The role of assessment criteria in risk assessment

SiLC Annual Forum 29 April 2015





 Typically, risk based contaminant concentrations in soil, groundwater or soil gas/vapour for comparison with measured concentrations to assess risk

Generic assessment criteria (GQRA)

Criteria derived using largely generic assumptions about the characteristics and behaviour of sources, pathways and receptors. These assumptions will be conservative in a defined range of conditions.

Site specific assessment criteria (DQRA) firth consultants

Derivation of assessment criteria

What is the risk of adverse health effects to the receptor?





Assessment criteria = concentration at which: (average daily) exposure = health based guidance value

firth consultants

Available GAC for human health GQRA

- Soil GAC for chronic risks to human health
 - SGV for 10 contaminants
 - CL:AIRE/EIC/AGS GAC for 33 contaminants
 - C4SL for 6 contaminants (+ plans to deliver up to 50 more forthcoming)
 - LQM/CIEH S4UL for 89 contaminants
 - Atkins ATRISK values
 - Other in-house values
- Groundwater GAC for chronic risks to human health from vapour inhalation
 - SoBRA subgroup due for completion this year
- Soil GAC for acute risks to human health

SoBRA subgroup with input from PHE – due for completion this year firth consultants

All within Part 2A Category 4

Soil GAC for chronic risks to human health

	SGV (2009)	EIC GAC (2010)	C4SL (2014)	LQM/CIEH S4UL (2015)
Exposure parameters	As SR3 (2009)	As SR3 (2009)	 As SR3 with some modifications: Reduced dermal exposure frequency (resi) Reduced soil to skin adherence factor (resi) Updated inhalation rates (resi + comm) Decreased produce consumption rates ("top 2 approach") 	 As SR3 with some modifications: Reduced dermal exposure frequency (resi) Reduced soil to skin adherence factor (resi) Updated inhalation rates (resi + comm)
Health based guidance value	Minimal risk HCV	Minimal risk HCV	Low level of toxicological concern (LLTC)	Minimal risk HCV (updated)

Soil GAC for chronic risks to human health – residential land-use

(mg/kg)	SGV	S4UL	C4SL	USEPA Region 9 screening level	CCME
Arsenic	32	37	37	0.67 ^a	12
Benzene	0.33 ^b	0.37 ^b	0.87 ^b	1.2 ^a	2.1 ^c
Benzo(a)pyrene	-	1.1 ^{b,d} - 3.0 ^b	5.0 ^b	0.015 ^a	5.3 ^e
Cadmium	10	11	22	7	10
Chromium VI	4.3	6	21	0.3 ^a	-
Lead	450 ^f	-	200	0.3 – 400 ^g	140

- a. Based on 10⁻⁶ excess lifetime cancer risk (not 10⁻⁵)
- b. 6% SOM
- c. Excluding ingestion of groundwater pathway
- d. BaP as a surrogate marker for genotoxic PAHs
- e. BaP equivalent concentration for all PAHs using total potency equivalents
- f. Withdrawn
- g. Depending on type of lead salt

firth consultants

Uncertainties in GQRA

- Conceptual site model
 - Is CSM adequately defined?
 - Are there suitable GAC available?
 - How well do GAC assumptions fit the site?
- Site measured concentrations
 - Sufficient representative sampling?
 - Sampling/lab accuracy + precision
 - Estimating representative exposure concentration
- How conservative are GAC?
 - Level of conservatism in exposure modelling
- Likelihood and severity of adverse health effects at health based guidance value firth consultants

Ideas for discussion

- Too many tools or not enough?
 - Is there an appetite/need for screening criteria describing different risk levels?
 - Do too many tools cause confusion?
- Factors that most influence risk?
 - How well the site has been characterised
 - Basis of the screening values
 - How these have been utilised
- How to keep GAC up to date?
 - Changes in toxicology