

Appendix A Methodology for Assessment of Land Contamination (England)

Stantec Guide: Generic Quantitative Risk Assessment - Evaluation Criteria (England)

1 INTRODUCTION

The aim of this document is to present an explanation for the selection of the evaluation criteria routinely used by Stantec UK Ltd when undertaking a land contamination Tier 2 Generic Quantitative Risk Assessment (GQRA).

A GQRA uses published criteria to screen the site-specific contamination testing data and identify potential hazards to specific receptors. Generic criteria are typically conservative in derivation and exceedance does not indicate that a site is statutorily contaminated and/or unsuitable for use in the planning context. These criteria are used to identify situations where further assessment and/or action may be required. This document is divided into general introductory text and sections on soils, waters and gases.

2 GENERAL NOTES

This document should be read in conjunction with another entitled "Stantec Methodology for Assessment of Land Contamination" which summarises the legislative regime and our approach to ground contamination and risk assessment.

Any Stantec interpretation of contamination test results is based on a scientific and engineering appraisal. The perceptions of, for example, banks, insurers, lay people etc are not taken into account.

Any tables included in this document are produced for ease of reference to the criteria, they do not in any way replace the documents of origin (which are fully referenced) and which should be read to ensure appropriate use and interpretation of the data.

Generic criteria provide an aid to decision-making, but they do not replace the need for sound professional judgement in risk assessment (EA, 2006). The criteria are based on numerous and complex assumptions. The appropriateness of these assumptions in a site-specific context requires confirmation on a project by project basis. Our interpretative report will comment on the appropriateness of the routine criteria for project objectives or ground conditions. In some cases the published criteria whilst typically conservative may in some circumstances not be suitable for the site being assessed, either because they do not address the identified pollutant linkages or because they may not be sufficiently precautionary in the context of the site. Under these circumstances it may be necessary to recommend deriving site-specific assessment criteria. Any deviation from the routine criteria and/or selection of criteria for parameters not covered in this document will be described in the report text.

3 CRITERIA FOR EVALUATING SOIL RESULTS

3.1 Potential Harm to Human Health

The criteria used by Stantec UK Ltd to assess the potential for harm to human health are:-

- Category 4 Screening Levels (C4SLs) (DEFRA, 2014).
- Suitable 4 Use Levels (S4ULs) (Nathanail *et al*, 2015).
- CL:AIRE/EIC/AGS Generic Assessment Criteria (GAC) (CL:AIRE, 2010).
- Soil Guideline Values (SGVs) (EA, 2009a).

These criteria have been generated using the Contaminated Land Exposure Assessment model (CLEA) and supporting technical guidance (EA, 2009b, 2009c, 2009d, 2009e). The CLEA model uses generic assumptions about the fate and transport of chemicals in the environment and a generic conceptual model for site conditions and human behaviour to estimate child and adult exposures to soil contaminants for those potentially living, working, and/or playing on contaminated sites over long time periods (EA, 2009c).

The S4ULs, SGVs and GACs are all based on use of minimal/tolerable risk Health Criteria Values (HCVs) as the toxicological benchmark whereas the C4SL are based on use of a "low level of toxicological concern" (LLTC) as the toxicological benchmark. The LLTC represents a slightly higher level of risk than the HCV.

An update to the software (1.071) was published on 04/09/2015 (the handbook (EA 2009f) referring to version 1.05 is still valid). The update includes the library data sets from the DEFRA research project SP1010 (Development of Category 4 Screening Levels for assessment of land affected by contamination).

The CLEA model uses ten exposure pathways (Ingestion (outdoor soil, indoor dust, homegrown vegetables and soil attached to homegrown vegetables), Dermal Contact (outdoor soil and indoor dust) and Inhalation (outdoor dust, indoor dust, outdoor vapours and indoor vapours)). There are exposure pathways not included in the CLEA model such as the permeation of organics into plastic water supply pipes.

The presence and/or significance of each of the potential exposure pathways is dependent on the land use being considered. The model uses standard land use scenarios as follows:-

Residential – habitation of a dwelling up to two storeys high with various default material and design parameters, access to either private or nearby community open space with soil track back

Stantec Guide: Criteria Used in Generic Quantitative Risk Assessment (England)

to form indoor dust. Assumes ingestion of homegrown produce.

Allotments – the model has default parameters for use and consumption of vegetables but not animals or their products (eggs).

Industrial/Commercial – assumes office or light physical work in a permanent three storey structure with breaks taken outside and that the site is NOT covered in hardstanding.

Public Open Space – two public open space (POS) scenarios are considered: POS_{resi} is shared communal space within a residential development where tracking back of soil into the home is assumed to occur. POS_{park} is intended for a public park sufficiently distant from housing (i.e. not adjacent to housing) such that tracking back of soil into the home is negligible. Note that the POS assessment criteria may not be appropriate for assessing sports fields.

The assessment criteria generated using CLEA can be used as a conservative starting point for evaluating long-term risks to human health from chemicals in soil.

It is important to note that the model does not assess all the potential exposure scenarios, for example risk to workers in excavations (short term exposure) or diffusion of contaminants through drinking water pipes.

Recent guidance (DEFRA 2012) introduces a four stage classification system where Category 1 sites are clearly contaminated land and Category 4 sites are definitely not contaminated land as defined by EPA 1990. Outside of these categories further specific risk assessment is required to determine if the site should fall into Category 2 (contaminated land) or Category 3 (not contaminated land). Category 4 screening values are considered to be more pragmatic than the current published SGV/GAC criteria but still strongly precautionary with the aim of allowing rapid identification of sites where the risk is above minimal but still low/acceptable.

Category 4 Screening Levels (C4SLs)

At the end of 2013, technical guidance in support of DEFRA's revised Statutory Guidance (SG) was published and then revised in 2014 (CL:AIRE 2014) which provided:

- A methodology for deriving C4SLs for the standard land-uses and two new public open space scenarios using the updated assumptions relating to the modelling of human exposure to soil contaminants; and
- A demonstration of the methodology, via the derivation of C4SLs for six substances – arsenic, benzene, benzo(a)pyrene, cadmium, chromium (VI) and lead.

Following issue of an Erratum in December 2014, a Policy Companion Document was published (DEFRA 2014).

A letter from Lord de Mauley dated 3rd September 2014 provides more explicit direction to local authorities on the use of the C4SL in a planning context. The letter identifies four key points:

- 1) that the screening values were developed expressly with the planning regime in mind
- 2) their use is recommended in DCLG's planning guidance
- 3) soil concentrations below a C4SL limit are considered to be 'definitely not contaminated' under Part IIA of the 1990 Environmental Protection Act and pose at most a 'low level of toxicological concern' and,
- 4) exceedance of a C4SL screening value does not mean that land is definitely contaminated land, just that further investigation may be warranted.

Stantec use the C4SLs as the Tier 2 soil screening criteria protective of human health for substances with C4SL available. Table 1 summarises the C4SL (DEFRA 2014) for each of the six substances.

Note that, with the exception of benzene, the DEFRA published C4SL are not dependent on soil organic matter content (SOM) ("*Given that BaP is non volatile and that empirical soil to plant concentration factors have been used, soil organic matter content has a negligible influence on the C4SLs for this chemical*"). The DEFRA published C4SL for benzene is based on an SOM of 6%. Stantec have used the CLEA model (v1.071) to derive C4SL for benzene for 1% and 2.5% SOM which are also shown in Table 1.

Note that an industry led project to derive C4SL for a further 20 substances has commenced (CL:AIRE, 2018). The project is being project managed by CL:AIRE and is funded by the Soil and Groundwater Technology Association (SAGTA), the Society of Brownfield Briefing (SoBRA) and others. A dedicated steering group, made up of representatives from SAGTA, DEFRA, Welsh Government, Public Health England, Environment Agency, Natural Resources Wales, Food Standards Agency, Homes England and further Land Forum representatives, has been set up to oversee the project. The new C4SL will be added to this document as they are published.

Suitable 4 Use Levels (S4ULs)

In July 2009, Generic Assessment Criteria (GACs) for 82 substances were published (LQM and CIEH, 2009) using the then current version of the CLEA software v1.04 and replaced those generated in

Stantec Guide: Criteria Used in Generic Quantitative Risk Assessment (England)

2006 using the original version of the model CLEA UK *beta*. In 2015 S4ULs were published by LQM/CIEH (Nathanail *et al*, 2015) to replace the second edition GACs. Table 2 summarises the S4ULs which are reproduced with permission; Publication Number S4UL3202.

Soil Guideline Values (SGVs) and Generic Assessment Criteria (GAC)

In 2009, Soil Guideline Values (SGVs) were published by the Environment Agency for arsenic, cadmium, mercury, nickel, selenium, benzene, toluene, ethyl benzene, xylenes, phenol and dioxins, furans and dioxin-like PCBs. These were derived using the CLEA model for residential, allotments and commercial land-uses.

These SGVs have now largely been superseded by the C4SLs and the S4ULs, with the exception of the SGVs for dioxins, furans and dioxin-like PCBs which are shown in Table 3.

In January 2010, Generic Assessment Criteria (GAC) derived using CLEA were published by CL:AIRE for 35 substances. These GAC are listed in Table 4.

Note that the SGVs for dioxins, furans and dioxin like PCBs and CL:AIRE GAC were derived using an older version of CLEA (v1.06) than used to derive the S4UL and C4SL (v1.07). This older version used slightly more conservative values for some exposure parameters and therefore the derived SGVs/GAC are still considered suitably precautionary for use as screening criteria.

Note on Mercury, Chromium and Arsenic

The analytical testing routinely undertaken by Stantec determines total concentration, however, the toxicity depends on the form of the contaminant.

If a source of Mercury, Chromium or Arsenic is identified or the total concentration exceeds the relevant worst case speciated criteria it will be desirable/necessary to undertake additional speciated testing and further assessment.

Note on Polycyclic Aromatic Hydrocarbons

Polycyclic Aromatic Hydrocarbons (PAHs) are a family of hundreds of different congeners whose chemical structures contain two or more fused aromatic rings. Whilst it is recognised that there is an ongoing debate on the most appropriate method to assess health effects of PAH mixtures, in 2010 the Health Protection Agency recommended the use of benzo[a]pyrene (BaP) as a surrogate marker approach in the assessment of carcinogenic risks posed by PAHs in soils (HPA, 2010).

In most cases, BaP is chosen as the surrogate marker (SM) due to its ubiquitous nature and the vast amount of data available and has been used

by various authoritative bodies to assess the carcinogenic risk of PAHs in food. The SM approach estimates the carcinogenic toxicity of a mixture of PAHs in an environmental matrix by using toxicity data for a PAH mixture for which the composition is known.

Exposure to the SM is assumed to represent exposure to all PAHs in that matrix therefore the toxicity of the SM represents the toxicity of the mixture. The SM approach relies on a number of assumptions (HPA, 2010).

- The SM (BaP) must be present in all the samples.
- The profile of the different PAH relative to BaP should be similar in all samples.
- The PAH profile in the soil samples should be sufficiently similar to that used in the pivotal toxicity study on which HBGV was based i.e. the Culp study (Culp *et al.* (1998)).

In order to justify the use of a surrogate marker assessment criterion (C4SL for benzo(a)pyrene and S4UL coal tar) the LQM PAH Profiling Tool is used by Stantec to assess the similarity of the PAH profile in a soil sample to that of the toxicity study. The spreadsheet calculates the relative proportions of the genotoxic PAHs and plots them relative to the composition of the two coal mixtures used by Culp *et al.* Provided that the relative proportions are within an order of magnitude of those from the Culp Study (as suggested by HPA) Stantec will use the C4SL for benzo(a)pyrene as a surrogate marker for the carcinogenic PAHs, i.e. benzo(a)pyrene, benzo(a)anthracene, chrysene, benzo(b)fluoranthene, benzo(k)fluoranthene, dibenzo(ah)anthracene, indeno(123-cd)pyrene and benzo(ghi)perylene. For projects where this approach is appropriate the results will be assessed using the Coal Tar criterion (BAP C4SL) and the criteria for non-carcinogenic PAHs (S4ULs), i.e. naphthalene, acenaphthylene, acenaphthene, fluorene, phenanthrene, anthracene, fluoranthene and pyrene.

Note on Total Petroleum Hydrocarbons

The S4UL for Total Petroleum Hydrocarbon (TPH) fractions are based on 'threshold' health effects. In accordance with Environment Agency guidance (EA, 2005) and the S4UL report (Nathanail *et al*, 2015) the potential for additivity of toxicological effects between fractions should be considered. Practically, to address this issue the hazard quotient (HQ) for each fraction should be calculated by dividing the measured concentration of the fraction by the GAC. The HQs are then added to form a hazard index (HI) for that sample. An HI greater than 1 indicates an exceedance.

Note on Dioxins, Furans and Dioxin-like PCBs

The SGVs for dioxins, furans and dioxin-like PCBs

Stantec Guide: Criteria Used in Generic Quantitative Risk Assessment (England)

are based on an assumed congener profile for urban soils. The total measured concentration of dioxin, furan and dioxin-like PCB congeners listed in the SGV report (EA, 2009a) should be compared with the SGVs to make an initial assessment of risk. A more accurate assessment can be made using the Environment Agency's site specific worksheet for dioxins, furans and dioxin like PCBs available from <https://www.claire.co.uk/useful-government-legislation-and-guidance-by-country/77-risk-assessment-info-ra/199-dioxins-site-specific-worksheets>.

Note on Asbestos

Asbestos in soil and made ground is currently under review by a number of bodies. There are no current published guidance values for asbestos in soil other than the waste classification values given in the EA's Technical Guidance WM3, Hazardous Waste – Interpretation of the definition and classification of hazardous waste (EA, 2015). This guidance is only appropriate for soils that are being discarded as waste.

Testing for asbestos will be carried out on selected samples of made ground encountered during investigation, initially samples will be subjected to an asbestos screen and, if asbestos is found to be present, subjected to quantification depending on the project specific requirements. The reader is directed to the report text for guidance on the approach adopted in respect to any asbestos found to be present.

Further guidance is also available in publication C733, Asbestos in soil and made ground: a guide to understanding and managing risks (CIRIA 2014).

Note on Soil Saturation Concentration

The soil saturation concentration is the concentration of an organic constituent in soil at which either the pore water or soil vapour has theoretically become saturated with the substance, i.e. the substance concentration has reached its maximum aqueous solubility or vapour pressure. The soil saturation concentration is related to the properties of the substance as well as the properties of the soil (including soil organic matter content).

The soil saturation concentrations are shown in Table 2 in brackets where exceeded by the assessment criteria and in Table 4 for all substances. Measured concentrations in excess of the soil saturation concentration have various potential implications as discussed below.

Firstly, where measured concentrations exceed the soil saturation concentration, the risk from vapour inhalation and/or consumption of produce may be limited. The CLEA model calculates the soil saturation concentration but it does not limit exposure where this concentration is exceeded. This adds an additional level of conservatism for

CLEA derived assessment criteria where these exceed the calculated soil saturation concentration. Secondly, the soil saturation concentration is sometimes used to flag the potential presence of non-aqueous phase liquid (NAPL, a.k.a. free phase) in soil. The presence of NAPL is an important consideration in the Tier 2 assessment because, where present, the risks from NAPL may need to be considered separately. Theoretically, where a measured concentration exceeds the soil saturation concentration NAPL could be present. However, using theoretical saturation values is not always reliable for the following reasons: The soil saturation concentration is based on the aqueous solubility and vapour pressure of a pure substance and not a mixture, of which NAPLs are often comprised; and

The soil saturation concentration does not account for the sorption capacity of the soil. As a result, exceedance of the soil saturation concentration does not necessarily imply that NAPL is present. This is particularly the case for longer chain hydrocarbons such as PAHs which have low solubility and vapour pressure and hence a low soil saturation concentration but that are strongly sorbed to soil.

The measured concentrations will be compared to the soil saturation concentrations shown in Tables 2 and 4. Where exceeded Stantec will use additional lines of evidence (such as visual evidence and concentration of total TPH) to determine whether or not NAPL is likely to be present. If the presence of NAPL is deemed plausible the implications will be considered in the risk assessment.

3.2 Potential Harm to the Built Environment

Land contamination can pose risks to buildings, building materials and services (BBM&S) in a number of ways. Volatile contaminants and gases can accumulate and cause explosion or fire. Foundations and buried services can be damaged by corrosive substances and contaminants such as steel slags can create unstable ground conditions through expansion causing structural damage.

Stantec use the following primary guidance to assess the significance of soil chemistry with respect to its potential to harm the built environment.

- i) Approved Document C - Site Preparation and Resistance to Contaminants and Moisture. (DCLG, 2013);
- ii) Concrete in aggressive ground SD1 (BRE 2005);
- iii) Guidance for the selection of water supply pipes to be used in brownfield sites (UK WIR 2011);
- iv) Protocols published by agreement between Water UK and the Home Builders Federation providing supplementary guidance which

Stantec Guide: Criteria Used in Generic Quantitative Risk Assessment (England)

- includes the Risk Assessment for Water Pipes (the 'RA') (Water UK 2014).
- v) Performance of Building Materials in Contaminated Land report BR255 (BRE 1994).
 - vi) Risks of Contaminated Land to Buildings, Building Materials and Services. A Literature Review - Technical Report P331 (EA, 2000).
 - vii) Guidance on assessing and managing risks to buildings from land contamination - Technical Report P5 035/TR/01 (EA, 2001).

3.3 Potential to Harm Ecosystems, Animals, Crops etc

The criteria routinely used by Stantec as Tier 2 screening values to assess the potential of soil chemistry to harm ecosystems are taken from the following guidance and are summarised in Table 5.

- i) Derivation and Use of Soil Screening Values for assessing ecological risks (EA, 2017a);
- ii) The Restoration and Aftercare of Metalliferous Mining Sites for Pasture and Grazing (ICRCL 70/90, 1990);
- iii) Sewage sludge on farmland: code of practice for England, Wales and Northern Ireland (DEFRA, 2018); and
- iv) BS 3882:2015 Specification for topsoil and requirements for use (BSI, 2015).

Unless stated in the report the assessment is solely for phytotoxic parameters and additional assessment is required to determine suitability as a growing medium.

4 CRITERIA FOR EVALUATING LIQUID RESULTS

4.1 Potential Harm to Human Health via Ingestion

The Tier 2 water screening values routinely adopted by Stantec for assessing the potential for harm to human health via ingestion (presented as Table 6) are taken from The Water Supply (Water Quality) Regulations (S.I. 2018/647) unless otherwise indicated.

It should be noted that some of the prescribed concentrations listed in the Water Supply Regulations have been set for reasons other than their potential to cause harm to human health. The concentrations of iron and manganese are controlled because they may taint potable water with an undesirable taste, odour or colour or may potentially deposit precipitates in water supply pipes.

4.2 Potential Harm to Human Health via Inhalation of Vapours

The Tier 2 water screening values adopted by

Stantec for assessing the potential for chronic human health risk from the inhalation of vapours from volatile contaminants in groundwater are presented in Table 7. These generic assessment criteria have been taken from a report published by the Society of Brownfield Risk Assessment (SoBRA) (SoBRA, 2017). The methodology adopted in their generation is considered compatible with the UK approach to deriving GAC and adopts a precautionary approach. As with all published GAC the suitability for use on the site being assessed has to be decided by the assessor based on a thorough understanding of the methodology and assumptions used in their derivation. Note, that the SoBRA groundwater vapour GAC are not intended for assessing risks to ground workers from short-term exposure.

Note that Table 7 shows the theoretical maximum aqueous solubility for each contaminant and indicates the GAC that exceed solubility. Measured concentrations in excess of solubility may be an indication that NAPL is present. As for the assessment of soils, if the presence of NAPL is deemed plausible the implications will be considered in the risk assessment.

4.3 Potential to Harm Controlled Waters

When assessing ground condition data and the potential to harm Controlled Waters Stantec uses the approach presented in the groundwater protection position statements published 14.03.17 (EA, 2017b) which describe the Environment Agency's approach to managing and protecting groundwater. They update and replace Groundwater Protection: principles and practice (GP3). Controlled Waters are rivers, estuaries, coastal waters, lakes and groundwaters. Water in the unsaturated zone is not groundwater but does come within the scope of the term "ground waters" as used and defined in the Water Resources Act 1991. It will continue to be a technical decision for the Environment Agency to determine what is groundwater in certain circumstances for the purposes of the Regulations. As discussed in our Methodology for Assessment of Land Contamination perched water is not considered a receptor in Stantec assessments.

The EU Water Framework Directive (WFD) 2000/60/EC provides for the protection of sub-surface, surface, coastal and territorial waters through a framework of river basin management.

The EU Updated Water Framework Standards Directive 2014/101/EU amended the EU WFD to update the international standards therein; it entered into force on 20 November 2014 with the requirement for its provisions to be transposed in Member State law by 20 May 2016.

Member States are required under the EU WFD to update their river basin management plans every six years. The first river basin management plans for England and Wales, Scotland and Northern

Stantec Guide: Criteria Used in Generic Quantitative Risk Assessment (England)

Ireland were published in December 2009, and these were updated in 2015.

Other EU Directives in the European water management framework include:

- the EU Priority Substances Directive 2013/39/EU;
- EU Groundwater Pollutants Threshold Values Directive 2014/80/EU amending the EU Groundwater Daughter Directive (GWDD) 2006/118/EC; and
- the EU Biological Monitoring Directive 2014/101/EU.

The Priority Substances Directive set environmental quality standards (EQS) for the substances in surface waters (river, lake, transitional and coastal) and confirmed their designation as priority or priority hazardous substances (PS), the latter being a subset of particular concern. Environmental Quality Standards for PS are determined at the European level and apply to all Member States. Member States identify and develop standards for 'Specific Pollutants'. Specific Pollutants (SP) are defined as substances that can have a harmful effect on biological quality.

The Water Framework Directive (Standards and Classification) Directions (England and Wales) (DEFRA, 2015) were issued to the Environment Agency as an associated document of the Water Environment (WFD) (England and Wales) Regulations 2015 (S.I. 2015/1623) and provide directions for the classification of surface water and groundwater bodies. Schedule 3 parts 2 and 3 relate to surface water standards for specific pollutants in fresh or salt water bodies and priority substances in inland (rivers, lakes and related modified/artificial bodies) or other surface waters respectively. Although Schedule 5 presents threshold values for groundwater the Direction specifically excludes their use as part of site-specific investigations.

Table 6 presents the criteria routinely used by Stantec as Tier 2 screening values. This table only presents a selection of the more commonly analysed parameters and the source documents should be consulted for other chemicals. For screening groundwater the criteria selected are the standards for surface water and/or human consumption as appropriate together with the following:-

For a **hazardous substance** Stantec adopts the approach that, if the concentration in a discharge to groundwater is less than the Minimum Reporting Value (MRV), the input is regarded as automatically meeting the Article 2 (b) 'de-minimus' requirement of exemption 6 (3) (b) of the GWDD. Stantec has selected hazardous substances from the latest list published by the Joint Agencies Groundwater Directive Advisory Group (JAGDAG, 2018). MRV is the lowest concentration of a substance that can

be routinely determined with a known degree of confidence, and may not be equivalent to limit of detection. MRVs have been identified from DEFRA's guidance on Hazardous Substances to Groundwater: Minimum Reporting Values (DEFRA, 2017), and are shown in Table 6.

Note that for land contamination assessments, where hazardous substances have already entered groundwater, remediation targets would typically be based on achieving appropriate water quality standards (e.g. drinking water standard or EQS) at a compliance point rather than an MRV. For this reason, when assessing measured groundwater or soil leachate concentrations, the values for human consumption, fresh water and salt water shown in Table 6 (whichever is appropriate for the context of the site) will be used as the Tier 2 assessment criteria rather than MRV. For hazardous substances with no water quality standard the laboratory method detection limit will be used as the assessment criteria.

For **non-hazardous substances** the GWDD requires that inputs be limited to avoid deterioration. UKTAG guidance equates deterioration with pollution. Non-hazardous substances are all substances not classified as hazardous. For Stantec assessments the values for human consumption, fresh water and salt water shown in Table 6 (whichever is appropriate for the context of the site) are used as the assessment criteria for non-hazardous substances.

Note on Copper, Lead, Manganese, Nickel and Zinc

EQS_{bioavailable} have been developed for UK Specific Pollutants copper, zinc and manganese and the EU priority substances lead and nickel. An EQS is the concentration of a chemical in the environment below which there is not expected to be an adverse effect on the specific endpoint being considered, e.g. the protection of aquatic life.

It is very difficult to measure the bioavailable concentration of a metal directly. The UK has developed simplified Metal Bioavailability Assessment Tool (M-BAT) for copper, zinc, nickel and manganese which uses local water chemistry data, specifically pH, dissolved organic carbon (DOC) (mg/L) and Calcium (Ca) (mg/L).

Where the recorded total dissolved concentration exceeds the screening criteria for these parameters (EQS_{bioavailable}) further assessment will be undertaken using the tools downloaded from <http://www.wfduk.org/resources/rivers-lakes-metal-bioavailability-assessment-tool-m-bat>

The models calculate a risk characterisation ratio (RCR) and where this is greater than 1 this indicates the bioavailable concentration is above the EQS and the parameter is then identified as a potential hazard. The report will discuss this identified

Stantec Guide: Criteria Used in Generic Quantitative Risk Assessment (England)

hazard noting that the pH, calcium and, in particular, the dissolved organic carbon (DOC) in groundwater may be quite different to the receiving water (e.g. due to the presence to leaf litter or organic sediments dissolving in the water).

5 CRITERIA FOR EVALUATING GAS RESULTS

Stantec use the following primary guidance on gas monitoring methods and investigation, the assessment of risk posed by soil gases (including Volatile Organic Compounds (VOCs)) and mitigation measures/risk reduction during site development.

- i) BS 8576:2013 – Guidance on Ground Gas Investigations: Permanent gases and Volatile Organic Compounds (VOCs) (BSI, 2013);
- ii) TB18 Continuous Ground-Gas Monitoring and the Lines of Evidence Approach to Risk Assessment CL:AIRE Technical Bulletin TB18 (CL:AIRE 2019)
- iii) RB17 A pragmatic approach to Ground Gas Risk Assessment. CL:AIRE Research Bulletin RB17 (Card et al, 2012);
- iv) The VOCs Handbook. C682 (CIRIA, 2009).
- v) Assessing risks posed by hazardous gases to buildings C665 (CIRIA, 2007);
- vi) Guidance on evaluation of development proposals on sites where methane and carbon dioxide are present. (NHBC, 2007); and
- vii) BS 8485:2015+A1:2019- Code of practice for the design of protective measures for methane and carbon dioxide ground gases for new buildings (BSI, 2019).

Gas and borehole flow data are used to obtain the gas screening value (GSV) for methane and carbon dioxide. The GSV is used to establish the characteristic situation and to make recommendations for gas protection measures for buildings if required.

Radon

Stantec use the following primary guidance to assess the significance of the radon content of soil gas.

- i) Radon: guidance on protective measures for new dwellings. Report BR211 (BRE, 2015); and
- ii) Indicative Atlas of Radon in England and Wales (HPA & BGS, 2007).

6 REFERENCES

BRE (1994) Performance of Building Materials in Contaminated Land (BR255) Building Research Establishment (BRE).

BRE (2005) Concrete in aggressive ground. Special Digest 1, Building Research Establishment (BRE), Garston, Herts.

BRE (2015) BR211-2015 : Radon: Guidance on protective measures for new buildings (2015 edition) Building Research Establishment (BRE), Garston, Herts.

BSI (2011) BS10175:2011 +A1:2013 Investigation of contaminated sites – code of practice. British Standards Institute, London.

BSI (2013) BS 8576:2013 – Guidance on Ground Gas Investigations : Permanent gases and Volatile Organic Compounds (VOCs). British Standards Institute, London.

BSI (2015) BS 3882:2015 - Specification for topsoil

BSI (2019) BS 8485:2015+A1:2019 Code of practice for the design of protective measures for methane and carbon dioxide ground gases for new buildings. British Standards Institute, London.

Card G, Wilson S, Mortimer S. (2012). A Pragmatic Approach to Ground Gas Risk Assessment. CL:AIRE Research Bulletin RB17. CL:AIRE, London, UK. ISSN 2047- 6450 (Online)

CL:AIRE (2019) TB18 Continuous Ground-Gas Monitoring and the Lines of Evidence Approach to Risk Assessment CL:AIRE Technical Bulletin TB18

CIRIA (2007) C665 Assessing risks posed by hazardous gases to buildings. Construction Industry Research and Information Association (CIRIA), London.

CIRIA (2009) C682 The VOCs Handbook. C682 Construction Industry Research and Information Association (CIRIA), London.

CIRIA (2014) C733, Asbestos in soil and made ground: a guide to understanding and managing risks. Construction Industry Research and Information Association (CIRIA), London.

CL:AIRE (2010) Soil Generic Assessment Criteria for Human Health Risk Assessment. Published in January 2010 by Contaminated Land: Applications in Real Environments, London. ISBN 978-1-905046-20-1.

CL:AIRE (2014) SP1010 – Development of Category 4 Screening Levels for Assessment of Land Affected by Contamination. Final Project Report published by Contaminated Land: Applications in Real Environments (CL:AIRE) 24th September 2014

Stantec Guide: Criteria Used in Generic Quantitative Risk Assessment (England)

- CL:AIRE (2018) Web page on Category 4 Screening Levels and Phase 2 project <https://www.claire.co.uk/projects-and-initiatives/category-4-screening-levels>
- Culp, S.J., Gaylor, D.W., Sheldon, W.G., Goldstein, L.W. and Beland, F.A. (1998) A comparison of the tumors induced by coal tar and benzo(a)pyrene in a 2-year bioassay. *Carcinogenesis*, 19, pp 117-124.
- DCLG (2013) Approved Document C - Site preparation and resistance to contaminants and moisture (2004 Edition incorporating 2010 and 2013 amendments).
- DEFRA (2012) Environmental Protection Act 1990: Part 2A Contaminated Land Statutory Guidance. Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (DEFRA).
- DEFRA (2014) SP1010: Development of Category 4 Screening Levels for Assessment of Land Affected by Contamination – Policy Companion Document. Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs December 2014
- DEFRA (2015) The Water Framework Directive (Standards and Classification) Directions (England and Wales) 2015.
- DEFRA (2017) Hazardous substances to groundwater: minimum reporting values. Updated 13 January 2017 <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/values-for-groundwater-risk-assessments/hazardous-substances-to-groundwater-minimum-reporting-values>
- DEFRA (2018) Sewage sludge in agriculture: code of practice for England, Wales and Northern Ireland <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/sewage-sludge-in-agriculture-code-of-practice/sewage-sludge-in-agriculture-code-of-practice-for-england-wales-and-northern-ireland>
- EA (2000) Risks of Contaminated Land to Buildings, Building Materials and Services. A Literature Review - Technical Report P331
- EA (2001) Guidance on assessing and managing risks to buildings from land contamination - Technical Report P5 035/TR/01
- EA (2006) CLEA update No. 4. Environment Agency, Bristol.
- EA (2008) Ecological Risk Assessment (ERA). Science Report Series SC070009, Environment Agency, Bristol.
- EA (2009a) Soil Guideline Values for contaminants in soil. Science Reports SC050021/various.
- EA (2009b) Using Soil Guideline Values. Science Report SC050021/SGV Introduction. Environment Agency, Bristol.
- EA (2009c) Updated Technical Background to the CLEA model. Science Report SC050021/SR3 Introduction. Environment Agency, Bristol.
- EA (2009d) Human health toxicological assessment of contaminants in soil. Science Report SC050021/SR2. Environment Agency, Bristol.
- EA (2009e) Compilation data for priority organic contaminants for derivation of soil guideline values Science Report SC50021/SR7
- EA (2009f) CLEA Software (Version 1.05) Handbook Science Report SC050021/SR4
- EA (2015) Guidance on the classification and assessment of waste (3rd edition 2015) - Technical Guidance WM3
- EA (2017a) Derivation and use of soil screening values for assessing ecological risks. Report – ShARE id26
- EA (2017b) Groundwater Protection Position Statements - <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/groundwater-protection-position-statements>
- HPA (2010) Risk assessment approaches for polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons. HPA contaminated land information sheet. Health Protection Agency (HPA)
- HPA & BGS (2007). Indicative Atlas of Radon in England and Wales. HPA-RPD-033. Health Protection Agency and British Geological Survey
- ICRCL (1990) The Restoration and Aftercare of Metalliferous Mining Sites for Pasture and Grazing 70/90. Interdepartmental Committee on the Redevelopment of Contaminated Land, London.
- JAGDAG (2018). Substances confirmed as hazardous or non-hazardous pollutants following public consultation. Last updated 31 January 2018. Joint Agencies Groundwater Directive Advisory Group http://wfd.uk.org/sites/default/files/Media/JAGDAG/2018%2001%2031%20Confirmed%20hazardous%20substances%20list_0.pdf
- Nathanail, C.P., McCaffrey, C., Gillett, A.G., Ogden, R.C. and Nathanail, J.F. (2015) The LQM/CIEH S4ULs for Human Health Risk Assessment. Land Quality Press, Nottingham.
- NHBC (2007) Guidance on evaluation of development proposals on sites where

Stantec Guide: Criteria Used in Generic Quantitative Risk Assessment (England)

methane and carbon dioxide are present.
National House Building Council.

S.I. (2018/647). Statutory Instrument 2018 No 614
The Water Supply (Water Quality) Regulations,
2016.

S.I. (2017/407). Statutory Instrument 2017 No 407
Water Environment (Water Framework
Directive) (England and Wales) Regulations
2017.

S.I. (2015/1623). Statutory Instrument 2015 No
1623 The Water Environment (Water
Framework Directive) (England and Wales)
(Amendment) Regulations 2015.

SoBRA (2017) Development of Generic
Assessment Criteria for Assessing Vapour
Risks to Human Health from Volatile
Contaminants in Groundwater Version 1.0
February 2017. Society of Brownfield Risk
Assessment (SoBRA)

UKWIR (2011) Guidance for the selection of Water
Pipes to be used in Brownfield Sites. UK Water
Industry Research (UKWIR)

Water UK (2014) Contaminated Land Assessment
Guidance

Stantec Guide: Generic Quantitative Risk Assessment - Evaluation Criteria (England)

Table 1: Category 4 Screening Levels (C4SL)

	Allotments	Residential (with home-grown produce)	Residential (without home-grown produce)	Commercial	Public Open Space 1	Public Open Space 2
Arsenic	49	37	40	640	79	170
Benzene						
- 1% SOM*	0.039	0.20	0.89	27	140	190
- 2.5% SOM*	0.081	0.41	1.6	50	140	210
- 6% SOM	0.18	0.87	3.3	98	140	230
Benzo(a)pyrene (as a surrogate marker for carcinogenic PAHs)	5.7	5.0	5.3	77	10	21
Cadmium	3.9	22	150	410	220	880
Chromium VI	170	21	21	49	21	250
Lead	80	200	310	2300	630	1300

Units mg/kg dry weight

Values taken from SP1010: Development of Category 4 Screening Levels for Assessment of Land Affected by Contamination – Policy Companion Document (Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs December 2014), unless stated otherwise
Public Open Space 1 – for grassed area adjacent to residential housing

Public Open Space 2 - Park Type Public Open Space Scenario

Based on a sandy loam as defined in SR3 (Environment Agency, 2009b)

Note that, with the exception of benzene, these C4SL are not SOM dependent

* - Stantec derived C4SL using CLEA v1.071

Table 2: Suitable 4 Use Levels (S4UL)

Determinand	Allotment	R _w HP	R _w oHP	Commercial/ Industrial	POSresi	POSpark
Metals						
Arsenic (Inorganic) ^{a, b, c}	43	37	40	640	79	170
Beryllium ^{a, b, d, e}	35	1.7	1.7	12	2.2	63
Boron ^{a, b, d}	45	290	11000	240000	21000	46000
Cadmium (pH6-8) ^{a, b, d, f}	1.9	11	85	190	120	560
Chromium (trivalent) ^{a, b, d, g}	18000	910	910	8600	1500	33000
Chromium (hexavalent) ^{a, b, c}	1.8 ^h	6 ⁱ	6 ⁱ	33 ^j	7.7 ^j	220 ^j
Copper ^{a, b, c}	520	2400	7100	68000	12000	44000
Mercury (elemental) ^{a, b, c, j}	21	1.2	1.2	58 ^{vap} (25.8)	16	30 ^{vap} (25.8)
Mercury (inorganic) ^{a, b, c}	19	40	56	1100	120	240
Methylmercury ^{a, b, c}	6	11	15	320	40	68
Nickel ^{a, b, c}	53 ^k	130 ^e	180 ^e	980 ^e	230 ^e	800 ^k
Selenium ^{a, b, c}	88	250	430	12000	1100	1800
Vanadium ^{a, b, c, i, j}	91	410	1200	9000	2000	5000
Zinc ^{a, b, c}	620	3700	40000	730000	81000	170000
BTEX Compounds (SOM 1%/ 2.5%/ 6%)						
Benzene ^{a, b, l, m}	0.017/0.034/ 0.075	0.087/0.17/ 0.37	0.38/0.7/1.4	27 / 47 / 90	72 / 72 / 73	90 / 100 / 110
Toluene ^{a, b, l, m}	22 / 51 / 120	130 / 290 / 660	880 ^{vap} (869) /1900/3900	56000 ^{vap} (869) / 110000 ^{vap} (1920) / 180000 ^{vap} (4360)	56000 / 56000 / 56000	87000 ^{vap} (869) / 95000 ^{vap} (1920) / 100000 ^{vap} (4360)
Ethylbenzene ^{a, b, l, m}	16 / 39 / 91	47 / 110 / 260	83 / 190 / 440	5700 ^{vap} (518) / 13000 ^{vap} (1220) / 27000 ^{vap} (2840)	24000 / 24000 / 25000	17000 ^{vap} (518) / 22000 ^{vap} (1220) / 27000 ^{vap} (2840)
O – Xylene ^{a, b, l, m, n}	28 / 67 / 160	60 / 140 / 330	88 / 210 / 480	6600 ^{sol} (478) / 15000 ^{sol} (1120) / 33000 ^{sol} (2620)	41000 / 42000 / 43000	17000 ^{sol} (478) / 24000 ^{sol} (1120) / 33000 ^{sol} (2620)
M – Xylene ^{a, b, l, m, n}	31 / 74 / 170	59 / 140 / 320	82 / 190 / 450	6200 ^{vap} (625) / 14000 ^{vap} (1470) / 31000 ^{vap} (3460)	41000 / 42000 / 43000	17000 ^{vap} (625) / 24000 ^{vap} (1470) / 32000 ^{vap} (3460)
P – Xylene ^{a, b, l, m, n}	29 / 69 / 160	56 / 130 / 310	79 / 180 / 430	5900 ^{sol} (576) / 14000 ^{sol} (1350) / 30000 ^{sol} (3170)	41000 / 42000 / 43000	17000 ^{sol} (576) / 23000 ^{sol} (1350) / 31000 ^{sol} (3170)
Total xylenes ^t	28 / 67 / 160	56 / 130 / 310	79 / 180 / 430	5900 ^{sol} (576) / 14000 ^{sol} (1350) / 30000 ^{sol} (3170)	41000 / 42000 / 43000	17000 ^{sol} (576) / 23000 ^{sol} (1350) / 31000 ^{sol} (3170)
Polycyclic Aromatic Hydrocarbons (SOM 1%/ 2.5%/ 6%)^{a, b, l, p}						
Acenaphthene	34 / 85 / 200	210 / 510 / 1100	3000 ^{sol} (57.0) / 4700 ^{sol} (141) / 6000 ^{sol} (336)	84000 ^{sol} (57.0) / 97000 ^{sol} (141) / 100000	15000 / 15000 / 15000	29000 / 30000 / 30000
Acenaphthylene	28 / 69 / 160	170 / 420 / 920	2900 ^{sol} (86.1) / 4600 ^{sol} (212) / 6000 ^{sol} (506)	83000 ^{sol} (86.1) / 97000 ^{sol} (212) / 100000	15000 / 15000 / 15000	29000 / 30000 / 30000
Anthracene	380 / 950 / 2200	2400 / 5400 / 11000	31000 ^{sol} (1.17) /35000/ 37000	520000 / 540000 / 540000	74000 / 74000 / 74000	150000 / 150000 / 150000
Benzo(a)anthracene	2.9 / 6.5 / 13	7.2 / 11 / 13	11 / 14 / 15	170 / 170 / 180	29 / 29 / 29	49 / 56 / 62
Benzo(a)pyrene (Bap) ^u	0.97 / 2.0 / 3.5	2.2 / 2.7 / 3.0	3.2 / 3.2 / 3.2	35 / 35 / 36	5.7 / 5.7 / 5.7	11 / 12 / 13
Benzo(b)fluoranthene	0.99 / 2.1 / 3.9	2.6 / 3.3 / 3.7	3.9 / 4.0 / 4.0	44 / 44 / 45	7.1 / 7.2 / 7.2	13 / 15 / 16

Stantec Guide: Criteria Used in Generic Quantitative Risk Assessment (England)

Determinand	Allotment	R _w HP	R _w HP	Commercial/ Industrial	POSresi	POSpark
Benzo(g,h,i)perylene	290 / 470 / 640	320 / 340 / 350	360 / 360 / 360	3900 / 4000 / 4000	640 / 640 / 640	1400 / 1500 / 1600
Benzo(k)fluoranthene	37 / 75 / 130	77 / 93 / 100	110 / 110 / 110	1200 / 1200 / 1200	190 / 190 / 190	370 / 410 / 440
Chrysene	4.1 / 9.4 / 19	15 / 22 / 27	30 / 31 / 32	350 / 350 / 350	57 / 57 / 57	93 / 110 / 120
Dibenzo(ah)anthracene	0.14 / 0.27 / 0.43	0.24 / 0.28 / 0.3	0.31 / 0.32 / 0.32	3.5 / 3.6 / 3.6	0.57 / 0.57 / 0.58	1.1 / 1.3 / 1.4
Fluoranthene	52 / 130 / 290	280 / 560 / 890	1500 / 1600 / 1600	23000 / 23000 / 23000	3100 / 3100 / 3100	6300 / 6300 / 6400
Fluorene	27 / 67 / 160	170 / 400 / 860	2800 ^{sol} (30.9) / 3800 ^{sol} (76.5) / 4500 ^{sol} (183)	63000 ^{sol} (30.9) / 68000 / 71000	9900 / 9900 / 9900	20000 / 20000 / 20000
Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene	9.5 / 21 / 39	27 / 36 / 41	45 / 46 / 46	500 / 510 / 510	82 / 82 / 82	150 / 170 / 180
Naphthalene ^q	4.1 / 10 / 24	2.3 / 5.6 / 13	2.3 / 5.6 / 13	190 ^{sol} (76.4) / 460 ^{sol} (183) / 1100 ^{sol} (432)	4900 / 4900 / 4900	1200 ^{sol} (76.4) / 1900 ^{sol} (183) / 3000
Phenanthrene	15 / 38 / 90	95 / 220 / 440	1300 ^{sol} (36.0) / 1500 / 1500	22000 / 22000 / 23000	3100 / 3100 / 3100	6200 / 6200 / 6300
Pyrene	110 / 270 / 620	620 / 1200 / 2000	3700 / 3800 / 3800	54000 / 54000 / 54000	7400 / 7400 / 7400	15000 / 15000 / 15000
Coal Tar (Bap as surrogate marker) ^u	0.32 / 0.67 / 1.2	0.79 / 0.98 / 1.1	1.2 / 1.2 / 1.2	15 / 15 / 15	2.2 / 2.2 / 2.2	4.4 / 4.7 / 4.8
Explosives ^{a, b, l, p}						
2, 4, 6 Trinitrotoluene	0.24 / 0.58 / 1.40	1.6 / 3.7 / 8.0	65 / 66 / 66	1000 / 1000 / 1000	130 / 130 / 130	260 / 270 / 270
RDX (Royal Demolition Explosive C ₃ H ₆ N ₆ O ₆)	17 / 38 / 85	120 / 250 / 540	13000 / 13000 / 13000	210000 / 210000 / 210000	26000 / 26000 / 27000	49000 ^{sol} (18.7) / 51000 / 53000
HMX (High Melting Explosive C ₄ H ₈ N ₈ O ₈)	0.86 / 1.9 / 3.9	5.7 / 13 / 26	6700 / 6700 / 6700	110000 / 110000 / 110000	13000 / 13000 / 13000	23000 ^{vap} (0.35) / 23000 ^{vap} (0.39) / 24000 ^{vap} (0.48)
Petroleum Hydrocarbons (SOM 1%/ 2.5%/ 6%) ^{a, b, l, m}						
Aliphatic EC 5-6	730 / 1700 / 3900	42 / 78 / 160	42 / 78 / 160	3200 ^{sol} (304) / 5900 ^{sol} (558) / 12000 ^{sol} (1150)	570000 ^{sol} (304) / 590000 / 600000	95000 ^{sol} (304) / 130000 ^{sol} (558) / 180000 ^{sol} (1150)
Aliphatic EC >6-8	2300 / 5600 / 13000	100 / 230 / 530	100 / 230 / 530	7800 ^{sol} (144) / 17000 ^{sol} (322) / 40000 ^{sol} (736)	600000 / 610000 / 620000	150000 ^{sol} (144) / 220000 ^{sol} (322) / 320000 ^{sol} (736)
Aliphatic EC >8-10	320 / 770 / 1700	27 / 65 / 150	27 / 65 / 150	2000 ^{sol} (78) / 4800 ^{vap} (190) / 11000 ^{vap} (451)	13000 / 13000 / 13000	14000 ^{sol} (78) / 18000 ^{vap} (190) / 21000 ^{vap} (451)
Aliphatic EC >10-12	2200 / 4400 / 7300	130 ^{vap} (48) / 330 ^{vap} (118) / 760 ^{vap} (283)	130 ^{vap} (48) / 330 ^{vap} (118) / 770 ^{vap} (283)	9700 ^{sol} (48) / 23000 ^{vap} (118) / 47000 ^{vap} (283)	13000 / 13000 / 13000	21000 ^{sol} (48) / 23000 ^{vap} (118) / 24000 ^{vap} (283)
Aliphatic EC >12-16	11000 / 13000 / 13000	1100 ^{sol} (24) / 2400 ^{sol} (59) / 4300 ^{sol} (142)	1100 ^{sol} (24) / 2400 ^{sol} (59) / 4400 ^{sol} (142)	59000 ^{sol} (24) / 82000 ^{sol} (59) / 90000 ^{sol} (142)	13000 / 13000 / 13000	25000 ^{sol} (24) / 25000 ^{sol} (59) / 26000 ^{sol} (142)
Aliphatic EC >16-35 °	260000 / 270000 / 270000	65000 ^{sol} (8.48) / 92000 ^{sol} (21) / 110000	65000 ^{sol} (8.48) / 92000 ^{sol} (21) / 110000	1600000 / 1700000 / 1800000	250000 / 250000 / 250000	450000 / 480000 / 490000
Aliphatic EC >35-44 °	260000 / 270000 / 270000	65000 ^{sol} (8.48) / 92000 ^{sol} (21) / 110000	65000 ^{sol} (8.48) / 92000 ^{sol} (21) / 110000	1600000 / 1700000 / 1800000	250000 / 250000 / 250000	450000 / 480000 / 490000
Aromatic EC 5-7 (benzene)	13 / 27 / 57	70 / 140 / 300	370 / 690 / 1400	26000 ^{sol} (1220) / 46000 ^{sol} (2260) / 86000 ^{sol} (4710)	56000 / 56000 / 56000	76000 ^{sol} (1220) / 84000 ^{sol} (2260) / 92000 ^{sol} (4710)
Aromatic EC >7-8 (toluene)	22 / 51 / 120	130 / 290 / 660	860 / 1800 / 3900	56000 ^{vap} (869) / 110000 ^{sol} (1920) / 180000 ^{vap} (4360)	56000 / 56000 / 56000	87000 ^{vap} (869) / 95000 ^{sol} (1920) / 100000 ^{vap} (4360)
Aromatic EC >8-10	8.6 / 21 / 51	34 / 83 / 190	47 / 110 / 270	3500 ^{vap} (613) / 8100 ^{vap} (1500) / 17000 ^{vap} (3580)	5000 / 5000 / 5000	7200 ^{vap} (613) / 8500 ^{vap} (1500) / 9300 ^{vap} (3580)
Aromatic EC >10-12	13 / 31 / 74	74 / 180 / 380	250 / 590 / 1200	16000 ^{sol} (364) / 28000 ^{sol} (899) / 34000 ^{sol} (2150)	5000 / 5000 / 5000	9200 ^{sol} (364) / 9700 ^{sol} (899) / 10000
Aromatic EC >12-16	23 / 57 / 130	140 / 330 / 660	1800 / 2300 ^{sol} (419) / 2500	36000 ^{sol} (169) / 37000 / 38000	5100 / 5100 / 5000	10000 / 10000 / 10000
Aromatic EC >16-21 °	46 / 110 / 260	260 / 540 / 930	1900 / 1900 / 1900	28000 / 28000 / 28000	3800 / 3800 / 3800	7600 / 7700 / 7800
Aromatic EC >21-35 °	370 / 820 / 1600	1100 / 1500 / 1700	1900 / 1900 / 1900	28000 / 28000 / 28000	3800 / 3800 / 3800	7800 / 7800 / 7900
Aromatic EC >35-44 °	370 / 820 / 1600	1100 / 1500 / 1700	1900 / 1900 / 1900	28000 / 28000 / 28000	3800 / 3800 / 3800	7800 / 7800 / 7900
Aliphatic+Aromatic EC >44-70 °	1200 / 2100 / 3000	1600 / 1800 / 1900	1900 / 1900 / 1900	28000 / 28000 / 28000	3800 / 3800 / 3800	7800 / 7800 / 7900
Chloroalkanes & Chloroalkenes (SOM 1%/ 2.5%/ 6%) ^{a, b, l, p}						
1,2-Dichloroethane	0.0046 / 0.0083 / 0.016	0.0071 / 0.011 / 0.019	0.0092 / 0.013 / 0.023	0.67 / 0.97 / 1.7	29 / 29 / 29	21 / 24 / 28

Stantec Guide: Criteria Used in Generic Quantitative Risk Assessment (England)

Determinand	Allotment	R _w HP	R _w HP	Commercial/ Industrial	POSresi	POSpark
1,1,1 Trichloroethane (TCA)	48 / 110 / 240	8.8 / 18 / 39	9.0 / 18 / 40	660 / 1300 / 3000	140000 / 140000 / 140000	57000 ^{vap} (1425) 76000 ^{vap} (2915)/ 100000 ^{vap} (6392)
1,1,1,2 Tetrachloroethane	0.79 / 1.9 / 4.4	1.2 / 2.8 / 6.4	1.5 / 3.5 / 8.2	110 / 250 / 560	1400 / 1400 / 1400	1500 / 1800 / 2100
1,1,2,2 Tetrachloroethane	0.41 / 0.89 / 2.0	1.6 / 3.4 / 7.5	3.9 / 8.0 / 17	270 / 550 / 1100	1400 / 1400 / 1400	1800 / 2100 / 2300
Tetrachloroethene (PCE)	0.65 / 1.5 / 3.6	0.18 / 0.39 / 0.90	0.18 / 0.4 / 0.92	19 / 42 / 95	1400 / 1400 / 1400	810 ^{sol} (424)/1100 ^s cl (951)/1500
Tetrachloromethane (Carbon Tetrachloride)	0.45 / 1.0 / 2.4	0.026 / 0.056 / 0.13	0.026 / 0.056 / 0.13	2.9 / 6.3 / 14	890 / 920 / 950	190 / 270 / 400
Trichloroethene (TCE)	0.041 / 0.091 / 0.21	0.016 / 0.034 / 0.075	0.017 / 0.036 / 0.080	1.2 / 2.6 / 5.7	120 / 120 / 120	70 / 91 / 120
Trichloromethane (Chloroform)	0.42 / 0.83 / 1.7	0.91 / 1.7 / 3.4	1.2 / 2.1 / 4.2	99 / 170 / 350	2500 / 2500 / 2500	2600 / 2800 / 3100
Chloroethene (Vinyl Chloride)	0.00055/ 0.001/ 0.0018	0.00064 / 0.00087/ 0.0014	0.00077 / 0.001 / 0.0015	0.059 / 0.077 / 0.12	3.5 / 3.5 / 3.5	4.8 / 5.0 / 5.4
Phenol & Chlorophenols ^{a, b, l, p}						
Phenol	23 / 42 / 83	120 / 200 / 380	440 / 690 / 1200	440 ^{dir} (26000) / 690 ^{dir} (30000) / 1300 ^{dir} (34000)	440 ^{dir} (10000)/ 690 ^{dir} (10000) 1300 ^{dir} (10000)	440 ^{dir} (7600) / 690 ^{dir} (8300) / 1300 ^{dir} (93000)
Chlorophenols (excluding PCP) ^f	0.13 ^s / 0.3 / 0.7	0.87 ^s / 2.0 / 4.5	94 / 150 / 210	3500 / 4000 / 4300	620 / 620 / 620	1100 / 1100 / 1100
Pentachlorophenol (PCP)	0.03 / 0.08 / 0.19	0.22/ 0.52 / 1.2	27 ^{vap} (16.4) / 29 / 31	400 / 400 / 400	60 / 60 / 60	110 / 120 / 120
Other ^{a, b, l, p}						
Carbon Disulphide	4.8 / 10 / 23	0.14 / 0.29 / 0.62	0.14 / 0.29 / 0.62	11 / 22 / 47	11000 / 11000 / 12000	1300 / 1900 / 2700
Hexachlorobutadiene (HCBD)	0.25 / 0.61 / 1.4	0.29 / 0.7 / 1.6	0.32 / 0.78 / 1.8	31 / 66 / 120	25 / 25 / 25	48 / 50 / 51
Pesticides (SOM 1%/ 2.5%/ 6%) ^{a, b, l, p}						
Aldrin	3.2 / 6.1 / 9.6	5.7 / 6.6 / 7.1	7.3 / 7.4 / 7.5	170 / 170 / 170	18 / 18 / 18	30 / 31 / 31
Atrazine	0.5 / 1.2 / 2.7	3.3 / 7.6 / 17.4	610 / 620 / 620	9300 / 9400 / 9400	1200 / 1200 / 1200	2300 / 2400 / 2400
Dichlorvos	0.0049 / 0.010 / 0.022	0.032 / 0.066 / 0.14	6.4 / 6.5 / 6.6	140 / 140 / 140	16 / 16 / 16	26 / 26 / 27
Dieldrin	0.17/0.41/0.96	0.97/ 2 / 3.5	7.0 / 7.3 / 7.4	170 / 170 / 170	18 / 18 / 18	30 / 30 / 31
Alpha - Endosulfan	1.2 / 2.9 / 6.8	7.4 / 18 / 41	160 ^{vap} (0.003)/ 280 ^{vap} (0.007)/ 410 ^{vap} (0.016)	5600 ^{vap} (0.003) / 7400 ^{vap} (0.007) / 8400 ^{vap} (0.016)	1200 / 1200 / 1200	2400 / 2400 / 2500
Beta - Endosulfan	1.1 / 2.7 / 6.4	7.0 / 17 / 39	190 ^{vap} (0.00007) /320 ^{vap} (0.0002) /440 ^{vap} (0.0004)	6300 ^{vap} (0.00007) /7800 ^{vap} (0.0002) / 8700	1200 / 1200 / 1200	2400 / 2400 / 2500
Alpha-Hexachlorocyclohexane	0.035/0.087/ 0.21	0.23/0.55 / 1.2	6.9 / 9.2 / 11	170 / 180 / 180	24 / 24 / 24	47 / 48 / 48
Beta - Hexachlorocyclohexane	0.013 / 0.032 / 0.077	0.085 / 0.2 / 0.46	3.7 / 3.8 / 3.8	65 / 65 / 65	8.1 / 8.1 / 8.1	15 / 15 / 16
Gamma – Hexachlorocyclohexane	0.0092 / 0.023 / 0.054	0.06 / 0.14 / 0.33	2.9 / 3.3 / 3.5	67 / 69 / 70	8.2 / 8.2 / 8.2	14 / 15 / 15
Chlorobenzenes ^{a, b, l, p}						
Chlorobenzene	5.9 / 14 / 32	0.46 / 1.0 / 2.4	0.46 / 1.0 / 2.4	56 / 130 / 290	11000 / 13000 / 14000	1300 ^{sol} (675)/ 2000 ^{sol} (1520)/ 2900
1,2-dichlorobenzene (1,2-DCB)	94 / 230 / 540	23 / 55 / 130	24 / 57 / 130	2000 ^{sol} (571) / 4800 ^{sol} (1370) / 11000 ^{sol} (3240)	90000 / 95000 / 98000	24000 ^{sol} (571) / 36000 ^{sol} (1370) /51000 ^{sol} (3240)
1,3-dichlorobenzene (1,3-DCB)	0.25 / 0.6 / 1.5	0.4 / 1.0 / 2.3	0.44 / 1.1 / 2.5	30 / 73 / 170	300 / 300 / 300	390 / 440 / 470
1-4-dichlorobenzene (1,4-DCB)	15 ⁱ / 37 ⁱ / 88 ⁱ	61 ^q / 150 ^q /350 ^q	61 ^q / 150 ^q / 350 ^q	4400 ^{vap,q} (224) / 10000 ^{vap,q} (540) / 25000 ^{vap,q} (1280)	17000 ⁱ / 17000 ⁱ / 17000 ⁱ	36000 ^{vap,i} (224) 36000 ^{vap,i} (540)/ 36000 ^{vap,i} (1280)
1,2,3-Trichlorobenzene	4.7 / 12 / 28	1.5 / 3.6 / 8.6	1.5 / 3.7 / 8.8	102 / 250 / 590	1800 / 1800 / 1800	770 ^{vap} (134) / 1100 ^{vap} (330) / 1600 ^{vap} (789)
1,2,4- Trichlorobenzene	55 / 140 / 320	2.6 / 6.4 / 15	2.6 / 6.4 / 15	220 / 530 / 1300	15000 / 17000 / 19000	1700 ^{vap} (318) / 2600 ^{vap} (786) / 4000 ^{vap} (1880)
1,3,5- Trichlorobenzene	4.7 / 12 / 28	0.33 / 0.81 / 1.9	0.33 / 0.81 / 1.9	23 / 55 / 130	1700 / 1700 / 1800	380 ^{vap} (36.7) / 580 ^{vap} (90.8) / 860 ^{vap} (217)
1,2,3,4-Tetrachlorobenzene	4.4 / 11 / 26	15 / 36 / 78	24 / 56 / 120	1700 ^{vap} (122) / 3080 ^{vap} (304) / 4400 ^{vap} (728)	830 / 830 / 830	1500 ^{vap} (122) / 1600 / 1600
1,2,3,5- Tetrachlorobenzene	0.38 / 0.90 / 2.2	0.66 / 1.6 / 3.7	0.75 / 1.9 / 4.3	49 ^{vap} (39.4) / 120 ^{vap} (98.1) / 240 ^{vap} (235)	78 / 79 / 79	110 ^{vap} (39.4) / 120 / 130
1,2,4,5- Tetrachlorobenzene	0.06 / 0.16 / 0.37	0.33 / 0.77 / 1.6	0.73 / 1.7 / 3.5	42 ^{sol} (19.7) / 72 ^{sol} (49.1) / 96	13 / 13 / 13	25 / 26 / 26

Stantec Guide: Criteria Used in Generic Quantitative Risk Assessment (England)

Determinand	Allotment	R _W HP	R _{WO} HP	Commercial/ Industrial	POSresi	POSpark
Pentachlorobenzene (P ₅ CB)	1.2 / 3.1 / 7.0	5.8 / 12 / 22	19 / 30 / 38	640 ^{sol} (43.0) / 770 ^{sol} (107) / 830	100 / 100 / 100	190 / 190 / 190
Hexachlorobenzene (HCB)	0.47 / 1.1 / 2.5	1.8 ^{vap} (0.20) / 3.3 ^{vap} (0.5) / 4.9	4.1 ^{vap} (0.20) / 5.7 ^{vap} (0.5) / 6.7 ^{vap} (1.2)	110 ^{vap} (0.20) / 120 / 120	16 / 16 / 16	30 / 30 / 30

Units are mg/kg Dry Weight

Copyright Land Quality Management Ltd reproduced with permission; Publication Number S4UL3202. All rights reserved

R_WHP Residential with homegrown produce

R_{WO}HP Residential without homegrown produce

POSresi public open spaces near residential housing

POSpark public open space for recreational use but not dedicated sports pitches

SOM Soil Organic Matter – **the S4UL for all organic compounds will vary according to SOM**

a Based on a sandy loam soil as defined in SR3 (Environment Agency, 2009b) and 6% soil organic matter (SOM)

b Figures rounded to two significant figures

c Based only on a comparison of oral and dermal soil exposure with oral Index Dose

d The background ADE is limited to being no larger than the contribution from the relevant soil ADE

e Based on comparison of inhalation exposure with inhalation TDI only

f Based on a lifetime exposure via the oral, dermal and inhalation pathways

g Based on localised effects comparing inhalation exposure with inhalation ID only

h Based on comparison of inhalation exposure with inhalation ID

i Based on comparison of oral and dermal exposure with oral TDI

j Based on comparison of oral, dermal and inhalation exposure with inhalation TDI

k Based on comparison of all exposure pathways with oral TDI

l S4ULs assume that free phase contamination is not present

m S4ULs based on a sub-surface soil to indoor air correction factor of 10

n The HCV applied is based on the intake of total Xylene and therefore exposure should not consider an isomer in isolation

o Oral, dermal and inhalation exposure compared with oral HCV

p S4ULs based on a sub-surface soil to indoor air correction factor of 1

q Based on a comparison of inhalation exposure with the inhalation TDI for localised effects

r Based on 2,4-dichlorophenol unless otherwise stated

s Based on 2,3,4,6-tetrachlorophenol

t Based on lowest GAC for all three xylene isomers

u Measured concentrations of benzo(a)pyrene should be compared to the S4UL for benzo(a)pyrene as a single compound and to the S4UL for benzo(a)pyrene as a surrogate marker of genotoxic PAHs.

vap S4UL presented exceeded the vapour saturation limit, which is presented in brackets

sol S4UL presented exceeds the solubility saturation limit, which is presented in brackets

dir S4ULs based on a threshold protective of direct skin contact, guideline in brackets based on the health effects following long term exposure provided for illustration only

Table 3: Soil Guideline Values (SGVs) for dioxins, furans and dioxin like PCBs

Determinand	Allotments	Residential with consumption of homegrown produce	Residential without consumption of homegrown produce	Commercial
Sum of PCDDs, PCDFs and dioxin- like PCBs	0.008	0.008	0.008	0.24

Units are mg/kg Dry Weight

Table 4: EIC/AGS/CL:AIRE Generic Assessment Criteria (GAC)

	Allotments	Residential with consumption of homegrown produce	Residential without consumption of homegrown produce	Commercial	Soil Saturation Concentration
Metals					
Antimony	ND	ND	550	7500	NA
Barium	ND	ND	1300	22000	NA
Molybdenum	ND	ND	670	17000	NA
Organics (SOM 1%/ 2.5%/ 6%)					
1,1,2 Trichloroethane	0.28 / 0.61 / 1.4	0.6 / 1.2 / 2.7	0.88 / 1.8 / 3.9	94 / 190 / 400	4030 / 8210 / 18000
1,1-Dichloroethane	9.2 / 17 / 35	2.4 / 3.9 / 7.4	2.5 / 4.1 / 7.7	280 / 450 / 850	1830 / 2960 / 5600
1,1-Dichloroethene	2.8 / 5.6 / 12	0.23 / 0.4 / 0.82	0.23 / 0.41 / 0.82	26 / 46 / 92	2230 / 3940 / 7940
1,2,4-Trimethylbenzene	0.38 / 0.93 / 2.2	0.35 / 0.85 / 2	0.41 / 0.99 / 2.3	42 / 99 / 220	557 / 1360 / 3250
1,2-Dichloropropane	0.62 / 1.2 / 2.6	0.024 / 0.042 / 0.084	0.024 / 0.042 / 0.085	3.3 / 5.9 / 12	1190 / 2110 / 4240
2,4-Dimethylphenol	3.1 / 7.2 / 17	19 / 43 / 97	210 / 410 / 730	16000 / 24000 / 30000	1380 / 3140 / 7240
2,4-Dinitrotoluene	0.22 / 0.49 / 1.1	1.5 / 3.2 / 7.2	170 / 170 / 170	3700 / 3700 / 3800	141 / 299 / 669
2,6-Dinitrotoluene	0.12 / 0.27 / 0.61	0.78 / 1.7 / 3.9	78 / 84 / 87	1900 / 1900 / 1900	287 / 622 / 1400
2-Chloronaphthalene	40 / 98 / 230	3.7 / 9.2 / 22	3.8 / 9.3 / 22	390 / 960 / 2200	114 / 280 / 669
Biphenyl	14 / 35 / 83	66 / 160 / 360	220 / 500 / 980	18000 / 33000 / 48000	34.4 / 84.3 / 201
Bis (2-ethylhexyl) phthalate	47 / 120 / 280	280 / 610 / 1100	2700 / 2800 / 2800	85000 / 86000 / 86000	8.68 / 21.6 / 51.7

Stantec Guide: Criteria Used in Generic Quantitative Risk Assessment (England)

	Allotments	Residential with consumption of homegrown produce	Residential without consumption of homegrown produce	Commercial	Soil Saturation Concentration
Bromobenzene	3.2 / 7.6 / 18	0.87 / 2 / 4.7	0.91 / 2.1 / 4.9	97 / 220 / 520	853 / 1970 / 4580
Bromodichloromethane	0.016 / 0.032 / 0.068	0.016 / 0.03 / 0.061	0.019 / 0.034 / 0.07	2.1 / 3.7 / 7.6	1790 / 3220 / 6570
Bromoform	0.95 / 2.1 / 4.6	2.8 / 5.9 / 13	5.2 / 11 / 23	760 / 1500 / 3100	2690 / 5480 / 12000
Butyl benzyl phthalate	220 / 550 / 1300	1400 / 3300 / 7200	42000 / 44000 / 44000	940000 / 940000 / 950000	26.3 / 64.7 / 154
Chloroethane	110 / 200 / 380	8.3 / 11 / 18	8.4 / 11 / 18	960 / 1300 / 2100	2610 / 3540 / 5710
Chloromethane	0.066 / 0.13 / 0.23	0.0083 / 0.0098 / 0.013	0.0085 / 0.0099 / 0.013	1 / 1.2 / 1.6	1910 / 2240 / 2990
Cis 1,2 Dichloroethene	0.26 / 0.5 / 1	0.11 / 0.19 / 0.37	0.12 / 0.2 / 0.39	14 / 24 / 47	3940 / 6610 / 12900
Dichloromethane	0.1 / 0.19 / 0.34	0.58 / 0.98 / 1.7	2.1 / 2.8 / 4.5	270 / 360 / 560	7270 / 9680 / 15300
Diethyl Phthalate	19 / 41 / 94	120 / 260 / 570	1800 / 3500 / 6300	150000 / 220000 / 290000	13.7 / 29.1 / 65
Di-n-butyl phthalate	2 / 5 / 12	13 / 31 / 67	450 / 450 / 450	15000 / 15000 / 15000	4.65 / 11.4 / 27.3
Di-n-octyl phthalate	940 / 2100 / 3900	2300 / 2800 / 3100	3400 / 3400 / 3400	89000 / 89000 / 89000	32.6 / 81.5 / 196
Hexachloroethane	0.27 / 0.67 / 1.6	0.2 / 0.48 / 1.1	0.22 / 0.54 / 1.3	22 / 53 / 120	8.17 / 20.1 / 48.1
Isopropylbenzene	32 / 79 / 190	11 / 27 / 64	12 / 28 / 67	1400 / 3300 / 7700	390 / 950 / 2250
Methyl tert-butyl ether (MTBE)	23 / 44 / 90	49 / 84 / 160	73 / 120 / 220	7900 / 13000 / 24000	20400 / 33100 / 62700
Propylbenzene	34 / 83 / 200	34 / 82 / 190	40 / 97 / 230	4100 / 9700 / 21000	402 / 981 / 2330
Styrene	1.6 / 3.7 / 8.7	8.1 / 19 / 43	35 / 78 / 170	3300 / 6500 / 11000	626 / 1440 / 3350
Total Cresols (2-, 3- and 4-methylphenol)	12 / 27 / 63	80 / 180 / 400	3700 / 5400 / 6900	160000 / 180000 / 180000	15000 / 32500 / 73300
Trans 1,2 Dichloroethene	0.93 / 1.9 / 4	0.19 / 0.34 / 0.7	0.19 / 0.35 / 0.71	22 / 40 / 81	3420 / 6170 / 12600
Tributyl tin oxide	0.042 / 0.1 / 0.24	0.25 / 0.59 / 1.3	1.4 / 3.1 / 5.7	130 / 180 / 200	41.3 / 101 / 241

Units are mg/kg Dry Weight

Table 5: Tier 2 Criteria for the Assessment of Soils – Protection of Flora and Fauna

Parameter	ICRCL 70/90 ^a		SSVs ^b	Code of Practice for Agricultural Use of Sewage Sludge ^c	BS 3882:2015 Specification for topsoil and requirements for use
	Maximum				
	Livestock	Crop Growth	mg/kgDW	mg/kgDW	mg/kgDW
	mg/kgDW	mg/kgDW			
Antimony			37		
Arsenic	500	1000		50	
Cadmium	30	50	0.6	3	
Chromium				400	
Cobalt			4.2		
Copper	500	250	35.1	80/ 100/ 135/ 200 ^d	<100/<135/<200 ^e
Fluoride	1000			500	
Lead	1000			300	
Mercury				1	
Molybdenum			5.1	4	
Nickel			28.2	50/ 60/ 75/ 110 ^d	<60/<75/<110 ^e
Selenium				3	
Silver			0.3		
Vanadium			2.0		
Zinc	3000	1000	35.6	200/200/200/300 ^d	<200/<200/<300 ^e
Benzo(a)pyrene			0.15		
Bis(2-ethylhexyl) phthalate			13		
Hexachlorobenzene			0.002		
Pentachlorobenzene					
Pentachlorophenol			0.6		
Perfluorooctanoic acid			0.022		
Perfluorooctane sulfonate			0.014		
Polychlorinated alkanes medium chain			11.9		
Tetrachloroethene					
Toluene					
Triclosan			0.13		

Stantec Guide: Criteria Used in Generic Quantitative Risk Assessment (England)

Parameter	ICRCL 70/90 ^a		SSVs ^b	Code of Practice for Agricultural Use of Sewage Sludge ^c	BS 3882:2015 Specification for topsoil and requirements for use
	Maximum				Phytotoxic contaminants
	Livestock	Crop Growth			
	mg/kgDW	mg/kgDW	mg/kgDW	mg/kgDW	mg/kgDW
Tris(2-chloroethyl)phosphate			1.1		
Tris(2-chloro-1-methylethyl)phosphate			1.8		

- a. Interdepartmental Committee on the Redevelopment of Contaminated Land (ICRCL) 70/90 Restoration and Aftercare of Metalliferous Mining Sites for Pasture and Grazing 1st edition 1990.
- b. Soil screening values for assessing ecological risks, EA 2017a Report – ShARE id26
- c. Maximum permissible concentration of potentially toxic elements for Arable land from the Sewage sludge in agriculture: code of practice.. There are also criteria for Grassland which are higher than for Arable.
- d. Where four values are presented, concentrations are for soils with pH values 5.0-5.5/ 5.5-6.0/ 6.0-7.0/ >7.0 (and the soils contain more than 5% calcium carbonate)
- e. Where three values are presented, concentrations are for soils with pH values <6.0/ 6.0-7.0/ >7.0

Table 6: Tier 2 Criteria for Screening Liquids

	Screening Concentration (mg/l)			
	Minimum Reporting Value	Human Consumption	Fresh Water/Inland	Salt Water/Other
Arsenic SP	-	0.01	0.05 ⁽²⁾	0.025 ⁽²⁾
Boron	-	1	-	-
Cadmium PS	0.0001	0.005	≤0.00008, 0.00008, 0.00009, 0.00015, 0.00025 ⁽¹⁴⁾	0.0002
Chromium (total)	-	0.05	-	-
Chromium (III) SP	-	-	0.0047	-
Chromium (VI) SP	-	-	0.0034	0.0006
Copper SP	-	2	0.001 bioavailable	0.00376 bioavailable
Iron SP	-	0.2	1	1
Lead PS	-	0.01	0.0012 bioavailable	0.0013 bioavailable
Mercury compounds PS	0.00001	0.001	0.00007 max	0.00007 max
Manganese SP	-	0.05	0.123 bioavailable	-
Nickel PS	-	0.02	0.004 bioavailable	0.0086 bioavailable
Selenium	-	0.01	-	-
Zinc SP	-	5 ⁽³⁾	0.0109bioavailable ⁽¹³⁾	0.0068bioavailable ⁽¹³⁾
Chlorinated Compounds				
C10-13 chloroalkanes PS short chain chlorinated paraffins	-	-	0.0004	0.0004
Dichloromethane PS	-	-	0.02	0.02
1,2-Dichloroethane PS	0.001	0.003	0.01	0.01
Trichloroethene PS	0.0001	0.01 ⁽⁵⁾	0.01	0.01
1,1,1-Trichloroethane	0.0001	-	-	-
1,1,2-Trichloroethane	0.0001	-	-	-
Trichloromethanes PS	-	0.1 ⁽¹⁾	0.0025	0.0025
1, 2, 4-Trichlorobenzene	0.00001	-	-	-
Tetrachloroethene PS	0.0001	0.01 ⁽⁵⁾	0.01	0.01
Tetrachloromethane PS	0.0001	0.003	0.012	0.012
Tetrachloroethane SP	-	-	0.140	-
Vinyl chloride	-	0.0005	-	-
Trichlorobenzene (TCB) PS	-	-	0.0004	0.0004
Chloroform	0.0001	-	-	-
Chloronitrotoluenes(CNT)⁽¹¹⁾	0.001	-	-	-
Hexachlorobutadiene PS	0.000005	-	0.0006 max	0.0006 max
Hexachlorocyclohexanes (HCH) PS	0.000001	-	0.00002	0.000002
Polycyclic Aromatic Hydrocarbons				
Acenaphthene	-	-	-	-

Stantec Guide: Criteria Used in Generic Quantitative Risk Assessment (England)

	Screening Concentration (mg/l)			
	Minimum Reporting Value	Human Consumption	Fresh Water/Inland	Salt Water/Other
Acenaphthylene	-	-	-	-
Anthracene PS	-	-	0.0001	0.0001
Benzo(a)anthracene	-	-	-	-
Benzo(b)fluoranthene PS	-	0.0001 ⁽¹⁰⁾	0.000017 max ⁽¹²⁾	0.000017 max ⁽¹²⁾
Benzo(a)pyrene PS	-	0.00001	0.00000017	0.00000017
Benzo(k)fluoranthene PS	-	0.0001 ⁽¹⁰⁾	0.000017 max ⁽¹²⁾	0.000017 max ⁽¹²⁾
Benzo(g,h,i)perylene PS	-	0.0001 ⁽¹⁰⁾	0.0000082 max ⁽¹²⁾	0.00000082 max ⁽¹²⁾
Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene PS	-	0.0001 ⁽¹⁰⁾	- ⁽¹²⁾	- ⁽¹²⁾
Chrysene	-	-	-	-
Dibenzo(a,h)anthracene	-	-	-	-
Fluoranthene PS	-	-	0.0000063	0.0000063
Fluorene	-	-	-	-
Phenanthrene	-	-	-	-
Pyrene	-	-	-	-
Naphthalene PS	-	-	0.002	0.002
Polycyclic Aromatic Hydrocarbons	-	0.0001 ⁽¹⁰⁾	-	-
Petroleum hydrocarbons				
Total petroleum hydrocarbons	-	0.01 ⁽³⁾	-	-
Benzene PS	0.001	0.001	0.01	0.008
Toluene SP	0.004	0.7 ⁽⁹⁾	0.074	0.074
Ethylbenzene	-	0.3 ⁽⁹⁾	-	-
Xylenes	0.003 ⁽⁴⁾	0.5 ⁽⁹⁾	-	-
Methyl tert-butyl ether (MTBE)	-	0.015 ⁽⁷⁾	-	-
Pesticides and Herbicides				
Alachlor PS	-	-	0.0003	0.0003
Aldrin PS	0.000003	0.00003	0.00001 ⁽⁸⁾	0.000005 ⁽⁸⁾
Dieldrin PS	0.000003	0.00003		
Endrin PS	0.000003	0.0006 ⁽⁹⁾		
Isodrin	0.000003	-	-	-
2,4 dichlorophenol SP	0.0001	-	0.0042	0.00042
2,4 D ester SP	0.0001	-	0.0003	0.0003
op and pp DDT (each) PS	-	0.001 ⁽⁶⁾	0.000025 ⁽⁶⁾	0.000025 ⁽⁶⁾
op and pp DDE (each)	-	-	-	-
op and pp TDE (each)	-	-	-	-
Dimethoate SP	0.00001	-	0.00048	0.00048
Endosulfan PS	0.000005	-	0.000005	0.0000005
Hexachlorobenzene PS	0.000001	-	0.00005 max	0.00005 max
Permethrin SP	-	-	0.000001	0.0000002
Atrazine PS	0.00003	-	0.0006	0.0006
Simazine PS	0.00003	-	0.001	0.001
Linuron SP	-	-	0.0005	0.0005
Mecoprop SP	-	-	0.018	0.018
Trifluralin PS	0.00001	-	0.00003	0.00003
Total pesticides	-	0.0005	-	-
Miscellaneous				
Ammoniacal nitrogen (as NH ₄ ⁺)	-	0.5	0.26 ¹⁶ 0.39 ¹⁷	-
Ammoniacal nitrogen (as N)	-	0.39	0.2 ¹⁶ 0.3 ¹⁷	-
Unionised Ammonia (NH ₃) SP	-	-	-	0.021
Chloride	-	250	-	-
Chlorine SP	-	-	0.002	0.01 max
Cyanide SP (hydrogen cyanide)	-	0.05	0.001	0.001
Nitrate (as NO ₃)	-	50	-	-
Nitrite (as NO ₂)	-	0.1	-	-
Phenol SP	-	0.005 ⁽³⁾	0.0077	0.0077
Pentachlorophenol PS	0.0001	-	0.0004	0.0004
PCBs (individual congeners)	0.000001	-	-	-
Sodium	-	200	-	-
Sulphate	-	250	-	-

Stantec Guide: Criteria Used in Generic Quantitative Risk Assessment (England)

	Screening Concentration (mg/l)			
	Minimum Reporting Value	Human Consumption	Fresh Water/Inland	Salt Water/Other
Tributyl and triphenyl tin compounds (each) PS	0.000001	-	0.0000002	0.0000002
Di(2-ethylhexyl)-phthalate PS	-	-	0.0013	0.0013

Substances highlighted in yellow are hazardous substances, PS = Priority Substances, SP = Specific Pollutants, '- screening concentration is not available, 'max' – maximum allowable concentration used where no annual average provided

Notes:

- Concentration for trihalomethanes is the sum of chloroform, bromoform, dibromochloromethane and bromodichloromethane.
- Concentration is the dissolved fraction of a water sample obtained by filtration through a 0.45um filter.
- Concentration is taken from Statutory Instrument 1989 No. 1147. The Water Supply (Water Quality) Regulations 1989, as amended.
- Concentration for xylenes is 0.003mg/l each for o-xylene and m/p xylene.
- Concentration is the Sum of TCE and PCE.
- Concentration is for Total DDT. Para DDT on its own has a target concentration of 0.00001mg/l.
- Concentration for MTBE is taken from Environment Agency guidance, dated 2006.
- Concentration is the sum of aldrin, dieldrin, endrin.
- Concentration is taken from WHO (2004) guidelines for drinking-water quality.
- Sum of benzo(b)fluoranthene, benzo(k)fluoranthene, benzo(ghi)perylene, indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene
- Concentration is for 2,6-CNT, 4,2-CNT, 4,3-CNT, 2,4-CNT, 2,5-CNT
- BAP can be considered as a marker of the other PAHs for comparison with the annual average
- Concentration plus ambient background concentration (dissolved)
- For cadmium and its compounds the EQS depends on the hardness of the water (Class 1: < 40 mg CaCO₃/l, Class 2: 40 to < 50 mg CaCO₃/l, Class 3: 50 to < 100 mg CaCO₃/l, Class 4: 100 to < 200 mg CaCO₃/l and Class 5: ≥ 200 mg CaCO₃/l).
- Manufactured and used in industrial applications, such as flame retardants and plasticisers, as additives in metal working fluids, in sealants, paints, adhesives, textiles, leather fat and coatings. Persistent, bioaccumulate and toxic to aquatic life (carcinogen in rat studies). Candidate Persistent Organic Pollutant (POP).
- Acceptable 90th percentile concentration for a freshwater lake/river with "High" chemical quality standard and alkalinity (as mg/l CaCO₃) < 50 mg/L or alkalinity < 200 mg/L where river elevation > 80 m above Ordnance Datum (mAOD). See the Water Framework Directive (Standards and Classification) Directions (England and Wales) 2015 for further details.
- Acceptable 90th percentile concentration for a freshwater lake/river with "High" chemical quality standard and alkalinity (as mg/l CaCO₃) ≥ 50 mg/L where river elevation < 80 m mAOD or > 200 mg/l where river elevation > 80 mAOD. See the Water Framework Directive (Standards and Classification) Directions (England and Wales) 2015 for further details.

Table 7: Tier 2 Criteria for Screening Groundwater Vapour Generation Hazard

Chemical	CAS	GAC _{gw vap} (µg/l) ^{1,2}		Aqueous Solubility (µg/l)
		Residential	Commercial	
Petroleum Hydrocarbons				
1,2,4-Trimethylbenzene	95-63-6	24	2,200	559,000
Benzene ³	71-43-2	210	20,000	1,780,000
Ethylbenzene ³	100-41-4	10,000	960,000 (sol)	180,000
Isopropylbenzene	98-82-8	850	86,000 (sol)	56,000
Propylbenzene	103-65-1	2,700	240,000 (sol)	54,100
Styrene	100-42-5	8,800	810,000 (sol)	290,000
Toluene ³	108-88-3	230,000	21,000,000 (sol)	590,000
TPH Aliphatic EC5-EC6 ³		1,900	190,000 (sol)	35,900
TPH Aliphatic >EC6-EC8 ³		1,500	150,000 (sol)	5,370
TPH Aliphatic >EC8-EC10 ³		57	5,700 (sol)	427
TPH Aliphatic >EC10-EC12 ³		37	3,600 (sol)	34
TPH Aromatic >EC5-EC7 ^{2,3}		210,000	20,000,000 (sol)	1,780,000
TPH Aromatic >EC7-EC8 ³		220,000	21,000,000 (sol)	590,000
TPH Aromatic >EC8-EC10 ³		1,900	190,000 (sol)	64,600
TPH Aromatic >EC10-EC12 ³		6,800	660,000 (sol)	24,500
TPH Aromatic >EC12-EC16 ³		39,000	3,700,000 (sol)	5,750
meta-Xylene ^{3,5}	108-38-3	9,500	940,000 (sol)	200,000
ortho-Xylene ^{3,5}	95-47-6	12,000	1,100,000 (sol)	173,000
para-Xylene ^{3,5}	106-42-3	9,900	980,000 (sol)	200,000
Polycyclic Aromatic Hydrocarbons (PAH)				
Acenaphthene	83-32-9	170,000 (sol)	15,000,000 (sol)	4,110

Stantec Guide: Criteria Used in Generic Quantitative Risk Assessment (England)

Chemical	CAS	GAC _{gw vap} (µg/l) ^{1,2}		Aqueous Solubility (µg/l)
		Residential	Commercial	
Acenaphthylene	208-96-8	220,000 (sol)	20,000,000 (sol)	7,950
Fluorene	86-73-7	210,000 (sol)	18,000,000 (sol)	1,860
Naphthalene	91-20-3	220	23,000 (sol)	19,000
Pesticides				
Aldrin	309-00-2	47 (sol)	3,700 (sol)	20
<i>alpha</i> -Endosulfan	959-98-8	7,400 (sol)	590,000 (sol)	530
<i>beta</i> -Endosulfan	33213-65-9	7,500 (sol)	600,000 (sol)	280
Halogenated Organics				
1,1,1,2-Tetrachloroethane	79-34-5	240	22,000	1,110,000
1,1,1-Trichloroethane	71-55-6	3,000	290,000	1,300,000
1,1,2,2-Tetrachloroethane	79-35-4	1,600	150,000	2,930,000
1,1,2-Trichloroethane	79-00-5	520	49,000	4,491,000
1,1-Dichloroethane	75-34-3	2,700	260,000	3,666,000
1,1-Dichloroethene	75-35-4	160	1,600	3,100,000
1,2,3,4-Tetrachlorobenzene	634-66-2	240	31,000 (sol)	7,800
1,2,3,5-Tetrachlorobenzene	634-90-2	7.0	600	3,500
1,2,3-Trichlorobenzene	87-61-7	35	3,100	21,000
1,2,4,5-Tetrachlorobenzene	95-94-3	8.1	700 (sol)	600
1,2,4-Trichlorobenzene	120-82-1	68	7,200	41,400
1,2-Dichlorobenzene	95-50-1	2,000	220,000 (sol)	133,000
1,2-Dichloroethane	107-06-2	8.9	850	8,680,000
1,2-Dichloropropane	78-87-5	22	2,600	2,050,000
1,3,5-Trichlorobenzene	108-70-3	7.4	660	6,000
1,3-Dichlorobenzene	541-73-1	31	2,800	103,000
1,4-Dichlorobenzene	106-46-7	5,000	460,000 (sol)	51,200
Bromobenzene	108-86-1	220	20,000	388,040
Bromodichloromethane	75-27-4	17	1,600	3,000,000
Bromoform (Tribromomethane)	75-25-2	3,100	400,000	3,000,000
Chlorobenzene	108-90-7	98	15,000	387,000
Chloroethane	75-00-3	10,000	1,000,000	5,742,000
Chloroethene (Vinyl Chloride)	75-01-4	0.62	63	2,760,000
Chloromethane	74-87-3	14	1,400	5,350,000
<i>cis</i> -1,2-Dichloroethene	156-59-2	130	13,000	7,550,000
Dichloromethane	75-09-2	3,300	370,000	20,080,000
Hexachlorobenzene	118-74-1	16 (sol)	1,400 (sol)	10
Hexachlorobutadiene	87-68-3	1.7	230	4,800
Hexachloroethane	67-72-1	8.5	740	49,900
Pentachlorobenzene	608-93-5	140	12,000 (sol)	500
Tetrachloroethene	127-18-4	34	4,600	225,000
Tetrachloromethane (Carbon Tetrachloride)	56-23-5	5.3	770	846,000
<i>trans</i> -1,2-Dichloroethene	156-60-5	160	16,000	5,250,000
Trichloroethene	79-01-6	5.7	530	1,370,000
Trichloromethane (Chloroform)	67-66-3	790	85,000	8,950,000
Others (organic and inorganic)				
2-Chloronaphthalene	91-58-7	160	14,000 (sol)	11,700
Biphenyl (Limonene)	92-52-4	15,000 (sol)	1,300,000 (sol)	4,060
Carbon Disulphide	75-15-0	56	5,600	2,100,000
Mercury, elemental	7439-97-6	1.1	95 (sol)	56
Methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE)	1634-04-4	83,000	7,800,000	48,000,000

Notes

1. GAC in *italics* with (sol) exceed aqueous solubility.
2. GAC rounded to two significant figures.
3. The GAC for these petroleum hydrocarbon contaminants have been calculated using a sub-surface soil to indoor air correction factor of 10 in line with the physical-chemical data sources.
4. The GAC for TPH fractions do not account for genotoxic mutagenic effects. Concentrations of TPH Aromatic >EC5-EC7 should therefore also be compared with the GAC for benzene to ensure that such effects are also assessed.
5. The Health Criteria Value used for each xylene isomer was for total xylene. If site specific additivity assessments are not completed, as a conservative measure the sum of isomer concentrations should be compared to the lowest xylene GAC (as is the case for soil GAC).