Pesticide Programs
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

Acknowledgements¹

Authors:

Refined Risk Assessment Implementation Team

Chair: Ingrid Sunzenauer

Terrestrial Team: Edward Fite (Lead)
Timothy Barry, Office of Economy and Environment
Henry Nelson, Office of Science Policy and Coordination
Edward Odenkirchen
Dirk Young

Aquatic Team: Donna Randall (Lead)
Timothy Barry, Office of Economy and Environment
Marietta Echeverria
Dirk Young

Additional Supporting Team Members: Douglas Urban (Deceased)
Stephanie Irene

Additional Contributors: Christine Hartless
James Carleton

Reviewers:

Steven Bradbury
R. David Jones
James Hetrick
Karen McCormack

¹Scientists identified are in the Environmental Fate and Effects Division, Office of Pesticide Programs unless noted otherwise.

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	
Chapter I. Introduction	1-1
A. Purpose and Organization of Document	1-1
B. History and Goals of Initiative	1-1
C. Overview of Proposed Conceptual Risk Assessment Process	1-3
1. Levels of Refinement	1-3
2. Guidance to Move Between the Levels of Refinement	1-4
Chapter II. Charge to the Panel	2-1
A. Purpose of This Consultation	2-1
B. Questions Regarding the Terrestrial Level II Model (Version 2.0)	2-1
C. Questions Regarding the Aquatic Level II Model (Version 2.0)	2-4
Chapter III. Terrestrial Level II Model	3-1
A. Introduction	3-1
B. General Model Overview	3-2
C. Generic Species	3-5
1. Background	3-5
2. Generic Species Approach	3-6
D. Bimodal Feeding Model	3-9
1. Modeling Approach	3-10
2. Markov Chain Model of On-Field Avian Persistence	3-16
3. Incorporation of the Markov Chain Model into the Level II Algorithm for Avian On-field persistence.	3-17
E. Puddle Model	3-24
1. Background	3-24
2. Model Description	3-24
a. Field Hydrology	3-24
b. Puddle Hydrodynamics	3-25
c. Field Contaminant Hydrology	3-26
d. Puddle Contaminant Hydrodynamics	3-29
3. Summary of Puddle Model Intervals	3-31
4. Parameterization	3-32
5. Future Developments	3-35
F. Model for Inhalation Exposure	3-38
1. General Inhalation Exposure Model	3-38
2. Consideration of Other Agency Approaches in Modeling the Air Concentration	3-40
3. Combining the HWIR Approach with Mass Conservation in a Two-Compartment Equilibrium Model	3-41
4. Parameterization	3-43

5. Scenarios for Consideration of Pesticide Exposure Through Inhalation.....	3-44
6. Relating External Inhalation Dose to Oral Dose Equivalents	3-44
7. Next Steps for Inhalation Exposure Model.....	3-45
a. Examination and Comparison of Alternative Air Concentration Models with Available Air Measurement Data	3-45
b. Sensitivity Analysis	3-46
G. Model for Dermal Exposure	3-46
1. General Dermal Exposure Model	3-46
2. Transfer Coefficient (TC)	3-50
3. Parameterization	3-50
4. Scenarios for Consideration of Pesticide Exposure Through Dermal Exposure.....	3-51
5. Relating External Dermal Dose to Oral Dose Equivalents.....	3-52
6. Sensitivity Analysis	3-53
Chapter IV. The Aquatic Level II Refined Risk Assessment Model (Version 2.0)	4-1
A. Introduction.....	4-1
B. Overview of the Aquatic Level II Assessment Objectives and Model	4-2
1. Objectives	4-2
2. Summary of Aquatic Level II RRA Model.....	4-2
3. Software Package.....	4-7
C. A Varying Volume Water Body Model with Daily Parameter Variations for Pesticide Risk Assessment.....	4-9
1. Introduction.....	4-9
2. Current Ecological Surface Water Scenario and Model.....	4-10
3. Varying Volume Surface Water Body Model (VVWM).....	4-10
a. Solute Holding Capacity Ratio (Θ).....	4-18
b. Effective Littoral Zone Dissipation (Γ_1).....	4-20
3. Effective Benthic Zone Dissipation (Γ_2).....	4-32
a. Benthic hydrolysis (μ_{hydr_2}).....	4-32
b. Benthic Metabolism (μ_{bio_2}).....	4-35
4. Mass Transfer Coefficient (Ω).....	4-35
5. Daily Piecewise Calculations.....	4-38
a. Volume Calculations.....	4-38
6. Daily Initial Pesticide Conditions.....	4-38
7. Analytical Solution	4-39
8. Testing and Comparison of Solution with EXAMS	4-41
9. Summary	4-41
D. Testing and Evaluation	4-45
1. Introduction.....	4-45
2. Methods and Approaches.....	4-45
a. QA/QC Testing	4-45
b. Evaluation of the RRA Level II Exposure Model	4-47
3. Results.....	4-49
a. QA/QC Testing	4-49

b. Evaluation of the RRA Level II Exposure Model	4-54
4. Summary and Conclusions	4-55
E. Development and Evaluation of Scenario-Specific Field Drainage Area and Water Body Size Parameter Conditions	4-63
1. Introduction.....	4-63
2. The Current Standard Surface Water Ecological Exposure Modeling Scenario.....	4-63
3. Sources of DA/VC Ratios and Associated Surface Water Body Dimensions	4-67
4. Development and Evaluation of Field Drainage Area and Water Body Size Conditions for Crop Scenarios.....	4-68
a. Methods.....	4-68
b. Results.....	4-69
5. Proposed Crop Scenario-Specific Field Drainage Area and Water Body Size Parameter Values	4-80
6. Summary and Conclusions	4-91
F. Implementation of a Probabilistic Curve Number Method in the PRZM Runoff Model	4-93
1. Introduction.....	4-93
2. Background.....	4-93
3. Probabilistic Treatments of Curve Number	4-97
4. Continuous Simulation Modeling With the Curve Number	4-99
5. The PRZM 3.12 Method of Curve Number Implementation	4-100
a. Incorporation of a Probabilistic Curve Number into PRZM.....	4-101
b. Example Implementation	4-105
6. Summary and Conclusions	4-106
Chapter V. Next Steps	5-1
A. Finalizing the Level II Models (Version 2.0)	5-1
B. Training	5-1
1. Risk Assessors	5-2
2. Risk Managers	5-2
3. Risk Assessors and Risk Managers	5-2
C. Outreach	5-2
D. Building Partnerships and Future Directions.....	5-3
1. Addressing Uncertainties Related to Effects Characterization.....	5-3
a. Extrapolation Research for Predicting Toxicological Responses.....	5-3
b. Advancing Techniques for Assessing Risk of Pesticides	5-4
2. Addressing Exposure Uncertainties.....	5-4
a. Database of Regional Small Surface Water Body Characteristics	5-5
b. Initial Application Date	5-5
c. Development of Uncertainty and Extrapolation Factors for Metabolism Rate Constants for Use in Modeling.....	5-5
3. Predictions of Population Dynamics.....	5-6
Chapter VI. Bibliography	6-1

Table and Figures

Table 3-1. Generic Species for Level II Assessments	3-9
Table 3-2. Transition probabilities for various combinations of the long-run, on-field probability, π_1 , and Q, the bias factor.	3-23
Table 3-3. List of input parameters for puddle model.	3-33
Table 3-4. A Summary of Mixing Zone Depths from the Literature.....	3-35
Table 3-5. Inhalation model parameters.	3-43
Table 3-6. Dermal model parameters.....	3-51
Table 4-1. Level I and II Aquatic Risk Assessment Exposure Components.....	4-6
Table 4-2. Level I and II Aquatic Risk Assessment Acute Effects Components	4-8
Table 4-3. Parameters and standard values used in the current EXAMS-based model. Parameters are defined in the EXAMS user manual	4-11
Table 4-4. Parameter values for the current EXAMS-based model in terms of the VVWM definitions of the parameters.	4-16
Table 4-5. VVWM parameter equivalents to EXAMS parameters ^(a)	4-17
Table 4-6. Input Parameters for Short-lived Chemical, ChemA, and Long-lived chemical, ChemB	4-48
Table 4-7. Summary of PRZM/EXAMS and PRZM/VVWM Field Area and Water Body Size Variables and Their Values.....	4-48
Table 4-8. Identified Disparities Between the PE4 Shell and the RRA Shell for Generating PRZM Input Files and Any Subsequent Modifications Made to Address Issues.....	4-50
Table 4-9. Identified Incompatibilities of Standard Crop Scenarios and Corresponding Meteorological Files with RRA Shell and Subsequent Modifications Made to Address Issues.....	4-51
Table 4-10. Identified Disparities Between VVWM and EXAMS Static Water Body Model While Holding the Volume of the Water Body in VVWM constant and Equal to the Water Body Volume in EXAMS (20,000 m ³) and Subsequent Modification Made to Address Issues.....	4-52
Table 4-11. Water body volume for a given depth and set surface area of 1 ha (10,000 m ²) ..	4-70
Table 4-12. Field drainage area (ha) for a given water body depth and water body volume. ...	4-70
Table 4-13. Water body surface area for a given initial depth and set water body volume (20,000 m ³).....	4-71
Table 4-14. Field drainage area for a given depth and set water body volume (20000 m ³).....	4-71
Table 4-15. Field drainage area and water body size parameter values for option (1) setting surface area, SA, to 1 ha, (2) setting volume capacity, VC, to 20,000 m ³ , and (3) setting field area, DA, to 10, 20, 40, and 100 ha for crop scenarios CA fruit and FL sugarcane.	4-73

Table 4-16. Field area and water body size parameter values derived by setting field area to 10 ha and setting initial and maximum depth to the minimum, average and maximum of the range in Figure 4-20b for crop scenarios CA fruit and FL sugarcane. 4-73

Table 4-17. Proposed field and water body size parameter values for all standard crop scenarios for the Level II Exposure Model..... 4-81

Table 4-18. Summary of simulated water volume and depth conditions and runoff volume associated with proposed crop scenario-specific conditions. 4-88

Table 4-19. Runoff Curve Numbers for soil cover complexes and soil groups (Antecedent Runoff Condition II and $I_a = 0.2$)..... 4-95

Table 4-20. Relationship of CN_I , CN_{II} and CN_{III} 4-96

Figure 3-1. Conceptual Model 3-4

Figure 3-2. Hypothetical examples of the avian bimodal feeding pattern..... 3-13

Figure 3-3. Examples of the betapert density used in the bimodal feeding pattern model and the range of shapes that it can assume. 3-14

Figure 3-4. Examples of feeding fractions based on bimodal feeding model. 3-15

Figure 3-5. The two-state, first-order Markov chain model for avian persistence. 3-16

Figure 3-6. Region of valid on-field to on-field transitional probability as a function of long-run, on-field probability, π_1 3-19

Figure 3-7. Effect of Q on the shape of the triangle distribution of P_{11} 3-20

Figure 3-8. Change in avian on-field persistence (persistence) as it depends on long-term on-field probability and on Q. 3-21

Figure 3-9. Figures (a), (b), and (c) above illustrate the main features of the Level II bimodal feeding model..... 3-22

Figure 3-10. Depiction of the area that contributes to runoff to the puddle. 3-36

Figure 3-11. Depiction of the hydrologic processes controlling puddle volume 3-37

Figure 3-12. Depiction of the field mixing zone concept. 3-37

Figure 4-1. Flowchart of the Level II Two-Dimensional Monte Carlo Risk Assessment Model..... 4-3

Figure 4-2. Conceptualization of the Varying Volume Water Body Model 4-14

Figure 4-3. Solute holding capacity as a function of K_{oc} for the current (EXAMS-based) model. 4-21

Figure 4-4. Relative solute holding capacity of individual components in the littoral zone. ... 4-22

Figure 4-5. Relative solute holding capacity of individual components in benthic region 4-23

Figure 4-6. Effective half-life of pesticide due to washout in a water body as currently parameterized (1 ha area by 2 m deep). 4-25

Figure 4-7. Effect of Henry's Law Coefficient and wind speed (measured at 6m) on effective volatilization half-life of aqueous phase..... 4-33

Figure 4-8. Effect of Henry's Law Coefficient and temperature on effective volatilization half-life of aqueous phase for the current (EXAMS-based) model. The lack of temperature sensitivity is a result of not considering the effect of temperature on Henry's Law Coefficient. Wind speed = 1 m/s, $MW=100$ 4-34

Figure 4-9. Comparison the volatilization mechanisms of the proposed VVWM and EXAMS for

conditions of pesticide solubility = 100 mg/L, $MW = 100$, vapor pressure = 0.1 torr, $K_{oc} = 1$ mL/g, wind speed = 1 m/s, temperature = 25 °C, and an input mass of 0.02 kg to the littoral zone. 4-42

Figure 4-10. Comparison of proposed VVWM with EXAMS for the conditions of $MW = 100$, solubility = 100 mg/L, vapor pressure of 0.01 torr, aerobic half-life of 10 days, anaerobic half-life of 100 days, K_{oc} of 100 mL/g, wind speed of 1 m/s, temperature of 25 °C, and arbitrarily selected PRZM input fluxes..... 4-43

Figure 4-11. Flow chart of Level II exposure modeling approach compared to Level I..... 4-46

Figure 4-12. RRA shell launched PRZM output compared to PE4 shell launched PRZM output, (a) mass loading in runoff (RFLX) and (b) mass loading in erosion (EFLX). 4-53

Figure 4-13. RRA Level II Exposure model (PRZM/VVWM) output compared to PRZM/EXAMS exposure model where all transformation processes were set to zero except aerobic metabolism, which was set to an 80 day half-life..... 4-56

Figure 4-14. RRA Level II Exposure model (PRZM/VVWM) output compared to PRZM/EXAMS exposure model where all transformation processes were set to zero except benthic metabolism, which was set to an 80 day half-life..... 4-57

Figure 4-15. RRA Level II Exposure model (PRZM/VVWM) output compared to PRZM/EXAMS exposure model where all transformation processes were set to zero except hydrolysis, which was set to an 80 day half-life. 4-58

Figure 4-16. RRA Level II Exposure model (PRZM/VVWM) output compared to PRZM/EXAMS exposure model where all transformation processes were set to zero except photolysis, which was set to an 80 day half-life. 4-59

Figure 4-17. RRA Level II Exposure model (PRZM/VVWM) output compared to PRZM/EXAMS exposure model where all transformation processes were set to zero except volatilization, vapor pressure was set to $1e-4$ torr..... 4-60

Figure 4-18. EXAMS and VVWM simulated daily concentrations for (a) short-lived ChemA and (b) long-lived ChemB and water body volume for CA almond crop scenario. 4-61

Figure 4-19. EXAMS and VVWM simulated daily concentrations for (a) short-lived ChemA and (b) long-lived ChemB and water body volume for FL sugarcane crop scenario. ... 4-62

Figure 4-20. (a) USDA recommended minimum depth of water for a small, permanent surface water supply (e.g., pond) in the U.S. (USDA, 1997). 4-65

Figure 4-21. (a)USDA guidelines for estimating the size of drainage area (in acres) required for each acre-foot of storage in an embankment or pond (USDA, 1997). 4-66

Figure 4-22. The effect of setting water body surface area, initial volume or drainage area on (a) daily concentration and (b) water body volume for ChemB at a semi-arid site corresponding to the CA fruit crop scenario (metfile W93193, DA/VC = 50 acre/acre-ft, $D_0 = D_{max} = 2.4$ m)..... 4-74

Figure 4-23. The effect of varying drainage areas on (a) daily concentration and (b) water body volume for ChemB in semi-arid site corresponding to standard scenario CA fruit (metfile W93193, DA/VC ratio = 50 acre/acre-ft, and $D_0 = D_{max} = 2.4$ m. 4-75

Figure 4-24. The effect of using the minimum (min), average (avg), and maximum (max) initial water body depth (D_0) on daily concentration for (a) ChemA and (b) ChemB and (c) water body volume in semi-arid site corresponding to standard scenario CA fruit, metfile w93193..... 4-78

Figure 4-25. The effect of using the minimum (min), average (avg), and maximum (max) initial water body depth (D0) on daily concentration for (a) ChemA and (b) ChemB and (c) water body volume in humid site corresponding to standard scenario FL sugarcane, metfile w12844. 4-79

Figure 4-26. Comparison of VVWM using standard water body conditions and VVWM using crop scenario-specific water body conditions for (a) ChemA, (b) ChemB, and (c) volume for CA fruit scenario, met w93193. 4-84

Figure 4-27. Comparison of VVWM using the standard water body conditions, and VVWM using the crop scenario-specific water body conditions for (a) ChemA, (b) ChemB and (c) volume for FL sugarcane. 4-86

Figure 4-28. Plot of the curve numbers that represent the 10th and 90th percentile exceedence frequencies for 14 watersheds as presented by Hjelmfelt (1991). 4-98

Figure 4-29. PRZM's relationship of curve number to soil moisture. FC is field capacity, and WP is wilting point. 4-102

Figure 4-30. Curve numbers implied by the data of Wauchope et al. (1999) plotted as a function of soil moisture. 4-103

Figure 4-31. A comparison of curve numbers derived from field data with those generated by the probabilistic curve number and those generated by PRZM. 4-107

Figure 4-32. Curve numbers generated probabilistically and by PRZM shown as a function of soil moisture. 4-108

Figure 4-33. A depiction of the runoff/rainfall relationship of the measured field data and PRZM 3.12 simulated values. 4-109