

# Contaminated Soils Forum

## Agenda

November 20, 2013; 1:00-5:00 pm

Room 609, Bob Martinez Center

2600 Blair Stone Rd., Tallahassee

Teleconference Number: (888) 670-3525, participant code 887-372-1397

- 1:00 – 1:15 Introductions and Opening Remarks
- General Announcements
  - Jorge Caspary – Director, Division of Waste Management
  - Richard Lewis – Conestoga-Rovers & Associates
- 1:15 – 3:00 Recommendations, Review and Discussion of Topics  
(see Preliminary Topics list below)
- 3:00 – 3:15 Break
- 3:15 – 4:45 Prioritization of Topics and Identification of Workgroups
- 4:45 – 5:00 Date, time and location for next meeting

### Contaminated Soils Forum Preliminary Topics

1. Soil - Direct Exposure
  - a. Need for IC when soils are impacted below two feet.
  - b. Alternatives to 2 feet of fill (e.g., geo-fabric with some soil on top, etc.) – Basically, alternative ways to be protective without an IC on soil (or in conjunction with an IC).
  - c. Arsenic SCTL. This item could be very important to the economy in the next few years, as there is a disconnect between Florida's regulatory levels and those in other neighboring/nearby states and Canada.
  - d. Re-examine individual criteria for substances where SCTL is based on acute toxicity.
2. Background
  - a. Regional anthropogenic and natural background are de facto the same (e.g., chloride in agricultural areas, grappling with PAHs).
  - b. Database of Existing Background Studies for Soil and Groundwater.
  - c. Consideration of alternative statistical options for characterizing background.
  - d. Establishment of consensus statewide or regional definitions of what constitutes background, including for urban sites. This has been an ongoing discussion for years, but it becomes increasingly important as ubiquitous substances like PAHs (e.g., BaP) are singled out for extraordinarily restrictive consideration by EPA (see 2013 BaP Toxicological Review, particularly the new dermal slope factor).
3. Exposure Scenarios
  - a. Guidance for non-default exposure scenarios in RMO III Risk Assessments
    - 1) Default Construction Worker Scenarios / Park / etc.
    - 2) Commercial / Residential non-default scenarios.

- b. Technical and administrative/legal approaches to implementation of 62-780 options for development of risk-based closure at unrestricted use sites with residual levels exceeding default residential SCTLs (e.g., with vs. without an IC).
  - c. Applicability, or lack thereof, of SCTLs to scenarios that fall outside conventional interpretations of the phrase "unrestricted use" (e.g., roadside and right-of-way soils).
4. Toxicity Values and other CTL Revisions
- a. Update toxicity values.
  - b. Consideration of revising Chapter 62-777 values to reflect not only toxicological guidance updated or developed since 2005 but also a probabilistic risk assessment approach to SCTL development. That strategy was employed in the 2008 Chapter 62-302 Baseline Risk Analysis prepared by UF, as well as the recent proposed health-based criteria revisions to 62-302 prepared by the Department. In practice, the discussion should focus on procedures to select the appropriate distributions for use in the Monte Carlo model. Once those distributions have been selected, the actual mechanical generation of the values should be straightforward, if time-consuming.
5. Development of or Revisions to Selected Guidance
- a. Accept selected ITRC Guidances, e.g., ISM, EACO, IDSS, etc.
  - b. Vapor Intrusion Guidance.
  - c. Clarification of FIFRA exemption under CERCLA.
6. Institutional Controls
- a. IC's/regulation for organoleptics and secondary parameters.
7. Surface Water (note the linkage of 62-780, 62-777, soils and water)
- a. Use of the SW standard when the property abuts a surface water body (e.g., 1,4-Dioxane on coast sites)
8. Brownfields
- a. For Brownfields, allowing funding for a non-abutting property that is within the plume.
  - b. Note: This requires a legislative change.