

HUMAN HEALTH AND ECOLOGICAL RISK ASSESSMENT

**SuperFund Site
Anywhere, USA**

Prepared for

Your Company Inc.

4800 Poplar Avenue
All cities, USA 10004

Prepared by

Word Angel
Document
Design Solutions
Virtual City, USA
www.wordangel.com

Month Day, Year

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF FIGURES	v
LIST OF TABLES.....	v
ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS	vi
1 INTRODUCTION.....	1-1
1.1 SUMMARY OF THE HUMAN HEALTH RISK ASSESSMENT	1-1
1.2 SUMMARY OF THE ECOLOGICAL RISK ASSESSMENT	1-1
1.3 DOCUMENT ORGANIZATION	1-2
1.4 SITE SETTING AND HISTORY	1-2
1.4.1 Operational History – Company	1-3
1.4.2 Operational History – City Dump and Wastewater Treatment Plant..	1-6
1.4.3 Other Site-Related Operations	1-8
1.4.4 Regulatory History	1-8
1.4.5 Remedial Action and Removal Action History	1-8
1.5 RISK ASSESSMENT APPROACH AND APPLICABLE GUIDANCE.....	1-8
1.5.1 Human Health Risk Assessment	1-8
1.5.2 Ecological Risk Assessment.....	1-8
1.6 RISK ASSESSMENT STUDY AREA	1-8
1.7 SOURCES OF ENVIRONMENTAL DATA USED IN THE RISK ASSESSMENT	1-8
1.7.1 Chemicals of Interest	1-8
2 DATA EVALUATION AND SELECTION	2-1
2.1 DATA EVALUATION AND SELECTION CRITERIA	2-2
2.2 RISK ASSESSMENT DATA SELECTION CONSIDERATIONS.....	2-2
2.2.1 Detected Analytical Results.....	2-2
2.2.2 Nondetected Data	2-2
2.2.3 Treatment of Duplicate Samples.....	2-2
2.2.4 Treatment of Split Samples.....	2-2
2.2.5 Treatment of Investigative Samples with Elevated Detection Limits ..	2-2
2.2.6 Additional Considerations	2-2
2.3 FINAL RISK ASSESSMENT DATA SET	2-2
2.4 CHEMICAL MIXTURES	2-2
2.4.1 Dioxins, Furans, and Coplanar PCB Congeners.....	2-2
2.4.2 Polycyclic Aromatic Hydrocarbons	2-2
2.4.3 Polychlorinated Biphenyls.....	2-2
2.5 EVALUATION OF BACKGROUND CONCENTRATIONS	2-3
3 CHEMICAL SOURCES, RELEASE MECHANISMS, AND TRANSPORT	
PATHWAYS.....	3-1
3.1 CHEMICAL SOURCES, RELEASE MECHANISMS AND TRANSPORT	
PATHWAYS.....	3-1
3.1.1 Area A.....	3-1

3.1.2	Area B	3-2
3.2	POTENTIAL EXPOSURE MEDIA	3-3
4	HUMAN HEALTH RISK ASSESSMENT	4-1
4.1	HUMAN HEALTH CONCEPTUAL SITE MODELS	4-2
4.1.1	Demographics and Land Use	4-2
4.1.2	Climate	4-2
4.1.3	Human Health Conceptual Site Model – Area A	4-2
4.1.4	Human Health Conceptual Site Model – Area B.....	4-2
4.2	IDENTIFICATION OF CHEMICALS OF POTENTIAL CONCERN	4-2
4.2.1	Frequency of Detection	4-2
4.2.2	Evaluation of Essential Nutrients	4-2
4.2.3	Selection of Screening Values.....	4-2
4.2.4	Chemicals Retained for the Human Health Risk Assessment.....	4-3
4.3	EXPOSURE ASSESSMENT	4-3
4.3.1	Exposure Pathway Summary – Area A	4-3
4.3.2	Exposure Pathway Summary – Area B.....	4-3
4.3.3	Calculation of Exposure Point Concentrations.....	4-4
4.3.4	Calculation of Intakes – General Approach and Assumptions	4-4
4.3.5	Soil, Dust and Sediment Ingestion	4-5
4.3.6	Dermal Contact with Soil and Sediment	4-6
4.3.7	Inhalation of Airborne Particulates and Vapors.....	4-6
4.3.8	Dermal Contact with Surface Water and Groundwater.....	4-6
4.3.9	Fish Ingestion	4-6
4.3.10	Wild Rice Ingestion.....	4-6
4.4	TOXICITY ASSESSMENT	4-6
4.4.1	Toxicity Values	4-6
4.4.2	Dose Response Assessment for Mixtures of Dioxins, Furans, and Dioxin-Like Coplanar PCBs	4-7
4.4.3	Dose Response Assessment for Mixtures of Carcinogenic PAHs.....	4-8
4.4.4	Naphthalene Toxicity Summary	4-8
4.4.5	Aroclors 1254 and 1260 Toxicity Summary	4-8
4.4.6	Pentachlorophenol Toxicity Summary	4-8
4.4.7	Manganese Toxicity Summary.....	4-8
4.5	RISK CHARACTERIZATION	4-8
4.5.1	Non-cancer Health Effects	4-8
4.5.2	Cancer Risk Estimates	4-8
4.5.3	Risk Characterization for Fish and Wild Rice Consumption Pathways.....	4-8
4.5.4	Background Exposures to Dioxins/Furans.....	4-8
4.5.5	Background Exposures to PAHs	4-9
4.6	UNCERTAINTY ASSESSMENT	4-9
4.6.1	Summary of Uncertainties	4-9
4.6.2	Sensitivity Analysis	4-9

4.7	HHRA SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	4-9
5	ECOLOGICAL RISK ASSESSMENT	5-1
5.1	PROBLEM FORMULATION	5-1
5.1.1	Refining Chemicals of Potential Ecological Concern.....	5-1
5.1.2	Potential Ecological Effects Associated with COPECs	5-2
5.1.3	Ecosystems Potentially at Risk.....	5-2
5.1.4	Ecological Conceptual Site Models and Receptors	5-2
5.1.5	Fate and Transport of Chemicals of Potential Ecological Concern.....	5-2
5.1.6	Exposure Routes and Pathways.....	5-2
5.1.7	Assessment Endpoints and Measure of Exposure and Effects.....	5-2
5.2	ANALYSIS PLAN SUMMARY	5-2
5.2.1	Collection of Site-specific Data.....	5-2
5.2.2	Receptor Groups	5-2
5.2.3	Exposure Characterization	5-2
5.2.4	Effects Characterization	5-3
5.2.5	Risk Characterization	5-3
5.2.6	Summary and Conclusions.....	5-3
5.3	SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS.....	5-3
5.3.1	Analysis Summary.....	5-3
5.3.2	Terrestrial Receptors.....	5-3
5.3.3	Conclusion	5-4
6	REFERENCES	5

Appendix A. Concentrations of Chemicals in Background Reference Areas—Soil

Appendix B. Concentrations of Chemicals in Background Reference Areas—Sediment

Appendix C. Concentrations of Chemicals in Background Reference Areas—Fish

Appendix D. Supporting Information and Calculations for the HHRA

Appendix E. Supporting Information and Calculations for the ERA

LIST OF FIGURES

- Figure 1-1. Example A
- Figure 1-2. Example B
- Figure 1-3. Example C

LIST OF TABLES

- Table 1-1. Example A
- Table 1-2. Example B
- Table 1-3. Example C

ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

2004 UAO	Unilateral Administrative Order, Docket no. V-W-04-C-796, issued on August 11, 2004
95UCL	95 percent upper confidence limit
ACA	ammoniacal copper arsenate
ACH	air changes per hour
ADD	average daily dose
AET	apparent effects threshold
AOC	Administrative Order on Consent
ARAR	applicable or relevant and appropriate requirements
ATSDR	Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry
AVS	acid-volatile sulfide
BaP	benzo[a]pyrene
BaPE	benzo[a]pyrene equivalent
BAF	bioaccumulation factor
BCF	bioconcentration factor
BNSF	Burlington Northern Santa Fe
CalEPA	California Environmental Protection Agency
CCC	Chlorine Chemistry Council
CERCLA	Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act of 1980
Champion	Champion International Corporation
CLP	Contract Laboratory Program
COI	chemical of interest
COPC	chemical of potential concern
COPEC	chemical of potential ecological concern
CSF	cancer slope factor
CSFII	Continuing Survey of Food Intake by Individuals
CSM	conceptual site model
CTE	central tendency estimate
CTR	critical tissue residue
DAD	dermally absorbed dose

1 INTRODUCTION

Lorem ipsum dolor sit amet, consectetur adipiscing elit. Fusce volutpat odio nec mauris. Praesent nunc pede, feugiat ac, varius ut, euismod ut, tellus. Mauris mi. Quisque neque lorem, varius a, tincidunt eget, pretium a, risus. Donec luctus venenatis risus. Proin non pede non libero nonummy sodales. Integer volutpat. Aliquam porttitor fringilla ipsum. Nam sit amet dolor. Cum sociis natoque penatibus et magnis dis parturient montes, nascetur ridiculus mus. In hac habitasse platea dictumst. Integer pede nunc, ornare sit amet, pretium tristique, volutpat in, nisi. Nunc eget purus. Nunc justo. Donec ultricies dictum mi. In vulputate libero in massa. Aliquam euismod sem eget sapien. Morbi tempor quam a quam. Donec venenatis. In rhoncus.

1.1 Summary of the Human Health Risk Assessment

Aliquam laoreet, dolor sit amet molestie posuere, dui tellus hendrerit elit, quis tristique urna urna eget magna. Donec imperdiet nulla eu arcu fringilla molestie. In eu mauris vel ligula dictum feugiat. Maecenas iaculis porttitor nisl. Morbi pharetra pretium mauris. Ut elit mi, pretium ut, ullamcorper at, faucibus ac, leo. Proin tristique aliquam est. Ut tincidunt purus eu lacus. Mauris nulla nibh, euismod ut, sagittis sed, laoreet sit amet, mauris. Proin id nulla nec lorem lobortis dignissim. Etiam ligula. Sed odio augue, gravida id, sodales et, consectetur ut, augue. Nam sit amet nisl at eros iaculis tincidunt. Integer sed lectus. Quisque turpis. Mauris non urna ac arcu posuere lacinia. Aliquam malesuada, urna in laoreet vestibulum, justo nibh consequat tortor, id fringilla mauris lorem eget urna. In faucibus turpis sit amet sem. Nulla molestie porttitor lectus.

1.2 Summary of the Ecological Risk Assessment

Aliquam rutrum, neque ac aliquam sagittis, justo ante ornare turpis, nec sollicitudin pede purus eget nunc. Suspendisse potenti. Duis ligula neque, blandit vitae, malesuada id, consectetur a, arcu. Donec fermentum risus et quam lacinia fermentum. Suspendisse potenti. Phasellus eget libero. Donec dui. Sed metus dolor, elementum nec, euismod non, pulvinar a, dolor. Donec pulvinar mattis neque. Cras rutrum, velit quis fermentum pharetra, sapien ligula ultrices magna, sed dignissim ligula metus quis purus.

1.3 Document Organization

Cras id libero. Suspendisse cursus, ligula aliquam euismod dapibus, turpis urna dictum tortor, facilisis sagittis dolor nunc sed mi. Pellentesque dictum. Aenean condimentum elit id sapien. In porta vestibulum est:

- Section 2. Data Evaluation and Selection
- Section 3. Chemical Sources, Release Mechanisms, and Transport Pathways
- Section 4. Human Health Risk Assessment
- Section 5. Baseline Ecological Risk Assessment
- Section 6. References.

Vestibulum leo augue, dictum ac, venenatis id, posuere ac, neque. Etiam lectus. Aenean arcu tortor, viverra id, convallis eget, nonummy ac, nibh. Mauris tincidunt ligula nec nulla. Sed viverra massa ut ipsum:

- Appendix A. Concentrations of Chemicals in Background Reference Areas—Soil
- Appendix B. Concentrations of Chemicals in Background Reference Areas—Sediment
- Appendix C. Concentrations of Chemicals in Background Reference Areas—Fish
- Appendix D. Supporting Information and Calculations for the HHRA
- Appendix E. Supporting Information and Calculations for the ERA.

1.4 Site Setting and History

Class aptent taciti sociosqu ad litora torquent per conubia nostra, per inceptos hymenaeos. Fusce lacinia augue in ante. Morbi purus felis, cursus in, lacinia quis, vulputate quis, tellus. Nulla sit amet lectus non tellus eleifend blandit. Cras volutpat fermentum leo. Nam eu libero ac turpis euismod malesuada. Donec semper tincidunt ipsum. Nulla ut odio sit amet quam faucibus blandit. Vestibulum et erat at dui sollicitudin auctor. Morbi elementum. Pellentesque quis tellus

1.4.1 Operational History—Company

Nunc sodales, mi at sollicitudin bibendum, nisi neque tincidunt pede, in suscipit mauris quam vel justo. Praesent dapibus, magna ut ultricies fermentum, nunc nunc iaculis risus, ut aliquam est tortor sit amet magna. Suspendisse vel ante. Curabitur pharetra nisl at turpis. In nisi elit, scelerisque eu, congue tempus, eleifend nec, orci. Curabitur semper nonummy tellus. Etiam diam tortor, venenatis in, aliquet id, scelerisque eget, mauris. Nullam tortor mi, lobortis nec, aliquam non, posuere porta, risus.

Donec magna nulla, consectetuer a, venenatis vel, lacinia ac, est. Pellentesque sodales augue ac lectus. Nullam ac felis vitae leo blandit imperdiet. Nunc tempus. Vestibulum euismod lectus nec elit. Nullam semper. Sed dui. Curabitur fringilla. Cras auctor est ac tellus.

Table 1-1. Example A

Column Heading ^a	Column Heading	Column Heading
Data type	0.00	0.00
Data type	0.00	--
Data type	0.00	0.00

Notes: -- = No data available

^a Column headings are centered.

Maecenas non orci eget elit viverra consequat. Proin mattis. Cras tempus. Mauris quis tellus. Fusce ligula sem, suscipit vitae, faucibus id, interdum nec, pede. Mauris ullamcorper sagittis enim. Duis eu orci nec lectus pellentesque fermentum. Etiam lacinia vehicula lectus. Duis eros. Praesent porttitor. Nunc gravida, neque ac rhoncus placerat, tellus leo ultricies arcu, non accumsan orci nisl vitae felis. Duis tincidunt consectetuer dui. Donec adipiscing purus quis velit. Quisque in nunc. Proin ornare sem non ligula. Phasellus mattis ante et dui. Nulla purus nibh, vehicula et, faucibus eu, volutpat vitae, nisi. In elementum lacus facilisis velit. In vestibulum magna. Aliquam id pede et nulla consectetuer scelerisque. Morbi quis nisl in ante consectetuer posuere. Praesent ante augue, cursus eu, consectetuer a, cursus eget, enim. Duis egestas congue justo. Mauris erat. Duis quis orci id velit volutpat sagittis.

Aliquam erat volutpat. Vestibulum quam lectus, tincidunt et, hendrerit eget, pretium vitae, elit. Nulla mattis, lorem sit amet eleifend lobortis, elit nunc congue sem, sed varius leo nisi at diam. Duis ac neque. Phasellus fringilla vestibulum nisi. Vestibulum posuere

luctus orci. Nam lobortis diam at quam. Class aptent taciti sociosqu ad litora torquent per conubia nostra, per inceptos hymenaeos. Aenean pulvinar, dui vel vulputate ultrices, augue nunc interdum urna, ut fringilla purus quam ac sapien. Nullam congue, eros quis pellentesque dapibus, dolor leo bibendum ligula, vitae commodo leo nibh in urna. Class aptent taciti sociosqu ad litora torquent per conubia nostra, per inceptos hymenaeos. Nullam vitae magna. Fusce congue purus et lacus. Etiam sit amet justo.

1.4.1.1 Example Heading 4

Subheading 1 (this is heading 5)

- Style named Dash
- Style named Dash
- Style named Dash
- Style named Dash

Proin ante turpis, volutpat ac, nonummy id, porttitor et, mauris. Nullam quis augue. Aliquam erat volutpat. Nam nunc. Praesent pellentesque ultricies arcu. Lorem ipsum dolor sit amet, consectetur adipiscing elit. Nulla facilisi. Mauris pellentesque est at diam. Cras et erat sit amet ipsum ultrices pharetra. In adipiscing velit eu enim. Donec feugiat orci quis metus.

Subheading 2

1. Style named List Number
2. Style named List Number
3. Style named List Number

In at turpis. Vestibulum tristique ullamcorper arcu. Morbi id dui. Nulla facilisi. Vestibulum ante. Donec ultrices quam ac nibh. Nam neque. Ut tempor scelerisque mi. Donec nisi tortor, semper a, accumsan at, tincidunt eget, ligula. Integer scelerisque mattis justo. Fusce nunc lacus, accumsan et, mattis dignissim, interdum eu, massa.

Nam porttitor. Nulla facilisi. Aliquam erat volutpat. Duis massa. Vestibulum eu leo non nunc sollicitudin commodo. Quisque laoreet lacus sed lacus. Suspendisse volutpat, quam eget ultrices ullamcorper, magna ipsum porttitor mi, et volutpat mi urna vitae dui. Suspendisse gravida dolor at justo. Etiam accumsan fermentum lectus. Curabitur at lectus id arcu scelerisque tristique.

Table 1-2. Example B

Column Heading ^a	Column Heading ^b	Column Heading
Subheading 1	0.00	0.00
Data type	0.00	--
Data type	0.00	0.00
Data type	0.00	0.00
Data type	0.00	--
Data type	0.00	0.00
Subheading 2	0.00	0.00
Data type	0.00	--
Data type	0.00	0.00
Data type	0.00	0.00
Data type	0.00	--
Data type	0.00	0.00
Subheading 3	0.00	0.00
Data type	0.00	--
Data type	0.00	0.00
Data type	0.00	0.00

Notes: -- = No data available

^a Column headings are centered.

^b Heading row and title repeat.

Sed arcu enim, vestibulum quis, consectetuer et, auctor eu, eros. Proin et nibh sit amet ipsum tempor placerat. Nam viverra, diam vel feugiat auctor, eros nulla sodales nisi, sed consectetuer felis augue in ipsum. Phasellus et diam ut lectus pharetra mattis. Maecenas aliquam. Nulla commodo erat ac diam. Etiam nonummy ligula sed nisi. In pellentesque enim nec nibh. Donec sodales. Donec velit. Vivamus commodo tincidunt metus. Integer luctus aliquam risus. Sed vestibulum. Aliquam dolor metus, aliquam vel, pharetra quis, scelerisque eget, mauris.

Proin dui eros, ullamcorper ornare, egestas a, porttitor quis, est. Duis iaculis mi ac lectus. Sed eget neque. Donec blandit diam a quam. Mauris ornare. Aenean eleifend venenatis elit. Proin in risus sit amet tortor blandit lobortis. Quisque rutrum dapibus ligula. Etiam nonummy, massa non rhoncus dapibus, felis nisl consequat odio, sit amet pulvinar ante enim sit amet erat. Aenean dui. Proin placerat adipiscing justo. Maecenas tellus nunc, faucibus eu, pulvinar a, placerat eget, elit. Maecenas ullamcorper pede id nibh. Aliquam rutrum diam at massa. Nulla facilisi.

1.4.2 Operational History—City Dump and Wastewater Treatment Plant

Nulla sodales tellus id risus lobortis blandit. Phasellus id dui. Nulla vulputate neque nec elit. Etiam purus ante, molestie et, adipiscing sed, interdum et, quam. Nam risus mi, rutrum eget, mollis id, nonummy vitae, est. Vestibulum ante ipsum primis in faucibus orci luctus et ultrices posuere cubilia Curae; Etiam a metus venenatis ipsum convallis accumsan. In hac habitasse platea dictumst. Vestibulum ante ipsum primis in faucibus orci luctus et ultrices posuere cubilia Curae; Suspendisse fringilla elit hendrerit tellus. Cum sociis natoque penatibus et magnis dis parturient montes, nascetur ridiculus mus. Phasellus ullamcorper, diam ac adipiscing bibendum, orci elit consectetur mauris, et ultricies pede metus ac turpis. Phasellus pellentesque, ante quis porttitor mollis, lorem turpis porta arcu, sed tempus nibh massa sit amet ligula. In in turpis ut mauris tincidunt rhoncus. Suspendisse faucibus mattis metus. Morbi dapibus enim eu augue. Donec porta mauris in justo. Suspendisse potenti.

Quisque arcu. Fusce egestas, ligula vitae porttitor luctus, neque libero venenatis odio, eu semper enim libero eu nibh. Vivamus aliquet, ligula at sollicitudin rhoncus, sapien pede ultricies est, ac ultrices nunc sem ultricies nulla. Vivamus in sapien vel enim dignissim laoreet. Proin rhoncus enim ac metus sollicitudin facilisis. Vivamus vitae elit. Donec imperdiet, enim quis imperdiet euismod, dolor odio adipiscing enim, a consectetur diam tortor eget nunc. Quisque purus dolor, aliquet quis, aliquet sit amet, molestie nec, urna. Fusce nulla eros, rhoncus et, lacinia in, pretium eu, nulla. Nullam ac eros. Ut tortor neque, venenatis at, aliquam ut, egestas eget, tellus. Quisque sit amet leo.

Table 1-3. Example C

Column Heading ^a	Column Heading ^b	Column Heading	Column Heading ^b	Column Heading	Column Heading ^b	Column Heading
Subheading 1	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Data type	0.00	--	0.00	--	0.00	--
Data type	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Data type	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Data type	0.00	--	0.00	--	0.00	--
Data type	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Subheading 2	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Data type	0.00	--	0.00	--	0.00	--
Data type	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Data type	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Data type	0.00	--	0.00	--	0.00	--
Data type	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Subheading 3	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Data type	0.00	--	0.00	--	0.00	--
Data type	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Data type	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

Notes: -- = No data available

^a Column headings are centered.

^b Heading row and title repeat.

1.4.3 Other Site-Related Operations

1.4.4 Regulatory History

1.4.5 Remedial Action and Removal Action History

1.5 Risk Assessment Approach and Applicable Guidance

1.5.1 Human Health Risk Assessment

1.5.2 Ecological Risk Assessment

1.6 Risk Assessment Study Area

1.7 Sources of Environmental Data Used in the Risk Assessment

1.7.1 Chemicals of Interest

2 DATA EVALUATION AND SELECTION

2.1 Data Evaluation and Selection Criteria

2.2 Risk Assessment Data Selection Considerations

2.2.1 Detected Analytical Results

2.2.2 Nondetected Data

2.2.3 Treatment of Duplicate Samples

2.2.4 Treatment of Split Samples

2.2.5 Treatment of Investigative Samples with Elevated Detection Limits

2.2.6 Additional Considerations

2.2.6.1 2001 and 2004 Sediment Sampling Results

2.2.6.2 2001 LLBO Fish Tissue Data

2.2.6.3 2002 LLBO Fish Tissue Data

2.2.6.4 2004 LLBO Fish Tissue Data

2.2.6.5 Fall 2004 Fish Tissue Data Set—Reconstructed Whole-Body Tissue Concentrations

2.2.6.6 2005 BNSF Removal Action

2.3 Final Risk Assessment Data set

2.4 Chemical Mixtures

2.4.1 Dioxins, Furans, and Coplanar PCB Congeners

2.4.2 Polycyclic Aromatic Hydrocarbons

2.4.3 Polychlorinated Biphenyls

2.5 Evaluation of Background Concentrations

3 CHEMICAL SOURCES, RELEASE MECHANISMS, AND TRANSPORT PATHWAYS

3.1 Chemical Sources, Release Mechanisms and Transport pathways

3.1.1 Area A

- 3.1.1.1 Historical Wastewater Disposal in Onsite Ponds A, B, and C
- 3.1.1.2 Historical Releases of Wood Treating Chemicals to Surface Soils
- 3.1.1.3 Lakehead Crude Oil Pipeline Rupture near BNSF Railroad and Channel Area
- 3.1.1.4 Railroad Operations and Maintenance
- 3.1.1.5 Combustion (Teepee Burners)
- 3.1.1.6 Historical Pesticide Application—USFS
- 3.1.1.7 Aerial Spraying of Zinc-Cadmium Sulfide—U.S. Army
- 3.1.1.8 Global and Regional Point and Nonpoint Sources
- 3.1.1.9 Unconfirmed Waste Disposal Activities
- 3.1.1.10 Potential Chemical Migration to Sediment and Surface Water
- 3.1.1.11 Volatilization
- 3.1.2 Area B**
 - 3.1.2.1 Historical Municipal/Industrial Landfill Use
 - 3.1.2.2 Historical Sludge Disposal and Burning in the City Dump Area
 - 3.1.2.3 Treated Wood Storage, Reported Storage and Release of Soluble Metal Salts, and Reported Sludge and Wastewater Disposal—Southwest Area
 - 3.1.2.4 Historical Effluent Discharge—City POTW
 - 3.1.2.5 Railroad Operations
 - 3.1.2.6 Historical Pesticide Application—Chippewa National Forest
 - 3.1.2.7 Aerial Spraying of Zinc-Cadmium Sulfide—U.S. Army

3.1.2.8 Global and Regional Point and Nonpoint Sources

3.1.2.9 Other Potential Sources

3.1.2.10 Potential Chemical Migration to Sediment and Surface Water

3.1.2.11 Volatilization

3.2 Potential Exposure Media

.

4 HUMAN HEALTH RISK ASSESSMENT

4.1 human health conceptual site models

4.1.1 Demographics and Land Use

4.1.2 Climate

4.1.3 Human Health Conceptual Site Model—Area A

4.1.3.1 Current and Future Residential Exposure Scenario

4.1.3.2 Subsistence or Traditional Tribal Lifeways Consumer Exposure Scenario

4.1.3.3 Current and Future Worker Exposure Scenarios

4.1.3.4 Current Recreational Scenario

4.1.4 Human Health Conceptual Site Model—Area B

4.1.4.1 Subsistence or Traditional Tribal Lifeways Consumer Exposure Scenario

4.1.4.2 Current and Future Worker Exposure Scenarios

4.1.4.3 Current and Future Recreational Scenarios

4.2 identification of chemicals of potential concern

4.2.1 Frequency of Detection

4.2.2 Evaluation of Essential Nutrients

4.2.3 Selection of Screening Values

4.2.3.1 Soil

4.2.3.2 Sediment

4.2.3.3 Surface Water

4.2.3.4 Groundwater

4.2.4 Chemicals Retained for the Human Health Risk Assessment

4.2.4.1 Soil

4.2.4.2 Sediment

4.2.4.3 Surface Water

4.2.4.4 Groundwater

4.3 Exposure Assessment

4.3.1 Exposure Pathway Summary—Area A

4.3.1.1 Standard and Tribal Residential Scenarios

4.3.1.2 Onsite Worker and Trench Worker Scenarios

4.3.1.3 Recreational Scenario

4.3.2 Exposure Pathway Summary—Area B

4.3.2.1 Traditional Tribal Lifeways Scenario

4.3.2.2 Qualitative Evaluation of Pathways Specific to Traditional Tribal Lifeways

Harvest and Consumption of Native Plants

Medicinal Uses of Plants, Animals, and Minerals

Other Uses of Plants, Animals, and Minerals

Sweat Lodge Use

4.3.2.3 Onsite Worker and Trench Worker Scenarios

4.3.2.4 Recreational User Scenario

4.3.3 Calculation of Exposure Point Concentrations

4.3.3.1 Exposure Units

4.3.3.2 Statistical Methods

4.3.3.3 Exposure Point Concentrations Derived through Modeling

Fugitive Dust

Groundwater Vapors in Utility Trench

Model Derivation

Model Input Parameters

4.3.4 Calculation of Intakes—General Approach and Assumptions

4.3.4.1 Exposure Duration

Standard Residential Scenario Exposure Duration

Tribal Residential and Traditional Tribal Lifeways Scenarios Exposure Duration

Worker Scenarios Exposure Duration

Recreational Scenario Exposure Duration

4.3.4.2 Exposure Frequency

Standard and Tribal Residential Scenarios Exposure Frequency

Traditional Tribal Lifeways Scenario Exposure Frequency

Worker Scenarios Exposure Frequency

Recreational Scenario Exposure Frequency

4.3.4.3 Body Weight

4.3.4.4 Averaging Time

4.3.5 Soil, Dust and Sediment Ingestion

4.3.5.1 Soil and Dust Ingestion Rates

Residential and Recreational Scenarios—Child Soil Ingestion

Residential, Recreational, and Onsite Worker Scenarios - Adult Soil Ingestion

Traditional Tribal Lifeways Scenario (Adult and Child) Soil Ingestion

Onsite Utility Worker Soil Ingestion

4.3.5.2 Relative Bioavailability of Chemicals in Soil

4.3.5.3 Fractional Intake

4.3.6 Dermal Contact with Soil and Sediment

4.3.6.1 Skin Surface Area

4.3.6.2 Dermal Absorption Factors

4.3.6.3 Soil Adherence Factor

4.3.6.4 Event Frequency and Fractional Intake for Dermal Contact

4.3.7 Inhalation of Airborne Particulates and Vapors

4.3.7.1 Exposure Time for Inhalation Exposures

4.3.7.2 Inhalation Rate

4.3.8 Dermal Contact with Surface Water and Groundwater

4.3.8.1 Event Duration for Water Contact

4.3.8.2 Skin Surface Area

4.3.9 Fish Ingestion

4.3.9.1 Traditional Tribal Lifeways Scenario – Fish Ingestion Rate

4.3.9.2 Recreational User Scenario—Fish Ingestion Rate

4.3.9.3 All Scenarios—Fractional Intake

4.3.10 Wild Rice Ingestion

4.4 toxicity assessment

4.4.1 Toxicity Values

4.4.1.1 Noncancer Effects

4.4.1.2 Carcinogenic Effects

4.4.1.3 Toxicity Assessment of Mixtures

4.4.2 Dose Response Assessment for Mixtures of Dioxins, Furans, and Dioxin-Like Coplanar PCBs

4.4.2.1 Noncancer Assessment of Dioxins, Furans, and Dioxin-Like Coplanar PCBs

4.4.2.2 History of TCDD Cancer Dose Response Assessment

4.4.2.3 Carcinogenicity Classification for TCDD

4.4.2.4 Cancer Dose-Response Model for TCDD

4.4.2.5 Consideration of Toxicokinetics in TCDD Dose Response Assessment

4.4.2.6 Relative Toxicity of Mixtures of Dioxins, Furans, and Dioxin-Like Coplanar PCBs

TEF Database Issues

TEF Application Issues

4.4.3 Dose Response Assessment for Mixtures of Carcinogenic PAHs

4.4.3.1 Relative Potency Approach for Carcinogenic PAHs

4.4.3.2 Benzo[a]pyrene Toxicity Summary

4.4.4 Naphthalene Toxicity Summary

4.4.5 Aroclors 1254 and 1260 Toxicity Summary

4.4.6 Pentachlorophenol Toxicity Summary

4.4.7 Manganese Toxicity Summary

4.5 Risk Characterization

4.5.1 Non-cancer Health Effects

4.5.1.1 Noncancer Health Hazards for Area A

4.5.1.2 Noncancer Health Hazard for Area B

4.5.2 Cancer Risk Estimates

4.5.2.1 Cancer Risk Estimates for Area A

4.5.2.2 Cancer Risk Estimates for Area B

4.5.3 Risk Characterization for Fish and Wild Rice Consumption Pathways

4.5.3.1 Fish

4.5.3.2 Wild Rice

4.5.4 Background Exposures to Dioxins/Furans

4.5.4.1 Sources of Dioxins/Furans for Human Exposure

Contribution of Dioxins/Furans from Source Releases to Air

Contribution of Dioxins/Furans from Source Releases to Land and Water

Human Intakes of Dioxins/Furans

Background Intakes of Dioxins/Furans

Comparison of Background Intakes to Calculated Site Intakes

4.5.5 Background Exposures to PAHs

4.6 Uncertainty Assessment

4.6.1 Summary of Uncertainties

4.6.1.1 Quantitative Evaluation of Homegrown Produce Consumption Pathway

4.6.1.2 Soil-to-Plant Transfer Pathways

4.6.1.3 Evaluation of Belowground Produce Consumption Pathway

Selection of COPCs and Exposure Locations

Calculation of Belowground Produce EPCs

Model One – (USEPA 2002 Dioxin, 2003 Chpt 4, 2005 Combust)

Model 2 – (Risk Assessment Information System 2005)

Model 3 – (Rideout and Teschke 2005)

Estimation of Potential COPC Intakes Due to Consumption of Homegrown Produce

Results of Homegrown Produce Sensitivity Analysis

Non-Cancer Risks

Cancer Risks

4.6.2 Sensitivity Analysis

4.7 HHRA Summary and Conclusions

5 ECOLOGICAL RISK ASSESSMENT

5.1 Problem Formulation

5.1.1 Refining Chemicals of Potential Ecological Concern

5.1.1.1 Screening Approach

Screening Values and Reference Area Concentrations

Criteria for Designating COPECs

5.1.1.2 Soil Screening Benchmarks and Results

5.1.1.3 Sediment Screening Benchmarks and Results

5.1.1.4 Surface Water Screening Benchmarks and Results

Metals

5.1.1.5 Summary of COPECs

5.1.2 Potential Ecological Effects Associated with COPECs

5.1.3 Ecosystems Potentially at Risk

5.1.3.1 Terrestrial Habitats – Area A

5.1.3.2 Forested Wetland – Area A

5.1.3.3 Terrestrial Habitats – Area B

5.1.3.4 Aquatic Habitats—Area B

5.1.4 Ecological Conceptual Site Models and Receptors

5.1.4.1 Aquatic Receptors

5.1.5 Fate and Transport of Chemicals of Potential Ecological Concern

5.1.6 Exposure Routes and Pathways

5.1.6.1 Exposure Routes—Aquatic

5.1.6.2 Complete Exposure Pathways

5.1.7 Assessment Endpoints and Measure of Exposure and Effects

5.2 Analysis Plan Summary

5.2.1 Collection of Site-specific Data

5.2.2 Receptor Groups

5.2.3 Exposure Characterization

5.2.3.1 Chemicals in Environmental Media

5.2.3.2 Bioaccumulation Bioassays

5.2.4 Effects Characterization

5.2.4.1 Toxicity Testing

5.2.5 Risk Characterization

5.2.5.1 Risk Estimation

5.2.5.2 Extrapolation of Measures of Effects to Assessment Endpoints

5.2.5.3 Uncertainty Analysis

5.2.6 Summary and Conclusions

5.3 Summary and Conclusions

5.3.1 Analysis Summary

5.3.2 Terrestrial Receptors

5.3.2.1 Terrestrial Plant Communities

5.3.2.2 Soil Invertebrate Communities

5.3.2.3 Terrestrial Mammals

5.3.2.4 Terrestrial Birds

5.3.2.5 Aquatic Receptors

Benthic Invertebrate Communities

5.3.2.6 Fish

5.3.2.7 Snapping Turtle

5.3.2.8 Semi-aquatic Mammals

5.3.2.9 Semi-aquatic Birds

5.3.3 Conclusion

6 REFERENCES

- ACS. 2005. Cancer Statistics 2005. A presentation from the American Cancer Society. <http://cancer.org>. Accessed on January 30, 2005. American Cancer Society.
- ATSDR. 1995. Toxicological profile for polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons. <http://www.atsdr.cdc.gov/>. Accessed on September 20, 2005. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Public Health Service, Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry, Atlanta, GA.
- ATSDR. 1998. Toxicological profile for chlorinated dibenzo-*p*-dioxins. <http://www.atsdr.cdc.gov/>. Accessed on May 11, 2005. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Public Health Service, Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry, Atlanta, GA.
- ATSDR. 2000. Toxicological profile for polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs). <http://www.atsdr.cdc.gov/>. Accessed on May 11, 2005. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Public Health Service, Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry, Atlanta, GA.
- ATSDR. 2001a. Guidance for the preparation of an interaction profile. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Public Health Service, Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry, Atlanta, GA.
- ATSDR. 2001b. Guidance manual for the assessment of joint toxic action of chemical mixtures. Final/Technical Report. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Public Health Service, Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry, Atlanta, GA.
- ATSDR. 2003. Draft toxicological profile for naphthalene, 1-methylnaphthalene, 2-methylnaphthalene. <http://www.atsdr.cdc.gov/>. Accessed on May 11, 2005a. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Public Health Service, Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry, Atlanta, GA.
- ATSDR. 2003b. Health consultation, St. Regis Paper Company, Cass Lake, Cass County, Minnesota. EPA Facility ID: MND05759740. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act (CERCLA). U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Public Health Service, Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry, Atlanta, GA. Public Comment Release. August 28, 2003.

ATSDR. 2004. Guidance manual for the assessment of joint toxic action of chemical mixtures. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Public Health Service, Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry, Atlanta, GA.

Aylward, L.L., R.C. Brunet, G. Carrier, et al. 2005a. Concentration-dependent TCDD elimination kinetics in humans: toxicokinetic modeling for moderately to highly exposed adults from Seveso, Italy, and Vienna, Austria, and impact on dose estimates for the NIOSH cohort. *J Expo. Anal. Environ. Epidemiol.* 15(1):51-65.

Aylward, L.L., R.C. Brunet, T.B. Starr, et al. 2005b. Exposure reconstruction for the TCDD-exposed NIOSH cohort using a concentration- and age-dependent model of elimination. *Risk Anal.* 25(4):945-956.

Aylward, L.L., S.M. Hays, N.J. Karch, et al. 1996. Relative susceptibility of animals and humans to the cancer hazard posed by 2,3,7,8-tetrachlorodibenzo-*p*-dioxin using internal measures of dose. *Envir. Sci. Technol.* 30:3534-3543.

Barr. 1985a. Remedial investigation/alternatives report, St Regis Sites, Cass Lake, Minnesota. Prepared for Champion International/Wheeler Division, April 1985. Prepared by Barr Engineering Company, Minneapolis, MN.

Barr. 1985b. Supplemental remedial investigation, City Dump Pit Site. Cass Lake, Minnesota. Prepared for Champion International, September 1985. Prepared by Barr Engineering Company, Minneapolis, MN.

Barr. 1989. Annual monitoring report, January 1989 through December 1989, St. Regis Paper Company Site, Cass Lake, Minnesota. Prepared for International Paper. January 1991. Prepared by Barr Engineering Company, Minneapolis, MN.

Barr. 2002. Annual Monitoring Report, January 2001 through December 2001, Groundwater and Surface Water Monitoring, St. Regis Paper Company Site, Cass Lake, Minnesota. Prepared by Barr Engineering Company for International Paper Company, Minneapolis, MN.

Barr. 2003a. Annual monitoring report, January 2002 through December 2002, groundwater and surface water monitoring, St. Regis Paper Company Site, Cass Lake, Minnesota. Prepared by Barr Engineering Company for International Paper Company, Minneapolis, MN.

Barr. 2003b. Residential well evaluation-supplemental assessment for St. Regis Paper Company Superfund Site, Cass Lake, MN. Prepared for: International Paper, Memphis, Tennessee. Prepared by Barr Engineering Company, Minneapolis, MN.

Barr. 2004a. Analytical data review/validation-2001 fish tissue samples St. Regis Paper Company Site, Cass Lake, Minnesota. Internal memorandum, Tom Mattison, to Tim Drexler, USEPA Region 5, April 5, 2004 Dated 2004a.

Barr. 2004b. Annual monitoring report, January 2003 through December 2003, groundwater and surface water monitoring, St. Regis Paper Company Site, Cass Lake, Minnesota. Prepared by Barr Engineering Company for International Paper Company, Minneapolis, MN.

Barr. 2005a. Annual monitoring report, January 2004 through December 2004, groundwater and surface water monitoring, St. Regis Paper Company Site, Cass Lake, Minnesota. Prepared by Barr Engineering Company for International Paper Company, Minneapolis, MN.

Barr. 2005b. Data report. Human health and ecological risk assessment unilateral administrative order docket no. V-W-'04-C-796. St. Regis Paper Company Superfund Site, Cass Lake, MN. Prepared for International Paper, Memphis, Tennessee. Prepared by Barr Engineering Company, Minneapolis, Minnesota.

Bial, R. 2000. *The Ojibwe*. Lifeways series, Benchmark Books, Marshall Cavendish New York, NY

Borgert, C.J., T.F. Quill, L.S. McCarty, et al. 2004. Can mode of action predict mixture toxicity for risk assessment? *Toxicol Appl. Pharmacol.* 201(2):85-96.

Bornschein, R. 1994. The Anaconda study: an assessment of residential arsenic exposures among children living in the vicinity of a former copper smelter. Update, September 6, 1994. University of Cincinnati, Columbus, OH.

Bruchac, J. 1993. The Native American sweat lodge: History and legends. The Crossing Press, Freedom, CA.

Budinsky, R., T.B. Starr, D. Paustenbach, et al. 2004. A preliminary evaluation of the toxic equivalency factor (TEF) for 2,3,4,7,8-PCDF (4-PCDF) using data from the recent NTP dioxin bioassays. *Organohalogen Compounds - Volume 66*.

Bureau of Indian Affairs. 2001. Indian service population and labor force estimates, U.S. Department of the Interior City-Data 2004.

Calabrese, E.J., E.J. Stanek, C.E. Gilbert, et al. 1990. Preliminary adult soil ingestion estimates; results of a pilot study. *Regul. Toxicol. Pharmacol.* 12:88-95.

CalEPA. 2002. Air toxics hot spots program risk assessment guidelines. Part II technical support document for describing available cancer potency factors. California

Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment, Sacramento, CA.

CCC. 2002. A comparison of dioxin risk characterizations. The Chlorine Chemistry Council.

CCME. 2000. Canada-wide standards for petroleum hydrocarbons (PHCs) in soil: Scientific rationale. Supporting technical document. Canadian Council of Ministers of the Environment, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada.

City-Data. 2004. Demographics Data obtained from 2000 Census. <http://www.city-data.com/city/Cass-Lake-Minnesota.html>. Accessed on January 1, 2004. City-Data.com

De Rosa, C.T., D. Brown, R. Dhara, et al. 1999. Dioxin and dioxin-like compounds in soil, Part I: ATSDR policy guideline and Part II: Technical support document for ATSDR policy guideline. *Toxicol Ind. Health* 15(6):552-576.

Densmore, F. 1974. Indian use of wild plants for crafts, food, medicine and charms (formerly titled "Uses of plants by the Chippewa Indians"). Dover Publications, Inc., New York, NY.

Drexler, T. 2005. Personal communication (e-mail message to T. Ross and T. Richardson, International Paper Company, dated October 12, 2005, regarding LLB proposed weight for St. Regis fall 04 fish). U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Chicago, IL.

Eaton, D.L. 2005. Personal communication (e-mail R. Schoof, Integral Consulting Inc. regarding dioxin report timing). University of Washington, Seattle, WA.

Ecological Specialists. 2005. Unionid assessment referenced in ERA.

Exponent. 2002. Analytical data split and supplemental sample event, St. Regis Paper Company Site, Cass Lake, Minnesota. October 10, 2002. Exponent, Bellevue, WA.

Freeman, M.H., T.F. Shupe, R.P. Vlosky, et al. 2003. Past, present, and future of the wood preservation industry. *Forest Products Journal*. 53(10):8-15.

Gerstenberger, S.L., D.R. Tavris, L.K. Hansen, et al. 1997. Concentrations of blood and hair mercury and serum PCBs in an Ojibwa population that consumes Great Lakes Region fish. *J. Toxicol. Clin. Toxicol.* 35(4):377-386.

GLIFWC. 2002. Non-medicinal uses of plants by the Great Lakes Ojibwe (compact disc). P.O. Box 9, 100 Maple Street, Odanah, WI, 54861. www.glifwc.org. Accessed September 2005. Great Lakes Indian Fish and Wildlife Commission .

- Harper, B.L., B. Flett, S. Harris, et al. 2002. The Spokane Tribe's multipathway subsistence exposure scenario and screening level RME. *Risk Anal.* 22(3):513-526.
- Harris, S.G., and B.L. Harper. 1997. A Native American exposure scenario. *Risk Anal.* 17:789-795.
- Hawley, J.K. 1985. Assessment of health risk from exposure to contaminated soil. *Risk Anal.* 5:289-302.
- Haws, L., M. Harris, S. Su, et al. 2004a. A preliminary approach to characterizing variability and uncertainty in the mammalian PCDD/F and PCB TEFs. *Organohalogen Compounds - Volume 66 (2004)*.
- Haws, L., M. Harris, S. Su, et al. 2004b. Development of a refined database of relative potency estimates to facilitate better characterization of variability and uncertainty in the current mammalian TEFs for PCDDs, PCDFs, and dioxin-like PCBs. *Organohalogen Compounds - Volume 66 (2004)*.
- Holmes, K.K., J.H. Shirai, K.Y. Richter, et al. 1999. Field measurement of dermal soil loadings in occupational and recreational activities. *Environ. Res.* 80(2 Pt 1):148-157.
- Howlett, C.T., R.G. Tardiff, and L.L. Aylward. 2004. Comments offered to the committee to "Review EPA's assessment of the health implications of exposure to dioxin.". Board on Environmental Studies and Toxicology, National Academy of Sciences, Washington, DC. November 22.
- Integral. 2004. Quality assurance project plan for human health and ecological risk assessment, St. Regis Paper Company Site, Cass Lake, MN. Prepared for International Paper Company. Integral Consulting, Inc, Mercer Island, WA.
- Integral. 2005. Technical memorandum: Final methods for estimation of tissue concentrations for the ecological risk assessment. St. Regis Paper Company site, Cass Lake, Minnesota. Prepared by Integral Consulting, Inc. for International Paper. June 30, 2005.
- IPCS. 1998. Selected Non-Heterocyclic Polycyclic Aromatic Hydrocarbons. Environmental Health Criteria 202. International Programme on Chemical Safety.
- IPCS. 2005. Announcement of project for the re-evaluation of human and mammalian toxic equivalency factors (TEFs) of dioxins and dioxin-like compounds and request for information. <http://www.who.int/ipcs/en/>. Accessed on April 12, 2005. International Programme on Chemical Safety.

- IWP. White House opts for broad science review of EPA dioxin risk study. Inside Washington Publishers. October 20, 2003.
- Kissel, J., J.H. Shirai, K.Y. Richter, et al. 1998. Investigation of dermal contact with soil in controlled trials. *J. Soil Contam.* 7:737-752.
- Klaassen, C.D. 1996. Casarett_& Doull's toxicology, the basic science of poisons. Fifth Ed. McGraw-Hill.
- Kolb, V.M. 2002. Herbal medicine of Wisconsin Indians. *Prog. Drug Res.* 58:51-97.
- Krablin, R. 1989. Letter of October 13, 1989 to Jonathan Z. Cannon concerning soil ingestion rates. Denver, CO: Arco Coal Co. As cited in USEPA 1997.
- LLBO. 2003. Leech Lake Band of Ojibwe pilot Superfund project final report. December. Leech Lake Band Division of Resources Management, Environmental Quality Services, Leech Lake Band of Ojibwe, MN.
- Locke, B. 2005. Personal communication (e-mail message to T. Drexler, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Chicago, IL, dated September 23, 2005, regarding additional fall 2004 fish tissue data reporting concerns). Integral Consulting Inc., Broomfield, CO.
- Magee, B., P. Anderson, and D. Burmaster. 1996. Absorption adjustment factor (AAF) distributions for polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs). *Hum. Ecol. Risk Assess.* 2(4):841-873.
- MDH. 2004. page 4-15 Risk Assessment Rules/Guidance. Minnesota Department of Health. <http://www.health.state.mn.us/divs/eh/risk/guidance/index.html>. Accessed on January 30, 2004. Minnesota Department of Health, St. Paul, MN.
- MDNR. 2005. Fishing regulations. Available at <http://www.michigan.gov/dnr/>. Michigan Department of Natural Resources.
- Midwest Regional Climate Center. 2004. Data for the Cass Lake climate station (211374). <http://mcc.sws.uiuc.edu/index.jsp>. Accessed on January 30, 2004.
- MPCA. 1984. Request for response action in the matter of the St. Regis Corporation/Burlington Northern, Inc./City of Cass Lake, St. Regis and Former City of Cass Lake City Dump Sites in Cass Lake, MN. Minnesota Pollution Control Agency, St. Paul, MN.
- MPCA. 1985a. Response order by consent-City Dump Pit Site in Cass Lake, February. Minnesota Pollution Control Agency, St. Paul, MN.

MPCA. 1985b. Response Order of Consent-St. Regis Paper Company Site in Cass Lake, February. Minnesota Pollution Control Agency, St. Paul, MN.

MPCA. 1986a. Minnesota enforcement decision document-City dump pit site in Cass Lake, July 1986. Minnesota Pollution Control Agency, St. Paul, MN.

MPCA. 1986b. Minnesota enforcement decision document-St. Regis Paper Company Site in Cass Lake, March 1986. Minnesota Pollution Control Agency, St. Paul, MN.

MPCA. 1995. Five-year review report, St. Regis Paper Company Site, Cass Lake, MN, March 1995. Minnesota Pollution Control Agency, St. Paul, MN.

MPCA. 1996. Draft site screening evaluation guidelines. Site response section. April. Minnesota Pollution Control Agency, St. Paul, MN.

MPCA. 1998. Ground water policy document. Working draft, August, 1998. Minnesota Pollution Control Agency Site Remediation Section, St. Paul, MN.

MPCA. 1999. Draft guidelines. Risk-based guidance for the soil—Human health pathway. Volume 2. Technical support document. Working draft. Minnesota Pollution Control Agency, Policy and Planning Division, Regular Facilities/Remediation Section, St. Paul, MN.

MPCA. 2000. Trace metal concentrations in surface sediments of nine Minnesota northern lakes and forests ecoregion reference lakes. Minnesota Pollution Control Agency, St. Paul, MN.

NAS. 1997. Cold war chemical tests over American cities were far below dangerous levels. Available at <http://www.nationalacademies.org/>. National Academy of Science, Online.

NAS. 2005. Project title: Review EPA's exposure and human health reassessment of TCDD and related compounds. <http://www.nas.edu/>. Accessed on May 6, 2005. The National Academies home page.

NEPI. 2000. Assessing the bioavailability of organics in soil for use in human health risk assessments. Bioavailability Policy Project Phase II, Organics Task Force Report. National Environmental Policy Institute, Washington, DC.

Nordrum, S. 2005. Personal communication (telephone conversation of April 28, 2005, with A.M. Cardenas, Integral Consulting Inc, Mercer Island, WA, regarding Leech Lake Band fish consumption rates). Leech Lake Band Department of Resource Management, Cass Lake, MN.

OEHHA. 2005. Toxicity criteria database. <http://www.oehha.ca.gov/risk/ChemicalDB/>. Accessed on May 3, 2005.

Peterson, D.E., M.S. Kanarek, M.A. Kuykendall, et al. 1994. Fish consumption patterns and blood mercury levels in Wisconsin Chippewa Indians. *Arch. Environ. Health* 49(1):53-58.

Pierce, F.J., R.H. Dowdy, and D.F. Gridal. 1982. Concentrations of six trace metals in some major Minnesota Soil Series. *Journal of Environmental Quality* 11(3):416-422.

Pohl, H.R., H.E. Hicks, D.E. Jones, et al. 2002. Public health perspectives on dioxin risks: Two decades of evaluations. *Hum. Ecol. Risk Assess.* 8:233-250.

Pu, X., G. Carlson, and L. Lee. 2003. Oral bioavailability of pentachlorophenol from soils of varying characteristics using a rat model. *J Toxicol Environ. Health A* 66(21):2001-2013.

RAIS. 2005. Oak Ridge National laboratory. <http://risk.lsd.ornl.gov/index.shtml>. Accessed on 2005.

Reeves, W.R., R. Barhoumi, R.C. Burghardt, et al. 2001. Evaluation of methods for predicting the toxicity of polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbon mixtures. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* 35(8):1630-1636.

Rodricks, J.V. 1995. Calculated risks: The toxicity and human health risks of chemicals in our environment. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, MA.

Ross, T. 2005. Personal communication (e-mail message to B. Locke, Integral Consulting Inc., Broomfield, CO, dated October 18, 2005, regarding Imhoff tank operation at Cass Lake). International Paper Company, Memphis, TN.

Ruby, M.V., K.A. Fehling, D.J. Paustenbach, et al. 2002. Oral bioaccessibility of dioxins/furans at low concentrations (50-350 ppt toxicity equivalent) in soil. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* 36(22):4905-4911.

Safe, S.H. 1998. Development validation and problems with the toxic equivalency factor approach for risk assessment of dioxins and related compounds. *J Anim Sci.* 76(1):134-141.

Shacklette, H.T., and J.G. Boerngen. 1984. Element concentrations in soils and other surficial materials of the conterminous United State. U.S. Geological Survey Professional Paper. U.S. Geological Survey, Washington, DC.

Shoaf, M.B., J.H. Shirai, G. Kedan, et al. 2005a. Adult dermal sediment loads following clam digging in tide flats. *Soil Sed. Contam.* 14:463-470.

Shoaf, M.B., J.H. Shirai, G. Kedan, et al. 2005b. Child dermal sediment loads following play in a tide flat. *J Expo. Anal. Environ. Epidemiol.* 15(5):407-412.

Sims, R.C., and M.R. Overcash. 1983. Fate of polynuclear aromatic compounds (PNAs) in soil-plant systems. pp. 2-68. *In: Residue Reviews: Residues of Pesticides and Other Contaminants in the Total Environment.* F.A. Gunther and J.D. Gunther (eds). Springer-Verlag, New York.

Singh, A., A.K. Sing, and R.W. Maichle. 2004. ProUCL version 3.0 user guide. EPA/600/R04/079. April.

Stanek, E.J., and E.J. Calabrese. 2000. Daily soil ingestion estimates for children at a Superfund site. *Risk Anal.* 20(5):627-635.

Stanek, E.J., E.J. Calabrese, R. Barnes, et al. 1997. Soil ingestion in adults--results of a second pilot study. *Ecotoxicol. Environ. Saf* 36(3):249-257.

Stanek, E.J., E.J. Calabrese, and M. Zorn. 2001. Biasing factors for simple soil ingestion estimates in mass balance studies of soil ingestion. *Hum. Ecol. Risk Assess.* 7:329-355.

Starr, T.B. 2003. Significant issues raised by meta-analyses of cancer mortality and dioxin exposure. *Environ. Health Perspect.* 111(12):1443-1447.

Tetra Tech. 2002. Response action contract for remedial enforcement oversight, and non-time-critical removal activities in Region 6, data evaluation report, St. Regis Company Site, Cass Lake, Minnesota. Prepared for U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 5. August 23, 2002. Tetra Tech EM Inc, Pasadena, CA.

Tetra Tech. 2003. Record of telephone communication regarding human health exposure scenarios. Between Eric Morton, Risk Assessor, and Shirley Nordrum, Environmental Director, Leech Lake Band of Ojibwe. Tetra Tech EM Inc, Pasadena, CA.

Tibbetts. 1981. Request for Assistance, in the Form of a Static Bioassay To Be Conducted on the City of Cass Lake Waste Water Treatment Plant Effluent, NPDES Permit Number MND00022331, November. Internal memorandum, John F. McGuire, Chief, Monitoring and Analysis Section, Division of Water Quality, Minnesota Pollution Control Agency, Dated 1981.

Toyoshiba, H., N.J. Walker, A.J. Bailer, et al. 2004. Evaluation of toxic equivalency factors for induction of cytochromes P450 CYP1A1 and CYP1A2 enzyme activity by dioxin-like compounds. *Toxicol Appl. Pharmacol.* 194(2):156-168.

USEPA. 1985. Aerial photographic analysis of six priority CERCLA waste sites-Minnesota. Prepared by J.S. Duggan, Lockheed Engineering and Management Services

Company, Inc., for U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Research and Development, Washington, DC. May.

USEPA. 1988. Risk assessment forum. Technical support document on risk assessment of chemical mixtures. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Washington, DC.

USEPA. 1989. Risk assessment guidance for Superfund (RAGS): Volume 1-Human health evaluation manual (Part A). Interim Final. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Emergency and Remedial Response, Washington, DC.

USEPA. 1991a. EPA Region 10 supplemental risk assessment guidance for Superfund. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 10, Washington, DC.

USEPA. 1991b. Risk assessment guidance for Superfund (RAGS): Volume 1–Human health evaluation manual (Part B, Development of risk-based preliminary remediation goals. Interim final. EPA/540/R-92/003. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Emergency and Remedial Response, Washington, DC.

USEPA. 1992a. Guidance for data usability in risk assessment (Part A), final. 9285.7-09A. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Emergency and Remedial Response, Washington, DC.

USEPA. 1992b. Hazard ranking system guidance manual. EPA 540-R-92-026. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Solid Waste and Emergency Response, Washington, DC.

USEPA. 1993. Provisional guidance for quantitative risk assessment of polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons. EPA/600/R-93/089. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Research and Development, Washington, DC.

USEPA. 1994. Guidance manual for the integrated exposure uptake biokinetic model for lead in children. EPA/540/R-93/081. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Washington, DC.

USEPA. 1995. Unilateral administrative order, Re: St. Regis Paper Company Superfund Site, Pursuant to Section 106 CERCLA, as amended, January, 24. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Washington, DC.

USEPA. 1996. Soil screening guidance: Technical background document, second edition. EPA/540/R95/128. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Solid Waste and Emergency Response, Washington, DC.

USEPA. 1997a. Ecological risk assessment guidance for Superfund: Process for designing and conducting ecological risk assessments. EPA 540-R-97-006. U.S.

Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Solid Waste and Emergency Response, Washington, DC.

USEPA. 1997b. Exposure factors handbook—Volume 1. General factors. EPA/600/P-95/002Fa. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, National Center for Environmental Assessment, Office of Research and Development, Washington, DC, and Versar Inc., Exposure Assessment Division, Springfield, VA.

USEPA. 1997c. Health effects assessment summary tables, FY 1997 update. EPA-540-R-97-036. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Solid Waste and Emergency Response, Washington, DC.

USEPA. 1998. Approach for addressing dioxin in soil at CERCLA and RCRA sites. OSWER Directive 9200.4-26. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Solid Waste and Emergency Response, Washington, DC.

USEPA. 1999. Guidance for identifying pesticide chemicals that have a common mechanism of toxicity. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Washington, DC.

USEPA. 2000a. Draft dioxin reassessment, Part III. Integrated summary and risk characterization for 2,3,7,8-tetrachlorodibenzo-*p*-dioxin (TCDD) and related compounds. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Washington, DC.

USEPA. 2000b. 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: Properties, environmental levels and background exposures, draft final report. EPA/600/P-00/001Bc. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Research and Development, Washington, DC.

USEPA. 2000c. Methodology for deriving ambient water quality criteria for the protection of human health. EPA-822-B-00-004. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Water, Office of Science and Technology, Washington, DC.

USEPA. 2000d. Second five-year review report for the St. Regis Paper Company Site, Cass Lake, Minnesota. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 5, Washington, DC.

USEPA. 2000e. Supplementary guidance for conducting health risk assessment of chemical mixtures. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. Washington, DC

USEPA. 2001a. Dioxin reassessment—an SAB review of the Office of Research and Development's reassessment of dioxin. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, EPA Science Advisory Board, Washington, DC.

USEPA. 2001b. Draft final guidelines for carcinogen risk assessment. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Research and Development, Washington, DC.

USEPA. 2001c. Risk assessment guidance for Superfund (RAGS): Volume 1—Human health evaluation manual. Part D: Standardized planning, reporting and review of Superfund risk assessments. Final. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Emergency and Remedial Response, Washington, DC.

USEPA. 2001d. Risk assessment guidance for Superfund (RAGS): Volume I-Human health evaluation manual. Part D: Standardized planning, reporting and review of Superfund risk assessments. Final. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Emergency and Remedial Response, Washington, DC.

USEPA. 2001e. Risk assessment guidance for Superfund (RAGS): Volume III—Part A, Process for conducting probabilistic risk assessment. EPA 540-R-02-002. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Washington, DC.

USEPA. 2002a. Calculating upper confidence limits for exposure point concentrations at hazardous waste sites. 9285.6-10. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Solid Waste and Emergency Response, Washington, DC.

USEPA. 2002b. Child-specific exposure factors handbook. EPA-600-P-00-002B. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Research and Development, National Center for Environmental Assessment, Washington, DC.

USEPA. 2002c. Contract Laboratory Program national functional guidelines for inorganic data review. 540-R-01-008. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Emergency and Remedial Response, Washington, DC.

USEPA. 2002d. Current national recommended water quality criteria. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Washington, DC.

USEPA. 2002e. Derivation of acute and subchronic oral reference doses for inorganic arsenic. Superfund Technical Support Center, National Center for Environmental Assessment, Cincinnati, OH.

USEPA. 2002f. Exposure analysis for dioxins, dibenzofurans, and coplanar polychlorinated biphenyls in sewage sludge, draft technical background document. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Water, Washington, DC.

USEPA. 2002g. Guidance for comparing background and chemical concentrations in soil for CERCLA sites. OSWER 9285.6-07P. EPA/540/R-01/003. U.S. Environmental

Protection Agency, Office of Solid Waste and Emergency Response, Office of Emergency and Remedial Response, Washington, DC.

USEPA. 2002h. Risk assessment guidance for Superfund (RAGS): Volume 1—Human health evaluation manual. Part E: Supplemental guidance for dermal risk assessment. Draft. EPA/540/R/99/005. September. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Emergency and Remedial Response, Washington, DC.

USEPA. 2002i. Supplemental guidance for developing soil screening levels for Superfund sites. 9355.4-24. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Solid Waste and Emergency Response, Washington, DC.

USEPA. 2003a. Baseline human health risk assessment for the International Smelter and Refinery Tooele County, Utah. Prepared by U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 8, Denver, CO.

USEPA. 2003b. CSFII analysis of food intake distributions. EPA/600/R-03/029. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, National Center for Environmental Assessment, Office of Research and Development, Washington, DC.

USEPA. 2003c. Exposure and human health reassessment of 2,3,7,8-tetrachlorodibenzo-*p*-dioxin (TCDD) and related compounds. Part II: Health assessment for 2,3,7,8-tetrachlorodibenzo-*p*-dioxin (TCDD) and related compounds. NAS Review Draft. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Research and Development, Washington, DC. Accessed online at www.epa.gov/ncea/dioxin

USEPA. 2003d. Human health toxicity values in Superfund risk assessments. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Washington, DC.

USEPA. December 5, 2003e. Superfund National Policy Managers, Regions 1-10, regarding human health toxicity values in superfund risk assessments. Internal memorandum, OSWER Directive 9285.7-53, from M.B. Cook, Director Office of Superfund Remediation and Technology Innovation, Dated December 5, 2003e.

USEPA. 2003f. Unilateral administrative order, V-W-'03-C-748, Pursuant to Section 106 CERCLA, as amended, December. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Washington, DC.

USEPA. 2003g. Unilateral administrative order, V-W-'04-C-771, Pursuant to Section 106 CERCLA, as amended, July. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Washington, DC.

USEPA. 2003h. User's guide for evaluating subsurface vapor intrusion into buildings. Prepared by Environmental Quality Management, Inc., for U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Emergency and Remedial Response, Washington, DC.

USEPA. 2004a. 2004 Edition of the drinking water standards and health advisories. EPA 822-R-04-005. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Water, Washington, DC.

USEPA. 2004b. Data validation report for September-October 2002 fish sample analyses St. Regis Paper Company Superfund Site, Cass Lake, MN. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Washington, DC.

USEPA. 2004c. Example exposure scenarios. EPA600/R-03/036. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, National Center for Environmental Assessment, Washington, DC.

USEPA. 2004d. Human Health and ecological risk assessment work plan: St. Regis Paper company Site, Cass Lake, Minnesota. Unilateral administrative order for human health and ecological risk assessment. Docket No. V-W-04-C-796. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Washington, DC. August 11.

USEPA. 2004e. Information sheet 3, dioxin reassessment process: What is the status of the reassessment and how was the reassessment developed? U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Research and Development, Washington, DC. October 15, 2004 Update.

USEPA. 2004. Preliminary remediation goal tables. <http://www.epa.gov/region09/waste/sfund/prg/index.html>. Accessed on January 30, 2004f. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Washington, DC.

USEPA. 2004g. Risk assessment guidance for Superfund (RAGS): Volume 1—Human health evaluation manual (Part E, Supplemental guidance for dermal risk assessment), final. EPA/540/R/99/005. OSWER 9285.7-02EP. PB99-963312. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Superfund Remediation and Technology Innovation, Washington, DC.

USEPA. 2004h. User's guide and background technical document for USEPA Region 9's preliminary remediation goals (PRG) table. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 9, San Francisco, CA.

USEPA. 2005a. Guidelines for carcinogen risk assessment. EPA/630/P-03/001B. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Risk Assessment Forum, Washington, DC.

USEPA. 2004. Integrated risk information system (IRIS) home page. <http://www.epa.gov/iris/carcino.htm>. Accessed on April 25, 2005b. Last updated on November 18, 2004. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Washington, DC.

- USEPA. 2005. National lake fish tissue study.
<http://www.epa.gov/waterscience/fishstudy/overview.htm>. Accessed on October 30, 2005c. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Washington, DC.
- USEPA. 2005d. Third five-year review report, St. Regis Paper Company Site, Cass Lake, MN. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Washington, DC.
- USEPAx. 2005. xPlaceholder for USEPA 2005x Need to clarify what reference this is supposed to be. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Solid Waste and Emergency Response, Washington, DC.
- USFS. 1984. Report on 2,4,5-T. Draft report prepared by Maryanne Stiemle. U.S. Department of Agriculture, U.S. Forest Service, Washington, DC.
- USFS. 2004. Information retrieved from National Forest Service website for the Pike Bay Experimental Forest. <http://www.ncrs.fs.fed.us/EF/pikebay/#climate>. Accessed on January 30, 2004. U.S. Department of Agriculture, U.S. Forest Service, Washington, DC.
- USGS. 2004. The National Geochemical Survey - database and documentation. Open-file report 2004-1001. Version 1. <http://tin.er.usgs.gov/geochem/doc/home.htm>. Accessed on January 30, 2004. U.S. Geological Survey
- Van den Berg, M., L. Birnbaum, A.T. Bosveld, et al. 1998. Toxic equivalency factors (TEFs) for PCBs, PCDDs, PCDFs for humans and wildlife. *Environ. Health Perspect.* 106(12):775-792.
- VDEQ. 2003. Voluntary remediation program risk assessment guidance. <http://www.deq.state.va.us/vrprisk/contents.html>. Accessed on January 30, 2003. Virginia Department of Environmental Quality, Richmond, VA.
- Vennum, T. 1988. Wild Rice and the Ojibway People. Minnesota Historical Society Press, St. Paul, MN.
- Walker, N.J., P.W. Crockett, A. Nyska, et al. 2004. Dose-additive carcinogenicity of a defined mixture of "dioxin-like compounds". *Environ. Health Perspect.* 113(1):43-48.