

**Exposure and Human Health Reassessment
of 2,3,7,8-Tetrachlorodibenzo-*p*-Dioxin (TCDD)
and Related Compounds**

Part I: Estimating Exposure to Dioxin-Like Compounds

Volume 3: Site-Specific Assessment Procedures

Exposure Assessment and Risk Characterization Group
National Center for Environmental Assessment - Washington Office
Office of Research and Development
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Washington, DC

DISCLAIMER

This document is a draft. It has not been formally released by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency and should not at this stage be construed to represent Agency policy. Mention of trade names or commercial products does not constitute endorsement or recommendation for use.

CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION	1-1
1.1. BACKGROUND	1-1
1.2. DESCRIPTION OF DIOXIN-LIKE COMPOUNDS	1-2
1.3. TOXICITY EQUIVALENCY FACTORS	1-4
1.4. OVERALL COMMENTS ON THE USE OF VOLUME IV OF THE DIOXIN EXPOSURE DOCUMENT	1-8
1.5. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY OF VOLUME III	1-11
REFERENCES FOR CHAPTER 1	1-45
2. ESTIMATING EXPOSURES AND RISKS	2-1
2.1. INTRODUCTION	2-1
2.2. EXPOSURE EQUATION	2-2
2.3. CANCER AND NON-CANCER RISK ASSESSMENT	2-4
2.3.1. Background Exposure Dose and Body Burden	2-6
2.3.2. The Increment Over Background Concept for Non-Cancer Risk Assessment	2-13
2.3.3. Traditional Agency Cancer Risk Assessment Procedures	2-15
2.3.4. Interpretation of Cancer and Non-Cancer Risk Assessment Results for Dioxin	2-18
2.4. THE TOXIC EQUIVALENCY PROCEDURE	2-19
2.5. PROCEDURE FOR ESTIMATING EXPOSURE	2-20
2.6. STRATEGY FOR DEVISING EXPOSURE SCENARIOS	2-22
2.7. EXPOSURE PATHWAYS AND PARAMETERS	2-26
2.7.1. Soil Related Exposures	2-26
2.7.1.1. <i>Soil Ingestion</i>	2-26
2.7.1.2. <i>Soil Dermal Contact</i>	2-28
2.7.2. Vapor and Dust Inhalation	2-30
2.7.3. Water Ingestion	2-32
2.7.4. Ingestion of Terrestrial Food Products	2-32
2.7.4.1. <i>Derivation of the Contact Fractions for Beef, Milk, Chicken, Eggs,</i> <i>Vegetables, and Fruits</i>	2-35
2.7.4.2. <i>Beef Ingestion</i>	2-37
2.7.4.3. <i>Dairy Ingestion</i>	2-37
2.7.4.4. <i>Chicken Ingestion</i>	2-38
2.7.4.5. <i>Egg Ingestion</i>	2-38
2.7.4.6. <i>Vegetable and Fruit Ingestion</i>	2-38
2.7.5. Fish Ingestion	2-39
REFERENCES FOR CHAPTER 2	2-41

CONTENTS (continued)

3.	EVALUATING ATMOSPHERIC RELEASES OF DIOXIN-LIKE COMPOUNDS FROM COMBUSTION SOURCES	3-1
3.1.	INTRODUCTION	3-1
3.2.	ESTIMATING THE EMISSIONS OF DIOXIN-LIKE COMPOUNDS FROM ANTHROPOGENIC COMBUSTION SOURCES	3-2
3.2.1.	A Strategy for Generating Emission Factors	3-4
3.2.2.	Use of Homologue and Congener-Specific Profiles to Estimate Emission Factors	3-7
3.2.2.1	Using Congener Profiles to Convert Total CDD/F	3-8
3.2.2.2	Estimating Congener-Specific Emissions when no Congener Profiles are Available	3-8
3.2.3.	Estimation of Emissions of Dioxin-Like Compounds from the Hypothetical Incinerator	3-9
3.2.4.	Estimation of the Vapor Phase/Particle Phase Partitioning of Emissions of Dioxin-Like Compounds	3-10
3.2.4.1.	Vapor Phase/Particulate Phase Inferences from Stack Measurements	3-10
3.2.4.2.	Discussion of Vapor/Particle Ratios Derived from Stack Testing Methods	3-13
3.2.4.3.	Vapor/Particle Partitioning of CDD/Fs from Ambient Air Sampling	3-16
3.2.4.4.	Discussion of the Vapor/Particle Partitioning in Ambient Air Sampling Studies	3-23
3.2.4.5.	Junge-Pankow Model of Particle/Gas Distribution in Ambient Air	3-23
3.2.4.6.	Modeling the Vapor/Particle (V/P) Distribution of CDD/Fs ..	3-26
3.2.4.7.	Comparison of Measured and Modeled Vapor/Particle Distributions for CDD/Fs	3-29
3.2.4.8.	Discussion of Monitored and Modeled Results for CDD/Fs ..	3-31
3.2.4.9.	Discussion of Vapor/Particle Partitioning	3-33
3.2.5.	Estimation of the Concentration of Dioxin-Like Compounds in Incineration Ash	3-34
3.3.	AIR DISPERSION/DEPOSITION MODELING OF THE STACK GAS EMISSIONS OF DIOXIN-LIKE COMPOUNDS	3-36
3.3.1.	Basic Physical Principles Used to Estimate Atmospheric Dispersion/Deposition of Stack Emissions	3-37
3.3.2.	Estimation of Dry Surface Deposition Flux	3-39
3.3.3.	Estimation of the Particle Size Distribution in the Stack Emissions ..	3-42
3.3.4.	Estimation of Wet Deposition Flux	3-44
3.3.5.	Using ISCST3 to Model Emissions of Particles and Vapors	3-46

CONTENTS (continued)

3.4.	RESULTS OF THE AIR DISPERSION MODELING OF CONGENER-SPECIFIC EMISSIONS FROM THE HYPOTHETICAL ORGANIC WASTE INCINERATOR	3-47
3.5.	REVIEW OF PROCEDURES FOR ESTIMATING SITE-SPECIFIC IMPACTS FROM A STACK EMISSION SOURCE	3-50
	REFERENCES FOR CHAPTER 3	3-52
4.	ESTIMATING EXPOSURE MEDIA CONCENTRATIONS	4-1
4.1.	INTRODUCTION	4-1
4.2.	BACKGROUND FOR SOLUTION ALGORITHMS	4-1
4.3.	ALGORITHMS FOR THE SOIL CONTAMINATION SOURCE CATEGORY	4-7
4.3.1.	Surface Water and Sediment Contamination	4-8
4.3.2.	Exposure Site Soil Concentrations	4-23
4.3.3.	Vapor- and Particle-Phase Air Concentrations	4-31
4.3.4.	Biota Concentrations	4-41
	4.3.4.1. Fish Concentrations	4-41
	4.3.4.2. Vegetation Concentrations	4-49
	4.3.4.3. Beef and Milk Concentrations	4-69
	4.3.4.4. Chicken and Egg Concentrations	4-78
4.3.5.	Specific Cases of Soil Contamination	4-84
	4.3.5.1. Landfills Receiving Ash from Municipal Waste Incinerators	4-85
	4.3.5.2. Land Application of Sludge from Pulp and Paper Mills	4-92
	4.3.5.3. Sites Studied in the National Dioxin Study	4-95
4.4.	ALGORITHMS FOR THE STACK EMISSION SOURCE CATEGORY	4-97
4.4.1.	Steady-State Soil Concentrations	4-99
4.4.2.	Surface Water Impacts	4-100
4.5.	ALGORITHMS FOR THE EFFLUENT DISCHARGE SOURCE CATEGORY	4-106
	4.5.1. The Simple Dilution Model	4-108
	REFERENCES FOR CHAPTER 4	4-116

CONTENTS (continued)

5.	DEMONSTRATION OF METHODOLOGY	5-1
5.1.	INTRODUCTION	5-1
5.2.	STRATEGIES FOR DEVISING EXPOSURE SCENARIOS	5-2
5.3.	EXAMPLE EXPOSURE SCENARIOS	5-8
5.4.	EXAMPLE COMPOUNDS	5-12
5.5.	SOURCE TERMS	5-13
5.6.	RESULTS	5-19
5.6.1.	Observations Concerning Exposure Media Concentrations	5-20
5.6.2.	Observations Concerning LADD Exposure Estimates	5-27
5.7.	HEALTH RISK DEMONSTRATIONS	5-30
	REFERENCES FOR CHAPTER 5	5-34
6.	USER CONSIDERATIONS	6-1
6.1.	INTRODUCTION	6-1
6.2.	CATEGORIZATION OF METHODOLOGY PARAMETERS	6-1
6.3.	SENSITIVITY ANALYSIS	6-7
6.3.1.	Limitations of the Sensitivity Analysis Exercises	6-7
6.3.2.	Methodology Description and Parameter Assignments	6-10
6.3.3.	Results	6-23
6.3.3.1.	Estimation of Vapor-Phase and Particle-phase Air Concentrations Distant from a Site of Soil Contamination ...	6-23
6.3.3.2.	Estimation of Soil Erosion Impacts to Nearby Sites of Exposure	6-25
6.3.3.3.	Estimation of Soil Erosion Impacts to Nearby Surface Water Bodies	6-27
6.3.3.4.	Vapor-Phase Transfers and Particle-Phase Depositions to Above Ground Vegetation	6-29
6.3.3.5.	Estimation of Below Ground Vegetation Concentrations	6-33
6.3.3.6.	Beef Fat Concentration Estimation in the Soil Contamination and Stack Emission Source Categories	6-34
6.3.3.7.	Impact of Distance from the Stack Emission Source on Concentrations in Soil, Vegetables, and Beef Fat	6-37
6.3.3.8.	Water and Fish Concentrations Resulting from Effluent Discharges	6-38
6.3.3.9.	Water and Fish Concentrations Resulting from Stack Emissions	6-39
6.3.4.	Key Trends from the Sensitivity Analysis Testing	6-40
6.4.	MASS BALANCE CONSIDERATIONS	6-42
	REFERENCES FOR CHAPTER 6	6-48

CONTENTS (continued)

7. MODEL COMPARISONS AND MODEL VALIDATIONS	7-1
7.1. INTRODUCTION	7-1
7.2. MODEL COMPARISON EXERCISES	7-3
7.2.1. Evaluation of Alternative Air-to-Leaf Modeling Approaches	7-3
7.2.1.1. <i>The Field Data</i>	7-4
7.2.1.2. <i>Model Descriptions and Application to the Field Data</i>	7-4
7.2.1.3. <i>Results and Discussion of the Air-to-Leaf Model Comparison Exercise</i>	7-9
7.2.1.4. <i>Literature Comparisons of Air-to-Plant Modeling Approaches</i>	7-14
7.2.2. An Alternate Modeling Approach for Estimating Water Concentrations Given a Steady Input Load from Overland Sources	7-16
7.2.3. Estimating Fish Tissue Concentrations Based on Water Column Concentrations Rather than Bottom Sediment Concentrations	7-19
7.2.4. Other Modeling Approaches and Considerations for Air Concentrations Resulting from Soil Volatilization	7-24
7.2.5. Alternate Models for Estimating Plant Concentrations from Soil Concentrations	7-37
7.2.6. Alternate Modeling Approaches for Estimating Beef and Milk Concentrations	7-40
7.2.7. An Alternate Approach to Vapor/Particle Partitioning in the Air	7-49
7.3. MODEL VALIDATION EXERCISES	7-54
7.3.1. The Impact of Dioxin Soil Contamination to Nearby Soils	7-54
7.3.2. Soil Concentrations and Concurrent Concentrations in Bottom Sediments and Fish	7-57
7.3.3. Other Bottom Sediment Concentration Data	7-61
7.3.4. Data on Water Concentrations of Dioxin-Like Compounds	7-63
7.3.5. Data on Fish Concentrations in the Literature	7-64
7.3.6. Impact of Pulp and Paper Mill Effluent Discharges on Fish Tissue Concentrations	7-67
7.3.7. Air Dispersion and Soil Concentration Modeling Around an Incinerator Known to be Emitting Large Amounts of Dioxins	7-73
7.3.7.1. <i>Modeling Procedures</i>	7-75
7.3.7.2. <i>Results and Discussions</i>	7-82
7.3.7.3. <i>Discussion and Concluding Remarks</i>	7-88
7.3.8. Air-to-Soil and Soil-to-Air Modeling	7-90
7.3.9. Transfer of Dioxins From Soils to Below Ground Vegetables	7-93
7.3.10. Impacts of Contaminated Soils to Vegetation	7-95
7.3.11. Comparison of Measured and Modeled Vapor/Particle Distributions for Semivolatile Compounds Other Than Dioxin	7-100

CONTENTS (continued)

7.3.12. An Update of the Air-to-Beef Model Validation Exercise	7-103
7.3.13. Expansion of the Terrestrial Food Chain Model for Dioxins and Applications to other Foodstuffs in the United Kingdom	7-113
7.3.14. Beef and Milk Fat Concentrations when Soil is the Source of Contamination	7-114
REFERENCES FOR CHAPTER 7	7-116
8. UNCERTAINTY	8-1
8.1. INTRODUCTION	8-1
8.2. A DISCUSSION OF UNCERTAINTY ISSUES ASSOCIATED WITH THE USE OF ISCST3 FOR TRANSPORT AND DISPERSION OF STACK EMITTED CONTAMINANTS	8-3
8.3. UNCERTAINTIES AND VARIABILITIES WITH CHEMICAL-SPECIFIC MODEL PARAMETERS AND ASSUMPTIONS	8-7
8.4. UNCERTAINTIES ASSOCIATED WITH EXPOSURE PATHWAYS	8-11
8.4.1. Lifetime, Body Weights, and Exposure Durations	8-12
8.4.2. Soil Ingestion Exposure	8-13
8.4.3. Soil Dermal Contact Pathway	8-16
8.4.4. Water Ingestion	8-18
8.4.5. Fish Ingestion Exposure	8-19
8.4.6. Vapor and Particle Phase Inhalation Exposures	8-22
8.4.7. Fruit and Vegetable Ingestion	8-26
8.4.8. Ingestion of Terrestrial Animal Food Products Including Beef, Milk, Chicken, and Eggs	8-30
8.5. USE OF PROBABILISTIC TECHNIQUES FOR ASSESSING EXPOSURE TO DIOXIN-LIKE COMPOUNDS	8-33
REFERENCES FOR CHAPTER 8	8-38

TABLES

Table 1-1.	The TEF scheme for I-TEQ _{DF}	1-12
Table 1-2.	The TEF scheme for dioxin-like coplanar PCBs, as determined by the World Health Organization in 1994	1-13
Table 1-3.	The TEF scheme for TEQ _{DFP} -WHO ₉₈	1-14
Table 2-1.	Summary of exposure pathway parameters selected for the demonstration scenarios of Chapter 5	2-45
Table 2-2.	Percent weight losses from preparation of various meats	2-48
Table 3-1.	The number of dioxin-like and total congeners within dioxin, furan, and coplanar PCB homologue groups	3-61
Table 3-2.	Emission factors and average emissions used for the hypothetical incinerator .	3-62
Table 3-3.	Percent distribution of dioxins and furans between vapor-phase (V) and particulate-phase (P) as interpreted by various stack sampling methods (4-D = tetraCDD; 4-F = tetraCDF)	3-63
Table 3-4.	Review of air monitoring data on the percentage of measured dioxins and furans which are in the particle phase (4-D = tetraCDD; 4-F = tetraCDF)	3-65
Table 3-5.	Values of θ , V_T , and TSP in different air regimes	3-66
Table 3-6.	Data for calculation of the liquid subcooled vapor pressure, p°_L , at 20 °C, and final p°_L for the dioxin-like congeners	3-67
Table 3-7.	Particle fractions, ϕ , in four airsheds at 20°C for the dioxin-like congeners . .	3-68
Table 3-8.	Regression parameters slope m and intercept b for Equation (3-5), $\text{Log } K_p = m \text{ Log } p^\circ_L + b$, based on field measurements of particle/gas distributions for CDD/Fs	3-69
Table 3-9.	Comparison of monitored and modeled particulate percentage for CDD/F homologues at 20°C	3-70
Table 3-10.	Factors that influence the dry deposition removal rate in the atmosphere	3-71
Table 3-11.	A summary of dry deposition velocities for particles	3-72
Table 3-12.	Generalized particle size distribution (μm), and proportion of available surface area, in particulate emissions from incineration	3-73
Table 3-13.	Unit wet deposition scavenging coefficients per particle diameter category (micrometers) used in the example ISCST3 analysis, expressed as $1/(\text{sec-mm/hr})$	3-74
Table 3-14.	Emission of CDD/Fs (g/sec) from the hypothetical incinerator	3-75
Table 3-15.	Modeling parameters used in the ISCST3 modeling of CDD/F emissions from the hypothetical incinerator	3-76
Table 3-16.	Predicted average vapor-phase concentrations of CDD/Fs (pg/m^3 ; columns are downwind distance in km)	3-77
Table 3-17.	Predicted average particle-phase concentrations of CDD/Fs (pg/m^3 ; columns are downwind distance in km)	3-78

TABLES (continued)

Table 3-18.	Predicted annual dry deposition of particle-bound CDD/Fs (pg/m ² -yr; columns are downwind distance in km)	3-79
Table 3-19.	Predicted annual wet deposition of particle-bound CDDs/Fs (pg/m ² -yr; columns are downwind distance in km)	3-80
Table 4-1.	Available Biota to Sediment Accumulation Factors, BSAF, for dioxin-like compounds	4-130
Table 4-2.	Available Biota to Sediment Accumulation Factors, BSAF, for PCBs	4-134
Table 4-3.	Data and parameters used to determine the part of the plant concentration which was due to the deposition of particle bound dioxins (see below table for definition of columns).	4-137
Table 4-4.	Development of the B _{vpa} using data of Welsch-Pausch, et al (1995) compared against the B _{vpa} as developed in EPA (1994) (see below table for column definitions)	4-138
Table 4-5.	Ratios of dioxins and furans in milk fat (MF) and body fat (BF) to concentrations in diets of farm animals	4-139
Table 4-6.	Ratios of PCBs in milk fat (MF) and body fat (BF) to concentrations in diets of lactating cows	4-141
Table 4-7.	BCFs for liver, adipose, thigh meat, and eggs calculated from the Cal-EPA experiments	4-142
Table 4-8.	Chicken and egg BCFs for Aroclor mixtures	4-143
Table 4-9.	Ranges of concentrations of PCDDs, PCDFs, and PCBs in municipal waste combustor ash (results in ng/g or ppb; ND = Not detected; NR = not reported; Tr = trace; DL between 0.01 and 0.1 ng/g)	4-144
Table 5-1.	Fate and transport parameters for the dioxin-like congeners demonstrated in this chapter	5-33
Table 5-2.	Summary of key source terms for the background scenarios, 1 and 2	5-35
Table 5-3.	Summary of key source terms for Scenarios 4 and 5, the stack emission demonstration scenarios	5-36
Table 5-4.	WHO ₉₈ -TEQ _{DF} environmental and exposure media concentrations for the background conditions scenarios, #1 and #2, and the stack emissions demonstration scenarios, #4 and #5	5-37
Table 5-5.	Environmental and exposure media concentrations for 2,3,7,8-TCDD ("dioxin"), 2,3,4,7,8-PCDF ("furan") and 2,3,3',4,4',5,5'-HPCB (PCB) for the soil contamination demonstration, scenario #3, and the effluent discharge demonstration, scenario #6 (NA = not applicable)	5-38
Table 5-6.	Individual congener and Toxic Equivalent (WHO ₉₈ -TEQ _{DF}) concentrations for predicted beef concentration for the background high scenario, scenario # 2, and the stack emission high scenario, scenario 5	5-39

TABLES (continued)

Table 5-7.	Lifetime average daily doses, LADD, of Toxic Equivalents (TEQs), for the background scenarios, #1 and #2, and for the stack emission scenarios, #4 and #5	5-40
Table 5-8.	Lifetime average daily doses, LADD, for 2,3,7,8-TCDD ("dioxin"), 2,3,4,7,8-PCDF ("furan") and 2,3,3',4,4',5,5'-HPCB (PCB) for the soil contamination demonstration, scenario #3, and the effluent discharge demonstration, scenario #6	5-42
Table 5-9.	Lifetime Average Daily Doses, LADD, of Toxic Equivalents (WHO ₉₈ -TEQ _{DF}) for exposure pathways evaluated outside of the scenarios for background conditions and stack emissions	5-43
Table 5-10.	Lifetime Average Daily Doses, LADD, of 2,3,7,8-TCDD ("dioxin"), 2,3,4,7,8-PCDF ("furan") and 2,3,3',4,4',5,5'-HPCB ("PCB") for exposure pathways evaluated outside of the scenarios for the soil contamination and the effluent discharge settings	5-44
Table 5-11.	Relative magnitude of all exposure pathways evaluated for the background setting and the stack emission, high exposure scenario setting (see table bottom for notes)	5-45
Table 6-1.	Parameters used to estimate exposure media concentrations for this assessment	6-51
Table 6-2.	Contribution of above ground vegetation concentrations of 2,3,7,8-TCDD from air-to-leaf transfers and particulate depositions	6-59
Table 7-1.	Observed data for the air-to-plant model comparison exercise	7-128
Table 7-2.	Model results comparing the EPA vapor transfer model and the Vapor Deposition Model with the field data for 2,3,7,8-TCDD (concentrations in pg/g dry weight)	7-129
Table 7-3.	Model parameters used in the Hwang and the alternate volatilization models tested in this comparison exercise	7-130
Table 7-4.	Results of model volatilization comparison exercise	7-131
Table 7-5.	Comparison of the derivation of the fraction of sorbed dioxin congener based on the octanol air partition coefficient, K _{oa} , or based on the sub-cooled liquid vapor pressure, as done for this document as described in Chapter 3	7-132
Table 7-6.	Summary of off-site soil contamination from Tier 1 and 2 sites of the National Dioxin Study	7-133
Table 7-7.	Description of soil, sediment, and fish sampling program of dioxin-like compounds undertaken by the Connecticut Department of Environmental Protection	7-134
Table 7-8.	Frequency of non-detects and detection limits for soil, sediment, and fish, for three congeners in the Connecticut Department of Environmental Protection data set	7-138

TABLES (continued)

Table 7-9.	Results for Connecticut Department of Environmental Protection sampling, including soil, sediment and fish concentrations, and the key concentration ratios of sediment to soil and the Biota Sediment Accumulation Factor (BSAF) ratio	7-139
Table 7-10.	Model parameters and results for effluent discharge model validation testing	7-142
Table 7-11.	ISCST3 and soil model input assumptions and parameters	7-148
Table 7-12.	Comparison of observed and modeled total CDD/F concentration increments at the urban monitoring stations	7-149
Table 7-13.	Comparison of observed and modeled homologue and TEQ concentrations at station SE-3 using on-site meteorological data for model input	7-150
Table 7-14.	Results of ISCST3 deposition and soil prediction modeling, comparing measured concentrations for clusters of soil samples with modeled concentrations assuming either the 1992 or the 1994 stack tests	7-151
Table 7-15.	Results of the air-to-soil and soil-to-air model testing	7-152
Table 7-16.	Data and results of the soil to below ground vegetable validation exercise	7-153
Table 7-17.	Summary of plant concentration versus soil concentration data for 2,3,7,8-TCDD	7-154
Table 7-18.	Parameters for the empirical relationship relating the sub-cooled liquid vapor pressure, p°_L , to the particle/gas partition coefficient, K_p , of semivolatile organic compounds (SOC)	7-158
Table 7-19.	Summary of modeling changes from the 1994 air-to-beef model validation exercise to the present update	7-159
Table 7-20.	Comparison of air concentration profiles used in the 1994 air-to-beef model validation compared against the current air profiles	7-160
Table 7-21.	Comparison of predicted leafy vegetation samples of the current, revised validation exercise with the previous predictions of leafy vegetations and several observations in the literature (units are pg/g dry weight)	7-161
Table 7-22.	Results of the 1994 air-to-beef model validation exercise compared against results from the current air-to-beef model validation exercises	7-162
Table 8-1.	Uncertainties associated with the lifetime, body weight, and exposure duration parameters	8-42
Table 8-2.	Uncertainties associated with the soil ingestion pathway	8-43
Table 8-3.	Uncertainties associated with the dermal exposure pathway	8-44
Table 8-4.	Uncertainties associated with the water ingestion pathway	8-45
Table 8-5.	Uncertainties associated with the fish ingestion pathway	8-46
Table 8-6.	Uncertainties and sensitivities associated with estimating vapor and particle-phase air concentrations from contaminated soils	8-47
Table 8-7.	Uncertainties associated with vegetable/ fruit ingestion exposure algorithms	8-49
Table 8-8.	Uncertainties associated with the terrestrial animal food pathways	8-50

TABLES (continued)

Table 8-9.	Distributions for a Monte Carlo exercise which developed soil cleanup levels at residential and industrial sites	8-51
Table 8-10.	Summary of Monte Carlo distributions used in a fish consumption assessment	8-52
Table 8-11.	Summary of Monte Carlo distributions used in food chain study	8-53
Table 8-12.	Summary of parameter distributions used for modeling terrestrial fruits and vegetables for human consumption in a Monte Carlo exercise	8-54

FIGURES

Figure 1-1.	Chemical structure of 2,3,7,8-TCDD and related compounds	1-15
Figure 2-1.	Predicted distributions of and average WHO ₉₈ -TEQ _{DF} concentrations within an adult population for four years: 1965, 1985, 1995, and 2030	2-49
Figure 3-1.	Example of a congener and a homologue profile from a sewage sludge incinerator	3-81
Figure 3-2.	The relationships between the log of liquid sub-cooled vapor pressure, $p_L^{\circ,0}$ and the particle-gas partition coefficient, K_p , (figure (a)), and between p_L° and modeled (as indicated by "J-P" in figure (b)) and measured percent particulate-phase in the ambient air (measurements from Eitzer & Hites (1989))	3-82
Figure 3-3.	Comparison of measured particulate percentages of PCDD/F on a homolog basis to predictions of the Junge-Pankow model as a function of the sub-cooled liquid vapor pressure, p_L° , of the homolog groups	3-83
Figure 4-1.	Diagram of the fate, transport, and transfer relationships for the soil contamination source category	4-145
Figure 4-2.	Diagram of the fate, transport, and transfer relationships for the stack emission source category	4-146
Figure 4-3.	Diagram of the fate, transport, and transfer relationships for the effluent discharge source category	4-147
Figure 4-4.	Watershed delivery ratio, SD_w , as a function of watershed size	4-148
Figure 6-1.	Results of sensitivity analysis of algorithms estimating exposure site vapor phase air concentrations resulting from a distant contaminated soil site	6-60
Figure 6-2.	Results of sensitivity analysis of algorithms estimating exposure site particle phase air concentrations resulting from a distant contaminated soil site	6-61
Figure 6-3.	Results of sensitivity analysis of algorithms estimating exposure site soil concentrations resulting from erosion from a site of soil contamination	6-62
Figure 6-4.	Results of sensitivity analysis of algorithms estimating surface water impacts, including sediment, water, and fish concentrations, resulting from a site of soil contamination	6-63
Figure 6-5.	Results of sensitivity analysis of algorithms estimate above ground vegetation concentrations due to vapor phase transfers	6-64
Figure 6-6.	Results of sensitivity of algorithms estimating above ground vegetation concentrations from deposition of particle-bound dioxins	6-65
Figure 6-7.	Impact of vapor/particle partitioning on vegetation concentrations in the stack emission source category	6-66
Figure 6-8.	Results of sensitivity analysis of algorithms estimating below ground vegetable concentrations in the soil contamination source category	6-67
Figure 6-9.	Results of sensitivity analysis of algorithms estimating beef fat concentrations in the soil contamination source category	6-68
Figure 6-10.	Results of sensitivity analysis of algorithms estimating beef fat concentrations in the stack emission source category	6-69

FIGURES (continued)

Figure 6-11.	Impact of distance from the stack emission source to soil, vegetable, and beef fat concentrations	6-70
Figure 6-12.	Results of sensitivity analysis of algorithms estimating surface water and fish concentrations resulting from effluent discharges	6-71
Figure 6-13.	Results of sensitivity analysis of algorithms estimating surface water and fish concentrations resulting from stack emissions	6-72
Figure 7-1.	Comparison of observed and predicted grass concentrations of dioxin and furan congeners for the EPA and the scavenging models at the rural site. The perfect match of observed and predicted is shown in the dashed observed = predicted line	7-163
Figure 7-2.	Comparison of observed and predicted grass concentrations of dioxin and furan congeners for the EPA and the scavenging models at the industrial site. The perfect match of observed and predicted is shown in the dashed observed = predicted line	7-164
Figure 7-3.	The observed scavenging coefficient (grass concentration over air concentration) calculated from the rural site data	7-165
Figure 7-4.	Comparison of observed and predicted deposition at the rural and industrial sites. The perfect match of observed and predicted is shown in the dashed observed = predicted line	7-166
Figure 7-5.	Schematic of effluent discharge model showing all parameter inputs and observed fish concentrations	7-167
Figure 7-6.	Comparison of predicted and observed fish tissue concentrations for validation of the effluent discharge model	7-168
Figure 7-7.	Site map showing locations of soil and air samples in the vicinity of the Columbus Municipal Solid Waste-To-Energy (CMWSTE, abbreviated WTE above) Facility	7-169
Figure 7-8.	Isoline figures of predicted air concentrations overlain by measured air concentrations of TCDD, OCDD, and TEQ (pg/m ³) when using the “on-site” meteorological data set (sub-figures a, b, and c) and when using the “airport” meteorological data set (sub-figures d, e, and f) . . .	7-170
Figure 7-9.	Isoline figures of predicted soil concentrations of TCDD, OCDD, and TEQ (sub-figures a, d, g) compared against isoline figures of measured soil concentrations using the 1992 stack emission test (sub-figures b, e, and h) and the 1994 stack emission test (sub-figures c, f, and i).	7-171
Figure 7-10.	Comparison of measured and predicted particulate percentages of PAHs in urban and rural air.	7-173
Figure 7-11.	Comparison of measured and predicted particulate percentages of PCBs and organochlorine pesticides in urban and rural air	7-174
Figure 7-12.	Overview of model to predict beef concentrations from air concentrations . .	7-175