## **SCCWRP Annual Report 2013**

## Passive sampling methods for contaminated sediments: Practical guidance for selection, calibration and implementation

Upal Ghosh<sup>1</sup>, Susan Kane Driscoll<sup>2</sup>, Robert M. Burgess<sup>3</sup>, Michiel T. O. Jonker<sup>4</sup>, Danny Reible<sup>5</sup>, Frank Gobas<sup>6</sup>, Yongju Choi<sup>7</sup>, Sabine E. Apitz<sup>8</sup>, Keith A. Maruya<sup>9</sup>, William R. Gala<sup>10</sup>, Munro Mortimer<sup>11</sup> and Chris Beegan<sup>12</sup>

## **ABSTRACT**

This paper provides practical guidance on the use of passive sampling methods (PSMs) that target the freely dissolved concentration ( $C_{free}$ ) for improved exposure assessment of hydrophobic organic chemicals in sediments. Primary considerations for selecting a PSM for a specific application include clear delineation of measurement goals for Cfree, whether laboratory-based "ex-situ" and/ or field-based "in-situ" application is desired, and ultimately which PSM is best suited to fulfill the measurement objectives. Guidelines for proper calibration and validation of PSMs, including use of provisional values for polymer-water partition coefficients, determination of equilibrium status, and confirmation of non-depletive measurement conditions are defined. A case study is described to illustrate how the measurement of  $C_{free}$  afforded by PSMs reduces uncertainty in assessing narcotic toxicity for sediments contaminated with polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons. The paper concludes with a discussion of future research that will improve the quality and robustness of  $C_{free}$  measurements using PSMs, providing a sound scientific basis to support risk assessment and contaminated sediment management decisions.

## **Full Text**

http://ftp.sccwrp.org/pub/download/DOCUMENTS/AnnualReports/2013AnnualReport/ar13 095 114.pdf

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>University of Maryland Baltimore County, Department of Chemical, Biochemical, and Environmental Engineering, Baltimore, MD

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup>Exponent, Maynard, MA

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup>US Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Research and Development, Narragansett, RI

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup>Utrecht University, Institute for Risk Assessment Sciences, Utrecht, The Netherlands

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup>University of Texas, Austin, TX

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup>Simon Fraser University, School of Resource and Environmental Management, Burnaby, Canada

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>7</sup>Stanford University, Department of Civil & Environmental Engineering, Stanford, CA

<sup>8</sup>SEA Environmental Decisions, Ltd., Hertfordshire, UK

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>9</sup>Southern California Coastal Water Research Project, Costa Mesa, CA

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>10</sup>Chevron Energy Technology Company, San Ramon, CA

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>11</sup>The University of Queensland, National Research Centre for Environmental Toxicology, Brisbane, Australia

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>12</sup>California State Water Resources Control Board, Sacramento, CA