NOAA Technical Memorandum NOS OMA 52

THE POTENTIAL FOR BIOLOGICAL EFFECTS OF SEDIMENT-SORBED CONTAMINANTS TESTED IN THE NATIONAL STATUS AND TRENDS PROGRAM

Edward R. Long and Lee G. Morgan



Seattle, Washington Second Printing August 1991

United States Department of Commerce Robert A. Mosbacher Secretary National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration John A. Knauss Assistant Secretary and Administrator National Ocean Service Virginia Tippie Assistant Administrator for Ocean Services and Coastal Zone Management Coastal and Estuarine Assessment Branch Ocean Assessments Division Office of Oceanography and Marine Assessment National Ocean Service National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration U.S. Department of Commerce Rockville, Maryland

NOTICE

This report has been reviewed by the National Ocean Service of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) and approved for publication. Such approval does not signify that the contents of this report necessarily represent the official position of NOAA or of the Government of the United States, nor does mention of trade names or commercial products constitute endorsement or recommendation for their use. Errata Sheet

Page 63, Table 21

83 Southern California

Moderate species richness: PCB concentration 400 ± 600 ppb should be 39 ± 60 ppb

(With this correction, the ER-M value for PCB in Tables 22 and B-11 would change from 400 ppb to 368 ppb.)

Page 126, Table 64

65 Spiked Sediment Bioassays

Significant toxicity to *R. abronius* with mixtures: 500 ppb should be 10,000 ppb

(With this correction, the ER-M values for phenanthrene in Tables 65 and B-29 would change from 1380 ppb to 1390 ppb.)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	1
METHODS	2
RESULTS	8
Trace metals 🖌	8
PCBs 🖌	61
Pesticides 🗸	66
Polynuclear Aromatic Hydrocarbons 🖌	87
DISCUSSION	135
CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	140
REFERENCES	168
APPENDIX A	A-1
APPENDIX B 🗸	B-1
GLOSSARY	G-1

A number of errors were discovered following the initial printing of this document. These errors have been corrected in this second printing. All corrected data are followed by a check (\checkmark). Except for total PCB and phenanthrene, none of the ER-L or ER-M values changed as a result of these corrections.

THE POTENTIAL FOR BIOLOGICAL EFFECTS OF SEDIMENT-SORBED CONTAMINANTS TESTED IN THE NATIONAL STATUS AND TRENDS PROGRAM

Edward R. Long and Lee G. Morgan

ABSTRACT

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) annually collects and chemically analyzes sediment samples from sites located in coastal marine and estuarine environments throughout the United States as a part of the National Status and Trends (NS&T) Program. While the chemical data provide indications of the relative degrees of contamination among the sampling sites, they provide neither a measure of adverse biological effects nor an estimate of the potential for effects. Data derived from a wide variety of methods and approaches were assembled and evaluated to identify informal guidelines for use in evaluation of the NS&T Program sediment data. The data from three basic approaches to the establishment of effects-based criteria were evaluated: the equilibriumpartitioning approach, the spiked-sediment bioassay approach, and various methods of evaluating synoptically collected biological and chemical data in field surveys. The chemical concentrations observed or predicted by the different methods to be associated with biological effects were sorted, and the lower 10 percentile and median concentrations were identified along with an overall apparent effects threshold. The lower 10 percentile in the data was identified as an Effects Range-Low (ER-L) and the median was identified as an Effects Range-Median (ER-M). Note that these ER-L and ER-M values are not to be construed as NOAA standards or criteria. The ambient NS&T Program sediment data from sampling sites were compared with the respective ER-L and ER-M values for each analyte. The comparisons were used to rank sites with regard to the potential for adverse biological effects, assuming that the sites in which the average chemical concentrations exceeded the most ER-L and ER-M values would have the highest potential for effects. The rankings indicated that a sampling site located in the Hudson-Raritan estuary had the highest potential for effects, followed by a site located in Boston Harbor, a site located in western Long Island Sound, and a site located in the Oakland estuary of San Francisco Bay.

INTRODUCTION

The concentrations of selected potentially toxic chemicals in marine and estuarine sediments have been quantified annually by NOAA in the NS&T Program since 1984. Sediments from about 200 sites nationwide have been sampled and analyzed for a variety of trace metals, petroleum hydrocarbons, and synthetic organic compounds. The chemical concentrations have been compared among sampling sites and among sampling years at many of the sites. These data have been useful in characterizing the chemical conditions at sampling sites (NOAA, 1987, 1988) and in determining whether or not conditions are changing over time. In selected geographic areas measures of biological effects have been performed to accompany the chemical analyses and used to determine or indicate the significance of the sediment contamination. However, biological measures of the effects or potential for effects of these mixtures of chemicals have not been determined at the majority of the sites.

The purpose of this report is to assess the relative likelihood or potential for adverse biological effects occurring due to exposure of biota to toxicants in sediments sampled and analyzed by the NS&T Program. In order to satisfy that objective, guidelines were developed for use in assessing the potential for effects. These guidelines were developed by employing a preponderance of evidence assembled from a variety of approaches and from data gathered in many geographic areas. These guidelines were used to rank and prioritize the NS&T Program sites with regard to the relative potential for contaminant-induced effects. The severity and geographic extent of adverse effects may be determined by NOAA in intensive regional surveys in areas in which high-priority sites are located. These guidelines were not intended for use in regulatory decisions or any other similar applications.

METHODS

Overall Approach

A three-step approach was followed to complete the evaluation: (1) assemble and review currently available information in which estimates of the sediment concentrations of chemicals associated with adverse biological effects have been determined or could be derived; (2) determine apparent ranges in concentrations of individual chemicals in which effects are likely to occur, based upon a preponderance of evidence; and (3) evaluate the NS&T Program sediment chemical data relative to these consensus effects ranges. The first step involved reviewing reports either (1) in which effects-based sediment quality values were reported or (2) in which matched chemistry and biological effects data were listed, followed by an evaluation of the co-occurrence of chemical concentrations with measures of effects. These reports embraced controlled laboratory studies of effects of sediments spiked with individual chemicals, calculations of unacceptable concentrations based upon theoretical equilibrium partitioning principles, and evaluations of data from field studies in which matching chemical and biological measures were performed on subsamples of sediments. Among the reports reviewed, only those that met certain criteria were selected for further use. Chapman et al., 1987 compared the estimated sediment quality values for three chemicals based upon four approaches, and noted that the values from the approaches were consistent.

The second step included screening the data by examining the degree of concordance between the biological and chemical data, sorting the remaining data in ascending order, and determining consensus ranges in values associated with adverse effects. A key element of the second step was the determination of the chemical concentrations above which adverse effects may be first expected and the concentrations above which adverse effects always or almost always may be expected. The intent was not to identify only the lowest concentration of contaminants at which an adverse effect had been observed or predicted for any organism.

The third step involved comparing the ambient sediment chemistry data from the NS&T Program with the respective ranges in chemical concentrations apparently associated with observations of effects. A comparison of proposed or preliminary sediment quality values and ambient concentrations of chemicals in United States sediments was previously conducted by Bolton *et al.*, 1985 and Lyman *et al.*, 1987 for the United States Environmental Protection Agency (U. S. EPA). Both reports involved a relatively small number of chemicals and sediment quality values derived from only one approach. The approach followed in this report is similar to the approach used in those two reports, but includes sediment quality values derived from many methods and evaluates data for 12 trace metals, 18 petroleum hydrocarbons, and 11 synthetic organic compounds or classes.

Approaches for Determining Effects-Based Sediment Quality Criteria

Since the purpose of this report is not to critique or evaluate the relative strengths and weaknesses of the various approaches that have been used to develop effects-based sediment quality values, only a brief description of each will be presented here. Chapman (1989) reviewed and compared the approaches currently being pursued to develop sediment quality values, but did not compare the concentrations resulting from those approaches. That report and the other documents cited herein should be consulted for more information on each of the respective approaches.

Effects-based sediment quality values derived from different numbers and types of approaches are available for some of the NS&T Program analytes. The values from some approaches are region-specific and those from other approaches are available for only a minority of the NS&T Program analytes. Because of the complementary strengths of each of the approaches, it was decided to determine if a consensus value in concentrations for each chemical was apparent and to use those consensus values in evaluating the NS&T Program

data. Conversely, because of the apparent weaknesses of each method alone, it was decided that values based upon a consensus of multiple approaches and multiple applications of each approach would have more credibility than values based upon only one approach.

Background Approach. Criteria have been established in various geographic areas of the United States and other countries based upon an approach involving the use of reference or background values in sediments. In this approach, the data from a pristine area have been used as the standard and concentrations in sediments from target areas that exceed these background values by some specified amount are considered unacceptable. In some cases the criteria were set at some value above the background concentration, say, at 125 percent of background or two standard deviations above the mean background concentration. This approach does not involve any determination or estimation of effects, but the criteria based upon this approach were included in this report for the purpose of comparing them with the criteria developed from the effects-based approaches. These criteria were listed in this report as presented in the cited documents without any modifications, however, they were not used to determine consensus ranges in concentrations associated with effects. Many had been listed and compared by Pavlou and Weston (1983).

Sediment-Water Equilibrium Partitioning (EP) Approach. In this approach the criteria are established for single chemicals at concentrations in sediment that ensure that the concentrations in interstitial water do not exceed the applicable U.S. EPA water quality criteria (Bolton et al., 1985; JRB Associates, 1984). It is assumed that water quality criteria, when applied to the interstitial water of sediments, would protect infaunal organisms. Physical/chemical principles are used to predict the chemical concentrations that would occur in the interstitial water in equilibrium with those concentrations of the chemicals sorbed to particulates in the sediments, recognizing that the distribution of the chemicals between the two phases is highly influenced by the amount of organic carbon or acid volatile sulfides (AVS) present in the sediments. Tessier and Campbell (1987) reviewed many of the chemical and physical factors in sediments that can strongly influence the partitioning of trace metals between aqueous- and particle-bound phases of sediments and observed that, because of these factors, bulk chemical concentrations of trace metals were poor predictors of the bioavailability of these toxicants. Where criteria were listed in cited documents in units dry weight, they were used in this report without any modifications. Where criteria were listed in units of organic carbon, they were converted to units dry weight, assuming a stated organic carbon concentration (usually 1% total organic carbon [TOC]). Where the criteria were listed in the cited documents in units dry weight assuming a reported TOC concentration other than 1 percent (e.g., 4%), those reported values were used in this report without modification.

Most of the EP-derived criteria listed herein were reported by the U. S. EPA, 1988. Since that report was published, new information has become available that strongly suggests that AVS are important in controlling availability of trace metals. The interim criteria reported by the U. S. EPA (1988) did not account for AVS. Nevertheless, these criteria were used in the present document as reported.

Also, some of the sediment/water partitioning coefficients used to calculate the criteria have changed as new data have been developed for some analytes. Although more recent EP-derived criteria are probably more accurate, some of the earlier values were also included in the present document as reported. In addition, some inaccuracy may be possible in the EP-derived values due to the methods used to determine the TOC content of the sediments. The organic carbon normalized partition coefficients (K_{0c}) used to calculate the criteria may differ by factors of 2 to 4 times depending upon whether percent volatile solids or percent organic carbon are determined (Dr. Peter Landrum, NOAA, personal communication).

Spiked-Sediment Bioassay (SSB) Approach. This approach involves exposing organisms to pristine sediments spiked in the laboratory with known amounts of single chemicals (or mixtures), observing either mortality and/or sublethal effects and determining dose-response relationships (*e.g.*, Swartz *et al.*, 1988). Usually the criteria were reported as LC50 or EC50 values, the lethal concentrations or effective concentrations resulting in 50 percent mortality or 50 percent change in some sublethal end-point relative to controls. Where the bioassays were performed specifically for the purpose of determining sediment

quality criteria, the values were listed in this report without modification and the species used and the exposure duration were noted. Where the bioassays were performed to determine the relative toxicity of various chemicals, the resulting values were also listed here without modification. Where bioassays of prospective dredge material or other sediments were performed to determine the potential for bioaccumulation and the authors noted their observations on mortality during the tests, those observations were included in this report.

Screening Level Concentrations (SLC) Approach. Field-collected data are used in this approach and patterns in co-occurrence in sediment concentrations of chemicals and matching analyses of benthic infaunal composition are determined. The SLC are the estimated highest concentration of selected nonpolar organic chemicals that co-occur with approximately 95 percent of the infauna. A cumulative frequency distribution of all stations at which a particular species of infaunal invertebrate is present is plotted against the organic carbon-normalized concentration in sediment of the selected contaminant. The concentration of the contaminant at the locus representing the 90th percentile of the total number of stations at which the species was present is estimated by interpolation and established as the species screening level concentration (SSLC). Next, the SSLCs for a large number of species are plotted as a frequency distribution, and the concentration above which 95 percent of the SSLCs are found is determined as the SLC (Neff *et al.*, 1986). The SLC were calculated based upon data from many areas of the United States (Neff *et al.*, 1986; 1987). It is assumed that the contaminants occur in mixtures. The criteria reported in units organic carbon were converted to units dry weight in this document, assuming a TOC content of 1 percent.

Apparent Effects Threshold (AET) Approach. This approach also involves use of data from matched sediment chemistry and effects measures performed with field-collected sediment samples. Similar to the SLC approach, it is assumed that the chemicals occur in mixtures. An AET concentration is the sediment concentration of a selected chemical above which statistically significant ($P \le 0.05$) biological effects (e.g., depressions in the abundance of benthic infauna or elevated incidence of mortality in sediment toxicity tests) always occur and, therefore, are always expected (PTI Environmental Services, 1988). The AET values reported for Puget Sound were based upon the evaluation of data from many surveys of various portions of that region and were used in this document without modifications. Values reported in 1986 were based primarily upon data from studies performed in the waterways of Commencement Bay and were updated with additional data from other areas in Puget Sound in 1988. In addition, AET values were calculated by the present authors for data from Mississippi Sound generated by Lytle and Lytle, 1985 and for data from San Francisco Bay generated by many investigators in independent surveys (Long and Buchman, 1989; Chapman et al., 1986; U.S. Navy, 1987; Word et al., 1988). These latter values were calculated using the SedQual version 1.1 software developed by PTI Environmental Services, Inc. (1988) for U.S. EPA Region 10 and a sorting procedure, using Microsoft Excel software on a Macintosh computer.

Both the 1986 and the 1988 Puget Sound AET values were used in the present document. The 1988 values were based upon a larger data base than those determined in 1986, they may be more accurate than the former values, and they are being used in management decisions regarding Puget Sound. However, the 1986 concentrations also were used in this document since they were derived with methods equivalent to those used in 1988, with knowledge and data available at that time, and reflect another independent attempt to determine an unacceptable level of sediment contamination. However, whenever a 1988 AET value was exactly the same as a 1986 value, that concentration was only used once during the present data evaluation.

The Puget Sound Dredge Disposal Analysis (PSDDA) prepared screening level and maximum level values based upon the AET concentrations for Puget Sound. These values were listed in the present document without modification.

Bioeffects/Contaminant Co-Occurrence Analyses (COA) Approach. Similar to the SLC and AET approaches, this method also involves use of field-collected data in which chemical mixtures occur. It involves calculation of statistics of central tendency (*i.e.*, means, standard deviations, maxima, minima) in chemical concentrations associated with matching

samples determined to have high, intermediate, and low indications of effects. For example, DeWitt *et al.*, 1988 listed means and standard deviations in concentrations of selected chemicals found to be nontoxic, intermediate in toxicity, and significantly toxic to the amphipod *Rhepoxynius abronius* in tests of Puget Sound sediments. Long (1989) listed the means, standard deviations, maxima, and minima in concentrations of nine physical and chemical parameters in sediments from the Commencement Bay waterways determined to be least, intermediate, and most toxic to *R. abronius*. Data from DeWitt *et al.*, 1988 were used in this report without modifications. The format used by Long (1989) was used and expanded to accommodate many more chemicals quantified in Commencement Bay sediments and the co-occurrence values are reported herein. In addition, many reports in which matching sediment chemistry and sediment toxicity and/or benthic data were listed were evaluated, co-occurrence analyses were performed and the results reported herein.

The COA data from these reports, were collected for purposes other than determining sediment effects thresholds, but, nevertheless, were used here to determine patterns in cooccurrence of effects and contamination. Only those data sets in which chemical concentrations of one or more analytes differed among sampling stations by over an order of magnitude were considered in these analyses. Measures of "effects" observed in studies with a smaller range in chemical concentrations may have been caused solely or in part by other Given the different degrees of variability in analytical procedures among factors. laboratories, orders-of-magnitude differences in chemical concentrations are likely representative of real differences among sites. Where some chemical concentrations were reported as less than the detection limits, one-half of the detection limits were used in the calculations of means and standard deviation. In those reports in which the authors identified statistically significant effects ("hits"), two categories of bioeffects response (hits and non-hits) were established and the means, standard deviation maxima, and minima in chemical concentrations associated with those categories were calculated. In those reports in which the authors did not identify statistically significant effects, a frequency distribution of the bioeffects data was examined, either two or three categories of severity of effects were determined where two or three modes, respectively, in response were evident, and the means, standard deviation, maxima, and minima in chemical concentrations were calculated for each category in bioeffects response. With regard to the latter reports, the determination of these categories of degree of effects was subjective and somewhat arbitrary. Only data from published reports were used in the COA; unpublished data from the numerous pre-dredging assessments that have been performed recently in the United States were not used.

This approach suffers from the same weaknesses as all of the others that involve the use of matching biological and chemical data collected in the field. The assumption must be made that the toxic chemicals have an influence on the biological responses that are measured that outweighs the influence of natural physicochemical factors. The assumption is also made that the chemicals that are quantified were those that were responsible for the measured effects, although co-varying chemicals not quantified may have had an influence upon the biological tests. Although the chemicals likely act together (*e.g.*, synergistically) as mixtures to influence the biological tests, their patterns in co-occurrence are estimated singly in the co-occurrence data analyses. Recognizing these weaknesses in the use of fieldcollected data, data from many geographic areas were evaluated and used in an attempt to evaluate co-occurrence patterns under different pollution conditions. For example, in the analyses of copper data, those data from areas known to be relatively highly contaminated with copper were given more credibility than those from areas known to be contaminated with other chemicals.

Evaluation of the Sediment Values from the Different Approaches.

Tessier and Campbell (1987) summarized the complexities of determining the significance of particulate trace metals contamination in aquatic environments. Uptake (and therefore, effects) of sediment-associated contaminants is largely a function of bioavailability. Bioavailability is strongly influenced by a complex suite of physical, chemical, and biological factors in the sediments. Trace metals can be adsorbed at particle surfaces, carbonate-bound, occluded in iron and/or manganese oxyhydroxides, bound to organic matter, sulphide-bound, matrix-bound, or dissolved in the interstitial water (Tessier and Campbell, 1987). The relative bioavailability of trace metals associated with these phases has the

effect of hindering the prediction of effects, based upon bulk sediment chemical analyses. The oxidation-reduction potential and the concentration of sulphides in the sediments can strongly influence the concentration of trace metals and their availability. Possibly as a result of these complex phase associations, Lee and Mariani (1977) observed very little concordance between measures of bulk sediment chemical concentrations and measures of toxicity, using the shrimp Palaemonetes pugio, in surveys performed nationwide. They concluded, "These bioassays clearly demonstrate the lack of validity of bulk chemical criteria for judging the significance of contaminants associated with dredged sediments." The present evaluation was performed with knowledge of the complexities and uncertainties involved with attempting to associate bulk chemical data with various measures of biological effects. DiToro (1988) argued that it is essential to understand the reasons for varying bioavailability before broadly applicable criteria can be established. His argument was based upon the observation that the concentration-response curve for toxicity could be correlated with the chemical concentration in the pore water and not the total (bulk) sediment. However, with no nationally adopted, official, final effects-based standards available, the use of a preponderance of evidence derived from many approaches was judged by the present authors to be the best method for developing guidance for interpreting the NS&T Program sediment data. Furthermore, in order to develop a preponderance of evidence, many data sets were used in the present document that did not include measures, such as TOC content, that could have been used to explain varying toxicity. In addition, data derived in freshwater and saltwater were merged and treated equally, despite the possibility that bioavailability may differ between the two regimes and the concentration levels may affect the two different ecosystems in much different ways.

Approximately 150 reports were reviewed for possible use in this document. In about onehalf of those reports, there was either no biological data to accompany the sediment chemistry data or vice versa, there was no discernible gradient in contamination for any of the analytes among samples (less than a ten-fold difference), the biological or chemical analytical methods were poorly documented, or the biological and chemical data were not derived from the same sampling locations. The reports in which the data did not satisfy these criteria were not used.

The data from the remaining 85 reports were assembled and listed for each of the NS&T Program analytes according to the categorical type of approach that was used. Then, they were subjected to a screening step. In this step, the data for each analyte were evaluated with consideration given to the methods that were used, the type and magnitude of biological end-point measured, and the degree of concordance between the chemical and biological data. Using these evaluation factors, professional judgment was used to eliminate and disregard some values for some of the chemicals where it appeared that the chemical under consideration was not likely a contributor to the gradient in biological effects. For example, if in a field study in which the investigators expressed the observation that one or more selected chemicals were known to be highly concentrated in their study area, but they also measured other analytes during their chemical analyses, the latter data were included in the data tables, but were excluded from further consideration. If matching chemical and biological data from field studies showed no concordance, the data were listed in the tables, but not given further consideration. If no gradient (generally, less than a two-fold difference) in chemical concentrations was reported between samples that indicated adverse effects and those that did not indicate effects, the data for that particular chemical also were not given further consideration. If no definitive AET concentration could be determined, the "greaterthan" value reported was excluded during this screening step. The screening step was not performed to force consensus where none existed. It was performed before the data were sorted (the next step), so it was not possible to have a priori knowledge of the consensus range. No other quality assurance screening steps were performed with the data.

The data that remained following this screening step were from studies in which effects were either predicted or observed in association with increasing concentrations of the respective analyte. Then, they were sorted in ascending order and listed in Appendix tables for each chemical. Next, usually two values were determined from these remaining data for each chemical: an ER-L, a concentration at the low end of the range in which effects had been observed; and an ER-M, a concentration approximately midway in the range of reported values associated with biological effects. These two values were determined using a method similar to that used by Klapow and Lewis (1979) in establishing marine water quality standards for the State of California. For each chemical of interest, they assembled available data from spiked-water bioassays, examined the distribution of the reported LC50 values, and determined the lower 10- and 50-percentile concentrations among the ranges of values. In the present document, the ER-L values were concentrations equivalent to the lower 10 percentile of the screened available data, and indicated the low end of the range of concentrations in which effects were observed or predicted. They were used in the document as the concentrations above which adverse effects may begin or are predicted among sensitive life stages and/or species or as determined in sublethal tests. The ER-M values for the chemicals were the concentrations equivalent to the 50 percentile point in the screened available data. They were used in the document as the concentration above which effects were frequently or always observed or predicted among most species. The methods of Byrkit (1975) were used to determine the percentile values.

Except for the benthic community data, most of the biological measurements made in the different approaches involved the determination of mortality as the end-point. Some contaminants, such as PCB and some aromatic hydrocarbons, may be mutagenic or teratogenic, and not very toxic in acute tests of mortality. Mutagenicity and other chronic effects may occur at levels lower than those listed in this document in association with acute mortality.

Klapow and Lewis (1979) examined data collected from only one approach, spiked-water bioassays, and assumed that the data from different investigators and studies were equivalent and comparable. The methods commonly used in spiked-water bioassays are relatively standardized. However, they evaluated data derived from tests of different species, which, presumably, had different sensitivities. In the present case, the data were assembled from more than one approach and often from different methods used in any one approach. They included data from studies that involved species with different contaminant sensitivities; therefore, they are less likely to be equivalent and comparable. Nevertheless, following the screening step, they were used as if they were equivalent and comparable in the estimation of ER-L and ER-M values.

In addition to the objectively determined ER-L and ER-M values, overall apparent effects thresholds were subjectively identified for some chemicals. These thresholds were the concentrations above which effects usually or always occurred in association with increasing concentrations of the chemical. They were determined independently of the ER-L and ER-M values by visually examining the sorted data. They are not to be confused with the AET values reported for Puget Sound, San Francisco Bay, and Mississippi Sound. They were identified as an aid in evaluating the accuracy of the ER-L and ER-M values and were not used in ranking the NS&T Program sites.

Data compilation and analysis was as inclusive as possible and no weighting was given to data derived from one approach or another. As Klapow and Lewis (1979) pointed out, the use of the inclusive approach and the calculation of percentiles of the data help eliminate the undue influence of a single (possibly outlier) data point upon the establishment of consensus ranges in concentrations associated with effects. In the present evaluation, the assumption was made that patterns established between effects and chemical concentrations would be more credible if based upon data from several sediment quality criteria than if based upon data from only one approach or experiment.

The ER-L and ER-M values were established objectively by determining the lower 10 and 50 percentiles in the data. No other more rigorous statistical procedures were used, since the consensus ER-L and ER-M values were intended only for use by NOAA as general guidance in evaluating the NS&T Program data.

The relative degrees of confidence in the accuracy of the ER-L and ER-M values are described for each analyte. Values for which we had relatively high confidence were those that were supported by clusters of data with similar concentrations, by data derived from more than one approach, by a data set that included more than results from the use of the COA approach, by data derived from multiple geographic areas, and for which the overall apparent effects threshold was similar to or within the range of the ER-L and ER-M values. Values for which we had relatively low confidence were those that were supported by data

with either a small cluster or no cluster of similar concentrations, by data derived from only one approach and/or from one geographic area, results derived only from the COA approach, and for which the overall apparent effects threshold was dissimilar to or outside the range of the ER-L and ER-M values.

Although the consensus ER-L and ER-M concentrations may be used by others as guidance in evaluating sediment contamination data, there is no intent expressed or implied that these values represent official NOAA standards.

Evaluation of Sediment Effects Values and NS&T Program Data.

Following the determination of the ER-L and ER-M values for each of the analytes, these values were compared with the NS&T Program data to determine which sites had sediments that exceeded these values. The averages of the concentrations of each NS&T Program analyte were calculated for each site, usually based upon 2 adjoining years of data (i.e., n = 3 samples x 2 years = 6 samples). Sites at which the average ambient concentrations exceeded the ER-L and ER-M values were listed for each analyte.

The potential for biological effects was assumed to be highest for those sites in which the sediments exceeded the most ER-M values. This potential was assumed to be lower for sites that exceeded many of the ER-L values, but not the ER-M values. Biological effects were assumed to be least likely at sites that exceeded none of these values. The sites were ranked accordingly.

RESULTS

Three data tables are presented for most NS&T Program analytes. The first appears in the text and lists all of the data from the various approaches that were assembled for each analyte: the type of biological test or measure that was performed or predicted, the geographic area in which the data were collected (if applicable), the chemical concentration associated with that observed or predicted measure of effects, and a reference citation keyed to the reference section of each table. The second appears in Appendix B and, again, lists all of the data. However, in these tables, the data have been sorted in ascending order with remarks regarding whether or not each data point was used to determine the ER-L and ER-M values. The third appears in the text and lists, in ascending order, only those concentrations that remained following examination and screening of the data and includes the ER-L and ER-M values with respect to the data that were used to derive them. The ER-L and ER-M values often were rounded to the nearest full integer as appropriate.

In the third table for each analyte, the type of approach was noted with a shorthand descriptor: EP for equilibrium partitioning, SSB for spiked-sediment bioassay, SLC for screening level concentration, AET for apparent effects threshold, and COA for co-occurrence analyses. Data available for some chemical analytes were judged to be insufficient to warrant the determination of ER-L and ER-M values.

Trace Metals:

Antimony

Acute and chronic toxicity of antimony to freshwater aquatic life occur at water concentrations as low as 9,000 and 1,600 parts per billion (ppb) ν , respectively; toxicity to algal species occurs at concentrations as low as 610 ppb ν ; no saltwater criteria are available (EPA, 1986).

The data evaluated for sediment antimony are from measures of effects performed in Puget Sound and San Francisco Bay (Table 1), and the values available are from AET and cooccurrence calculations. The Puget Sound AET values range from 3.2 ppm to 200 ppm. The AET values for the amphipod bioassay and benthic community composition differed considerably between 1986 and 1988. AET values calculated by the present authors for San Francisco Bay are 1.9 and 2.9 ppm for bivalve (*Crassostrea gigas, Mytilus edulis*) larvae and *R. abronius* amphipod bioassays, respectively. The data from Commencement Bay, Washington indicate that toxicity to both *R. abronius* and the larvae of the oyster *C. gigas* increased with increasing antimony concentrations in the sediments. Sediments that caused moderate bioassay toxicity to both species had a mean of 2.0 ± 5.5 ppm antimony, whereas sediments that were most highly toxic had means of 91.5 ± 184.3 and 27.5 ± 101.5 ppm antimony, respectively.

In San Francisco Bay, there was no concordance between sediment toxicity to amphipods and antimony concentration. Sediments that were least toxic or not toxic had higher mean antimony concentrations than those that were most toxic or significantly toxic. For example, samples in which *R. abronius* mortality was highest $(67 \pm 12\%)$ had antimony concentrations below the detection limits, while those in which mortality was lowest $(18 \pm 6.6\%)$ had a higher mean concentration. This lack of concordance suggests that some other sediment characteristic(s) had a greater influence upon the toxic response than antimony; therefore, the San Francisco Bay amphipod bioassay data were not considered in the estimations of ER-L and ER-M (Table B-1).

Biological effects were noted in San Francisco Bay and Commencement Bay sediments with mean antimony concentrations as low as about 2 ppm (Table 2). The data suggest an ER-L of about 2 ppm, equivalent to the lower 10 percentile of the data (Table 2). Commencement Bay sediments that were moderately toxic to both amphipods and bivalve larvae had a mean concentration of 2 ppm; the PSDDA screening level concentration was 2.6; and the lowest Puget Sound AET value was 3.2 ppm. The data suggest an ER-M of about 25 ppm, roughly equivalent to the 50 percentile of the data (Table 2). This value is supported by observations of high toxicity to bivalve larvae exposed to San Francisco Bay sediments (mean of 25 ppm) and Puget Sound AET from two different biological tests (both 26 ppm). With one exception, effects were always associated with antimony concentrations of 25 ppm or greater (Table B-1).

Data were available from only two approaches and from only two geographic regions. The degree of confidence in both the ER-L and ER-M values for antimony should be considered as moderate. Both values were supported by clusters of similar data, and the overall apparent effects threshold was equivalent to the ER-M value. The determination of the relationships between antimony concentrations and measures of biological effects is hindered by the the lack of data from the predictive EP approach and from single-chemical, SSBs

Referer	ces Biological Approaches	Concentrations (ppm)				
Apparent Effects Threshold						
1	1986 PUGET SOUND AET - R. abronius amphipod bioassay - oyster larvae bioassay - benthic community composition - Microtox [™] bioassay	5.3 26.0 3.2 26.0				
2	1988 PUGET SOUND AET - R. abronius amphipod bioassay - benthic community composition	200.0 150.0				
20	PSDDA guidelines (based upon Puget Sound AET) - screening level concentration - maximum level criterion	2.6 26.0				

Table 1. Summary of sediment effects data available for antimony.

Table 1. Antimony (continued)

Reference	s Biological Approaches C	Concentrations (ppm)				
Apparent Effects Threshold						
*	SAN FRANCISCO BAY, CALIFORNIA AET					
	- bivalve larvae bioassay - R. <i>abronius</i> amphipod bioassay	>1.9 >2.9				
Co-occurre	ence Analyses					
80	COMMENCEMENT BAY, WASHINGTON					
	- highly toxic to R. abronius (15.7 \pm 3.9 dead/20)	91.5 ± 184				
	- moderately toxic to R. abronius (5.2 \pm 1.1 dead/20)	2.0 ± 5				
	- least toxic to R. abronius (2.5 \pm 0.9 dead/20)	0.9 ± 1.0				
	- highly toxic (44.5 \pm 19.0% abnormal) to oyster larvae	27.5 ± 101.5				
	- moderately toxic ($23 \pm 2.3\%$ abnormal) to oyster larvae	2.0 ± 5.5				
	- least toxic (15.1 \pm 3.1% abnormal) to oyster larvae	1.0 ± 1.4				
*	SAN FRANCISCO BAY, CALIFORNIA	• ,				
	- highly toxic (67.0 \pm 11.8% mortality) to R. abronius	na				
	- moderately toxic (33.8 \pm 4.7% mortality) to R. abronius	2.7 ± 6.7				
	- least toxic (18.4 \pm 6.8% mortality) to R. abronius	9.0 ± 11.6				
	- significantly toxic (42.9 \pm 19.2% mortality) to R. abronius	2.3 ± 6.3				
	- not toxic (18.4 \pm 6.8% mortality) to R. abronius	9.9 ± 11.8				
	- highly toxic (92.4 \pm 4.5% abnormal) to bivalve larvae	25 ± 0				
	- moderately toxic (59.4 \pm 11.3% abnormal) to bivalve larve	ae 6.6 ± 1				
	- least toxic (23.3 \pm 7.3% abnormal) to bivalve larvae	5 ± 11.2				
	- significantly toxic (55.7 \pm 22.7% abnormal) to bivalve lar	vae 8.6 ± 11.9				
	- not toxic (31.9 \pm 15.5% abnormal) to bivalve larvae	6.7 ± 12.3				

Reference	Background Approach	Concentrations (ppm)
12	EPA Region VI proposed guideline	500.0
na - not avail	lable	

References:

Beller et al., 1986
 PTI Environmental Services, 1988

12. Pavlou and Weston, 1983 20. U.S. ACOE, 1988 80. Tetra Tech, 1985* Various, please see text

Concentrations (ppm)	End Point	
2.0	Commencement Bay, Washington bioassay COA	
2.0	ER-L	
2.0	Commencement Bay, Washington bioassay COA	
3.2	Puget Sound, Washington AET - benthic	
5.3	Puget Sound, Washington AET - amphipod	
6.6	San Francisco Bay, California bioassay COA	
8.6	San Francisco Bay, California bioassay COA	
25.0	ER-M	
25.0	San Francisco Bay, California bioassay COA	
26.0	Puget Sound, Washington AET - oyster	
26.0	Puget Sound, Washington AET - Microtox [™]	
27.5	Commencement Bay, Washington bioassay COA	
91.5	Commencement Bay, Washington bioassay COA	
150.0	Puget Sound, Washington AET - benthic	
200.0	Puget Sound, Washington AET - amphipod	

 Table 2. Effects range--low and effects range--median values for antimony and 13 concentrations used to determine these values arranged in ascending order.

Arsenic

Arsenic is carcinogenic and teratogenic in humans and other mammals. Acute toxicity, as well as sublethal effects, have been observed in fish and invertebrates. Acute toxicity can be highly different among species, including those that are taxonomically related, and can be highly influenced by temperature, pH, speciation, and many other factors. Inorganic arsenicals are generally more toxic than organic forms (Eisler, 1988a). Inorganic arsenic (V) is acutely toxic to freshwater aquatic animals at concentrations as low as 850 ppb/ in water, and can affect marine plants at concentrations as low as 13 to 56 ppb/ in water and marine animals at 2,319 ppb/ in water (EPA, 1986). Klapow and Lewis (1979) proposed a marine water quality standard of 8 ppb/ for total arsenic.

The data available for effects of arsenic in sediment are from three approaches: EP and field studies in which AET values and/or co-occurrence values have been calculated (Tables 3 and 4). Both acute and chronic marine values based upon EP principles are available. AETs for both Puget Sound and San Francisco Bay are available and vary from 54 ppm arsenic to 700 ppm. COA were performed with data from Puget Sound, Commencement Bay, San Francisco Bay, Waukegan Harbor, Black Rock Harbor, southern California, Sheboygan River, Trinity River, Baltimore Harbor, DuPage River, Kishwaukee River, and a dump site off Georgetown, South Carolina.

Data from many of the studies were not used in estimating the ER-L and ER-M values (Table B-2). The chemical data from San Francisco Bay indicated a pattern of concordance with the bivalve embryo bioassay data, but not with the amphipod bioassay. Thus, the latter were not considered in the estimation of ER-L and ER-M values. The arsenic concentration reported for Waukegan Harbor was below detection limits and was not considered further. The data from Southern California, Trinity River, DuPage River, and Kishwaukee River indicated relatively small ranges in arsenic concentrations and were not considered further. The Black Rock Harbor data were from a bioavailability/uptake experiment in which the concentrations of other metals were substantially higher than that of arsenic. No effects upon benthic communities were reported at arsenic concentrations up to 1.4 ppm at the Georgetown, South Carolina dumpsite. The bioassay data from Los Angeles Harbor were from a small sample size (two) and the ranges in concentrations for some of the other chemicals in the sediments were much higher than that for arsenic. The Sheboygan River data were from a small sample size (three), from an experiment whose objective was to determine uptake (mainly of PCBs), and where the range in arsenic values was very small.

The remaining data suggest an ER-L of about 33 ppm, the lower 10 percentile value of the data (Table 4). San Francisco Bay sediments that were moderately toxic to bivalve larvae had a mean concentration of 22.1 ppm, and the chronic marine value derived from EP is 33 ppm (assuming a 4% TOC content). In addition, two values based upon the background approach are consistent with this value: the New England class III level (>20 ppm) and The Netherlands Harbor moderately polluted level (23 to 32 ppm).

The ER-M suggested by the data (Table 4) is about 85 ppm; supported by the acute marine threshold predicted by EP methods (64 ppm), high toxicity in Baltimore Harbor samples (mean of 91.9 ppm) and Puget Sound AET for benthic community effects and amphipod bioassays (85 and 93 ppm, respectively). With one exception, effects were always observed in association with arsenic concentrations of 50 ppm or greater, an apparent effects threshold for arsenic (Table B-2). Many values calculated from data collected in Commencement Bay and nearby southern Puget Sound indicate very high arsenic concentrations (690 to 2257 ppm) in sediments associated with observed effects. This area was highly impacted by the atmospheric and aqueous discharge of arsenic from an industrial point source for many years and high arsenic concentrations have been frequently observed there.

The arsenic data are from three approaches and from several geographic areas, but do not include observations made in single-chemical, laboratory, SSBs. There appears to be relatively poor consistency and clustering among the available values at the low end of the range. Therefore, the degree of confidence in the ER-L should be considered as relatively poor. The ER-M value is supported by several observations and is roughly equivalent to an overall apparent effects threshold, and the degree of confidence in it should be considered as moderate.

Referen	ces Biological Approaches	Concentrations (ppm)					
Apparent Effects Thresholds							
1	1986 PUGET SOUND AET - R. abronius amphipod bioassay - oyster larvae (C. gigas) bioassay - benthic community composition - Microtox [™] bioassay	93 700 85 700					
2	1988 PUGET SOUND AET - R. abronius amphipod bioassay - oyster larvae (C. gigas) bioassay - benthic community composition - Microtox [™] bioassay	93 700 57 700					
20	PSDDA guidelines (based upon Puget Sound AET) - screening level concentration - maximum level criterion	70 700					
4	SAN FRANCISCO BAY, CALIFORNIA AET - oyster/mussel larvae bioassay - amphipod bioassay	54 70					

Table 3. Summary of sediment effects data available for arsenic.

Table 3.	Arsenic	(continued)
----------	---------	-------------

References

Co-occu	rrence Analyses	
80	COMMENCEMENT BAY, WASHINGTON - highly toxic (15.7 \pm 3.9% dead/20) to R. abronius - moderately toxic (5.2 \pm 1.1% dead/20) to R. abronius - least toxic (2.5 \pm 0.9% dead/20) to R. abronius	$\begin{array}{r} 2257.1 \pm 4213.7 \\ 63.2 \ \pm \ 148 \\ 28.3 \ \pm \ 26.6 \end{array}$
	- highly toxic (44.5 \pm 19% abnormal) to oyster larvae - moderately toxic (23 \pm 2.3% abnormal) to oyster larvae - least toxic (15.1 \pm 3.1% abnormal) to oyster larvae	689.9 ± 2350.9 58.7 ± 148.1 27.8 ± 30.8
26	PUGET SOUND, WASHINGTON - highly toxic samples (95%LPL) to R. abronius - moderately toxic (<87.5 to >95% LPL) to R. abronius - non-toxic (>87.5% survival) to R. abronius	$\begin{array}{rrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrr$
*	SAN FRANCISCO BAY, CALIFORNIA - highly toxic ($67 \pm 11.8\%$) to R. abronius - moderately toxic ($33.8 \pm 4.7\%$) to R. abronius - least toxic ($18 \pm 6.6\%$) to R. abronius	17.5 ± 14.2 10.4 ± 13.4 28 ± 21.5
	- significantly toxic (42.9 \pm 19.2% mortality) to R. abronius - not toxic (18.4 \pm 6.8% mortality) to R. abronius	14.65 ± 13.9 30.3 ± 22.4
	- highly toxic (92.4 \pm 4.5% abnormal) to bivalve larvae - moderately toxic (59.4 \pm 11.3% abnormal) to bivalve larva - least toxic (23.3 \pm 7.3% abnormal) to bivalve larvae	$\begin{array}{rrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrr$
	- significantly toxic (55.7 \pm 22.7% abnormal) to bivalve lar - not toxic (31.9 \pm 15.5% abnormal) to bivalve larvae	rvae 22.8 ± 22.1 22 ± 18.7
72	WAUKEGAN HARBOR, WISCONSIN highly toxic (66.3 \pm 4.25 % survival \checkmark) to H. azteca	<47.2
71	BLACK ROCK HARBOR, CONNECTICUT - 100% mortality to N. virens	1.88
56	 SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA Mean concordance with significant mortality (51.7%) to G. japonica Mean concordancenot signicantly toxic (23.2% mortality) to G. japonica 	8.3 5.8
74	SHEBOYGAN RIVER, WISCONSIN - significant mortality to M. rosenbergii	2.7 ± 0.2
39	DUWAMISH RIVER, WASHINGTON - 0 to 10% mortality to <i>P. pugio</i> in 96-h bioassays	1.3
39	NEWPORT, RHODE ISLAND - 0% mortality to <i>P. pugio</i> in 96-h elutriate bioassays	2.8
39	STAMFORD, CONNECTICUT - 10% mortality to <i>P.pugio</i> in 96-h elutriate bioassays	1.0

Biological Approaches

Concentrations (ppm)

Table 3. Arsenic (continued).

.

Refer	ences Biological Approaches	Concentrations (ppm)
Co-O (ccurrence Analyses	
39	NORWALK RIVER, CONNECTICUT - 0% mortality to <i>P. pugio</i> in 96-h elutriate bioassays	3.4
39	LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA - >50% mortality to <i>P. pugio</i> in 96-h 20% elutriate bioassays	12.8
75	TRINITY RIVER, TEXAS - significant mortality to Daphnia magna - non-toxic to D. magna	3.4 ± 1.8 2.2 ± 1.2
64	GEORGETOWN OCEAN DREDGED MATERIAL DISPOSAL SOUTH CAROLINA	
	- no effects on benthic community abundance or species richness	s 1.36
62	BALTIMORE HARBOR, MARYLAND - most toxic to mummichogs and spot in 48-hour bioassays - least toxic to mummichogs and spot in 48-hour bioassays	91.9 ± 78.6 32 ± 14.3
60	DUPAGE RIVER, ILLINOIS - low number of taxa (6.7 ± 2.5) - high number of taxa (15.8 ± 2)	7.4 ± 2.2 5.9 ± 1.1
61	KISHWAUKEE RIVER, ILLINOIS - low number of taxa (8.4 ± 0.5) - high number of taxa (16.3 ± 4.6)	3.7 ± 1.0 5.0 ± 1.8
Equili	ibrium Partitioning Approach	
17	EPA acute marine EP threshold (@4% TOC)	64
	EPA chronic marine EP threshold (@4% TOC)	33
Refer	ences Background Approach	Concentrations (ppm)
68	Great Lakes harbors sediments - classification of non-polluted sediment	3
	 classification of moderately polluted sediment classification of heavily polluted sediment 	3.0-8.0 >8
43	New England interim high contamination level for dredge m	aterial >20
12	EPA Region V guideline for pollution classification of sedimer	
	USGS alert levels to flag 15 to 20% of samples analyzed Ontario Ministry of the Environment Dredge Spoil Guidelines	200 8 8
	EPA Region VI proposed guideline	5 5

20 EPA/ACOE Puget Sound Interim Criteria (central basin background) 12.5

Table 3. Arsenic (continued).

References		Background Approach		Concentrations (ppm) >23 23-32 32-110 >220	
23	 23 Rotterdam Harbor sediment quality classifications - Class 1 (slightly contaminated) - Class 2 (moderately contaminated) - Class 3 (contaminated) - Class 4 (heavily contaminated) 				
References:					
1.	Beller et al., 1986	39.	Lee and Mariani, 1977	68.	Bahnick et al., 1981
2.	PTI Environmental Services, 1988	43.	NERBC, 1980	71	Simmers et al., 1984
12.	Pavlou and Weston, 1983	56.	Anderson et al., 1988	72.	Ingersoll and Nelson, in press
17.	Lyman et al., 1987	60.	llinois EPA, 1988a		Tatem, 1986
20	TIS ACOF 1988	61	Illinois EDA 1088h		Oacim at al 1080

- 20. U.S. ACOE, 1988 23. Jansen, 1987
- 26. DeWitt et al., 1988
- 61. Illinois EPA, 1988b
 - Tsai et al., 1979
- 64. VanDolah et al., 1984
- 75. Qasim et al., 1980
- 80. Tetra Tech, 1985

Table 4. Effects range-low and efects range-median values for arsenic and 16 concentrations used to determine these values arranged in ascending order.

62.

Concentration (ppm)	End Point
22.1	San Francisco Bay, California bioassay COA
33.0	ER-L
33.0	EP chronic @4% TOC
50.7	San Francisco Bay, California bioassay COA
54.0	San Francisco Bay, California AET
57.0	Puget Sound, Washington AET - benthic
58.7	Commencement Bay, Washington bioassay COA
63.2	Commencement Bay, Washington bioassay COA
64.0	EP Acute @4% TOC
85.0	ER-M
85.0	Puget Sound, Washington AET - benthic
91.9	Baltimore Harbor, Maryland bioassay COA
93.0	Puget Sound, Washington AET - amphipod
689.9	Commencement Bay, Washington bioassay COA
700.0	Puget Sound, Washington AET - oyster
700.0	Puget Sound, Washington AET - Microtox™
1005.0	Puget Sound, Washington bioassay COA
2257.1	Commencement Bay, Washington bioassay COA

Cadmium

Eisler (1985) summarized available toxicological data for cadmium and concluded that concentrations in freshwater exceeding 10 ppb are associated with high mortality, reduced growth, inhibited reproduction, and other adverse effects. He also concluded that resistance to cadmium was higher among marine species than among freshwater species; the LC50s for some marine organisms ranged from 320 to 430 ppb. Klapow and Lewis (1979) proposed a marine water quality standard of 3 ppb/. Effects have been observed at concentrations as low as 1 ppb/ among freshwater animals in water, 2 ppb/ among freshwater plants in water, and 15.5 ppb/ among marine animals in water (EPA, 1986). The 96-h LC50 for *Mysidopsis bahia* is 16 μ g/L Cd Cl² (U.S. EPA, 1987).

A relatively large amount of data exists for cadmium in sediments (Tables 5 and 6). AET values have been calculated with data from Puget Sound (range: 5.1 to 9.6 ppm) and San Francisco Bay (1.2 to 1.7 ppm). Acute and chronic marine threshold values (96 and 31 ppm, respectively, assuming 4 percent TOC content) based upon EP are available. Spiked-sediment bioassays have been performed with the amphipod *R. abronius* (range in LC 50s of 1.01 -20.8 ppm), the fish *Pimepheles affinis* (LC50 of 11 ppm), and the polychaete *Nereis virens* (no effects in 40 ppm cadmium). The *R. abronius* bioassays have been performed with 4-d and 10-d exposure periods and with lethality and sublethal end-points. Matching chemical and biological data from field-collected samples are available from many geographic areas including Commencement Bay, San Francisco Bay, Southern California Bight, San Diego Bay, Hudson-Raritan Bay, Black Rock Harbor, Massachusetts Bay, and Baltimore Harbor; patterns in co-occurrence were determined for all of these and other data sets. In most cases, the chemical analyses determined that the sediments had contaminants other than cadmium that could have influenced the biological measures.

Either no measurable effects or very small apparent effects were observed in the data from bioassays of sediments from the Duwamish River (<0.5 ppm), Newport (<0.5 ppm), Stamford (2.8 ppm), Norwalk (4.1 ppm), New York Harbor (38.6 ppm), and in analyses of benthos at the Georgetown disposal site (<0.1 ppm). Mean cadmium concentrations differed very little between samples from Massachusetts Bay that had high, moderate, and low species richness (0.4 to 1.1 ppm). Relatively high survival in a suite of bioassays of San Diego Harbor was observed over a relatively large range in cadmium concentrations (0.9 to 32.5 ppm). Bioassay data from San Francisco Bay either lacked concordance with cadmium concentrations or indicated very little difference in mean concentration between the highly, moderately, or least toxic samples. Similarly, the AET values from San Francisco Bay are likely of limited value, since it appears other factors influenced the toxic responses. The Lake Union data indicated that only one site was significantly toxic and it was highly contaminated with petroleum hydrocarbons. Total species abundance in Southern California Bight sediments lacked concordance with the mean concentration of cadmium. Los Angeles Harbor sediments were more contaminated with chemicals other than cadmium (mean = 3.0ppm). The data from bioassays of Waukegan Harbor were from a very small sample size (n=4) and those sediments had relatively high levels of many other contaminants. The Black Rock Harbor sediments were tested in an uptake/bioavailability study and had higher concentrations of metals other than cadmium. The data from the Sheboygan River bioassays were from an uptake study with a sample size of three and in sediments in which PCBs and other chemicals were highly elevated. Various tests with the clam Macoma balthica in Fraser River estuary sediments indicated a small gradient in cadmium concentrations among samples and a high proportion of the samples had cadmium concentrations below the detection limits (0.4 ppm). All of the data above were not used in the estimation of ER-L and ER-M values (Table B-3).

DuPage River sediments indicated no concordance between benthic taxa richness and mean cadmium concentrations. Most of the sediments sampled in the Kishwaukee River had cadmium concentrations below the detection limits of 1 ppm. An LC50 of 1.01 ppm developed from a *R. abronius* bioassay of foundry sands spiked with cadmium was, in effect, a bioassay of aqueous cadmium since no or very little fine-grained particles were available. Keweenaw Waterway sediments that were toxic to *Daphnia magna* contained higher concentrations of copper compared to cadmium. Sediments from Phillips Chain of Lakes, Torch Lake, and

Little Grizzly Creek were highly contaminated with copper; cadmium differed little between toxic and non-toxic sampling stations. Sediments from Cubatao River, Brazil were highly contaminated with chemicals other than cadmium All of the data described above were not considered further in the estimation of ER-L and ER-M values (Table B-3).

The remaining data suggest an ER-L of about 5 ppm (5.3 rounded to 5.0 ppm) (Table 6). Puget Sound AET values based upon different biological indicators ranged from 5.1 to 6.7 ppm. Significant mortality occurred among the amphipod *Grandidierella japonica* in bioassays of southern California sediments that had a mean cadmium concentration of 5.3 ppm. Lowest species richness and lowest abundance of arthropods and echinoderms in southern California sediments occurred in samples with mean cadmium concentrations of 4.7, 4.3, and 6.2 ppm, respectively. The amphipod *R. abronius* avoided sediments spiked with 5.6 and 5.8 ppm cadmium; and in other *R. abronius* bioassays of cadmium-spiked sediments, LC50s as low as 6.9 ppm were observed. Effects were usually observed at cadmium concentrations of 5 ppm or greater, but there were many exceptions to this overall apparent effects threshold (Table B-3).

The data also suggest an ER-M of about 9 ppm (9.1 rounded to 9.0 ppm) (Table 6). Many LC50 and EC50 concentrations for SSBs performed with *R. abronius* are in the range of 8.2 to 11.5 ppm cadmium. The Puget Sound AET values based upon oyster embryo and MicrotoxTM bioassays are 9.6 ppm. Significant mortality to *Daphnia magna* exposed to Trinity River, Texas sediments occurred in samples with a mean cadmium concentration of 10.6 ppm. Significant reduction in survival of *P. affinis* occurred in sediments spiked with 11 ppm.

The degree of confidence in the ER-L and ER-M values for cadmium should be considered as very high. Data are available from many approaches, from multiple methods for some approaches, and they are relatively consistent. An overall apparent effects threshold coincided with the ER-L value.

Referen	ces Biological Approaches	Concentrations (ppm)
Apparen	t Effects Threshold	
1	1986 PUGET SOUND AET	
	- R. abronius amphipod bioassay	6.7
	- oyster larvae (Č. gigas) bioassay	9.6
	- benthic community composition	5.8
	- Microtox™ bioassay	9.6
2	1988 PUGET SOUND AET	
	- R. abronius amphipod bioassay	6.7
	- oyster larvae (C. gigas) bioassay	9.6
•	- benthic community composition	5.1
	- Microtox™ bioassay	9.6
20	PSDDA GUIDELINES (based upon Puget Sound AET)	
	- screening level concentration	0.96
	- maximum level criterion	9.6
*	SAN FRANCISCO BAY, CALIFORNIA AET	
	- bivalve larvae bioassay	1.7
	- amphipod bioassay	1.2

Table 5. Summary of sediment effects data available for cadmium.

Table 5. Cadmium (continued)

eference	s Biological Approaches	Concentrations (ppm)			
Co-Occurrence Analyses					
80	COMMENCEMENT BAY, WASHINGTON				
00	- highly toxic (15.7 \pm 3.9 dead/20) to R. abronius	s 41.6 ± 79.8			
	- moderately toxic (5.2 \pm 1.1 dead/20) to R. abro				
	- least toxic (2.5 \pm 0.9 dead/20) to R. abronius	2.3 ± 1.3			
	- highly toxic (44.5 \pm 19% abnormal) to oyster 1	arvae 15.3 ± 45.1			
	- moderately toxic (23 ± 2.3% abnormal) to oyst				
	- least toxic (15.1 \pm 3.1% abnormal) to oyster lat	rvae 1.9 ± 1.1			
29	LAKE UNION, WASHINGTON				
	- 95% mortality to H. azteca	1.98			
39	DUWAMISH RIVER, WASHINGTON				
	- 0-10% mortality to P. pugio	<0.5			
77	FRASER RIVER, B.C., CANADA				
	- sediment devoid of M. balthica	1.2 ± 1			
	- sediment populated by M. balthica	<0.04			
67	STRAIT OF GEORGIA, B.C., CANADA				
	- significant increase in burrowing time (ET50) of	of M. balthica 0.4			
	- significant 24-h avoidance behavior among M.	balthica 1.4			
*	SAN FRANCISCO BAY, CALIFORNIA				
	- highly toxic (67 ±1 1.8% mortality) to R. abroa	nius 0.8 ± 0.5			
	- moderately toxic (33.8 ±4 .7% mortality) to R				
	- least toxic (18 \pm 6.6% mortality) to R. abroniu	0.6 ± 0.3			
	- significantly toxic (42.9 \pm 19.2% mortality) to	R. abronius 0.6 ± 0.4			
	- not toxic (18.4 \pm 6.8% mortality) to R. abronius	0.6 ± 0.3			
	- highly toxic (92.4 \pm 4.5% abnormal) to bivalv	e larvae 0.7 ± 0.3			
	- moderately toxic (59.4 \pm 11.3% abnormal) to 1				
	- least toxic (23.3 \pm 7.3% abnormal) to bivalve	larvae 0.4 ± 0.1			
	- significantly toxic (55.7 \pm 22.7% abnormal) to	bivalve larvae 0.6 ± 0.4			
	- not toxic (31.9 \pm 15.5% abnormal) to bivalve la	arvae 0.6 ± 0.3			
49	PALOS VERDES SHELF, CALIFORNIA				
	 significantly toxic to R. abronius not toxic to R. abronius 	28.7 ± 3.1			
	- not toxic to R. abronius	8.9 ± 9.2			
50	- major degradation to macrobenthos (20.2sp./0.2	lm. sq.) 28.7 ± 3.1			
56	SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA				
	- significantly toxic (51.65% mortality) to G. ja				
	- not toxic (23.2% mortality) to G. japonica	3.2			
83	- high echinoderm abundance (191.3 \pm 70.1/0.1 s				
	- moderate echinoderm abundance (56.2 ± 23/0.1	$sq. m.$) 0.5 ± 0.3			
	- low echinoderm abundance $(6.1 \pm 7.2/0.1 \text{ sq. m})$	6.2 ± 13.1			

Table 5. Cadmium (continued)

•

References		Biological Approaches	Concentrations (ppm)		
Co-Occurrence Analyses					
	- moderate arthrop	bundance (148 ±5 8/0.1 sq. m.) ood abundance (72.6 ± 6.8/0.1 sq. m.) oundance (35.3 ± 15.8/0.1 sq. m.)	$\begin{array}{c} 0.9 \pm 1 \\ 0.7 \pm 0.7 \\ 4.3 \pm 11.4 \end{array}$		
	- moderate species	ness (96.3 ± 22.3/0.1 sq. m) richness (72 ± 3.3/0.1 sq. m.) ess (51.2 ± 8.6/0.1 sq. m.)	$\begin{array}{c} 1.5 \pm 4 \\ 0.6 \pm 0.7 \\ 4.7 \pm 12.2 \end{array}$		
	- moderate total al	ance (88.9 ± 35.4/0.1 sq. m.) pundance (75.6 ± 12.7/0.1 sq. m.) nce (57.6 ± 13.6/0.1 sq. m.)	9.4 ± 17.3 0.8 ± 1.1 1.1 ± 2		
39		ARBOR, CALIFORNIA to P. pugio (20% elutriate bioassay)	3.0		
48 66	- >97% survival o - ≥82% survival o	f P. staminea	32.5 28.0 22.7 32.5 0.9 0.9		
55	LITTLE GRIZZLY - significant mort	CREEK, CALIFORNIA ality to D. magna	1.2 ± 0.3		
72		RBOR, ILLLINOIS 3 ± 4.25% survival🖌) to H. azteca	2.5		
79	- negative rate of	AN BAY, NEW YORK growth in nematode, <i>C.germanica</i> growth in nematode, <i>C.germanica</i>	18.6 ± 8.9 11.8 ± 6.6		
71		ARBOR, CONNECTICUT to polychaete, N. virens	1.6		
82	 high benthos spectrum moderate bentho 	S BAY, MASSACHUSETTS cies richness (93.6 \pm 9.4/0.1 sq. m.) s species richness (58.2 \pm 1 0.5/0.1 sq. m.) ties richness (31 \pm 6.5/0.1 sq. m.)	0.4 ± 0.1 0.7 ± 0.6 1.1 ± 1.0		
74		VER, WISCONSIN llity to prawn, M. rosenbergii	2.8 ± 0.5		
39	NEWPORT, RHO - 0% mortality to		<0.5		
39	STAMFORD, CON - 10% mortality to		2.8		
39	NORWALK, CON - 0% mortality to		4.1		

·

References		Biological Approaches	Concentrations (ppm)		
Co-Occurrence Analyses					
40	CUBATAO RIVER, B - 24-hour EC-50 with		0.2		
54	KEWEENAW WATE - significantly toxic to - not toxic to <i>D. magna</i> - mean conc. in highly - mean conc. in least t	D. magna	$\begin{array}{c} 1.7 \pm 0.3 \\ 0.6 \pm 0.3 \\ gna \\ 1.5 \pm 0.2 \checkmark$		
55	PHILLIPS CHAIN O - significant mortality - low mortality (0-5%)		4.9 3.1 ± 0.6		
55	TORCH LAKE, MICH - significant mortality	IIGAN to <i>D. magna</i> and <i>Hexagenia</i> sp.	2.5		
75	TRINITY RIVER, TEX - significant mortality - low mortality to D.	to D. magna	$\begin{array}{c} 10.6 \pm 8.7 \\ 4.8 \pm 5.6 \end{array}$		
64	SOUTH CAROLINA	AN DREDGED MATERIAL DISPOS	AL SITE, <0.1		
44	NEW YORK HARBO - <10% mortality in a	R, NEW YORK dult N. virens, M. mercenaria, and P.	pugio 38.6		
62		PR, MARYLAND ichogs (5.1 ± 3.5 TLm) spot (5.9 ± 3.4 7 chogs (43.2 ± 31.1 TLm) spot (24 ± 5.6			
60		.INOIS hic macroinvertebrate taxa (6.7 \pm 2.5 enthic macroinvertebrate taxa (15.8 \pm			
60		R, ILLINOIS hic macroinvertebrate taxa (8.4 ± 0.5 enthic macroinvertebrate taxa (16.3 ±			
Equili	brium Partitioning				
17	EPA acute marine EP	threshold (@4%TOC)	96		
4	EPA chronic marine H	EP threshold (@4%TOC)	31		
Spike	d-sediment Bioassays				
70	Significant reduction i	in survival of <i>P. affinis</i> in 446- d bioa	ssay 11		
8		n 10-d bioassay (n=25) nergence in 10-d bioassay burial in 10-d bioassay	9.81 9.72 9.07		

Refer	ences Biological Approaches C	oncentrations (ppm)		
Spiked-sediment Bioassays				
28	LC50 for R. abronius in 10-d bioassay (Yaquina Bay) LC50 for R. abronius in 10-d bioassay (Whidbey Island)	8.8 10		
45	LC50 \pm 95% C.L. for <i>R. abronius</i> (fresh) 10-d bioassay LC50 \pm 95% C.L. for <i>R. abronius</i> juveniles LC50 \pm 95% C.L. for <i>R. abronius</i> adults	8.7 (8.1 - 9.4) 8.2 (7.6 - 8.9) 11.5 (10.6 - 12.4)		
9	LC50 for R. <i>abronius</i> survival, 10-d ($n = 5 \times 11$ dilutions) EC50 for R. <i>abronius</i> reburial, 10-d ($n = 5 \times 11$ dilutions) EC50 for R. <i>abronius</i> reburial, 4-d ($n = 5 \times 6$ dilutions) LC50 for R. <i>abronius</i> survival, 4-d ($n = 5 \times 6$ dilutions)	6.9 6.5 20.8 25.9		
22	No observable mortality or behavioral effects to N. virens in 28 d	lays 40		
11	23.2% dead and 86% avoidance, 56 R. <i>abronius</i> , 72-h, 2-choice exeriment. 44.4% avoidance, 45 R. <i>abronius</i> , 72-h, 2-choice experiment	5.8 5.6		
27	LC76 for <i>R. abronius</i> in 72-h bioassay LC98 for <i>E. sencillus</i> in 72-h bioassay	8.5 8.4		
73	LC50 for <i>R. abronius</i> exposed to foundry sands, 10-d bioassay Overall LC50 for <i>R. abronius</i> exposed to sand (MS-1)	1.0 ± 1.1 8.9		

Refer	ences Background Approach	Concentrations (ppm)	
68	Great Lakes harbors classification of non-polluted sediment	. 6	
43	New England interim high contamination level for dredge mat	erial >7	
12	EPA Region V guideline for pollution classification of sediments USGS alert levels to flag 15 to 20% of samples analyzed Ontario Ministry of the Environment Dredge Spoil Guidelines EPA Region VI proposed guidelines	s 6 20 1 2	
20	EPA/ACOE Puget Sound Interim Criteria (central basin backgrou	und) 0.7	
23	Rotterdam Harbor sediment quality classifications - Class 1 (slightly contaminated) - Class 2 (moderately contaminated) - Class 3 (contaminated) - Class 4 (heavily contaminated)	<6 6-19 19-32 >32	

References:

1. Beller et al., 1986 40. Zagatto et al., 1987 66. Salazar	and Salazar, 1985
2. PTI Environmental Services, 1988 43. NERBC, 1980 67. McGree	
4. Bolton et al., 1985 44. Rubinstein et al., 1983 68. Bahnic	k et al., 1981
8. Mearns et al., 1986 45. Robinson et al., 1988 70. Sundel	in, 1984
9. Swartz et al., 1985a 48. Salazar et al., 1980 71. Simme	ers et al., 1984

• • •

Table 5. Cadmium (continued)

References:

11.	Oakden et al., 1984a	49. Swartz et al., 1985b	72. Ingersoll and Nelson, 1989
12.	Pavlou and Weston, 1983	50. Swartz et al., 1986	73. Ott, 1986
17.	Lyman <i>et al.</i> , 1987	54. Maleug et al., 1984a	74. Tatem, 1986
20.	U.S. ACOE, 1988	55. Maleug et al., 1984b	75. Qasim et al., 1980
22.	Olla et al., 1988	56. Anderson et al., 1988	77. McGreer, 1982
23.	Jansen, 1987	60. Illinois EPA, 1988a	79. Tietjen and Lee, 1984
27.	Oakden et al., 1984b	61. Illinois EPA, 1988b	80. Tetra Tech, 1985
28.	Kemp et al., 1986	62. Tsai et al., 1979	82. Gilbert et al., 1976
29.	Yake et al., 1986	64. Van Dolah et al., 1984	83. Word and Mearns, 1979
39.	Lee and Mariani, 1977	* Various, please see text	

 Table 6. Effects range-low and effects range-median values for cadmium and 36

 concentrations used to determine these values arranged in ascending order.

Concentrations (ppm)	End Point		
4.3	Southern California arthropods COA		
4.7	Southern California species richness COA		
5.0	ER-L		
5.1	Puget Sound, Washington AET - benthic		
5.3	Southern California bioassay COA		
5.6	SSB with R. abronius		
8.4	SSB with R. abronius		
5.8	Puget Sound, Washington AET - benthic		
5.8	SSB with R. abronius		
6.2	Southern California echinoderms COA		
6.5	SSB with R. abronius		
6.7	Puget Sound, Washington AET - amphipod		
6.9	SSB with R. abronius		
8.2	SSB with E. sencillus		
8.5	SSB with R. abronius		
8.7	SSB with R. abronius		
8.8	SSB with R. abronius		
8.9	SSB with R. abronius		
9.0	ER-M		
9.1	SSB with R. abronius		
9.6	Puget Sound, Washington AET - oyster		
9.6	Puget Sound, Washington AET - Microtox™		
9.7	SSB with R. abronius		
9.8	SSB with R. abronius		
10.0	SSB with R. abronius		
10.6	Trinity River, Texas bioassay COA		
11.0	SSB with P. affinis		
11.5	SSB with R. abronius		
15.3	Commencement Bay, Washington bioassay COA		
18.6	Hudson-Raritan, New York bioassay COA		
20.8	SSB with R. abronius (4-day)		
22.8	Baltimore Harbor, Maryland bioassay COA		
25.9	SSB with R. abronius (4-day)		
28.7	Palos Verdes Shelf, California bioassay COA		
28.7	Palos Verdes Shelf, California benthos COA		
31.0	EP chronic marine @4% TOC		
41.6	Commencement Bay, Washington bioassay COA		
96.0	EP acute marine @4% TOC		

Chromium

The toxicity of chromium is highly influenced by speciation; acute and chronic toxicity to aquatic and marine organisms has been tested with chromium (III) and chromium (VI). Acute toxicity of chromium (VI) to saltwater animals occurs at concentrations ranging from 2,000 to 105,000 ppb/. Acute toxicity of chromium (III) has been observed at concentrations of 10,300 to 31,500 ppb/ (U. S. EPA, 1986). Eisler (1986) also observed a wide range in concentrations in water that caused effects: 445 to 2,000 ppb for chromium (VI) and 2,000 to 3,200 ppb/ for chromium (III). Klapow and Lewis (1979) proposed a marine water quality standard of 2. ppb/ for total chromium.

A relatively large amount of data exists for chromium in sediments (Table 7). AET values were available for Puget Sound and were calculated from data available from several studies in San Francisco Bay. No single-chemical, SSB data were available and no SLC or EP data for chromium were available. Co-occurrence analyses were performed with data from studies performed with benthic community composition and toxicity tests. These studies had been performed in many areas, including Commencement Bay, Strait of Georgia, San Francisco Bay, off various areas of southern California, Hudson-Raritan Bay estuary, Massachusetts Bay, Trinity River, Baltimore Harbor, DuPage River, Kishwaukee River, and Phillips Chain of Lakes.

No effects among the benthos at the Georgetown, South Carolina disposal site were observed at up to 2.5 ppm chromium. Most of the bioassays of San Diego Bay sediments indicated high survival. Only one sample from Lake Union indicated toxicity and it was overwhelmingly dominated by PAH. Very little concordance between chromium and toxicity was observed in Commencement Bay samples. Southern California sediments that had moderate densities of echinoderms had mean concentrations of chromium similar to those that had high densities. Waukegan Waterway sediments toxic to Hyalella azteca were tested with only three samples. Kishwaukee sediments were more highly contaminated with PCBs than with chromium. Southern California sediments with moderate arthropod densities had chromium concentrations similar to those that had high densities of arthropods. Los Angeles Harbor sediments toxic to P. pugio were not highly contaminated with chromium. Three stations in the DuPage River had low numbers of benthic macroinvertebrate taxa, but only one had a high chromium concentration. Burrowing time for Macoma balthica exposed to Fraser River sediments was increased relative to controls, but most of the variance in the data was explained by the high concentrations of other chemicals. None of the data from these studies was used further in the estimation of ER-L and ER-M values (Table B-4).

The remaining data (Table 8) suggest an ER-L of about 80 ppm chromium, roughly the lower 10 percentile of the data. Massachusetts Bay sediments with low species richness had a mean chromium content of 81 ppm, as compared to a mean of 27 ppm in samples that had high species richness. Trinity River sediments that were significantly toxic to Daphnia magna had a mean of 72.6 ppm, as compared to samples that were not toxic that had a mean of 18.1 ppm. Southern California samples that were significantly toxic to Grandidierella japonica had a mean of 81.4 ppm, as compared to non-toxic samples with a mean of 73 ppm.

The data suggest an ER-M value of about 145 ppm, the 50 percentile value of the data (Table 8). This value is supported by significant toxicity of Sheboygan River sediments (128 ppm) and low southern California arthropod abundance (145.8 ppm).

The degree of confidence in the ER-L and ER-M values for chromium should be considered as moderate. There are no data from single-chemical, spiked-sediment bioassays and from EP principles. All of the available data are field collections of matching biological and chemical data and are, therefore, subject to the weaknesses described previously regarding cooccurrence analyses. Furthermore, there appears to be relatively little convergence, or consistency in the values reported from the various studies. Some of the poor consistency may be due to a lack of speciation data for chromium; all of the data were reported as total chromium, whereas the hexavalent form has been reported as the most toxic. No overall effects threshold is apparent from the available data.

Table 7. Summary of sediment effects data available for chromium.	Table 7.	Summary of	f sediment e	effects	data avai	lable for	chromium.
-------------------------------------------------------------------	----------	------------	--------------	---------	-----------	-----------	-----------

Referenc	es Biological Approaches	Concentrations (ppm)		
Apparent Effects Threshold				
2	1988 PUGET SOUND AET - <i>R. abronius</i> amphipod bioassay - benthic community composition	270 260		
*	SAN FRANCISCO BAY, CALIFORNIA AET - bivalve larvae bioassay - R. abronius amphipod bioassay	280 370		
Co-occur	rrence Analyses			
80	 COMMENCEMENT BAY, WASHINGTON highly toxic to R. abronius (15.7 ± 3.9 dead/20) moderately toxic to R. abronius (5.2 ± 1.1 dead/20) least toxic to R. abronius (2.5 ± 0.9 dead/20) highly toxic (44.5 ± 19.0% abnormal) to oyster larvae moderately toxic (23 ± 2.3% abnormal) to oyster larvae least toxic (15.1 ± 3.1% abnormal) to oyster larvae 	$19.7 \pm 11.3 \\ 17.7 \pm 7.3 \\ 16.2 \pm 8.1 \\ 22.2 \pm 9 \\ 17.7 \pm 7.3 \\ 11.8 \pm 3.7 \\ 11.8$		
29	LAKE UNION, WASHINGTON - 95% mortality to H. azteca	20		
39	DUWAMISH RIVER, WASHINGTON - 0-10% mortality to P. pugio	15.3		
67	STRAIT OF GEORGIA, B.C., CANADA - significant increase in burrowing time (ET50) of <i>M. balthic</i> - significant 24-h avoidance behavior among <i>M. balthica</i>	a 60 90		
77	FRASER RIVER, B.C., CANADA - sediment devoid of feral <i>M. balthica</i> - sediment populated by feral <i>M. balthica</i>	87.3 ± 22.1 42 ± 11		
*	SAN FRANCISCO BAY, CALIFORNIA - highly toxic (67.0 \pm 11.8% mortality to R. abronius - moderately toxic (33.8 \pm 4.7% mortality) to. R. abronius - least toxic (18.4 \pm 6.8% mortality) to R. abronius	141.8 ± 86.5 163.3 ± 116.7 195 ± 93.9		
	- significantly toxic (42.9 \pm 19.2% mortality) to <i>R. abronius</i> - not toxic (18.4 \pm 6.8% mortality) to <i>R. abronius</i>	154.9 ± 102.1 202.6 ± 97.3		
	- highly toxic (92.4 \pm 4.5% abnormal) to bivalve larvae - moderately toxic (59.4 \pm 11.3% abnormal) to bivalve larv - least toxic (23.3 \pm 7.3% abnormal) to bivalve larvae	97.5 ± 66.7 vae 164 ± 91.4 88.2 ± 82.7		
	- significantly toxic (55.7 \pm 22.7% abnormal) to bivalve law - not toxic (31.9 \pm 15.5% abnormal) to bivalve larvae	rvae 133.7 ± 94.2 150.2 ± 85.9		
50	PALOS VERDES SHELF , CALIFORNIA - "major degradation" to macrobenthos (20.2sp/0.1m. sq.)	669.3 ± 172.9		

Reference	s Biological Approaches	Concentrations (ppm)
Co-occurre	ence Analyses	
56	SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA - significantly toxic (51.65% mortality) to <i>G. japonica</i> - not toxic (23.2% mortality) to <i>G. japonica</i>	81.4 ± 88.5 73 ± 124.4
83	- high echinoderm abundance $(191.3 \pm 70.1/0.1 \text{ sq. m.})$ - moderate echinoderm abundance $(56.2 \pm 23/0.1 \text{ sq. m.})$ - low echinoderm abundance $(6.1 \pm 7.2/0.1 \text{ sq. m.})$	29.6 ± 15.6 32.3 ± 17.5 201.3 ± 349
	- high arthropod abundance (148 \pm 58/0.1 sq. m.) - moderate arthropod abundance (72.6 \pm 6.8/0.1 sq. m.) - low arthropod abundance (35.3 \pm 15.8/0.1 sq. m.)	40.7 ± 30.9 46.3 ± 43.3 145.8 ± 307.9
	- high species richness (96.3 \pm 22.3/0.1 sq. m.) - moderate species richness (72 \pm 3.3/0.1 sq. m.) - low species richness (51.2 \pm 8.6/0.1 sq. m.)	62.3 ± 139.2 38.1 ± 36.3 156.6 ± 320.9
	- high total abundance (88.9 \pm 35.4/0.1 sq. m.) - moderate total abundance (75.6 \pm 12.7/0.1 sq. m.) - low total abundance (57.6 \pm 13.6/0.1 sq. m.)	292.6 ± 459.3 42 ± 39.8 54 ± 83.5
39	LOS ANGELES HARBOR , CALIFORNIA - >50% mortality to <i>P. pugio</i> (20% elutriate bioassay)	47.6
48	 SAN DIEGO BAY, CALIFORNIA >97% survival of clam, P. staminea >97% survival of shrimp, M. elongata >97% survival of polychaete, N. arenaceodentata >97% survival of sanddab, C. stigmaeus, and M. elongata 	299.5 254.8 299.5 299.5
66	- ≥82% survival of C. stigmaeus, A. sculpta, and A. tonsa - ≥86% survival of N. arenaceaodentata and M. nasuta	26 26
55	LITTLE GRIZZLY CREEK, CALIFORNIA - significant mortality to D. magna	87 ± 47
72	WAUKEGAN HARBOR, ILLINOIS - highly toxic (66.3 \pm 4.25% survivals) to H. azteca	38.5
60	DUPAGE RIVER, ILLINOIS - least number of benthic macroinvertebrate taxa (6.7 ± 2.5 - highest number of benthic macroinvertebrate taxa (15.8 ± 2.5	
61	KISHWAUKEE RIVER, ILLINOIS - least number of benthic macroinvertebrate taxa (8.4 ± 0.5 - highest number of benthic macroinvertebrate taxa (16.3 ± 0.5	
54	KEWEENAW WATERWAY, MICHIGAN - significantly toxic to D. magna - not toxic to D. magna mean contention in highly toxic (northern)	$\begin{array}{c} 108.8 \pm 19.6 \\ 36.3 \pm 21.9 \end{array}$
	 mean concentration in highly toxic (northern) sediments (to <i>D. magna</i>) mean concentration in least toxic (southern) 	101.6 ± 23 ~
	sediments (to D. magna)	29 ± 14 ✓

•

Table 7. Chromium (continued)

.

.

:

Refer	ences Biological Approaches	Concentrations (ppm)	
Co-oc	currence Analyses		
55	TORCH LAKE, MICHIGAN - significant mortality to <i>D. magna</i> and <i>Hexagenia</i> sp.	180	
55	PHILLIPS CHAIN OF LAKES, WISCONSIN - significant mortality to <i>D. magna</i> - low mortality to <i>D. magna</i>	980 315.4 ± 236	
74	SHEBOYGAN RIVER, WISCONSIN - significant mortality to prawn, M. rosenbergii	128 ± 4	
79	HUDSON-RARITAN BAY, NEW YORK - negative rate of growth in nematode, C. germanica - positive rate of growth in nematode, C. germanica	160.3 ± 85.4 144.6 ± 88.6	
71	BLACK ROCK HARBOR, CONNECTICUT - 100% mortality to polychaete, N. virens	369.2	
82	MASSACHUSETTS BAY, MASSACHUSETTS - high benthos species richness (mean = 93.6 ± 9.4) - moderate benthos species richness (mean = 58.2 ± 10.5) - low benthos species richness (mean = 31 ± 6.5)	27 ± 11.1 60.9 ± 27.5 81 ± 29.3	
39	NEWPORT, RHODE ISLAND - 0% mortality to P. pugio	19.9	
39	STAMFORD, CONNECTICUT - 10% mortality to P. pugio	86	
39	NORWALK, CONNECTICUT - 0% mortality to P. pugio	67.5	
64	GEORGETOWN OCEAN DREDGED MATERIAL DISPOSAL SITE, SOUTH CAROLINA - no effects upon benthos species richness or abundance	2.46	
75	TRINITY RIVER, TEXAS - significant mortality to D. magna - low mortality to D. magna	72.6 ± 60.6 18.1 ± 16.8	
62	BALTIMORE HARBOR, MARYLAND - most toxic to mummichogs (5.1 ± 3.5) and spot (5.9 ± 3.4) - least toxic to mummichogs (43.2 ± 31.1) and spot (24 ± 5.6)	1646 ± 1628 335 ± 179.7	
Refer	ences Background Approach	Concentrations (ppm)	

68	Great Lakes harbors classification of non-polluted sediment Great Lakes harbors classification of moderately polluted sediment Great Lakes harbors classification of heavily polluted sediment	<25 25-75 >75
43	New England interim high contamination level for dredged material	>300

.

-9²

Refer	ences Background Approach	Concentrations (ppm)	
12	EPA Region V guideline for pollution classification of sedimen USGS alert levels to flag 15-20% of samples analyzed	ts 25 200	
	Ontario Ministry of the Environment Dredge Spoil Guidelines EPA Region VI proposed guidelines	25 100	
23	Rotterdam Harbor sediment quality classifications		
	- Class 1 (slightly contaminated)	<190	
	- Class 2 (moderately contaminated)	190-220	
	- Class 3 (contaminated)	220-550	
	- Class 3 (heavily contaminated)	>550	

References:

2. PTI Environmental Services, 1988	56. Anderson et al., 1988	72. Ingersoll and Nelson, In press
12. Pavlou and Weston, 1983	60. Illinois EPA, 1988a	74. Tatem, 1986
23. Jansen, 1987	61. Illinois EPA, 1988b	75. Qasim et al., 1980
29. Yake et al., 1986	62. Tsai et al., 1979	77. McGreer, 1982
39. Lee and Mariani, 1977	64. Van Dolah et al., 1984	79. Tietjen and Lee, 1984
43. NERBC, 1980	66. Salazar and Salazar, 1985	80. Tetra Tech, 1985
48. Salazar et al., 1980	67. McGreer, 1979	82. Gilbert et al., 1976
50. Swartz et al., 1986	68. Bahnick et al., 1981	83. Word and Mearns, 1979
54. Malueg et al., 1984a	71. Simmers et al., 1984	* Various, please see text
55. Malueg et al., 1984b		-

Table 8. Effects range-low and effects range-median values for chromium and 21 concentrations used to determine these values arranged in ascending order.

Concentrations (ppm)	End Point
60.9	Massachusetts Bay benthos COA
72.6	Trinity River, Texas bioassay COA
80.0	ER-L
81.0	Massachusetts Bay benthos COA
81.4	Southern California bioassay COA
87.0	Little Grizzly Creek, California bioassay COA
87.3	Fraser River, B.C. bivalves COA
90.0	Fraser River, B.C. bioassay COA
101.6	Keweenaw Waterway, Michigan bioassay COA
108.8	Keweenaw Waterway, Michigan bioassay COA
128.0	Sheboygan River, Wisconsin bioassay COA
145.0	ER-M
145.8	Southern California arthropod abundance COA
156.6	Southern California benthos COA
160.3	Hudson-Raritan Bay, New York estuary toxicity COA
180.0	Torch Lake, Michigan bioassay COA
201.3	Southern California echinoderm abundance COA
260.0	Puget Sound, Washington, AET - benthic
270.0	Puget Sound, Washington, AET - amphipod
369.2	Black Rock Harbor, Connecticut, bioassay COA

Concentrations (ppm)	End Point
669.3 980.0	Palos Verdes Shelf, California, benthos COA Phillips Chain of Lakes, Wisconsin, bioassay COA
1646.0	Baltimore Harbor, Maryland, bioassay COA

Copper

Saltwater animals are acutely sensitive to copper in water at concentrations ranging from 5.8 ppb \checkmark to 600 ppb \checkmark , mysids indicate sensitivity in chronic life-cycle studies at 77 ppb \checkmark , and freshwater animals are sensitive at concentrations as low at 16.7 ppb \checkmark (EPA, 1986). Klapow and Lewis (1979) proposed a marine water quality standard of 5 ppb \checkmark .

A considerable amount of data exist in which the concentration of copper in sediments can be associated with measures of effects (Table 9). EP values are available for acute and chronic marine conditions. Apparent effects threshold values for Puget Sound and San Francisco Bay are listed. Spiked-sediment bioassays have been performed with sediment collected in Puget Sound and Oregon. Matching sediment chemistry and biological data are available for many areas and the results of analyses of co-occurrence are listed in Table 9.

Several field studies are noteworthy as regards copper concentrations and measures of effects in sediments. Malueg *et al.* (1984a) sampled sites along the north and south reaches of the Keweenaw Waterway. Copper concentrations were very high in the north reaches and much lower in the southern part. The minimal concentration above which toxicity always occurred (equivalent to an AET) was 480 ppm. Kraft and Sypniewski (1981) also sampled benthos in the north and south reaches of the Keweenaw Waterway. The average copper concentration in the northern sampling stations was 589 ppm and was associated with a depressed average number of benthic taxa relative to the southern stations. Rygg (1985) reported that above 200 ppm copper, benthic community diversity was invariably depressed in Norwegian fjords. The lowest copper concentration in Little Grizzly Creek sediments above which toxicity was always observed by Malueg *et al.* (1984b) was 550 ppm.

In one of only two reports in which results of SSBs with copper were performed, Phelps *et al.* (1983) reported that the burrowing time for the littleneck clam *Protothaca staminea* was significantly decreased at sediment concentrations exceeding 17.8 ppm. There appeared to be a threshold between 14.7 and 17.8 ppm copper in this burrowing response. The sediments used in the tests had a background concentration of 12 ppm before spiking was performed. However, other field-collected sediments with ambient concentrations of 23 ppm caused no increase in burrowing time and sediments spiked with 10,240 ppm copper and Chelex 100 chelating agent also caused no increase in burrowing time. Therefore, it appears that copper concentrations of about 20 ppm may begin to induce sublethal behavioral effects when the copper is not tightly chelated or otherwise bound to the sediments. The data from toxicity tests of four samples from Waukegan Waterway (Ingersoll and Nelson, in press) indicate that copper concentrations in sediments and toxicity to *Hyalella azteca* were positively correlated, whereas there was poor concordance between the toxicity data and the concentrations of other chemicals. The minimum copper concentration associated with a significantly toxic sample was 19.5 ppm, similar to the 17.8 ppm value determined in the spiked bioassays.

The data from two studies (Massachusetts Bay benthos and Puget Sound spiked sediments) suggest that effects may begin at concentrations as low as 15 to 18 ppm, but very little other data provide confirmatory evidence that effects are commonly associated with concentrations this low (Table B-5). The lower 10 percentile of the data is equivalent to about 70 ppm (68.2 rounded to 70 ppm). This ER-L value is supported by bioassay data from a *Macoma* burrowing experiment with British Columbia sediments (67 ppm copper), significantly toxic sediments from the Trinity River (mean 68.4) and San Francisco Bay bioassay data (means of 68.2 and 76 ppm). An ER-M value (50 percentile) of about 390 ppm is

supported by two Puget Sound AETs (390 ppm). With the exception of bioassays of San Diego Bay sediments performed with relatively resistant species, effects were always observed in association with copper concentrations of 300 ppm or greater (Table B-5).

It is noteworthy that LC50 values from six different bioassay series with copper-spiked sediments ranged from 681 to 2,296 ppm (Cairns *et al.*, 1984) as compared to the previously described ET50 of 17.8 ppm for a burrowing bivalve. Effects have been associated with copper concentrations ranging from 17.8 to 2820 ppm. However, the degree of confidence in the ER-L and ER-M values must be considered relatively high. A relatively large amount of data is available and they are from all of the major approaches. Both values are supported by clusters of data. The overall apparent effects threshold is similar to the ER-M value.

Refere	nces Bi	ological Approaches	Concentrations (ppm)	
Apparent Effects Threshold				
1	1986 PUGET SOUND A - R. abronius amphipod - oyster larvae (C. gigas - benthic community cor - Microtox [™] bioassay	bioassay >) bioassay	810 390 310 390	
2	1988 PUGET SOUND A - R. <i>abronius</i> amphipod - oyster larvae (C gigas) - benthic community cor - Microtox™ bioassay	bioassay) bioassay	1300 390 530 390	
20	PSDDA GUIDELINES (- screening level concen - maximum level criter		81 810	
*	SAN FRANCISCO BAY - bivalve larvae bioass - R. abronius amphipod	ay	110 180	
Co-Oco	currence Analyses			
80		9 dead/20) to R. abronius \pm 1.1 dead/20) to R. abronius	2820 ± 4881 118 ± 98 85.1 ± 69	
	- moderately toxic (23 :	9% abnormal) to oyster larvae ± 2.3% abnormal) to oyster larv % abnormal) to oyster larvae	918 ± 2750 ae 106 ± 93 73 ± 75	
26	PUGET SOUND, WAS - highly toxic to <i>R. abro</i> - moderately toxic to <i>R</i> - least toxic to <i>R. abron</i>	onius (95% LPL) . abronius (<87.5% survival to >	1260 ± 3251 95% LPL) 138 ± 124 98 ± 90	
29	LAKE UNION, WASH - 95% mortality to H. a		156	
39	DUWAMISH RIVER, - 0-10% mortality to P.		43	

Table 9. Summary of sediment effects data available for copper.

Table 9. Copper (continued)

.

Refere	nces Biological Approaches	Concentrations (ppm)
Co-Occ	currence Analyses	
67	STRAIT OF GEORGIA, B.C., CANADA - significant increase in burrowing time (ET50) of <i>M. balthica</i> - significant 24-h avoidance behavior among <i>M. balthica</i>	67 150
77	FRASER RIVER, B.C., CANADA - sediment devoid of feral <i>M. balthica</i> - sediment populated by feral <i>M. balthica</i>	135 ± 57 28 ± 16
*	SAN FRANCISCO BAY, CALIFORNIA - highly toxic ($67 \pm 11.8\%$ mortality) to <i>R. abronius</i> - moderately toxic ($33.8 \pm 4.7\%$ mortality) to <i>R. abronius</i> - least toxic ($18 \pm 6.6\%$ mortality) to <i>R. abronius</i>	85 ± 63 64 ± 40 72 ± 41
	- significantly toxic (42.9 \pm 19.2% mortality) to R. abronius - not toxic (18.4 \pm 6.8% mortality) to R. abronius	70 ± 47 75 ± 43
	- highly toxic (92.4 \pm 4.5% abnormal) to bivalve larvae - moderately toxic (59.4 \pm 11.3% abnormal) to bivalve larv - least toxic (23.3 \pm 7.3% abnormal) to bivalve larvae	88 ± 33 vae 76 ± 51 35 ± 17
	- significantly toxic (55.7 \pm 22.7% abnormal) to bivalve lar - not toxic (31.9 \pm 15.5% abnormal) to bivalve larvae	rvae 68 ± 48 47 ± 26
55	LITTLE GRIZZLY CREEK, CALIFORNIA - significant mortality to <i>D. magna</i> and <i>Hexagenia</i> sp.	1374 ± 809
56	SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA - significantly toxic (51.65% mortality) to G. japonica - not toxic (23.2% mortality) to G. japonica	181 62
83	- high echinoderm abundance (191.3 \pm 70.1/0.1 sq. m.) - moderate echinoderm abundance (56.2 \pm 23/0.1 sq. m.) - low echinoderm abundance (6.1 \pm 7.2/0.1 sq. m.)	12 ± 6 13 ± 14 97 ± 177
	- high arthropod abundance $(148 \pm 58/0.1 \text{ sq. m.})$ - moderate arthropod abundance $(72 \pm 3.3/0.1 \text{ sq. m.})$ - low arthropod abundance $(35.3 \pm 15.8/0.1 \text{ sq. m.})$	16 ± 14 15 ± 18 71 ± 155
	- high species richness (96.3 \pm 22.3/0.1 sq. m.) - moderate species richness (72 \pm 3.3/0.1 sq. m.) - low species richness (51.2 \pm 8.6/0.1 sq. m.)	31 ± 60 15 ± 15 73 ± 166
	- high total abundance (88.9 \pm 35.4/0.1 sq. m.) - moderate total abundance (75.6 \pm 12.7/0.1 sq. m.) - low total abundance (57.6 \pm 13.6/0.1 sq. m.)	147 ± 232 20 ± 22 21 ± 39
49	PALOS VERDES, CALIFORNIA - significantly toxic to <i>R. abronius</i> - not toxic to <i>R. abronius</i> - major degradation to macrobenthos (20.2 sp/0.1 m. sq.)	592 ± 126 251 ± 227 592 ± 126
39	LOS ANGELES HARBOR, CALIFORNIA - >50% mortality to <i>P. pugio</i> (20% elutriate bioassay)	147

30

.

 Table 9. Copper (continued)

References		Biological Approaches	Concentrations (ppm)	
Co-Occurrence Analyses				
48		clam, P. staminea	elongata	995 312 995 995
66		C. stigmaeus, A. sculpta, and A. tonsa N. arenaceaodentata and M. nasuta		210 210
72	WAUKEGAN HA - highly toxic (66.3	RBOR, ILLINOIS ± 4.25% survival✔) to H. azteca		19.5
60		ILLINOIS enthic macroinvertebrate taxa (6.7 ± f benthic macroinvertebrate taxa (15.8		77 ± 39 62 ± 25
61		VER, ILLINOIS enthic macroinvertebrate taxa (8.4 \pm f benthic macroinvertebrate taxa (16.3		45 ± 53 19.5 ± 6
74	SHEBOYGAN RIV - significant mortal	VER, WISCONSIN lity to prawn, M. rosenbergii		145 ± 2
55		OF LAKES, WISCONSIN liity to D. magna ($n = 1$) D. magna ($n = 5$)		540 135 ± 118
54	- significantly toxic - not toxic to D. ma	igna	-	730 ± 205 43 ± 49
	(to D. magna)	on in highly toxic (northern) sediments		612 ± 318✔ 24 ± 11✔
78	- significantly depr - high macrobenthe	essed macrobenthos taxa richness os taxa richness		589 33
55	TORCH LAKE, MI - significant mortal	CHIGAN ity to D. magna and Hexagenia sp.		1800
69	- 25% (n = 1) survi - 80-100% survival - 55% ± 10% surviv	ER (92 \pm 6.3) of G. pseudolimnaeus, 4-d bio val of mayfly (Hexagenia sp.), 4-d bioa (90 \pm 7.5) of mayfly (Hexagenia sp), 4-d val of midges (C. tentans), 4-d bioassay val of midges (C. tentans), 4-d bioassay	ssay d bioassay	17.8 2.2 8 ± 5 4 ± 3 9 ± 4
82	 high benthos spec moderate benthos 	5 BAY, MASSACHUSETTS ties richness (93.6 \pm 9.4) species richness (58.2 \pm 10.5) es richness (31 \pm 6.5)		5±2 15±7 16±7

.

Table 9. Copper (continued)

References		Biological Approaches	Concentrations (ppm)	
Co-Oo	currence Analyse	°8		
79	- negative rate o	TAN BAY, NEW YORK f growth in C. germanica growth in C. germanica	453 ± 311 251 ± 232	
71	BLACK ROCK I - 100% mortality	HARBOR, CONNECTICUT to N. virens	612	
39	STAMFORD, CO - 10% mortality		218	
39	NORWALK, CC - 0% mortality to		224	
39	NEWPORT, RH - 0% mortality to		12	
62	- most toxic to m spot (TLm5.9	ummichogs (TLm 43.2 \pm 31.1) and spot	1071 ± 948 158 ± 29	
64	SOUTH CARC	OCEAN DREDGED MATERIAL DISPOSA DLINA benthos species richness or abundance	AL SITE, 1	
75	TRINITY RIVER - significant mor - low mortality	tality to D. magna	68 ± 62 18 ± 15	
41		FJORDS, NORWAY from maximum in Hurlbert's benthic species ex	s 200	
Equil	ibrium Partitioni	ng		
17	EPA acute marin	ne EP threshold (@4% TOC)	216	
4	EPA chronic ma	rine EP threshold (@4% TOC)	. 136	
Spike	ed-Sediment Bioa	ssays		
53		ER, OREGON , C. <i>tentans</i> in 10-d bioassay teran, D. <i>magna</i> in 48-h bioassay	2296 937	
	 LC50 of cladoo LC50 of amphi 	OND, OREGON , C. tentans in 10-d bioassay ceran, D. magna in 48-h bioassay pod, G. lacustris in 10-d bioassay pod, H. azteca in 10-d bioassay	857 681 964 1078	
32	PUGET SOUNE - ET50 for burro), WASHINGTON wing time of clam, P. staminea	17.8	
		00		

Refer	ences Back	ground Approaches	Concentrations (ppm)	
68	Great Lakes Harbors			
	 classification of non-pollute classification of moderately 		<25	
	- classification of heavily p		25-50 >50	
43	New England interim high	contamination level for dredge	material >400	
12	EPA Region V guideline for	pollution classification of sedir	nents 25	
	USGS alert levels to flag 15	to 20% of samples analyzed	2000	
•	Ontario Ministry of the Envi	ironment Dredge Spoil Guideli		
	EPA Region VI proposed gui	idelines	50	
20	EPA/ACOE Puget Sound Int	terim Criteria (central basin bac	kground) 68	
23	Rotterdam Harbor sediment	t quality classifications		
	- Class 1 (slightly contamin		<60	
	- Class 2 (moderately contai	minated)	60-190	
	- Class 3 (contaminated)		190-370	
	- Class 4. (heavily contamin	nated)	>370	

References:

1.	Beller et al., 1986	48. Salazar et al., 1980	68. Bahnick et al., 1981
2.	PTI Environmental Services, 1988	49. Swartz et al., 1985	69. Marking et al., 1981
4.	Bolton et al., 1985	50. Swartz et al., 1986	71 Simmers et al., 1984
12.	Pavlou and Weston, 1983	53. Cairns et al., 1984	72. Ingersoll and Nelson, in press
17.	Lyman et al., 1987	54. Maleug et al., 1984a	74. Tatem, 1986
20.	U.S. ACOE, 1988	55. Maleug et al., 1984b	75. Qasim et al., 1980
23.	Jansen, 1987	56. Anderson et al., 1988	77. McGreer, 1982
26.	DeWitt et al., 1988	60. Illinois EPA, 1988a	78. Kraft and Sypniewski, 1981
29.	Yake et al., 1986	61. Illinois EPA, 1988b	79. Tietjen and Lee, 1984
32.	Phelps et al., 1983	62. Tsai et al., 1979	80. Tetra Tech, 1985
39.	Lee and Mariani, 1977	64. Van Dolah et al., 1984	82. Gilbert et al., 1976
4.4	D . 1 1005	22 01 101 100F	00 117 1 137 1000

- 41. Rygg et al., 1985
- 43. NERBC, 1980
- 67. McGreer, 1979
- 66. Salazar and Salazar, 1985 83. Word and Mearns, 1979
 - * -Various, please see text

Table 10. Effects range-low and effects range-median values for copper and 51 concentrations used to determine these values arranged in ascending order.

Concentrations (ppm)	End Point	
15.0	Massachusetts Bay benthos COA	
17.8	Sublethal SSB with Macoma	
19.5	Waukegan Waterway, Illinois bioassay COA	
45.4	Kishwaukee River, Illinois benthos COA	
67.0	M. balthica burrowing ET50 COA	
68.2	San Francisco Bay, California bioassay COA	
68.4	Trinity River, Texas bioassay COA	
70.0	ER-L	
76.0	San Francisco Bay, California bioassay COA	
84.6	San Francisco Bay, California bioassay COA	
87.7	San Francisco Bay, California bioassay COA	
96.7	Southern California echinoderms COA	
106.3	Commencement Bay, Washington bioassay COA	
110.0	San Francisco Bay, California AET	
117.8	Commencement Bay, Washington bioassay COA	
134.6	Fraser River, B.C. benthos - M. balthica COA	
136.0	EP chronic marine threshold	
138.0	Puget Sound, Washington bioassay COA	
145.0	Sheboygan River, Wisconsin bioassay COA	
147.0	Los Angeles Harbor, California bioassay COA	
150.0	Fraser River, B.C bioassay COA	
156.0	Lake Union, Washington bioassay COA	
180.0	San Francisco Bay, California AET	
181.3	Southern California bioassay COA	
200.0	Norway benthos COA	
216.0	EP acute marine threshold Bugst Sound Washington AET - bonthia	
310.0	Puget Sound, Washington AET - benthic E R-M	
390.0 390.0	Puget Sound, Washington AET - oyster	
390.0	Puget Sound, Washington AET - Microtox TM	
453.0	Hudson-Raritan Bay, New york bioassay COA	
530.0	Puget Sound, Washington AET - benthic	
540.0	Phillips Chain of Lakes, Wisconsin bioassay COA	
589.0	Keweenaw Waterway, Michigan benthos COA	
592.0	Palos Verdes Shelf, California, bioassay COA	
592.0	Palos Verdes Shelf, California benthos COA	
612.0	Black Rock Harbor, Connecticut bioassay COA	
612.0	Keweenaw Waterway, Michigan bioassay COA	
681.0	SSB with Daphnia	
730.0	Keweenaw Waterway, Michigan bioassay COA	
810.0	Puget Sound, Washington AET - amphipod	
857.0	SSB with midge	
918.0	Commencement Bay, Washington bioassay COA	
937.0	SSB with Daphnia	
964.0	SSB with amphipod	
1071.0	Baltimore Harbor, Maryland bioassay COA	
1078.0	SSB with amphipod	
1260.0	Puget Sound, Washington bioassay COA	
1300.0	Puget Sound, Washington AET - amphipod	
1374.0	Little Grizzly Creek, California bioassay COA	
1800.0	Torch Lake, Michigan bioassay COA	
2296.0	SSB with midge	
2820.0	Commencement Bay, Washington bioassay COA	

34

Lead

Along with other adverse effects, lead can modify the function and structure of kidney, bone, the central nervous system, and the hepatopoietic system (Eisler, 1988b). Adverse effects upon daphnid reproduction has been observed at concentrations in water as low as 1 ppm, organolead compounds are generally more toxic than inorganic forms, adverse effects usually occur at concentrations ranging from 1.3 to 7.7 ppb/ in water; and marine animals may be more resistant to effects of lead than freshwater species (Eisler, 1988b). The proposed marine water quality standard for California was 8 ppb/ in water (Klapow and Lewis, 1979).

A relatively large amount of data exists for lead and measures of effects in sediments (Table 11). AET and EP values are available. Matching biological and chemical data from many studies performed in areas such as Puget Sound, Commencement Bay, San Francisco Bay, southern California, Hudson-Raritan estuary, and Trinity River are available. However, no single-chemical, SSB data are available.

No significant toxicity was observed in sediments from the Duwamish River, Stamford, Norwalk, and Newport at lead concentrations up to 277 ppm. San Francisco Bay sediments that were significantly toxic to amphipods had very little difference in lead concentrations compared to those that were not toxic. Total benthos abundance and some categories of other measures of benthic communities off southern California were not in concordance with lead concentrations. The minimum lead concentration associated with toxicity of Waukegan Harbor sediments was below the detection limits of 32 ppm. Lead concentrations did not differ remarkably among stations sampled in the Cubatao River, Brazil. The Little Grizzly Creek system toxicity tests suggested little concordance between toxicity and lead concentrations. These data were not considered further in the estimation of ER-L and ER-M values (Table B-6).

The minimum concentration above which effects were observed was about 27 ppm; significant toxicity to *Daphnia magna* was reported at this concentration (Table 12). Kishwaukee River macroinvertebrate taxa richness was lower in sediments with a mean lead concentration of 31 ppm, compared to a mean of 21 ppm in taxa-rich sediments. The data suggest an ER-L of about 35 ppm, equivalent to the lower 10 percentile of the data. This value is supported by increased burrowing time of Macoma balthica (32 ppm), depressed benthos diversity in Norwegian fjords (35 ppm), Los Angeles Harbor bioassay data (41.3 ppm), and depressed benthos species richness in Massachusetts Bay (mean 42 ppm). The 50 percentile value in the data suggests an ER-M of about 110 ppm; supported by Torch Lake and Commencement Bay bioassay data (110 ppm, mean 113 ppm, respectively), San Francisco Bay AET for amphipod bioassay (120 ppm), observations of the concentration associated with significant bioeffects in San Francisco Bay (130 ppm), and the EP chronic marine threshold of 132 ppm. Effects were usually observed at concentrations of 110 ppm or greater and always observed at concentrations of 300 ppm or greater (Table B-6).

The degree of confidence in the ER-L and ER-M values for lead should be considered as moderate and high, respectively. A relatively large amount of data exist to relate sediment concentrations with measures of effects, and both values are supported by small clusters of data. However, the chemical data are not speciated to indicate the proportion that is in organic and inorganic forms, there are no SSB data, the available data indicate a fairly wide range in concentrations associated with effects, and the overall apparent effects threshold lies outside the ER-L/ER-M range.

References	Biological Approaches	Concentrations (ppm)
Apparent F	affects Threshold	6.3
1	1986 PUGET SOUND AET	
	- R. abronius amphipod bioassay	660
	- oyster larvae (C. gigas) bioassay	660
	- benthic community composition	300
	- Microtox™ bioassay	530
2	1988 PUGET SOUND AET	
	- R. abronius amphipod bioassay	660
	- oyster larvae (C gigas) bioassay	660
	- benthic community composition	450
	- Microtox TM bioassay	530
20	PSDDA GUIDELINES (based upon Puget Sound AET)	
	- screening level concentration	66
	- maximum level criteria	660
*	SAN FRANCISCO BAY, CALIFORNIA AET	
	- bivalve larvae bioassay	140
	- R. abronius amphipod bioassay	120
Co-Occurre	ence Analyses	
80	COMMENCEMENT BAY, WASHINGTON	
•••	- highly toxic (15.7 \pm 3.9 dead/20) to R. abronius	1613 ± 2628
	- moderately toxic (5.2 \pm 1.1 dead/20) to R. abronius	171 ± 192
	- least toxic (2.5 ± 0.9 dead/20) to R. abronius	78 ± 75
	- highly toxic (44.5 \pm 19% abnormal) to oyster larvae	570 ± 1489
	- moderately toxic ($23 \pm 2.3\%$ abnormal) to oyster larvae	113 ± 123
	- least toxic (15.1 \pm 3.1% abnormal) to oyster larvae	105 ± 173
26	PUGET SOUND, WASHINGTON	
	- highly toxic to R. abronius (95%LPL)	750 ± 1763
	- mod. toxic to R. abronius (<87.5% survival to >95% LPL)	137 ± 140
	- least toxic to R. abronius (>87.5% survival)	47 ± 31
29	LAKE UNION, WASHINGTON	
	- 95% mortality to H. azteca	300
39	DUWAMISH RIVER, WASHINGTON	
	- 0-10% mortality to P. pugio	27.1
67	STRAIT OF GEORGIA, B.C., CANADA	•
	 significant increase in burrowing time (ET50) of M. balthica significant 24-h avoidance behavior among M. balthica 	1 32 74
77	FRASER RIVER, B.C., CANADA	00 • 40
77	FRASER RIVER, B.C., CANADA - sediment devoid of feral <i>M. balthica</i> - sediment populated by feral <i>M. balthica</i>	82 ± 49 14 ± 9

References	s Biological Approaches	Concentrations (ppm	
Co-Occurr	ence Analyses		
*	SAN FRANCISCO BAY, CALIFORNIA - highly toxic ($67 \pm 11.8\%$ mortality) to <i>R. abronius</i> - moderately toxic ($33.8 \pm 4.7\%$ mortality) to <i>R. abronius</i> - least toxic ($18 \pm 6.6\%$ mortality) to <i>R. abronius</i>	96 ± 93 42 ± 27 51 ± 34	
	- significantly toxic (42.9 \pm 19.2% mortality) to <i>R. abronius</i> - not toxic (18.4 \pm 6.8% mortality) to <i>R. abronius</i>	58 ± 61 54 ± 36	
	- highly toxic (92.4 \pm 4.5% abnormal) to bivalve larvae - moderately toxic (59.4 \pm 11.3% abnormal) to bivalve larvae - least toxic (23.3 \pm 7.3% abnormal) to bivalve larvae	$ \begin{array}{r} 105 \pm 87 \\ 63 \pm 63 \\ 25 \pm 17 \end{array} $	
	- significantly toxic (55.7 \pm 22.7% abnormal) to bivalve larva - not toxic (31.9 \pm 15.5% abnormal) to bivalve larvae	ae 59 ± 63 43 ± 33	
7	 sediment quality triad minimum or no bioeffects sediment quality triad significant bioeffects 	≤50 ≥130	
55	LITTLE GRIZZLY CREEK, CALIFORNIA - significant mortality to <i>D. magna</i> and <i>H. limbata</i>	32 ± 18	
56	SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA - significantly toxic (51.65% mortality) to G. japonica - not toxic (23.2% mortality) to G. japonica	73 ± 42 46 ± 59	
83	- high echinoderm abundance (191.3 ± 70.1/0.1 sq. m.) - moderate echinoderm abundance (56.2 ± 23/0.1 sq. m.) - low echinoderm abundance (6.1 ± 7.2/0.1 sq. m.)	12 ± 13 10 ± 9 64 ± 118	
	- high arthropod abundance (148 \pm 58/0.1 sq. m.) - moderate arthropod abundance (72 \pm 3.3/0.1 sq. m.) - low arthropod abundance (35.3 \pm 15.8/0.1 sq. m.)	$\begin{array}{c} 12 \pm 9 \\ 13 \pm 10 \\ 48 \pm 103 \end{array}$	
- n	high species richness (96.3 \pm 22.3/0.1 sq. m.) noderate species richness (72 \pm 3.3/0.1 sq. m.) now species richness (51.2 \pm 8.6/0.1 sq. m.)	20 ± 34 11 ± 8 51 ± 111	
- n	high total abundance (88.9 \pm 35.4/0.1 sq. m.) noderate total abundance (75.6 \pm 12.7/0.1 sq. m.) now total abundance (57.6 \pm 13.6/0.1 sq. m.)	95 ± 154 13 ± 10 17 ± 24	
49 PA - ":	ALOS VERDES, CALIFORNIA major degradation" to macrobenthos (20.2 sp/0.1 m. sq.)	312 ± 23	
	OS ANGELES HARBOR, CALIFORNIA >50% mortality to <i>P. pugio</i> (20% elutriate bioassay)	41	
	AUKEGAN HARBOR, ILLINOIS nighly toxic (66.3 ± 4.25% survival) to H. azteca	<32	
- 1	UPAGE RIVER, ILLINOIS east number of benthic macroinvertebrate taxa (6.7 \pm 2.5/site) highest number of benthic macroinvertebrate taxa (15.8 \pm 2/site)		

Table 11. Lead (continued)

.

Refer	ences	Biological Approaches	Concen	trations (ppm	
Co-Occurrence Analyses					
61		VER, ILLINOIS inthic macroinvertebrate taxa (8.4 ± 0.5 /site) benthic macroinvertebrate taxa (16.3 ± 4.6 /s	ite)	31 ± 26 21 ± 11	
74	SHEBOYGAN RIVI - significant mortali	ER, WISCONSIN ty to prawn, <i>M. rosenbergii</i>		253 ± 47	
55		OF LAKES, WISCONSIN ity to D. magna ($n = 1$) 0. magna ($n = 5$)		160 79 ± 34	
54	 significantly toxic not toxic to D. mag mean concentration 		magna) agna)	29 ± 8 11 ± 10 27 ± 9✔ 9.5 ± 10.3✔	
55	TORCH LAKE, MIC - significant mortali	CHIGAN ty to D. magna and H. limbata		110	
82	 high benthos specie moderate benthos s 	BAY, MASSACHUSETTS es richness (93.6 \pm 9.4/0.1 sq. m.) species richness (58.2 \pm 10.5/0.1 sq. m.) s richness (31 \pm 6.5/0.1 sq. m.)		13 ± 4 42 ± 26 47 ± 17	
79	- negative rate of gr	N BAY, NEW YORK owth in <i>C. germanica</i> owth in <i>C. germanica</i>		321 ± 195 145 ± 132	
71	BLACK ROCK HAI - 100% mortality to	RBOR, CONNECTICUT N. virens		90	
39	STAMFORD, CONN - 10% mortality to P			123	
39	NORWALK, CONN - 0% mortality to P.			277	
39	NEWPORT, RHODI - 0% mortality to P.			<1	
62		3 OR, MARYLAND michogs (TLm 5.1 \pm 3.5) and spot (TLm 5.9 \pm 3. nichogs (TLm 43.2 \pm 31.1) and spot (TLm 24 \pm		512 ± 231 ✔ 213 ± 131	
64	SITE, SOUTH CA	EAN DREDGED MATERIAL DISPOSAL ROLINA thos species richness or abundance		<0.5	
75	TRINITY RIVER, T - significant mortali - low mortality to D	ty to D. magna		54 ± 27 35 ± 22	

.

Table 11. Lead (continued)

References Bio		iological Approaches	Concentrations (ppm)		
Co-Occurrence Analyses					
40	CUBATAO RIVER, BRA - 24-h EC50 with D. simil		18		
41	NORWEGIAN FJORDS, - 50% reduction from max diversity index	NORWAY simum in Hurlbert's benthic spec	ies 35		
Equil i	ibrium Partitioning				
17 4	EPA acute marine EP th EPA chronic marine EP t		3360 132		
Refer	ences B	ackground Approach	Concentrations (ppm)		
 68 Great Lakes Harbors - classification of non-polluted sediments - classification of moderately polluted sediments - classification of heavily polluted sediments 		<40 40-60 >60			
43	New England interim hi	gh contamination level for dred	ge material >200		
12	USGS alert levels to flag Ontario Ministry of the E EPA Region VI proposed FWPCA Chicago Guideli FWPCA Chicago Guideli (pollutant tolerant ber FWPCA Chicago Guideli	PA Region V guideline for pollution classification of sediments GGS alert levels to flag 15-20% of samples analyzed mario Ministry of the Environment Dredge Spoil Guidelines PA Region VI proposed guidelines VPCA Chicago Guidelines: LIGHT (no alteration to benthos) VPCA Chicago Guidelines: MODERATE (pollutant tolerant benthos) VPCA Chicago Guidelines: HEAVY (benthos absent or abundance reduced)			
20		ACOE Puget Sound interim criteria			
23	Rotterdam Harbor sediment quality classifications - Class 1 (slightly contaminated) - Class 2 (moderately contaminated) - Class 3 (contaminated) - Class 4. (heavily contaminated)		<110 110-460 460-660 >660		
Refer	ences:				
 Beller et al., 1986 PTI Environmental Services, 1988 Bolton et al., 1985 Chapman et al., 1987 Pavlou and Weston, 1983 Lyman et al., 1987 U.S. ACOE, 1988 Jansen, 1987 DeWitt et al., 1988 		 41. Rygg, 1985 43. NERBC, 1980 49. Swartz et al., 1985 50. Swartz et al., 1986 54. Maleug et al., 1984a 55. Maleug et al., 1984b 56. Anderson et al., 1988 60. Illinois EPA, 1988a 61. Illinois EPA, 1988b 	 Bahnick et al., 1981 Simmers et al., 1984 Ingersoll and Nelson, in press Tatem, 1986 Qasim et al., 1980 McGreer, 1982 Tietjen and Lee, 1984 Tetra Tech, 1985 Gilbert et al., 1976 		

Table 11. Lead (continued)

References:

29. Yake et al., 1986	62. Tsai et al., 1979
39. Lee and Mariani, 1977	64. Van Dolah et al., 1984
40. Zagatto et al., 1987	67. McGreer, 1979

83. Word and Mearns, 1979 * -Various, please see text.

Table 12. Effects range-low and effects range-median values for lead and 47concentrations used to determine these values arranged in ascending order.

Concentrations (ppm)	End Point
27	Keweenaw Waterway, Michigan bioassay COA
29.0	Keweenaw Waterway, Michigan bioassay COA
30.6	Kishwaukee River Illinois, benthos COA
32.0	M. balthica burrowing ET50 COA
35.0	Norway benthos COA
35.0	ER-L
41.3	Los Angeles Harbor, California bioassay COA
42.1	San Francisco Bay, California bioassay COA
42.4	Massachusetts Bay, Massachusetts benthos COA
46.7	Massachusetts Bay, Massachusetts benthos COA
47.8	Southern California arthropods COA
≤50.0	San Francisco, California, triad minimum effects COA
51.0	Southern California species richness COA
53.7	Trinity River, Texas bioassay COA
58.9	San Francisco Bay, California bioassay COA
>60.0	FWPCA Classification: benthos absent COA
63.4	San Francisco Bay, California bioassay COA
64.4	Southern California echinoderms COA
73.1	Southern California bioassay COA
74.0	M balthica bioassay avoidance COA
81.7	Fraser River B.C., Canada benthos COA
89.6	Black Rock Harbor, Connecticut bioassay COA
95.7	San Francisco Bay, California bioassay COA
104.5	San Francisco Bay, California bioassay COA
110.0	ER-M
110.0	Torch Lake, Michigan bioassay COA
113.1	Commencement Bay, Washington bioassay COA
120.0	San Francisco Bay, California AET
≥130.0	San Francisco Bay, California triad significant effects CO
132.0	EP chronic marine @4% TOC
136.6	Puget Sound, Washington bioassay COA
140.0	San Francisco Bay, California AET
143.7	DuPage River, Illinois benthos COA
160.0	Phillips Chain of Lakes, Wisconsin bioassay COA
170.8	Commencement Bay, Washington bioassay COA
253.0	Sheboygan River, Wisconsin bioassay COA
300.0	Puget Sound, Washington AET - benthic
300.0	Lake Union, Washington bioassay COA
312.3	Palos Verdes Shelf, California benthos COA
320.9	Hudson-Raritan Bay, New York bioassay COA
450.0	Puget Sound, Washington AET - benthic
512.0	Baltimore Harbor, Maryland bioassay COA
530.0	Puget Sound, Washington AET - Microtox™
570.1	Commencement Bay, Washington bioassay COA
660.0	Puget Sound, Washington AET - amphipod

Table 12. (continued)

Concentrations (ppm)	End Point	
660.0	Puget Sound. Washington AET - oyster	
750.2	Puget Sound, Washington AET - oyster Puget Sound, Washington bioassay COA Commencement Bay, Washington bioassay COA EP acute marine @4% TOC	
1613.0	Commencement Bay, Washington bioassay COA	
3360.0	EP acute marine @4% TOC	

Mercury

Acute toxicity of mercury (II) to freshwater invertebrates ranges from 2.2 to 2,000 ppb/ and from 3.5 to 1678 ppb/ for marine organisms (U.S. EPA, 1986). Klapow and Lewis (1979) proposed a marine water quality standard of 0.14 ppb/ mercury. Eisler (1987) reported that organomercury compounds-especially methylmercury-were more toxic than inorganic forms; lethal concentrations of total mercury to sensitive organisms varied from 0.1 to 2.0 ppb/ for aquatic fauna; mercury was the most toxic trace metal to aquatic organisms; and that toxicity was increased in the presence of zinc and lead.

A moderate amount of sediment data exist for mercury (Table 13). AET values for Puget Sound and San Francisco Bay are available. Matching chemistry and biological data for Puget Sound, San Francisco Bay, DuPage River, Phillips Chain of Lakes, Baltimore Harbor, and Trinity River are listed in Table 13 along with those from other areas. EP threshold values and data from two SSB experiments are available.

No toxicity was observed in bioassays of sediments from the Duwamish River, Stamford, Norwalk, and Newport with mercury concentrations up to 0.3 ppm. Very small gradients in mercury concentrations were observed in data from San Francisco Bay, southern California, Kishwaukee River, Keweenaw Waterway, Massachusetts Bay, and Trinity River. These data were not considered in the estimation of ER-L and ER-M values (Table B-7).

The remaining data suggest an ER-L value of about 0.15 ppm (0.17 rounded to 0.15 ppm), equivalent to the lower 10 percentile of the data (Table 14). This value is supported by bioassay data from Los Angeles Harbor (0.15 ppm), Lake Union (0.17 ppm), and Macoma burrowing bioassays of Fraser River sediments (0.18 ppm). Chronic effects are predicted by EP principles to occur at 0.032 ppm.

The data suggest an ER-M of about 1.3 ppm mercury, the 50 percentile value in the data. This value is supported by two San Francisco Bay AETs (1.3 and 1.5 ppm), moderate toxicity of Puget Sound sediments to amphipods (mean of 1.38 ppm), and significant toxicity of Little Grizzly Creek sediments to *Daphnia* (mean of 1.5 ppm). With several exceptions (principally data from San Diego Bay), effects were usually observed at concentrations of 1.0 ppm or greater (Table B-7).

The degree of confidence in the ER-L and ER-M estimates should be considered as moderate and high, respectively. There are clusters of data around the 0.15 and 1.3 ppm values, suggesting that these values are supported by a preponderance of evidence and an apparent effects threshold within the ER-L/ER-M range. However, the predicted chronic marine value (0.032 ppm) is considerably lower than the ER-L, the majority of the available data are from field studies, there are relatively little data from SSBs, and the available data from bioassays with *R. abronius* and *Pontoporeia affinis* were not consistent.

Refe	rences Biologie	cal Approaches	Concentrations (ppm)
Арра	arent Effects Threshold		
1	1986 PUGET SOUND AET		
-	- R. abronius amphipod bioassa	l y	2.1
	- oyster larvae (C. gigas) bioass	say	0.6
	 benthic community composition 	n	0.9
	- Microtox™ bioassay		0.4
2	1988 PUGET SOUND AET		
	- R. abronius amphipod bioassa	ly	2.1
	- oyster larvae (Ĉ gigas) bioass		0.6
	 benthic community compositio 		2.1
	- Microtox [™] bioassay		0.4
20	PSDDA GUIDELINES (based up	on Puget Sound AET)	
	- screening level concentration		0.2
	- maximum level criteria		2.0
*	SAN FRANCISCO BAY, CALI	FORNIA AET	
	- bivalve larvae bioassay		1.5
	- R. abronius amphipod bioassa	y	1.3
Co-C	occurrence Analyses		<i>r</i> -
80	COMMENCEMENT BAY, WA	SLIINICTON	
00	- highly toxic $(15.7 \pm 3.9 \text{ dead})$		11.2 ± 22.8
	- moderately toxic (5.2 \pm 1.1 de		0.3 ± 0.2
	- least toxic (2.5 \pm 0.9 dead/20)		0.2 ± 0.1
	- highly toxic (44.5 \pm 19% above	rmal) to ovster larvae	3.5 ± 12.5
	- moderately toxic (23 \pm 2.3% a		0.2 ± 0.1
	- least toxic (15.1 \pm 3.1% abnor		0.2 ± 0.1
26	BLICET SOLIND WASHINGT	ראר	
20	PUGET SOUND, WASHINGT - highly toxic to R. abronius (95)	5% I PI)	5 ± 14.8
	- mod. toxic to R. abronius (<87		1.4 ± 4.6
	- least toxic to R. abronius (>87		0.5 ± 0.5
29	LAKE UNION, WASHINGTO	N	
47	- 95% mortality to H. azteca	* 1	0.2
A C	•		
39	DUWAMISH RIVER, WASHI	NGION	<u>^ 1</u>
	- 0-10% mortality to P. pugio		0.1
67	STRAIT OF GEORGIA, B.C., C		
	- significant increase in burrow	ing time (ET50) of M. balthi	
	- significant 24-h avoidance be	havior among M. balthica	0.5
77	FRASER RIVER, B.C., CANAI	DA	
	- sediment devoid of feral M. I		0.4 ± 0.2
	- sediment populated by feral.		0.1 ± 0.1

Table 13. Summary of sediment effects data available for mercury.

Table 13. Mercury (continued)

.

Ref	erences	Biological Approaches	Concentrations (ppm)
Co-	Occurrence Analyses		
*	SAN FRANCISCO B - highly toxic (67 ± 1 - moderately toxic (33	AY, CALIFORNIA 1.8% mortality) to <i>R. abronius</i> 3.8 ± 4.7% mortality) to <i>R. abronius</i> % mortality) to <i>R. abronius</i>	$\begin{array}{c} 1 \pm 1 \\ 0.7 \pm 0.8 \\ 0.5 \pm 0.4 \end{array}$
		42.9 ± 19.2% mortality) to <i>R. abroni</i> % mortality) to <i>R. abronius</i>	$\begin{array}{c} 0.7 \pm 0.8 \\ 0.6 \pm 0.4 \end{array}$
	- moderately toxic (5	4.5% abnormal) to bivalve larvae 9.4 \pm 11.3% abnormal) to bivalve la .3% abnormal) to bivalve larvae	0.6 ± 0.4 rvae 0.9 ± 1 0.3 ± 0.2
		55.7 ± 22.7% abnormal) to bivalve l 5% abnormal) to bivalve larvae	larvae 0.7 ± 0.9 0.5 ± 0.3
55	LITTLE GRIZZLY CF - significant mortality	REEK, CALIFORNIA to D. magna and Hexagenia sp.	1.5 ± 0.9
56	SOUTHERN CALIFO - significantly toxic (- not toxic (23.2% mo	51.65% mortality) to G. japonica	$\begin{array}{c} 0.3 \pm 0.1 \\ 0.3 \pm 0.02 \end{array}$
39	LOS ANGELES HAR - >50% mortality to P	BOR, CALIFORNIA P. pugio (20% elutriate bioassay)	0.15
48	SAN DIEGO BAY, C - >97% survival of cla - >97% survival of m - >97% survival of C.	am, P. staminea	66.5 58.2 254.4
66	- ≥82% survival of C.	stigmaeus, A. sculpta,, and A. tonsa	2.7
72	WAUKEGAN HARB - highly toxic (66.3 ±	OR, ILLINOIS 4.25% survival✔) to H. azteca	0.1
60		LINOIS thic macroinvertebrate taxa (6.7 ± 2 penthic macroinvertebrate taxa (15.8	
61		ER, ILLINOIS thic macroinvertebrate taxa (8.4 ± 0 penthic macroinvertebrate taxa (16.3	
74	SHEBOYGAN RIVE	R, WISCONSIN v to prawn, M. rosenbergii	<0.1
55		F LAKES, WISCONSIN y to D. magna $(n = 1)$ magna $(n = 5)$	9.4 1 ± 1.3

Table 13. Mercury (continued)

References		Biological Approaches C	Concentrations (ppm)	
Co-Occurrence Analyses				
54		D. magna		
55	TORCH LAKE, MICH - significant mortality	IIGAN to <i>D. magna</i> and Hexagenia sp.	0.3	
69	- 25% (n=1) survival o - 80-100% survival (90 - 55%±10% survival of	2 ± 6.3) of G. pseudolimnaeus, 4-d bioassay of mayfly (Hexagenia sp.) 4-d bioassay 2 ± 7.5) of mayfly (Hexagenia sp), 4-d bioas f midges (C. tentans), 4-d bioassay of midges (C. tentans), 4-d bioassay	<0.01	
82	- high benthos species	ecies richness (58.2 ± 10.5)	$\begin{array}{c} 0.06 \pm 0.04 \\ 0.2 \pm 0.1 \\ 0.1 \pm 0.02 \end{array}$	
79	HUDSON-RARITAN - negative rate of grow - positive rate of grow	wth in C. germanica	8.9 ± 7.5 5 ± 6.7	
44	NEW YORK HARBO - <10% mortality to N 100-d exposures	R, NEW YORK I. virens, M. mercenaria and P. pugio;	34.9	
39	STAMFORD, CONNE - 10% mortality to P.		0.2	
39	NORWALK, CONNE 0% mortality to P. p		0.3	
39	NEWPORT, RHODE - 0% mortality to P. p		0.03	
62	BALTIMORE HARBC - most toxic to mummi - least toxic to mummi	DR, MARYLAND ichogs (TLm 5.1 \pm 3.5) and spot (TLm 5.9 \pm ichogs (TLm 43.2 \pm 31.1) and spot (TLm 24	$\begin{array}{ll} 3.4) & 1.6 \pm 1.1 \\ \pm 5.6) & 0.4 \pm 0.1 \end{array}$	
64	SOUTH CAROLII	AN DREDGED MATERIAL DISPOSAL SI NA 105 species richness or abundance	ITE, 0.6	
75	TRINITY RIVER, TE> - significant mortality - low mortality to D.	to D. magna	$0.3 \pm 0.1 \\ 0.6 \pm 0.7$	
40	CUBATAO RIVER, B - 24-h EC50 with D. s		0.9	

44

 Table 13. Mercury (continued)

Refe _	rences Biological Approaches	Concentrations (ppm)
Equi	librium Partitioning	
17	EPA acute marine EP threshold (@4% TOC)	0.6
4	EPA chronic marine EP threshold (@4% TOC)	0.03
Spik	ed-Sediment Bioassays	
63	No reduction in the activity behavior of <i>P. affinis</i> , 2-d experiment	0.65 - 1.15
	Significant reduction in the activity behavior of <i>P. affinis</i> , 5-d experiment	2.15 - 3.35
18	LC50 of R. abronius in 10-d bioassay	13.1
Refe	rences Background Approach	Concentrations (ppm
68	Great Lakes Harbors	
	 classification of non-polluted sediments classification of heavily polluted sediments 	<1 ≥1
43	New England interim high contamination level for dredge n	naterial >1.5
12	EPA Region V guideline for pollution classification of sedime USGS alert levels to flag 15 to 20% of samples analyzed	20
	Ontario Ministry of the Environment Dredge Spoil Guideline EPA Region VI proposed guidelines	1
	EPA Jensen Criteria for open water dredge material disposal	
~~	EPA/ACOE Puget Sound Interim Criteria (central basin backg	ground) 0.15
20 23	Rotterdam Harbor sediment quality classifications - Class 1 (slightly contaminated)	<1.5

1. Beller et al., 1986	43. NERBC, 1980	67. McGreer, 1979
2. PTI Environmental Services, 1988	•	68. Bahnick et al., 1981
4. Bolton et al., 1985	48. Salazar et al., 1980	69. Marking et al., 1981
12. Pavlou and Weston, 1983	54. Maleug et al., 1984a	72. Ingersoll and Nelson, in press
17. Lyman et al., 1987	55. Maleug et al., 1984b	74. Tatem, 1986
18. Swartz et al., 1988	56. Anderson et al., 1988	75. Qasim et al., 1980
20. U.S. ACOE, 1988	60. Illinois EPA, 1988a	77. McGreer, 1982
23. Jansen, 1987	61. Illinois EPA, 1988b	79. Tietjen and Lee, 1984
26. DeWitt et al., 1988	62. Tsai <i>et al.</i> , 1979	80. Tetra Tech, 1985
29. Yake et al., 1986	63. Magnuson et al., 1976	82. Gilbert et al., 1976
39. Lee and Mariani, 1977	64. Van Dolah <i>et al.</i> , 1984	* -Various, please see text.
40. Zagatto et al., 1987	66. Salazar and Salazar, 1985	

Table 14. Effects range-low and effects range-median values for mercury and 30 concentrations used to determine these values arranged in ascending order.

Concentrations (ppm)	End Point	· · ·
0.032	EP Chronic Marine @4% TOC	
0.08	Waukegan Harbor, Illinois bioassay COA	
0.15	ER-L	
0.15	Los Angeles Harbor, California bioassay COA	; [*]
0.17	Lake Union, Washington bioassay COA	
0.18	M. balthica burrowing bioassay COA	
0.29	Torch Lake, Michigan bioassay COA	
0.41	Puget Sound, Washington bioassay AET - Microtox™	· ·
0.42	Fraser River, B.C., Canada M. balthica bioassay COA	
0.48	M. balthica avoidance bioassay COA	•••••
0.59	Puget Sound, Washington AET - oyster	
0.6	EP acute marine @4% TOC	
0.88	Puget Sound, Washington AET - benthic	
U.9	San Francisco Bay, California bioassay COA	
0.9	Cubatao River, Brazil bioassay COA	
0.96	San Francisco Bay, California bioassay COA	
1.3	ER-M	
1.3	San Francisco Bay, California AET	•••
1.38	Puget Sound, Washington bioassay COA	
1.5	San Francisco Bay, California AET	
1.5	Little Grizzly Creek, California bioassay COA	
1.6	Baltimore Harbor, Maryland bioassay COA	
1.6	DuPage River, Illinois benthos COA	
2.1	Puget Sound, Washington AET - amphipod	
2.1	Puget Sound, Washington AET - benthic	
2.15-3.35	SSB with Pontoporeia	
3.5	Commencement Bay, Washington bioassay COA	
5.04	Puget Sound, Washington bioassay COA	
8.9	Hudson-Raritan Bay, New York bioassay COA	
9.4	Phillips Chain of Lakes, Wisconsin bioassay COA	
11.2	Commencement Bay, Washington bioassay COA	
13.1	SSB with R. abronius	

Nickel

Acute toxicity to organisms occurs at nickel concentrations as low as 1101 ppb \checkmark in freshwater and as low as 151.7 ppb \checkmark in saltwater; chronic effects can occur at concentrations of 141 ppb \checkmark or greater in saltwater; and toxicity is influenced greatly by water hardness and salinity (U.S. EPA, 1986). The 96-h LC50s for two species of estuarine fish were 38 and 70 mg/L nickel chloride (Mayer, 1987). The proposed California marine water quality standard for nickel is 20 ppb \checkmark (Klapow and Lewis, 1979).

A moderate amount of data are available for sediments to estimate effects thresholds (Table 15), however all of the data are from matching biological and chemical analyses performed with field samples. AET values for Puget Sound are available and were calculated for San Francisco Bay and matching biological and chemical data are available from San Francisco Bay, Commencement Bay, the Keweenaw River, southern California, Massachusetts Bay, Baltimore Harbor, and other areas.

Data from the Cubatao River, Brazil lacked concordance between the biological measure and nickel concentrations. Very small gradients in nickel concentrations were reported in results from San Francisco Bay, Trinity Bay, Fraser River, and some categories of effects from Commencement Bay. The nickel concentration was below the detection limits of 31.8 ppm in a Waukegan Harbor sample that was toxic. Several of the Puget Sound AETs were not definitive. All of these data were not used in the determination of ER-L and ER-M values (Table B-8).

Effects were not observed in association with mean nickel concentrations below 21 ppm in sediments (Table B-8). Benthic species richness was moderate in Massachusetts Bay sediments with a mean nickel concentration of 21 ppm (Table 16). The lower 10 percentile value of the data suggest an ER-L of about 30 ppm (28 rounded to 30 ppm). This value is supported by a Puget Sound AET of 28 ppm, high oyster larvae toxicity in Commencement Bay sediments with a mean nickel concentration of 30 ppm, high toxicity in a Los Angeles Harbor sediment with 31 ppm, and low benthic species richness in Massachusetts Bay sediments with a mean of 33 ppm (Table 16). The 50 percentile value of the data suggests an ER-M of about 50 ppm (52 rounded to 50 ppm), supported by a 1986 Puget Sound AET (49 ppm) and 100 percent mortality in Black Rock Harbor sediments (52 ppm). No overall effects threshold was apparent.

The degree of confidence in the ER-L and ER-M values for nickel should be considered as moderate. The available data indicate relatively high consistency and clustering at or between the two values, but the data are only from field studies, include no SSBs or thresholds derived from the EP approach, and no overall effects threshold is apparent.

Table 15.	Summary of	sediment eff	ects data availa	able for nickel.
-----------	------------	--------------	------------------	------------------

Referenc	es Biological Approaches	Concentrations (ppm)
Apparent	Effects Threshold	
1	1986 PUGET SOUND AET - R. abronius amphipod bioassay - oyster larvae (C. gigas) bioassay - benthic community composition - Microtox [™] bioassay	>120 39 49 28
2	1988 PUGET SOUND AET - R. abronius amphipod bioassay - benthic community composition	>140 >140
20	PSDDA GUIDELINES (based upon Puget Sound AET) - screening level concentration - maximum level criteria	28 120
*	SAN FRANCISCO BAY, CALIFORNIA AET - bivalve larvae bioassay - R. abronius amphipod bioassay	>170 >170
Co-Occui	rrence Analyses	
80	COMMENCEMENT BAY, WASHINGTON - highly toxic (15.7 \pm 3.9 dead/20) to <i>R. abronius</i> - moderately toxic (5.2 \pm 1.1 dead/20) to <i>R. abronius</i> - least toxic (2.5 \pm 0.9 dead/20) to <i>R. abronius</i>	41 ± 32 20 ± 13 16 ± 7
	- highly toxic (44.5 \pm 19% abnormal) to oyster larvae - moderately toxic (23 \pm 2.3% abnormal) to oyster larvae - least toxic (15.1 \pm 3.1% abnormal) to oyster larvae	30 ± 22 e 17 ± 8 12 ± 3
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	

Refer	ences	Biological Approaches	Concentrations	6 (ppm)
Co-O	ccurrence Analyses			
29	LAKE UNION, WA - 95% mortality to H		88	
39	DUWAMISH RIVEI - 0-10% mortality to		17.5	;
77	FRASER RIVER, B.C - sediment devoid of - sediment populated	feral M. balthica	44 ± 34 ±	
*	- moderately toxic (3	BAY, CALIFORNIA 11.8% mortality) to R. abronius 33.8 \pm 4.7% mortality) to R. abronius 5% mortality) to R. abronius	99 <u>+</u>	± 42 : 35 ± 25
	- significantly toxic - not toxic (18.4 \pm 6.0	(42.9 ± 19.2% mortality) to <i>R. abronii</i> 3% mortality) to <i>R. abronius</i>		± 36 ± 27
	 moderately toxic (5) 	\pm 4.5% abnormal) to bivalve larvae 59.4 \pm 11.3% abnormal) to bivalve lar 7.3% abnormal) to bivalve larvae	93 1 rvae 112 78 1	± 31
	- significantly toxic - not toxic (31.9 ± 15	(55.7 \pm 22.7% abnormal) to bivalve 1 .5% abnormal) to bivalve larvae		± 35 ± 44
49	PALOS VERDES, C. - "major degradation"	ALIFORNIA ' to macrobenthos (20.2 sp/0.1 m. sq.)) 94 ±	: 5
55	LITTLE GRIZZLY C - significant mortali	REEK, CALIFORNIA ty to D. magna and H. limbata	40 ±	: 16
56	SOUTHERN CALIF - significantly toxic - not toxic (23.2% m	ORNIA (51.65% mortality) to G. japonica ortality) to G. japonica	24 ± 20 ±	
39	LOS ANGELES HAT - >50% mortality to	RBOR, CALIFORNIA P. pugio (20% elutriate bioassay)	31	
72	WAUKEGAN HAR - highly toxic (66.3 ±	BOR, ILLINOIS 24.25% survival () to H. azteca	<13	.8
74	SHEBOYGAN RIVE - significant mortalit	R, WISCONSIN y to prawn, M. rosenbergii	110	± 0
55	PHILLIPS CHAIN (DF LAKES, WISCONSIN ty to D. magna $(n = 1)$	350	
54	 significantly toxic t not toxic to D. mag mean concentration 	ERWAY, MICHIGAN to D. magna na in highly toxic (northern) sediments in least toxic (southern) sediments (35 ± (to D. magna) 100	± 19 : 14 ± 26✔ : 3.6✔

Table 15. Nickel (continued)

. .

Refer	ences	Biological Approaches	Concentrations (ppm)
Co-O	ccurrence Analyses		·
55	TORCH LAKE, MICH - significant mortality	IGAN to D. magna and H. limbata	150
82	 high benthos species moderate benthos species 	AY, MASSACHUSETTS richness (93.6 \pm 9.4/0.1 sq. m.) ecies richness (58.2 \pm 10.5/0.1 sq. m.) ichness (31 \pm 6.5/0.1 sq. m.)	10 ± 3 21 ± 11 33 ± 12
71	BLACK ROCK HARB - 100% mortality to N		52
39	STAMFORD, CONNE - 10% mortality to P. 1		38
39	NORWALK, CONNE - 0% mortality to P. pr		43
39	NEWPORT, RHODE - 0% mortality to P. p		10
62	BALTIMORE HARBO - most toxic to mummi - least toxic to mummi	R, MARYLAND chogs (TLm 5.1 ± 3.5) and spot (TLm5.9 chogs (TLm 43.2 ± 31.1) and spot (TLm	± 3.4) 97 ± 53 24 ± 5.6) 70 ± 14
64	DISPOSAL SITE, S	AN DREDGED MATERIAL OUTH CAROLINA os species richness or abundance	6
75	TRINITY RIVER, TEX - significant mortality - low mortality to D.	to D. magna	29 ± 26 36 ± 29
40	CUBATAO RIVER, B - 24-h EC50 with D. st	RAZIL. milis	3

Refer	enc es	Background Approach Conce		entrations (ppm)	
68	Great Lakes Harbor - classification of non-p - classification of mode - classification of heav	ertely polluted sediments		<20 20-50 >50	
43	New England interim	hih contamination level for dred	lge material	>100	
12	USGS alert levels to fl	ne or pollution classification of se a 15-20% of samples analyzed e Evironment Dredge Spoil Guid edguidelines		20 2000 25 50	

Refer	ences Ba	ckground Approach	Concentrations (ppm
23	Rotterdam Harbor sedime - Class 1 (slightly contam	nt quality classifications	<35
	- Class 2 (moderately cont	aminated)	35-65
	- Class 3 (contaminated)		65-80
	- Class 4 (heavily contam	inated)	>80
Refer	ences:		
	ences: ller <i>et al</i> 1986	43. NERBC, 1980	71. Simmers et al., 1984
1. Be		-	71. Simmers <i>et al.</i> , 1984 72. Ingersoll and Nelson, In press
1. Be 2. PT	ller et al 1986	-	-
 Be PT Pa 	ller et al 1986 I Environmental Services, 1988	49. Swartz et al., 1985	72. Ingersoll and Nelson, In press

29. Yake et al., 1986

- 39. Lee and Mariani, 1977
- 40. Zagatto et al., 1987

56. Anderson *et al.*, 1988 62. Tsai et al., 1979 64. Van Dolah et al. 1984 68. Bahnick et al., 1981

80. Tetra Tech, 1985

82. Gilbert et al., 1976

* -Various, please see text

Table 16. Effects range-low and effects range-median values for nickel and 18 concentrations used to determine these values arranged in ascending order.

Concentrations (ppm)	End Point
21	Massachusetts Bay benthos COA
28	Puget Sound, Washington, AET - Microtox™
30	ER-L
30 -	Commencement Bay, Washington, bioassay COA
31	Los Angeles Harbor, California, bioassay COA
33	Massachusetts Bay benthos COA
39	Puget Sound, Washington, AET - oyster
40	Little Grizzly Creek, California, bioassay COA
41	Commencement Bay, Washington bioassay COA
49	Puget Sound, Washington, AET - benthic
50	ER-M
52	Black Rock Harbor, Connecticut, bioassay COA
88	Lake Union, Washington, bioassay COA
94	Palos Verdes Shelf, California, benthos COA
97	Baltimore Harbor, Maryland, bioassay COA
100	Keweenaw River, Michigan, bioassay COA
10 9	Keweenaw River, Michigan, bioassay COA
110	Sheboygan River, Wisconsin, bioassay COA
150	Torch Lake, Michigan, bioassay COA
350	Phillips Chain of Lakes, Wisconsin, bioassay COA

Silver

Available data indicate that chronic toxicity to freshwater organisms may occur at concentrations in water as low as 0.12 ppb \checkmark and that concentrations in seawater should not exceed 2.3 ppb \checkmark at any time (U.S. EPA, 1986). The proposed California marine water standard is 0.45 ppb \checkmark (Klapow and Lewis, 1979).

A relatively small amount of data exist for relating the concentrations of silver in sediments to measures of effects (Table 17). Definitive AETs for Puget Sound could not be calculated for many of the biological end-points and, therefore, are reported as greater-than values. Co-occurrence analyses were performed with data from Commencement Bay, San Francisco Bay, and southern California. Sublethal tests of sediments from the Strait of Georgia were performed with Macoma balthica.

There was little or no concordance between measures of toxicity to either amphipods or oyster larvae and silver concentrations in Commencement Bay. Also, amphipod bioassay data from San Francisco Bay and southern California indicated little concordance with respective silver concentrations. In addition, total benthic community abundance and silver concentrations on the southern California shelf indicated little concordance. San Diego Bay sediments with up to 0.8 ppm silver were not toxic in a variety of bioassays. Several of the Puget Sound AETs were not definitive. These data were not considered during the determination of ER-L and ER-M values (Table B-9).

From the remaining data, it appears that effects were not observed in association with silver concentrations of less than about 0.6 ppm (Table 18). The data suggest an ER-L of about 1.0 ppm, the lower 10 percentile value of the available data. This value is supported by results of an avoidance bioassay performed with *M. balthica* (1.0 ppm), San Francisco Bay bioassay data (1.0 ppm), and a San Francisco Bay AET (1.1 ppm). The ER-M suggested by the data is 2.2 ppm, the 50 percentile value of the available data. This value is supported by the absence of feral *M. balthica* in Fraser River sediments (2.1 ± 1.3 ppm), low arthropod abundance in southern California benthos (2.2 ± 3.9 ppm), low species richness in southern California benthos (2.5 ± 4.1 ppm), and increased burrowing time of *M. balthica* exposed to Strait of Georgia sediments (2.6 ppm). With several exceptions, effects were observed at silver concentrations of 1.7 ppm or greater (Table B-9).

The degree of confidence in the silver ER-L and ER-M values should be considered as moderate. There is consistency in the clusters of data around the ER-L and ER-M values and a weak apparent effects threshold lies within ER-L/ER-M range. However, these values are based upon a relatively small amount of data and there are no data from SSBs, nor from EP approaches.

Table 17. Summary of sediment effects data available for silver.

Reference	s Biological Approaches	Concentrations	(ppm)
Apparent]	Effects Threshold		
1	1986 PUGET SOUND AET		
1	- R. abronius amphipod bioassay	>3.7	
	- oyster larvae (C. gigas) bioassay	>0.6	
	- benthic community composition	5.2	
	- Microtox™ bioassay	>0.6	
2	1988 PUGET SOUND AET		н.,
	- R. abronius amphipod bioassay	6.1	
	- benthic community composition	>6.1	
	- oyster larvae (C. gigas) bioassay	>0.6	
	- Microtox™ bioassay	>0.6	
20	PSDDA GUIDELINES (based upon Puget Sound AET)		
	- screening level concentration	1.2	
	- maximum level criteria	5.2	
*	SAN FRANCISCO BAY, CALIFORNIA AET		•
	- bivalve larvae bioassay	1.1	
-	- R. abronius amphipod bioassay	>8.6	-
Co-Occurr	ence Analyses		U
80	COMMENCEMENT BAY, WASHINGTON		
	- highly toxic (15.7 \pm 3.9 dead/20) to R. abronius	0.2 ± 0.1	
	- moderately toxic (5.2 \pm 1.1 dead/20) to R. abronius	0.3 ± 0.1	
	- least toxic (2.5 \pm 0.9 dead/20) to R. abronius	0.3 ± 0.1	
	- highly toxic (44.5 \pm 19% abnormal) to oyster larvae	0.3 ± 0.1	
	- moderately toxic (23 \pm 2.3% abnormal) to oyster larvae	0.3 ± 0.1	
	- least toxic (15.1 \pm 3.1% abnormal) to oyster larvae	0.3 ± 0.1	
26	PUGET SOUND, WASHINGTON		
	- highly toxic to R. abronius (95% LPL)	0.6 ± 1.0)
	- moderately toxic to R. abronius		
	(<87.5% survival to >95% LPL)	0.6 ± 0.6	
	- least toxic to R. abronius (>87.5% survival)	0.3 ± 0.1	
67	STRAIT OF GEORGIA, B.C., CANADA	0.4	
	- significant increase in burrowing time (ET50) of M. balthica	2.6 1	
	- significant 24-h avoidance behavior among M. balthica	L	
77	FRASER RIVER, B.C., CANADA - sediment devoid of feral <i>M. balthica</i>	2.1 ± 1.3	ł
		2.1 ± 1.5 0.8 ± 0.6	
	- sediment populated by feral M. balthica	0.0 I 0.0	•
*	SAN FRANCISCO BAY, CALIFORNIA		
	- highly toxic (67 \pm 11.8% mortality) to <i>R. abronius</i>	1.7 ± 2.6	
	- moderately toxic (33.8 \pm 4.7% mortality) to R. abronius	0.9 ± 0.9	
	- least toxic (18 \pm 6.6% mortality) to R. abronius	1.3 ± 1.8)
	- significantly toxic (42.9 \pm 19.2% mortality to R. abronius	1.2 ± 1.7	
	- not toxic (18.4 \pm 6.8% mortality) to R. abronius	1.4 ± 1.9)

Reference	Biological Approaches	Concentrations	(ppm
Co-Occurre	ence Analyses		
	- highly toxic (92.4 \pm 4.5% abnormal) to bivalve larvae	6.9 ± 2.5	
	- moderately toxic (59.4 \pm 11.3% abnormal) to bivalve larvae	1 ± 0.6	
	- least toxic (23.3 \pm 7.3% abnormal) to bivalve larvae	0.5 ± 0.4	
	- significantly toxic (55.7 \pm 22.7% abnormal) to bivalve larvae	1.7 ± 2.2	
	- not toxic (31.9 \pm 15.5% abnormal) to bivalve larvae	0.6 ± 0.5	
56	SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA		
	- significantly toxic (51.65% mortality) to G. japonica	1.3 ± 1.4	
	- not toxic (23.2% mortality) to G. japonica	1.1 ± 1.9	
83	- high echinoderm abundance (191.3 \pm 70.1/0.1 sq. m.)	0.6 ± 0.8	
	- moderate echinoderm abundance $(56.2 \pm 23/0.1 \text{ sq. m.})$	0.6 ± 0.7	
	- low echinoderm abundance (6.1 \pm 7.2/0.1 sq. m.)	3.1 ± 4.5	
•	- high arthropod abundance (148 \pm 58/0.1 sq. m.)	0.9 ± 1.6	
	- moderate arthropod abundance ($73 \pm 6.8/0.1$ sq. m.)	0.7 ± 1	
	- low arthropod abundance $(35.3 \pm 15.8/0.1 \text{ sq. m.})$	2.2 ± 3.9	
	- high species richness (96.3 \pm 22.3/0.1 sq. m.)	0.9 ± 2.1	
	- moderate species richness ($72 \pm 3.3/0.1$ sq. m.)	0.7 ± 0.8	
	- low species richness $(51.2 \pm 8.6/0.1 \text{ sq. m.})$	2.5 ± 4.1	
•	- high total abundance ($88.9 \pm 35.4/0.1 \text{ sq. m.}$)	3.2 ± 5.6	
	- moderate total abundance (75.6 \pm 12.7/0.1 sq. m.)	1 ± 2	
	- low total abundance (57.6 \pm 13.6/0.1 sq. m.)	1.3 ± 1.8	
66	SAN DIEGO BAY, CALIFORNIA		
	- ≥82% survival of sanddab C. stigmaeus, A. sculpta, and A. ton	sa 0.8	
	- \geq 86% survival of A. sculpta, N. arenacaedentata;, and M. nasul	ta 0.8	

USGS alert levels to flag 15-20% of samples analyzed 12

1000

References:

1. Beller et al., 1986

26. DeWitt et al., 1988

2. PTI Environmental Services, 1988

12. Pavlou and Weston, 1983

- 20. U.S. ACOE, 1988
- 56. Anderson et al., 1988
 - 66. Salazar and Salazar, 1985
 - 67. McGreer, 1979
- 77. McGreer, 1982
- 80. Tetra Tech, 1985
- 83. Word and Mearns, 1979

* -Various, please see text

Table 18. Effects range-low and effects range-median values for silver and 13 concentrations used to determine these values arranged in ascending order.

Concentrations (ppm)	End Point	
0.6	Puget Sound, Washington, bioassay COA	
1.0	M. balthica avoidance bioassay COA	
1.0	San Francisco Bay, California Bioassay COA	
1.0	ER-L	
1.1	San Francisco Bay, California AET	
1.7	San Francisco Bay, California bioassay COA	
2.1	Feral Fraser River M. balthica absent COA	
2.2	Southern California arthropod abundance COA	
2.2	ER-M	
2.5	Southern California species richness COA	
2.6	M. balthica burrowing time bioassay COA	
3.1	Southern California echinoderm abundance COA	
5.2	Puget Sound, Washington AET - benthic	
6.1	Puget Sound, Washington AET - amphipod	
6.9	San Francisco Bay, California bioassays COA	

Tin

No data were found with which total tin concentrations could be related to effects in sediments. However, organotin concentrations in sediments can be related to toxicity with data from two small studies (Word *et al.*, 1988; Salazar and Salazar, 1985). Significant percent mortality among amphipods (*R. abronius*) was observed inconsistently (*i.e.*, some samples were toxic, some others were not) over a range of tributyltin concentrations of 18.7 to 2,214 ppm dry weight and over a range of total butyltin concentrations of 30 to 3,011 ppm dry weight in tests of Oakland Inner Harbor sediments (Word *et al.*, 1988). Over 86 percent survival of mysids (*Acanthomysis sculpta*) was observed in bioassays of San Diego Bay sediments with a range of tributyltin concentrations of 155 to 780 ppm wet weight (no moisture content data provided) (Salazar and Salazar, 1985).

Because of a lack of data, no consensus values can be determined for the concentrations of tin in sediments that are associated with biological effects.

Zinc

Freshwater daphnids are sensitive to zinc at concentrations as low as 51 ppb/ in water; chronic effects in daphnids have been observed at concentrations as low as 47 ppb/; LC50s for saltwater animals/ range from 192 ppb/ to 320,400 ppb/; and chronic effects among marine mysids occur as low as 120 ppb/ (U.S. EPA, 1986). The proposed marine water quality standard for California is 20 ppb/ (Klapow and Lewis, 1979).

A relatively large amount of data are available to use in relating measures of effects to zinc concentrations in sediments (Table 19). They are available from all of the major approaches to the development of sediment quality standards. AET values for Puget Sound and San Francisco Bay are listed in Table 19. Co-occurrence analyses were performed with data from Commencement Bay, San Francisco Bay, Puget Sound, southern California, DuPage River, Kishwaukee River, Keweenaw Waterway, Trinity River, Massachusetts Bay, Hudson-Raritan Estuary, Baltimore Harbor, and other areas. Chronic and acute EP thresholds are available, assuming a 4 percent TOC content. Data from SSB performed with *R. abronius* and *Ponotoporeia affinis* are available.

No effects to the benthos were observed at the Georgetown, South Carolina disposal site. No concordance between toxicity and zinc concentrations was apparent in tests of Cubatao River sediments. No concordance between total abundance of benthos and zinc concentrations was apparent for southern California. A relatively poor correlation between species diversity and zinc concentrations in Norwegian fjords was reported. A relatively small gradient in zinc concentrations was reported for sediments from the Kishwaukee River, Illinois. A relatively poor correlation between *M. balthica* burrowing time and zinc concentrations was reported. Relatively poor concordance between toxicity to amphipods and zinc concentrations was apparent in the data from San Francisco Bay. These data were not considered in the estimation of ER-L and ER-M values (Table B-10).

From the remaining data, it appears that biological effects have not been observed in association with zinc concentrations of about 50 ppm or less in sediments (Table 20). Behavioral effects upon the amphipod *R. abronius* and the shrimp *P. affinis* have been observed at zinc concentrations of 51 to 124 ppm. The data suggest an ER-L value of about 120 ppm, the lower 10 percentile value of the available data. This value is supported by observations of low species richness among Massachusetts Bay benthos (117 \pm 42 ppm), significant mortality among *Daphnia magna* exposed to Trinity River sediments (121 \pm 20 ppm), high mortality among *H. azteca* exposed to Waukegan Harbor sediments (127 ppm), and a San Francisco Bay AET based upon bivalve larvae bioassays (130 ppm). With a few exceptions, biological effects were usually observed at zinc concentrations of 260 ppm or greater (Table B-10). Also, the 50 percentile of the available data is equivalent to about 270 ppm, the ER-M suggested by the data. This value is supported by bioassay data from the Hudson-Raritan estuary (245 \pm 201 ppm) and Little Grizzly Creek (267 \pm 298 ppm), a Puget Sound AET (260 ppm), and an LC50 for a SSB with *R. abronius* (276 ppm).

The degree of confidence in the ER-L and ER-M values for zinc should be considered as relatively high. Both of the values are supported by a consistent cluster of data derived from more than one data set and/or approach. The available data strongly suggest that sublethal and other sensitive measures of effects occur at zinc concentrations of about 50 to 125 ppm and that effects almost always occur at or above zinc concentrations of 260 ppm. However, several of the Puget Sound AET values and the two EP thresholds suggest that thresholds for effects occur at concentrations much higher than the ER-L and ER-M values.

Refere n	ces Biological Approaches	Concentrations (ppm)		
Apparent Effects Threshold				
1	1986 PUGET SOUND AET			
	- R. abronius amphipod bioassay	870		
•	- oyster larvae (C. gigas) bioassay	1600		
	- benthic community composition	260		
	- Microtox™ bioassay	1600		
2	1988 PUGET SOUND AET			
	- R. abronius amphipod bioassay	960		
	- oyster larvae (C. gigas) bioassay	1600		
	- benthic community composition	410		
	- Microtox™ bioassay	1600		
20	PSDDA GUIDELINES (based upon Puget Sound AET)	а		
	- screening level concentration	160		
	- screening level concentration - maximum level criterion	1600		

Table 19. Summary of sediment effects data available for zinc.

.

Reference	ces Biological Approaches Conc	entrations (ppm)
Apparen	t Effects Threshold	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
*	SAN FRANCISCO BAY, CALIFORNIA AET - bivalve larvae bioassay - R. abronius amphipod bioassay	130 230
Co-Occu	rrence Analyses	•
80	COMMENCEMENT BAY, WASHINGTON - highly toxic (15.7 \pm 3.9 dead/20) to <i>R. abronius</i> - moderately toxic (5.2 \pm 1.1 dead/20) to <i>R. abronius</i> - least toxic (2.5 \pm 0.9 dead/20) to <i>R. abronius</i>	941 ± 1373 211 ± 342 108 ± 79
	- highly toxic (44.5 \pm 19% abnormal) to oyster larvae - moderately toxic (23 \pm 2.3% abnormal) to oyster larvae - least toxic (15.1 \pm 3.1% abnormal) to oyster larvae	387 ± 783 185 ± 335 107 ± 122
26	PUGET SOUND, WASHINGTON - non-toxic (>87.5% survival of <i>R. abronius</i>) - moderately toxic (<87.5% to >95% LPL to <i>R. abronius</i>) - highly toxic (95% LPL to <i>R. abronius</i>)	114 ± 52 195 ± 166 707 ± 955
29	LAKE UNION, WASHINGTON - 95% mortality to H. azteca	320
39	DUWAMISH RIVER, WASHINGTON - 0-10% mortality to P. pugio	72
77	FRASER RIVER, B.C., CANADA - sediment devoid of <i>M. balthica</i> - sediment populated by <i>M. balthica</i>	169 ± 53 65 ± 19
67	STRAIT OF GEORGIA, B.C., CANADA - significant increase in burrowing time (ET50) of M. balthica - significant 24-h avoidance behavior among M. balthica	109 172
*	SAN FRANCISCO BAY, CALIFORNIA - highly toxic ($67 \pm 11.8\%$ mortality to <i>R. abronius</i> - moderately toxic ($33.8 \pm 4.7\%$ mortality) to <i>R. abronius</i> - least toxic ($18 \pm 6.6\%$ mortality) to <i>R. abronius</i>	187 ± 115 146 ± 73 171 ± 91
	- significantly toxic (42.9 \pm 19.2% mortality) to <i>R. abronius</i> - not toxic (18.4 \pm 6.8% mortality) to <i>R. abronius</i>	158 ± 87 177 ± 96
	- highly toxic (92.4 \pm 4.5% abnormal) to bivalve larvae - moderately toxic (59.4 \pm 11.3% abnormal) to bivalve larvae - least toxic (23.3 \pm 7.3% abnormal) to bivalve larvae	205 ± 90 172 ± 92 89 ± 41
	- significantly toxic (55.7 \pm 22.7% abnormal) to bivalve larvae - not toxic (31.9 \pm 15.5% abnormal) to bivalve larvae	154 ± 91 136 ± 78
50	PALOS VERDES SHELF, CALIFORNIA - "major degradation" to macrobenthos (20.2sp./0.1m. sq.)	739 ± 139

.

~

.

.

Refer	ences Biological Approaches Co	oncentrations (ppm)
Co-O	ccurrence Analyses	· · ·
56	SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA - significantly toxic (51.65% mortality) to <i>G. japonica</i> - not toxic (23.2% mortality) to <i>G. japonica</i>	348 ± 234 212 ± 243
83	- high echinoderm abundance (191.3 \pm 70.1/0.1 sq. m.) - moderate echinoderm abundance (56.2 \pm 23/0.1 sq. m.) - low echinoderm abundance (6.1 \pm 7.2/0.1 sq. m.)	50 ± 13 55 ± 34 230 ± 444
	- high arthropod abundance (148 ± 58/0.1 sq. m.) - moderate arthropod abundance (72.6 ± 6.8/0.1 sq. m.) - low arthropod abundance (35.3 ± 15.8/0.1 sq. m.)	51 ± 24 52 ± 28 182 ± 384
	 high species richness (96.3 ± 22.3/0.1 sq. m) moderate species richness (72 ± 3.3/0.1 sq. m.) low species richness (51.2 ± 8.6/0.1 sq. m.) 	71 ± 106 50 ± 22 197 ± 415
	- high total abundance (88.9 \pm 35.4/0.1 sq. m.) - moderate total abundance (75.6 \pm 12.7/0.1 sq. m.) - low total abundance (57.6 \pm 13.6/0.1 sq. m.)	347 ± 592 53 ± 28 73 ± 81
39	LOS ANGELES HARBOR, CALIFORNIA - >50% mortality to <i>P. pugio</i> (20% elutriate bioassay)	223
55	LITTLE GRIZZLY CREEK, CALIFORNIA - significant mortality to D. magna	267 ± 298
55	PHILLIPS CHAIN OF LAKES, WISCONSIN - significant mortality to D. magna - low mortality (0-5%) to D. magna	570 216 ± 213
74	SHEBOYGAN RIVER, WISCONSIN - significant mortality to prawn, M. rosenbergii	290 ± 10
72	WAUKEGAN HARBOR, ILLINOIS - highly toxic (66.3 \pm 4.25% survival \checkmark) to <i>H. azteca</i>	127
60	DUPAGE RIVER, ILLINOIS - least number of benthic macroinvertebrate taxa (6.7 ± 2.5 /site) - highest number of benthic macroinvertebrate taxa (15.8 ± 2 /site)	
61	KISHWAUKEE RIVER, ILLINOIS - least number of benthic macroinvertebrate taxa (8.4 ± 0.5 /site) - highest number of benthic macroinvertebrate taxa (16.3 ± 4.6 /s	
54	KEWEENAW WATERWAY, MICHIGAN - significantly toxic to D. magna - not toxic to D. magna	168 ± 52 69 ± 24
	- mean concentration in highly toxic (northern) sediments to D. magna	154 ± 54 √
	 mean concentration in least toxic (southern) sediments to D. magna 	62 ± 20 ✓

Table 19. Zinc (continued)

55 TC 75 TT 75 TT 82 M -1 -1 39 NT 39 ST -1 39 39 ST -1 -1 39 ST -1 -1 39 ST -1 -1 39 ST -1 -1 39 NC -0 -1 62 BA - m -1 64 GE -1 -1 40 CU	 rence Analyses DRCH LAKE, MICHIGAN significant mortality to D. magna and H. limbata. RINITY RIVER, TEXAS significant mortality to D. magna ow mortality to D. magna ASSACHUSETTS BAY, MASSACHUSETTS sigh benthos species richness (93.6 ± 9.4/0.1 sq. m.) noderate benthos species richness (58.2 ± 10.5/0.1 sq. m.) Sw benthos species richness (31 ± 6.5/0.1 sq. m.) SWPORT, RHODE ISLAND mortality to P. pugio ACK ROCK HARBOR, CONNECTICUT mortality to P. pugio AMFORD, CONNECTICUT mortality to P. pugio DRWALK, CONNECTICUT mortality to P. pugio JDSON-RARITAN BAY, NEW YORK egative rate of growth in nematode, C.germanica utimore HARBOR, MARYLAND 	310 121 ± 100 58 ± 41 32 ± 7 98 ± 64 117 ± 42 55 334 340 636 449 ± 252 245 ± 201
 75 TI 75 TI 82 M 1 82 M 1 7 81 7 83 NI 61 71 BI 71 BI 71 - 1 39 NI 70 71 BI 71 - 1 39 NI 70 71 BI 71 - 1 39 NI 70 71 BI 71 - 1 39 NI 62 BA 7 7 7 62 BA 7 7 64 GE 64 GE 1 1 40 CU 	 significant mortality to D. magna and H. limbata. RINITY RIVER, TEXAS significant mortality to D. magna ow mortality to D. magna ASSACHUSETTS BAY, MASSACHUSETTS sigh benthos species richness (93.6 ± 9.4/0.1 sq. m.) noderate benthos species richness (58.2 ± 10.5/0.1 sq. m.) bw benthos species richness (31 ± 6.5/0.1 sq. m.) SWPORT, RHODE ISLAND % mortality to P. pugio ACK ROCK HARBOR, CONNECTICUT 00% mortality to polychaete, N. virens AMFORD, CONNECTICUT 0% mortality to P. pugio DRWALK, CONNECTICUT % mortality to P. pugio JDSON-RARITAN BAY, NEW YORK egative rate of growth in nematode, C.germanica 	$121 \pm 100 \\ 58 \pm 41 \\ 32 \pm 7 \\ 98 \pm 64 \\ 117 \pm 42 \\ 55 \\ 334 \\ 340 \\ 636 \\ 449 \pm 252 \\ \end{cases}$
	ASSACHUSETTS BAY, MASSACHUSETTS high benthos species richness (93.6 ± 9.4/0.1 sq. m.) noderate benthos species richness (58.2 ± 10.5/0.1 sq. m.) bw benthos species richness (31 ± 6.5/0.1 sq. m.) bw benthos species richness (31 ± 6.5/0.1 sq. m.) EWPORT, RHODE ISLAND % mortality to <i>P. pugio</i> ACK ROCK HARBOR, CONNECTICUT 00% mortality to polychaete, <i>N. virens</i> AMFORD, CONNECTICUT 0% mortality to <i>P. pugio</i> DRWALK, CONNECTICUT % mortality to <i>P. pugio</i> JDSON-RARITAN BAY, NEW YORK egative rate of growth in nematode, <i>C.germanica</i> ositive rate of growth in nematode, <i>C.germanica</i>	58 ± 41 32 ± 7 98 ± 64 117 ± 42 55 334 340 636 449 ± 252
- 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1	high benthos species richness (93.6 ± 9.4/0.1 sq. m.) noderate benthos species richness (58.2 ± 10.5/0.1 sq. m.) bw benthos species richness (31 ± 6.5/0.1 sq. m.) EWPORT, RHODE ISLAND We mortality to <i>P. pugio</i> ACK ROCK HARBOR, CONNECTICUT 00% mortality to polychaete, <i>N. virens</i> AMFORD, CONNECTICUT 0% mortality to <i>P. pugio</i> DRWALK, CONNECTICUT % mortality to <i>P. pugio</i> JDSON-RARITAN BAY, NEW YORK egative rate of growth in nematode, <i>C.germanica</i> ositive rate of growth in nematode, <i>C.germanica</i>	98 ± 64 117 ± 42 55 334 340 636 449 ± 252
- (71 BL - 1 39 ST - 1 39 NO - 0 79 HU - n - p 62 BA - n - le 64 GE - n - 1 40 CU	 ^{9%} mortality to <i>P. pugio</i> ACK ROCK HARBOR, CONNECTICUT 00% mortality to polychaete, <i>N. virens</i> AMFORD, CONNECTICUT 0% mortality to <i>P. pugio</i> DRWALK, CONNECTICUT % mortality to <i>P. pugio</i> JDSON-RARITAN BAY, NEW YORK egative rate of growth in nematode, <i>C.germanica</i> ositive rate of growth in nematode, <i>C.germanica</i> 	334 340 636 449 ± 252
- 1 39 ST - 1 39 NO - 0 79 HU - n - P 62 BA - n - le 64 GE 1 - no 40 CU	00% mortality to polychaete, N. virens AMFORD, CONNECTICUT 0% mortality to P. pugio DRWALK, CONNECTICUT % mortality to P. pugio JDSON-RARITAN BAY, NEW YORK egative rate of growth in nematode, C.germanica ositive rate of growth in nematode, C.germanica	340 636 449 ± 252
- 1 39 NG - 0 79 HU - n - p 62 BA - m - le 64 GE - no 40 CU	0% mortality to <i>P. pugio</i> DRWALK, CONNECTICUT % mortality to <i>P. pugio</i> JDSON-RARITAN BAY, NEW YORK egative rate of growth in nematode, <i>C.germanica</i> ositive rate of growth in nematode, <i>C.germanica</i>	636 449 ± 252
- 0 79 HU - n - p 62 BA - r - le 64 GE	% mortality to <i>P. pugio</i> JDSON-RARITAN BAY, NEW YORK egative rate of growth in nematode, <i>C.germanica</i> ositive rate of growth in nematode, <i>C.germanica</i>	449 ± 252
- n - p 62 BA - n - le 64 GE 1 - no 40 CU	egative rate of growth in nematode, <i>C.germanica</i> ositive rate of growth in nematode, <i>C.germanica</i>	
- m - le 64 GE 1 - no 40 CU	TTIMORE HARROR MARVI AND	
) - no 40 CU	host toxic to mummichogs (5.1 ± 3.5 TLm) spot (5.9 ± 3.4 TLm) ast toxic to mummichogs (43.2 ± 31.1 TLm) spot (24 ± 5.6 TLm)	1804 ± 2098 738 ± 394
	ORGETOWN OCEAN DREDGED MATERIAL DISPOSAL SITE, SOUTH CAROLINA o effects upon benthos species richness or abundance	11
	BATAO RIVER, BRAZIL I-h EC-50 with <i>D. simillis</i>	20
41 NC - 50	RWEGIAN FJORDS, NORWAY % reduction from max in Hurlbert's benthic species diversity index	80 ,
quilibriu	m Partitioning	•
17 EP 4 EP	A acute marine EP threshold (@4%TOC) A chronic marine EP threshold (@4%TOC)	2240 760
viked-Se	liment Bioassays	a an da su s
70%	% dead out of 53 R. abronius in 72-h bioassay avoidance, out of 59 R. abronius in 72-h, 2-choice experiment % avoidance, out of 45 R. abronius, in 72-h, 2-choice experiment	613. 51 188

на, на селото на село

• •

Refer	ences	Biological Approaches	Concentrations (ppm)	
Spiked-Sediment Bioassays				
18	LC50 for R.	abronius in 10-d bioassay	276	
63	Activity be	havior of Pontoporeia significantly decreased, 5-day	y exposure 59-124	
27		n and LC76 for Cd, R. <i>abronius</i> , 72-h bioassay n and LC98 for Cd, R. <i>abronius</i> , 72-h bioassay	79 76	
Refer	ences	Background Approach	Concentrations (ppm)	
68	- Classificat	s Harbors tion of non-polluted sediments tion of moderately polluted sediments tion of heavily polluted sediments	<90 90-200 >200	
43	New Engla	nd interim high contamination level for dredge m	naterial >400	
12	USGS alert Ontario Mi EPA Region FWPCA Ch - LIGHT (n - MODERA - HEAVY: (EPA Jenser	n V guideline for pollution classification of sedimer levels to flag 15-20% of samples analyzed nistry of the Environment Dredge Spoil Guidelines nicago Guidelines: to alteration to benthos) TE: (predominance of pollutant-tolerant benthos) benthos absent or abundance reduced) n Criteria for open water dredge material disposal n VI proposed guidelines for sediment disposal	5000	
20	EPA/ACO	E Puget Sound Interim Criteria (central basin backg	round) 105	
23	- Class 1 (s - Class 2 (n - Class 3 (c	Harbor sediment quality classifications slightly contaminated) noderately contaminated) ontaminated) heavily contaminated)	<370 370-1160 1160-2330 >2330	

References:

1. Beller et al., 1986	40. Zagatto et al., 1987	68. Bahnick et al., 1981
2. PTI Environmental Services, 1988	41. Rygg, 1985	71. Simmers et al., 1984
4. Bolton et al., 1985	43. NERBC, 1980	72. Ingersoll and Nelson, In press
11. Oakden et al., 1984a	50. Swartz et al., 1986	74. Tatem, 1986
12. Pavlou and Weston, 1983	54. Maleug et al., 1984a	75. Qasim et al., 1980
17. Lyman et al., 1987	55. Maleug et al., 1984b	77. McGreer, 1982
18. Swartz et al., 1988	56. Anderson et al., 1988	79. Tietjen and Lee, 1984
20. U.S. ACOE, 1988	60. Illinois EPA, 1988a	80. Tetra Tech, 1985
23. Jansen, 1987	61. Illinois EPA, 1988b	82. Gilbert et al., 1976
26. DeWitt et al., 1988	62. Tsai et al., 1979	83. Word and Mearns, 1979
27. Oakden et al., 1984b	63. Magnuson et al. 1976	 Various, Please see text
29 Yake et al., 1986	64. Van Dolah et al., 1984	•
39 Lee and Mariani, 1977	67. McGreer, 1979	

Table 20. Effects range-low and effects range-median values for zinc and 46 concentrations used to determine these values arranged in ascending order.

Concentrations (ppm)	End Point
51	Sublethal SSB with R. abronius
59 - 124	Sublethal SSB with P. affinis
9 8	Massachusetts Bay, Massachusetts benthos COA
117	Massachusetts Bay, Massachusetts benthos COA
120	ER-L
121	Trinity River, Texas bioassays COA
127	Waukegan Harbor, Illinois bioassays COA
130	San Francisco Bay, California AET
154	Keweenaw Waterway, Michigan bioassays COA
168	Keweenaw Waterway, Michigan bioassays COA
169	Feral Fraser River M. balthica absent COA
172	M. balthica avoidance bioassay COA
172	San Francisco Bay, California bioassays COA
182	Southern California arthropod abundance COA
185	Commencement Bay, Washington bioassays COA
188	Sublethal SSB with R. abronius
195	Puget Sound, Washington bioassays COA
197	Southern California species richness COA
205	San Francisco Bay, California bioassays COA
211	Commencement Bay, Washington bioassays COA
223	Los Angeles Harbor, California bioassays COA
230	San Francisco Bay, California AET
230	Southern California echinoderm abundance COA
260	Puget Sound, Washington AET - benthic
267	Little Grizzly Creek, California bioassays COA
270	ER-M
276	SSB with R. abronius LC50
290	Sheboygan River, Wisconsin bioassays COA
310	Torch Lake, Michigan bioassays COA
320	Lake Union, Washington bioassays COA
327	DuPage River, Illinois species richness COA
334	Black Rock Harbor, Connecticut bioassays COA
348	Southern California bioassays COA
387	Commencement Bay, Washington bioassays COA
410	Puget Sound, Washington AET - benthic
449	Hudson-Raritan Bay, New York bioassays COA
570	Phillips Chain of Lakes, Wisconsin bioassays COA
613	SSB with R. abronius
707	Puget Sound, Washington bioassays COA
739	Palos Verdes Shelf, California "major degradation" COA
760	EP marine chronic threshold @ 4% TOC
870	Puget Sound, Washington AET - amphipod
941	Commencement Bay, Washington bioassays COA
960	Puget Sound, Washington AET - amphipod
1600	Puget Sound, Washington AET - oyster
1600	Puget Sound, Washington AET - Microtox™
1804	Baltimore Harbor, Maryland bioassays COA
2240	EP marine acute threshold @ 4% TOC

Other Major and Trace Elements

Data with which measures of biological effects could be related to the concentrations of aluminum, iron, manganese, silicon, thallium, and selenium were not found. Therefore, no ER-L or ER-M values were determined for these analytes that are quantified in sediments by the NS&T Program.

PCBs

Acute toxicity of PCBs in water to freshwater aquatic organisms probably occurs at concentrations above 2.0 ppm and above 10 ppm for saltwater species (U.S. EPA, 1986). LC50s for Aroclor 1242 tested in 96-h bioassays with *Palaemonetes pugio* ranged from 15 to 57 ppm (Mayer, 1987)

A considerable amount of data exist with which PCB concentrations in sediments and measures of biological effects can be related (Table 21). Most of these data are from field studies and were evaluated with co-occurrence analyses. Matching biological and chemical data are available from Puget Sound, Commencement Bay, San Francisco Bay, southern California, San Diego Bay, DuPage River, Kishwaukee River, Waukegan Harbor, Mississippi River, Trinity River, Massachusetts Bay, Baltimore Harbor, Hudson-Raritan estuary, and other areas. AET were listed for Puget Sound and San Francisco Bay. An EP chronic marine threshold was available, along with marine and freshwater SLCs and results of two sSSB experiments.

Data from the Trinity River indicated no gradient in PCB concentrations among stations. Most of the Mississippi River data indicated no concordance between toxicity and PCB concentrations. No gradient in PCB concentrations among Massachusetts Bay stations was apparent. There was very little concordance between bivalve larvae bioassay results and PCB concentrations in San Francisco Bay. Data from southern California indicated no concordance between total abundance of benthos and PCB concentrations. There was no concordance between moderately and highly toxic samples and PCB concentrations in data from Commencement Bay. There was very little difference in PCB concentrations in samples from Puget Sound that were moderately toxic versus those that were highly toxic. No concordance was apparent between toxicity and PCB concentrations in tests of southern California sediments. San Diego Bay sediments were not highly toxic. These data were not considered in the estimation of ER-L and ER-M values (Table B-11).

It appears that biological effects may begin in association with PCB concentrations above about 3 ppb (Table 22). The ER-L suggested by the data is 50 ppb PCB (54 rounded to 50 ppm), equivalent to the lower 10 percentile value of the available data. This value is supported only by the two marine SLCs (36.6 and 42.6 ppb) and a San Francisco Bay AET for bivalve larvae (based upon data that indicated weak concordance--54 ppb). The data suggest an ER-M of about 400 ppb; a value supported by Commencement Bay samples highly toxic to oyster larvae (mean 368 ppb) and the mean concentration in southern California sediments with moderate species richness (400 ppb). With very few exceptions, effects were almost always associated with PCB concentrations of 370 ppb or more (Table B-11).

The degree of confidence in these values should be considered as moderate. There are data from all of the major approaches, the overall apparent effects threshold is roughly equivalent to the ER-M concentration, and consistent clusters of data support the ER-L and ER-M values. However, much of the data available from the various approaches are not consistent. The highest and lowest Puget Sound AETs differ by over an order of magnitude; the data from the only single-chemical SSB indicate relatively low acute toxicity and a value (LC50 of 10,800 ppb) inconsistent with much of the other data; PCB concentrations in Waukegan Harbor sediments determined to be toxic in MicrotoxTM tests differed by four orders of magnitude from those determined to be toxic in Puget Sound with the same test; and the marine and freshwater SLCs are much lower than the concentrations associated with benthic effects in other studies. Since the only data from a SSB unexpectedly indicated an LC50 much higher than the PCB concentrations associated with measures of effects in the field, PCBs in field-collected sediments may be highly particle-bound and not bioavailable and/or

they may have a relatively minor role in causing biological effects such as acute mortality relative to other co-occurring contaminants.

eference	es Biological Approaches	Concentrations (ppb)			
Apparent Effects Threshold					
1	1986 PUGET SOUND AET				
-	- R. abronius amphipod bioassay	2500			
	- oyster larvae (C. gigas) bioassay	1100			
	- benthic community composition	1100			
	- Microtox [™] bioassay	130			
2	1988 PUGET SOUND AET				
	- R. abronius amphipod bioassay	3100			
	- oyster larvae (C. gigas) bioassay	1100			
	- benthic community composition	1000			
	- Microtox [™] bioassay	130			
20	PSDDA GUIDELINES (based upon Puget Sound AET				
	- screening level concentration	130			
	- maximum level criterion	2500			
*	SAN FRANCISCO BAY, CALIFORNIA AET				
	- bivalve larvae bioassay	54			
	- R. abronius amphipod bioassay	260			
o-Occur	rence Analyses				
80	COMMENCEMENT BAY, WASHINGTON				
	- highly toxic (15.7±3.9 dead/20) to R. abronius	38 ± 32			
	- moderately toxic (5.2±1.1 dead/20) to R. abronius	251 ± 556			
	- least toxic (2.5±0.9 dead/20) to R. abronius	61 ± 88			
	- highly toxic (44.5±19% abnormal) to oyster larvae	368 ± 695			
	- moderately toxic (23±2.3% abnormal) to oyster larvae	140 ± 262			
	- least toxic (15.1±3.1% abnormal) to oyster larvae	28 ± 27			
26	PUGET SOUND, WASHINGTON				
	- highly toxic (<95% LPL to R. abronius)	276 ± 365			
	- moderately toxic (<87.5% to >95% LPL to R. abronius)	259 ± 407			
	- non-toxic (≥87.5% survival of R. abronius)	99 ± 120			
29	LAKE UNION, WASHINGTON				
	- 95% mortality to H. azteca	4300			
*	SAN FRANCISCO BAY, CALIFORNIA				
	- highly toxic (67 \pm 11.8% mortality) to R. abronius	169 ± 171			
	- moderately toxic (33.8 \pm 4.7% mortality) to <i>R. abronius</i>	151 ± 260			
	- least toxic (18 \pm 6.6% mortality) to R. abronius	94 ± 147			
	- significantly toxic (42.9 \pm 19.2% mortality) to R. abronius	146 ± 218			
	- not toxic (18.4 \pm 6.8% mortality) to R. abronius	101 ± 153			
	- highly toxic (92.4 \pm 4.5% abnormal) to bivalve larvae	164 ± 100			
	- moderately toxic (59.4 \pm 11.3% abnormal) to bivalve larve				
	-1100000000000000000000000000000000000				

:

Table 21. Summary of sediment effects data available for PCBs.

References Biological Approaches

Concentrations	(ppb)
----------------	-------

ĩ

Co-Occurrence Analyses

	- significantly toxic (55.7 \pm 22.7% abnormal) to bivalve larvae - not toxic (31.9 \pm 15.5% abnormal) to bivalve larvae	127 ± 171 216 ± 376
7	 sediment quality triad minimum or no bioeffects sediment quality triad significant bioeffects 	≤100 ≥160
56	SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA - significantly toxic (51.7% mortality) to G. japonica - not toxic (23.2% mortality) to G. japonica	272 ± 217 480 ± 724
83	- low echinoderm abundance $(6.1 \pm 7.2/0.1 \text{ sq. m.})$ - moderate echinoderm abundance $(56.2 \pm 23/0.1 \text{ sq. m.})$ - high echinoderm abundance $(191.3 \pm 70.1/0.1 \text{ sq. m.})$	1300 ± 2700 30 ± 50 20 ± 20
	 low arthropod abundance (35.3 ± 15.8/0.1 sq. m.) moderate arthropod abundance (72.6 ± 6.8/0.1 sq. m.) high arthropod abundance (148 ± 58/0.1 sq. m.) 	1000 ± 2400 60 ± 70 80 ± 100
	- low species richness ($51.2 \pm 8.6/0.1$ sq. m.) - moderate species richness ($72 \pm 3.3/0.1$ sq. m.) - high species richness ($96.3 \pm 22.3/0.1$ sq. m)	1110 ± 2610 400 ± 600 220 ± 540
	- low total abundance (57.6 \pm 13.6/0.1 sq. m.) - moderate total abundance (75.6 \pm 12.7/0.1 sq. m.) - high total abundance (88.9 \pm 35.4/0.1 sq. m.)	160 ± 430 80 ± 140 2260 ± 3530
66	SAN DIEGO BAY, CALIFORNIA - ≥82% survival of C. stigmaeus, A. sculpta, A. tonsa - ≥86% survival of A. sculpta, N. arenacaedentata, M. nasuta	25 25
60	DUPAGE RIVER, ILLINOIS - least number of benthic macroinvertebrate taxa (6.7 ± 2.5 /site) - highest number of benthic macroinvertebrate taxa (15.8 ± 2 /site)	190 ± 214 31 ± 19
61	KISHWAUKEE RIVER, ILLINOIS - least number of benthic macroinvertebrate taxa (8.4 ± 0.5 /site) - highest number of benthic macroinvertebrate taxa (16.3 ± 4.6 /site)	128 ± 264 7 ± 6
24	WAUKEGAN HARBOR, ILLINOIS - high Microtox [™] toxicity (average EC50 of 47.7 ± 15.2) - moderate Microtox [™] toxicity (average EC50 of 128.7 ± 49.3) - low Microtox [™] toxicity (average EC50 of 368.1 ± 101.7)	3,550,050 ± 6,598,300 ✓ 1,141,300 ± 2,229,700 ND-174,000 ✓
69	MISSISSIPPI RIVER - 80 to 100% survival (92 ± 6.3) of G. pseudolimnaeus - 25% survival of mayfly (Hexagenia sp.; n = 1) - 80-100% survival of mayfly (Hexagenia sp.) - 55% ± 10% survival of midges (C. tentans) - 90% ± 5.8% survival of midges (C. tentans)	$60 < 1.13 12 \pm 20 0.7 \pm 0.3 15 \pm 22$
75	TRINITY RIVER, TEXAS - significant mortality to D. magna - low mortality to D. magna	0.005 ± 0 0.005 ± 0

Refer	ences Biological Approaches C	Concentrations (ppb)
Co-Oc	currence Analyses	
82	MASSACHUSETTS BAY, MASSACHUSETTS - low benthos species richness $(31 \pm 6.5/0.1 \text{ sq. m.})$ - moderate benthos species richness $(58.2 \pm 10.5/0.1 \text{ sq. m.})$ - high benthos species richness $(93.6 \pm 9.4/0.1 \text{ sq. m.})$	5±5 5±5 2±1
58	BLACK ROCK HARBOR, CONNECTICUT - significant toxicity to A. abdita in 10-day bioassay	1700
79	HUDSON-RARITAN BAY, NEW YORK - negative rate of growth in nematode, <i>C.germanica</i> - positive rate of growth in nematode, <i>C.germanica</i>	638 ± 512 290 ± 502
44	NEW YORK HARBOR - <10% mortality to N. virens, M. mercenaria, P. pugio	7280
62	BALTIMORE HARBOR, MARYLAND - most toxic to mummichogs (TLm5.1 \pm 3.5), spot (TLm5.9 \pm 3.4) - least toxic to mummichogs (TLm43.2 \pm 31.1), spot (TLm24 \pm 5.6	1100 ± 800) 180 ± 160
64	GEORGETOWN OCEAN DREDGED MATERIAL DISPOSAL S SOUTH CAROLINA - no effects upon benthos species richness or abundance	ITE, 50
Natio	nal Screening Level Concentrations	
5	Freshwater sediments @ 1% TOC Marine sediments @ 1% TOC	2.9 42.6
14	Marine sediments @ 1% TOC	36.6
Iquili	brium Partitioning	
4	EPA chronic marine EP threshold (@4%TOC) (hexa-CB)	280
Spike	d Sediment Bioassays	
18	LC50 for R. abronius in 10-d bioassay	10800
65	significant toxicity to R. abronius in 10-d bioassay	1000 ± 300
Refer	ences Background Approach (Concentrations (ppb)
68	Great Lakes Harbors - Classification of heavily polluted sediments	≥10000
43	New England interim high contamination level for dredge ma	terial 1000
12	EPA Region V guideline for pollution classification of sediment USGS alert levels to flag 15-20% of samples analyzed Ontario Ministry of the Environment Dredge Spoil Guidelines	ts 1000-10000 20 50
20	EDA (ACOE Busch Cound Interim Criteria (control hasin hasher	aund) 200

....

20 EPA/ACOE Puget Sound Interim Criteria (central basin background) 380

Table 21. PCBs (continued)

* -Various, please see text

References Background		d Approaches	Concentrations (ppb)	
	Rotterdam Harbor sedimen - Class 1 (slightly contamin - Class 2 (moderately conta - Class 3 (contaminated) - Class 4 (heavily contamin	nated) minated)	<100 100-250 250-500 >500	
Refere	nces:		· ·	
1. Bell	ler et al., 1986	24. Ross et al., 1988	64. Van Dolah et al., 1984	
	Environmental Services, 1988	26. DeWitt et al., 1988	65. Plesha et al., 1988	
4. Bol	ton et al., 1985	29. Yake et al., 1986	66. Salazar and Salazar, 1985	
5. Nef	f et al., 1986	43. NERBC, 1980	68. Bahnick et al., 1981	
7. Cha	pman et al., 1987	44. Rubenstein et al., 1983	69. Marking et al., 1981	
	lou and Weston, 1983	56. Anderson et al., 1988	75. Qasim et al., 1980	
14. Nef	f et al., 1987	58. Rogerson et al., 1985	79. Tietjen and Lee, 1984	
10 9.00	anter at al 1099	60 Illinois EDA 1088a	80 Tetro Tech 1085	

1.	Beller et al., 1986	24. Ross et al., 1988	64. Van Dolah et al., 1984
2.	PTI Environmental Services, 1988	26. DeWitt et al., 1988	65. Plesha et al., 1988
4.	Bolton et al., 1985	29. Yake et al., 1986	66. Salazar and Salazar, 1985
5.	Neff et al., 1986	43. NERBC, 1980	68. Bahnick et al., 1981
7.	Chapman et al., 1987	44. Rubenstein et al., 1983	69. Marking et al., 1981
12.	Pavlou and Weston, 1983	56. Anderson et al., 1988	75. Qasim et al., 1980
14.	Neff et al., 1987	58. Rogerson et al., 1985	79. Tietjen and Lee, 1984
18.	Swartz et al., 1988	60. Illinois EPA, 1988a	80. Tetra Tech, 1985
20.	U.S. ACOE, 1988	61. Illinois EPA, 1988b	82. Gilbert et al., 1976
23.	Jansen, 1987	62. Tsai et al., 1979	83. Word and Mearns, 1979

Table 22. Effects range-low and effects range-median values for PCBs and 34 concentrations used to determine these values arranged in ascending order.

Concentrations	(ppb) End Point
2.9	Freshwater SLC
36.6	Marine SLC
42.6	Marine SLC
50	ER-L
54	San Francisco Bay, California AET
≤100	San Francisco Bay, California triad minimum bioeffects COA
128	Kishwaukee River, Illinois benthos COA
130	Puget Sound, Washington AET - Microtox™
140	Commencement Bay, Washington bioassay COA
146	San Francisco Bay, California, bioassay ČOA
151	San Francisco Bay, California bioassay COA
≥160	San Francisco Bay, California triad significant bioeffects COA
165	San Francisco Bay, California bioassay COA
190	DuPage River, Illinois benthos COA
259	Puget Sound, Washington bioassay COA
260	San Francisco Bay, California AET
280	EP chronic marine @ 4% TOC
368	Commencement Bay, Washington bioassay COA
400	ER-M
400	Southern California benthos COA
638	Hudson-Raritan Bay, New York bioassay COA
1000	Puget Sound, Washington AET - benthic
1000	Southern California arthropod abundance COA

Concentrations (pp	End Point	
1000	SSB with R. abronius (PCBs mixed with hydrocarbons)	
1100	Puget Sound, Washington AET - oyster	
1100	Puget Sound, Washington AET - benthic	
1110	Baltimore Harbor, Maryland bioassay COA	
1100	Southern California species richness COA	
1300	Southern California echinoderm abundance COA	
1700	Black Rock Harbor, Connecticut bioassay COA	
2500	Puget Sound, Washington AET - amphipod	
3100	Puget Sound, Washington AET - amphipod	
4300	Lake Union, Washington toxicity COA	
10800	SSB with R. abronius LC50	
1,141,300	Waukegan Harbor, Illinois bioassay COA	
3,550,050	Waukegan Harbor, Illinois bioassay COA	

<u>Pesticides:</u>

DDT and Metabolites

Data and estimates of threshold concentrations have been reported as the concentrations for each of the six isomers (p,p-DDT, o,p-DDT, p,p-DDD, o,p,-DDD, p,p-DDE, o,p-DDE); as the total of the two isomers each of DDT, DDD, and DDE; and as the concentration for the total of all six of these isomers of DDT. Therefore, within the limits of data availability, the data are treated separately here for each of the isomers and for the total. However, this approach has the unfortunate effect of reducing the amount of data available for any one of the isomers and for the total of the isomers.

The criterion to protect freshwater aquatic organisms is 0.001 ppm as a 24-h average and the concentration should not exceed 1.1 ppm at any time; the criterion to protect saltwater species is also 0.001 ppm as a 24-h average and the concentration should not exceed 0.13 ppm at any time (U.S. EPA, 1986). Available data indicate that acute toxicity of DDE occurs at concentrations as low as 1,050 ppm in freshwater and 14 ppm in saltwater (U.S. EPA, 1986). The LC50s for p,p'-DDT, p,p'-DDD, and p,p'-DDE were 0.45 ppm for a mysid (96-h test); 20 ppm for spot (48-h test); and over 100 ppm for spot (48-h test), respectively.

Data are available for either p,p'-DDT or the sum of o,p'-DDT and p,p'-DDT from Puget Sound AET, San Francisco Bay bioassays, Palos Verdes bioassays (with very small sample sizes), benthic effects at the Georgetown disposal site, SSB with R. abronius, and various applications of EP approaches (Table 23). The seven LC50s determined in the spiked bioassays averaged 49.5 ppb and ranged from 11.2 to 125.1 ppb, assuming 1 percent TOC content. The data for p,p'-DDT and the sum of the two isomers were treated as equivalent, since o,p'-DDT was rarely reported at high concentrations. There was no concordance between DDT concentrations in San Francisco Bay sediments and effects to bivalve larvae exposed to the sediments; neither the co-occurrence nor the AET data were used further. Likewise, there was no appreciable gradient in DDT concentration between samples least toxic to amphipods versus those moderately toxic to amphipods among San Francisco Bay sediments. Two of the Puget Sound AETs were not definitive. These data and the small amount of Palos Verdes data were not used to estimate ER-L and ER-M values (Table B-12). The remaining data suggest an ER-L of about 1.0 ppb DDT, the lower 10 percentile of the data (Table 24). This value is supported by EP-based thresholds of 0.7 and 1.6 ppb (assuming 1% TOC content). The data suggest an ER-M of about 7 ppb, roughly equivalent to the 50 percentile value of the data. This value is supported by moderate toxicity to bivalve larvae (6.6 ppb) and significant toxicity to amphipods (7.5 ppb) exposed to San Francisco Bay sediments. With several exceptions, effects were usually observed at concentrations of about 6 ppb or greater (Table B-12).

The degree of confidence in the p,p'-DDT ER-L and ER-M values should be considered as low. The data points do not cluster about the ER-L or ER-M values, especially at the upper end of the bioeffects range. Also, the values are based upon data from a few areas rather than over a broad range of areas. However, except for the EP-derived values, the highest and lowest threshold values differ by about an order of magnitude (3.9 to 49.5 ppb).

Table 23. Summary of sediment effects data available for p,p'-DDT.

Reference	Biologic	al Approaches	Concentrations (pp	ь)
Apparent Effects Threshold				
1	1986 PUGET SOUND AET	•		
-	- R. abronius amphipod bioa	ssay	3.9	
	- oyster larvae (C. gigas) bio	assay	>6	
•	- benthic community composi		11	
2	1988 PUGET SOUND AET			
-	- R. abronius amphipod bioa	Issav	>270	•
	- oyster larvae (C. gigas) bio	1899aV	>6	
	- benthic community compos	ltion	34	
*	SAN FRANCISCO BAY, CA	LIFORNIA AFT		
	- bivalve larvae bioassay		9.6	
	- R. abronius amphipod bioa	issay	9.6	
Co-Occurr	nce Analyses			
*	SAN FRANCISCO BAY, C.	ALIFORNIA		
	- highly toxic (67 \pm 11.8% n		s 12 ± 2!	5
	- moderately toxic (33.8 \pm 4			
	- least toxic ($18 \pm 6.6\%$ mor		1±3	
	- significantly toxic (42.9 \pm	19.2% mortality) to R.	abronius 8 ± 18	
	- not toxic (18.4 \pm 6.8% mor		1±3	
	- highly toxic (92.4 \pm 4.5% a	abnormal) to bivalve la	arvae 0.6 ± (.2
	- moderately toxic (59.4 \pm 1			
	- least toxic (23.3 \pm 7.3% ab			
	- significantly toxic (55.7 \pm)	22.7% abnormal) to biv	valve larvae 5 ± 15	
	- not toxic (31.9 \pm 15.5% abr			
49	PALOS VERDES, CALIFOR	INIA		
	- significantly toxic to R. ab		83	
	- not toxic to R. abronius (n		74	
64	GEORGETOWN OCEAN DI DISPOSAL SITE, SOUT			
	- no effects upon benthos spe		nce <50	
Iquilibriu	n Partitioning			
17	EPA acute marine EP thresh	nold (@ 4% TOC)	840	
	EPA chronic marine EP thro		6.4	
4	EPA chronic marine EP thro	shold (@ 4% TOC)	6	
-	THE COMPARENCE THE COMPANY		U	

Referen	ces Bi	ological Approaches	Concentrations	в (рр b)
Equilibr	ium Partitioning	· ·	· · ·	
25		used upon sediment/water p e water quality criteria (@ 1		210
		ised upon sediment/water p nic water quality criteria (@		1.6
13	partition coefficient	narine permissable (sedimei) narine permissable (sedimer		0.7
	partition coefficient)		0.4
piked	Sediment Bioassays			
16		r R. abronius in Puget Sound DC) (LC50s ranged from 11.2		49.5
Referen	ces:	· · · ·	·····	
	et al., 1986 nvironmental Services, 1988	9. Swartz et al., 198516. 16. Word et al., 1987	25. Pavlou, 19 64. Van Dolah	
	n at al 1095	17 Tymon et al 1097	* Variona play	

4. Bolton et al., 1985

17. Lyman et al., 1987

* -Various, please see text

Table 24. Effects range-low and effects range-median values for p,p'-DDT and 15concentrations used to determine these values arranged in ascending order.

Concentrations (ppb)	End Point
0.4	EP 99 percentile chronic marine
0.7	EP 95 percentile chronic marine
1.0	ER-L
1.6	EP chronic safe level @ 1% TOC
3.9	Puget Sound, Washington, AET - amphipod
6.0	EP chronic marine @ 4% TOC
6.4	EP chronic marine @ 4% TOC
6.6	San Francisco Bay, California, bioassay COA
7.0	ER-M
7.5	San Francisco Bay, California, bioassay COA
9.6	San Francisco Bay, California, AET
11.0	Puget Sound, Washington, AET - benthic
12.2	San Francisco Bay, California, bioassay COA
34.0	Puget Sound, Washington, AET - benthic
49.5	SSB with R. abronius: overall mean LC50
210.0	EP acute safe level @ 1% TOC
840.0	EP acute marine @ 4% TOC

68

. 5

For the p,p'-DDE isomer or total DDE, data are available from Puget Sound AET, San Francisco Bay bioassays and AET, Palos Verdes bioassays and benthic community analyses, Mississippi River bioassays, benthic community analyses at the Georgetown disposal site, and various uses of the EP approaches (Table 25). No effects upon benthos at the Georgetown site were observed at concentrations below the limits of detection of 50 ppb; there was no concordance between DDE concentrations in San Francisco Bay and significantly toxic versus non-toxic samples tested with bivalve larvae; nor for sediments that were highly versus moderately toxic to bivalves or moderately versus least toxic to amphipods. Low survival of Hexagenia sp. exposed to Mississippi River sediment was observed in only one sample and there was a very small gradient in DDE concentration among samples; therefore, these data were not used in estimating ER-L and ER-M values (Table B-13). The remaining data (Table 26) suggest an ER-L of about 2 ppb, the lower 10 percentile value of the available data. This value is supported by AET and bioassay data from San Francisco Bay sediments tested with R. abronius amphipods and bivalve larvae (2.2., 2.2, 2.1, 2.2 ppb). Effects were almost always seen in association with concentrations exceeding 2 ppb (Table B-13). The 50 percentile value of the data suggest an ER-M of about 15 ppb, a value supported by relatively few data points: Puget Sound AETs of 9 and 15 ppb.

The degree of confidence in the p,p'-DDE ER-L and ER-M values should be considered as moderate and low, respectively. There are few data points available and no measures of effects based upon SSBs. An apparent effects threshold could not be determined due to the lack of sufficient data. The ER-L value is supported by a small cluster of data from San Francisco Bay.

Refere _	nces Biological Approaches	Concentrations (ppb)		
Apparent Effects Threshold				
1	1986 PUGET SOUND AET - R. abronius amphipod bioassay - benthic community composition	15 9		
2	1988 PUGET SOUND AET - R. <i>abronius</i> amphipod bioassay - benthic community composition	15 9		
*	SAN FRANCISCO BAY, CALIFORNIA AET - bivalve larvae bioassay - R. abronius amphipod bioassay	2.2 2.2		
Co-occ	urrence Analyses			
*	SAN FRANCISCO BAY, CALIFORNIA - highly toxic ($67 \pm 11.8\%$ mortality) to <i>R. abronius</i> - moderately toxic ($33.8 \pm 4.7\%$ mortality) to <i>R. abronius</i> - least toxic ($18 \pm 6.6\%$ mortality) to <i>R. abronius</i>	3±5 1±1 1±1		
	- significantly toxic (42.9 \pm 19.2% mortality) to <i>R. abronius</i> - not toxic (18.4 \pm 6.8% mortality) to <i>R. abronius</i>	2±4 1±1		
	- highly toxic (92.4 \pm 4.5% abnormal) to bivalve larvae - moderately toxic (59.4 \pm 11.3% abnormal) to bivalve larvae - least toxic (23.3 \pm 7.3% abnormal) to bivalve larvae	1±1 e 2±4 1±1		
	- significantly toxic (55.7 \pm 22.7% abnormal) to bivalve larva - not toxic (31.9 \pm 15.5% abnormal) to bivalve larvae	ae 2±3 1±1		
	40			

Table 25. Summary of sediment effects data available for DDE.

Table 25. DDE (continued).

		<u></u>	<u>`````</u>
Referenc	ces Biological Appro	aches	Concentrations (ppb)
Co-occur	rence Analyses		
49	PALOS VERDES, CALIFORNIA - significantly toxic to <i>R. abronius</i> - not toxic to <i>R. abronius</i> - major degradation" of macrobenthos (2)	20.2 sp./0.1 m. sq.)	5157 ± 1065 3374 ± 3153 5157 ± 1065
69	 MISSISSIPPI RIVER 80-100% survival (92 ± 6.3) of G. pseu 4-d bioassay 25% (n = 1) survival of mayfly (Hexag 80-100% survival (90 ± 7.5) of mayfly 4-d bioassay 55% ± 10% survival of midges (C. tent 90% ± 5.8% survival of midges (C. tent 	zenia sp.), 4-d bioassa (Hexagenia sp.) tans), 4-d bioassay	$\begin{array}{c} 0.28 \\ < 0.2 \\ \\ 0.1 \pm 0 \\ < 0.21 \checkmark \end{array}$
64 Fauilibr	GEORGETOWN OCEAN DREDGED M DISPOSAL SITE, SOUTH CAROLIN - no effects upon benthos species richnes ium Partitioning	NA	<50
4	EPA chronic marine EP threshold (@49	% TOC)	28000
17	EPA acute marine EP threshold (@4%	TOC)	28000
25	Safe level based on sediment/water pa acute water quality criteria	artitioning coefficient	, 7000
13	99 percentile chronic marine permissab partition coefficient)95 percentile chronic marine permissab partition coefficent)		27 60

١

References:

1. Beller et al., 1986	13. Pavlou et al., 1987	50. Swartz et al., 1986
2. PTI Environmental Services, 1988	17. Lyman et al., 1987	69. Marking et al., 1981
4. Bolton et al., 1985	25. Pavlou, 1987	64. Van Dolah et al., 1984
5. Neff et al., 1986	49. Swartz et al., 1985	* -Various, please see text

.

Concentrations (ppb)	End Point	
2.0	ER-L	
2.1	San Francisco Bay, California, bioassay COA	
2.2	San Francisco Bay, California, AET	
2.2	San Francisco Bay, California, bioassay COA	
2.2	San Francisco Bay, California, AET	
3.4	San Francisco Bay, California, bioassay COA	
9.0	Puget Sound, Washington, AET - benthic	
15.0	ER-M	
15.0	Puget Sound, Washington, AET - amphipod	
27.0	EP 99 percentile chronic marine @ 1% TOC	
60.0	EP 95 percentile chronic marine @ 1% TOC	
5157.0	Palos Verdes, California, bioassay COA	
5157.0	Palos Verdes, California, major benthic degradation COA	
7000.0	EP acute safe level @ 1% TOC	
28000.0	EP acute marine @ 1% TOC	

Table 26. Effects range-low and effects range-median values for p,p'-DDE and 13 concentrations used to determine these values arranged in ascending order.

Puget Sound and San Francisco Bay AET, San Francisco Bay bioassay data, Palos Verdes bioassay data, and EP-based thresholds are available for p,p'-DDD (Table 27). There were very small differences in DDD concentration in San Francisco Bay samples that were significantly toxic to bivalve larvae versus those that were not toxic, so these data were not used to estimate ER-L and ER-M values (Table B-14). Also, there was no concordance between DDD concentration and toxicity with the sediments that were highly and moderately toxic to bivalve larvae--these data were not used further (Table B-14). The Palos Verdes data were from a relatively small number of samples (n=6) and were not used to estimate ER-L/ ER-M values, although they indicated no toxicity at a mean concentration two orders of magnitude higher than the concentrations in Puget Sound and San Francisco Bay. Lyman et al. (1987) listed the EP criterion for DDD as 13,000 ppb for acute effects. Bolton et al., (1985) also listed the EP-based DDD threshold as 13 mg/kg (equivalent to 13,000 ppb dry weight), but did not identify this as a threshold for acute or chronic effects (the text implied that it was for chronic effects). The concentration identified by Lyman et al. (1987) was used to determine the ER-L and ER-M values. The lower 10 percentile value of the remaining data (Table 28) suggest an ER-L of about 2 ppb; a value also supported by a Puget Sound AET of 2 ppb. The data suggest an ER-M of about 20 ppb; a value supported by a Puget Sound AET (16 ppb). There were too little data to justify the identification of an apparent effects threshold. A small amount of data were available for o,p'-DDD and indicated no relationship with measures of biological effects, thereby precluding estimation of ER-L and ER-M values. Thus, the degree of confidence in the p,p'-DDD ER-L and ER-M values should be considered as low. A small amount of data are available from only two areas. There are no SSB data.

Table 27. Summary of sediment effects data available for DDD.

Referenc	es Biological Approaches	Concentrations (ppb)
Apparen	t Effects Threshold	
1	1986 PUGET SOUND AET - R. abronius amphipod bioassay - benthic community composition	43 2

Referenc	es Biological Approaches C	Concentrations (ppb
Apparent	Effects Threshold	
2	1988 PUGET SOUND AET	
-	- R. abronius amphipod bioassay	43
	- benthic community composition	16
*	SAN FRANCISCO BAY, CALIFORNIA, AET	
	- bivalve larvae bioassay	16
	- R. abronius amphipod bioassay	16
Co-Occur	rence Analyses	
+	SAN FRANCISCO BAY, CALIFORNIA	
	- highly toxic (67 \pm 11.8% mortality) to R. abronius	1 ± 2
	- moderately toxic (33.8 \pm 4.7% mortality) to R. abronius	1±1
	- least toxic (18 \pm 6.6% mortality) to R. abronius	1 ± 1
	- significantly toxic (42.9 \pm 19.2% mortality) to R. abronius	1±2
	- not toxic (18.4 \pm 6.8% mortality) to R. abronius	2 ± 0.1
	- highly toxic (92.4 \pm 4.5% abnormal) to bivalve larvae	1 ± 0.3
	- moderately toxic (59.4 ± 11.3% abnormal) to bivalve larva	
	- least toxic (23.3 \pm 7.3% abnormal) to bivalve larvae	10 ± 7
	- significantly toxic (55.7 \pm 22.7% abnormal) to bivalve lar	vae 13 ± 21
	- not toxic (31.9 \pm 15.5% abnormal) to bivalve larvae	13 ± 9
49	PALOS VERDES SHELF, CALIFORNIA	
	- significantly toxic to R. abronius $(n = 3)$	1090.7 ± 573
	- not toxic to R. abronius	324 ± 387.3
64	GEORGETOWN OCEAN DREDGED MATERIAL	
	DISPOSAL SITE, SOUTH CAROLINA	
	- no effects upon benthos species richness or abundance	<50
quilibri	um Partitioning	
1 7	EPA acute marine EP threshold (@ 4% TOC)	13000
4	EPA chronic marine EP threshold (@4% TOC)	13000
13	99 percentile chronic marine permissable (@ 1% TOC)	6
	95 percentile chronic marine permissable (@ 1% TOC)	22
25	Sediment safe level based upon sediment/water partitionin	۱ ۲ ۰
	coefficients and acute water quality criteria (@1% TOC)	3250

References:

•

1.	Beller et al., 1986	13. Pavlou et al., 1987	49. Swartz et al., 1985
2.	PTI Environmental Services, 1988	17. Lyman et al., 1987	64. Van Dolah et al., 1984
4.	Bolton et al., 1985	25. Pavlou, 1987	* -Various, please see text.

Table 28. Effects range-low and effects range-median values for p,p'-DDD and 7 concentrations used to determine these values arranged in ascending order.

Concentrations (ppb)	End Point
2.0	ER-L
2.0	Puget Sound, Washington, AET - benthic
6.0	EP 99 percentile chronic marine @ 1% TOC
16.0	Puget Sound, Washington, AET - benthic
20.0	ER-M
22.0	EP 95 percentile chronic marine @ 1% TOC
43.0	Puget Sound, Washington, AET - amphipod
3250.0	Puget Ŝound, Washington, AET - amphipod EP Acute Safe Level @ 1% TOC
13000.0	EP Acute Marine @ 1% TOC

Data available with which to evaluate total DDT (a summation of all the quantified isomers) include those from southern California bioassays and benthic communities; DuPage River benthic communities; Trinity River bioassays; SSBs performed with Nereis virens, Crangon septemspinosa, Hyallella azteca, and R. abronius; and various applications of EP approaches (Table 29). The DDT LC50 for the C. septemspinosa sediment bioassays was reported as ug/L in the data table and ug/kg in the text (McLeese and Metcalfe, 1980); it was assumed that the units of ug/kg were correct and they were used in the present document. There was no concordance between mean DDT concentrations and both high and moderate total abundance and high and moderate species richness among southern California benthic communities, so these data were not used in the estimation of ER-L and ER-M values (Table B-15). The lower 10 percentile of the remaining data (Table 30) suggest an ER-L value of about 3 ppb, a value poorly supported by two EP-derived thresholds (1.58 and 3.29 ppb) and a freshwater SLC (1.9 ppb). The ER-M value equivalent to the 50 percentile of the available data is about 350 ppb, a value supported by observations of moderate abundances of anthropods in southern California sediments (mean 350 ppb) and low taxa richness in DuPage River macrobenthos (mean 222 ppb). The series of SSBs with H. azteca demonstrate the importance of organic carbon in regulating bioavailability, and, therefore, toxicity of sediment-associated DDT. There was no overall apparent threshold in concentration of total DDT above which effects were usually or always observed (Table B-15). The degree of confidence in the ER-L and ER-M values should be considered as moderate. A moderate amount of data are available and they are from all the major approaches, however, there is very little clustering of the data.

Referen	ces Biological Approaches	Concentrations (ppb)			
Co-Occu	Co-Occurrence Analyses				
20	PSDDA GUIDELINES (based upon Puget Sound AET) - screening level concentration - maximum level criterion	6.9 69			
56	 SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA significantly toxic (51.7% mortality) to G. japonica not toxic (23.2% mortality) to G. japonica (includes Palos Verdes sample) not toxic (21.3% mortality) to G. japonica (excludes Palos Verdes sample) 	68±72 1018±2424 28.6			

Table 29. Summary of sediment effects data available for total DDT.

_			
Co-Oo	ccurrence Analyses		
83	- moderate echinoderm a	dance (191.3±70.1/0.1 sq. m.) abundance (56.2±23/0.1 sq. m.) ance (6.1 ± 7.2/0.1 sq. m.)	50 ± 60 79 ± 126✔ 18260 ± 43080
	- moderate arthropod ab	ance (148 ± 58/0.1 sq. m.) oundance (72.6 ± 6.8/0.1 sq. m.) nce (35.3 ± 15.8/0.1 sq. m.)	100 ± 150 350 ± 710 13420 ± 37670
	- high species richness (! - moderate species richn - low species richness (5	ess (72 ± 3.3/0.1 sq. m.)	1874 ± 6660✔ 250 ± 620 14190 ± 40200
	- high total abundance (- moderate total abundat - low total abundance (5	nce (75.6 ± 12.7/0.1 sq. m.)	35300 ± 59540 210 ± 490 1410 ± 5440
60	DUPAGE RIVER, ILLIN - least number of benthi - highest number of ben	VOIS ic macroinvertebrate taxa (6.7 ± 2 ithic macroinvertebrate taxa (15.8	.5/site) 222 ± 282 ± 2/site) 20 ± 18
75	TRINITY RIVER, TEXA - significant mortality to - low mortality to D. m	o D. magna	$\begin{array}{c} 31\pm20\\ 7\pm10 \end{array}$
Natio	nal Screening Level Cor	centrations	
5	For freshwater sedimen For marine sediments (@		1.9 428
14	For marine sediments (@	@1%TOC)	505
Equili	ibrium Partitioning		
15	(1% TOC)	ning coefficient/marine chronic ning coefficient/marine chronic c	1.58
	(1% TOC)	ang coemercity marine enrome c	3.29
6	EPA interim marine sed 1% TOC	iment quality criteria based upor	n EP @ 8.28
35	Lethal threshold in fres	hwater based on Koc coefficients	s 45.9
Spike	d-Sediment Bioassays		
42	LD50 for cricket nymph	, G. pennsylvanicus in 18-h bioas	say 67232
34	LC50 for N. virens in 28	8-h bioassay (no deaths)	16500
35	LC50 for C. septemspinos Lethal threshold for C.	sa in 97-h bioassay septemspinosa	31 20

.

Refer	ences	Biological Approaches	Concentra	tions	(ррb)
Spike	d-Sediment Bioassays				
89	LC50 for Hyallella azteca @ LC50 for Hyallella azteca @ LC50 for Hyallella azteca @	7.2% organic carbon		11,00 19,60 49,70	0
Refer	ences	Background Approach	Concentra	tions	(ppb)
12	USGS alert levels to flag 1	5-20% of samples analyzed		20	
20	EPA/ACOE Puget Sound Ir	terim Criteria (central basin bac	kground)	5	
23	Rotterdam Harbor sedimer - Class 1 (slightly contamin - Class 2 (moderately conta - Class 3 (contaminated) - Class 4 (heavily contamin	nated) minated)		<200 200-2 2000- >100	10000

5. Neff et al., 1986	20. U.S. ACOE, 1988	43. NERBC, 1980
6. EPA, 1988	23. Jansen, 1987	56. Anderson et al., 1988
12. Pavlou and Weston 1983	34. McLeese et al., 1982	75. Qasim et al., 1980
13. Pavlou et al., 1987	35. McLeese and Metcalfe, 1980	83. Word and Mearns, 1979
14. Neff et al., 1987	42. Harris, 1964	89. Nebeker et al., 1989
15. JRB Associates, 1984	* -Various, please see text.	

Table 30. Effects range-low and effects range-median values for total DDT and 21concentrations used to determine these values arranged in ascending order.

End Point
EP marine chronic @ 1% TOC
Freshwater SLC @ 1% TOC
ER-L
EP marine chronic @ 1% TOC
Interim EP marine criteria @ 1% TOC
SSB lethal threshold with Crangon
SSB 97-h LC50 for Crangon bioassay
Trinity River, Texas, bioassay COA
Calculated freshwater EP threshold
Southern California echinoderm abundance COA
DuPage River, Illinois benthos COA
ER-M
Southern California arthropod avoidance COA
Marine SLC @ 1% TOC
Marine SLC @ 1% TOC
Overall LC50 for R. abronius bioassay
SSB LC50 H. azteca bioassay @ 3% TOC

Concentrations (ppb)	End Point
13420.0	Southern California arthropod abundance COA
14190.0	Southern California species richness COA
18260.0	Southern California echinoderm abundance COA
19600.0	
49700.0	SSB LC50 H. azteca bioassay @ 7.2% TOC SSB LC50 H. azteca bioassay @ 10.5% TOC
62732.0	SSB LD50 cricket nymph bioassay

Some of the DDD concentrations (1 to 16 ppb) in Puget Sound and San Francisco Bay sediments associated with toxicity were at the low end of the range and relatively similar to some of the thresholds predicted by the EP approach, however, they differed considerably from the mean DDD concentrations (324 to 1090 ppb) observed off Palos Verdes, California. There are relatively large disparities among the available data for total DDT from the same and different approaches. Values derived for total DDT from EP approaches (1.58 to 45.9 ppb) differ considerably from those derived from SSBs with marine animals (31 to 16,500 ppb). No deaths were observed in N. virens exposed to 16,500 ppb total DDT; whereas, an LC50 of 31 ppb and a lethal threshold of 20 ppb were calculated for bioassays performed with C. septemspinosa. Freshwater and saltwater SLCs for total DDT differed by over two orders of magnitude. Chronic thresholds predicted by the EP approach differed by about four orders of magnitude from mean concentrations associated with low echinoderm abundance off southern California, an area well documented to be highly contaminated with DDT and metabolites (Word and Mearns, 1979). Some of the EP-derived thresholds for the DDE isomers exceed those derived for total DDT. Overall, the degree of confidence in the ER-L and ER-M values for DDT and metabolites should be considered as relatively low, mainly since there are relatively large inconsistencies in the data derived from different approaches and different uses of some of the same approaches. These differences may be largely due to differences in organic carbon content of test sediments or other physical/chemical factors.

Lindane

In bioassays of marine fish and macroinvertebrates, 96-h LC50s of 0.077 to 190 ug/L (ppm) have been observed for lindane in saltwater (Mayer, 1987). Data with which to associate lindane concentrations in sediments with measures of effects are restricted to predictions based upon the EP approach (Table 31). A few samples tested with amphipod and bivalve larvae bioassays in San Francisco Bay had measurable amounts of lindane (up to 1.9 ppb dry weight), but most of the samples were not tested for this pesticide or had non-detectable concentrations, precluding use of the data to determine ER-L and ER-M values. The PSDDA screening level concentration was based upon analytical capabilities, not on AET or other measures of effects. No effects among benthic communities at the Georgetown, South Carolina dumpsite were observed in samples that had less than the detection limits of 50 ppb lindane. The remaining data from the EP approach predict that effects would occur at concentrations ranging from 1.57 to 12 ppb dry weight (Table 31). These data are insufficient to determine ER-L and ER-M values.

Table 31. Summary of sediment effects data available for lindane.

Refer	ences	Biological Approaches	Concentrations (ppb)
Co-O	ccurrence Analyses		
*	 highly toxic (67 : - moderately toxic least toxic (18 ± 6 significantly toxi not toxic (18.4 ± 6 highly toxic (92.6 moderately toxic 	 BAY, CALIFORNIA ± 11.8% mortality) to <i>R. abronius</i> (33.8 ± 4.7% mortality) to <i>R. abronius</i> 6.6% mortality) to <i>R. abronius</i> c (42.9 ± 19.2% mortality) to <i>R. abronius</i> c (42.9 ± 19.2% mortality) to <i>R. abronius</i> 4 ± 4.5% abnormal) to bivalve larvae (59.4 ± 11.3% abnormal) to bivalve larvae ± 7.3% abnormal) to bivalve larvae 	$\begin{array}{c} 0.6 \pm 0.8 \\ \text{not detected} \\ \text{not detected} \\ 0.33 \pm 0.65 \\ \text{not detected} \\ \text{not detected} \\ \text{not detected} \\ 0.4 \pm 0.7 \\ \text{not detected} \end{array}$
	- significantly toxi - not toxic (31.9 \pm	c (55.7 \pm 22.7% abnormal) to bivalve larva 15.5% abnormal) to bivalve larvae	$\begin{array}{c} \text{ae} \qquad 0.3 \pm 0.7 \\ \text{not detected} \end{array}$
64	DISPOSAL SIT	CEAN DREDGED MATERIAL E, SOUTH CAROLINA enthos species richness or abundance	<50
Equil	ibrium Partitioning		
6	EPA interim marin	ne sediment quality criteria @ 1% TOC	1.57
4	EPA chronic marin	ne EP threshold (@ 4% TOC)	12
25		l based upon sediment/water partitioning cute water quality criteria (@ 1% TOC)	3.1
Refer	ences	Background Approach	Concentrations (ppb)
12	USGS alert level t	o flag 15-20% of samples analyzed	20
20	PSDDA guidelines	s (based upon analytical capabilities)	5.0

References:

U.S. ACOE, 1988
 Pavlou, 1987

64. Van Dolah *et al.*, 1984 * -Various, please see text

Bolton *et al.*, 1985
 EPA, 1988
 Pavlou and Weston, 1983

77

Chlordane

The chlordane water quality criteria are 0.0043 ppm as a 24-h average and not to exceed 2.4 ppm in freshwater at any time. In saltwater they are 0.004 ppm and 0.09 ppm, respectively (U.S. EPA, 1986). EC50s for estuarine organisms range from 2.4 to 260 ppm tested in 48-h bioassays (Mayer, 1987). Data with which to evaluate measures of effects and chlordane in sediments are available from EP methods, SSBs, and analyses of matching fieldcollected biological and chemical analyses (Table 32). The field-collected data are from San Francisco Bay, Trinity River, and DuPage River. No effects upon the benthic communities were observed at the Georgetown disposal site at chlordane concentrations below the limits of detection (<50 ppb). San Francisco Bay sediments that were highly toxic to bivalve larvae were not tested for chlordane concentrations so these data (and the AET for bivalve larvae) were not used to determine ER-L and ER-M values. Among the 20 San Francisco Bay sediments that were moderately toxic to amphipods, only 4 were tested for chlordane concentrations; no chlordane was detected in those 4 samples. Likewise, among the 22 samples that were least toxic to amphipods, 4 were tested for chlordane concentrations; and one had 2 ppb and the others had no detectable amount. These data were not considered further in the determination of ER-L and ER-M values (Table B-16). Effects are predicted by EP methods to occur at concentrations as low as 0.3 ppb (Table 33). The ER-L suggested by the data is 0.5 ppb, supported by two EP-derived concentrations (0.3, 0.6 ppb). The 50 percentile value in the available data is 6 ppb, an ER-M supported by San Francisco Bay bioassay data (means of 4.1 and 6.4 ppb). Effects were usually observed at concentrations of 2 ppb or greater (Table B-16).

The degree of confidence in these values for chlordane should be considered as low. Two of the EP-derived chronic thresholds are very low compared to the co-occurrence and SSB data; SSBs have not been performed with sensitive infaunal organisms such as amphipods; and the abundance of data from San Francisco Bay where chlordane concentrations are not particularly high may have biased the determination of the ER-L and ER-M values.

Refere	nces Biological Approaches	Concentrations (ppb)
Appare	ent Effects Threshold	
*	SAN FRANCISCO BAY, CALIFORNIA AET - bivalve larvae bioassay - R. abronius amphipod bioassay	2.0 2.0
Co-occ	urrence Analyses	
H-	SAN FRANCISCO BAY, CALIFORNIA - highly toxic ($67 \pm 11.8\%$ mortality) to <i>R. abronius</i> - moderately toxic ($33.8 \pm 4.7\%$ mortality) to <i>R. abronius</i> - least toxic ($18 \pm 6.6\%$ mortality) to <i>R. abronius</i>	6.4 ± 7.5 Not detected Not detected
	- significantly toxic (42.9 \pm 19.2% mortality) to <i>R. abronius</i> - not toxic (18.4 \pm 6.8% mortality) to <i>R. abronius</i>	3.5 ± 6.3 1 ± 1.4
	- highly toxic (92.4 \pm 4.5% abnormal) to bivalve larvae - moderately toxic (59.4 \pm 11.3% abnormal) to bivalve larva - least toxic (23.3 \pm 7.3% abnormal) to bivalve larvae	No data e 4.1 ± 6.6 0.5 ± 1
	- significantly toxic (55.7 \pm 22.7% abnormal) to bivalve larv - not toxic (31.9 \pm 15.5% abnormal) to bivalve larvae	ae 3.5 ± 6.3 1 ± 1.4

Table 32. Summary of sediment effects data available for chlordane.

Table 32. Chlordane (continued)

٢

Referer	aces Biological Approaches O	Concentrations (ppb)
Co-occu	urrence Analyses	
75	TRINITY RIVER, TEXAS.	
	- significant mortality to D. magna - low mortality to D. magna	31.3 ± 29.4 1.7 ± 2.3
60	DUPAGE RIVER, ILLINOIS	
·	- least number of benthic macroinvertebrate taxa $(6.7 \pm 2.5/\text{site})$	25 ± 22.3
	- highest number of benthic macroinvertebrate taxa (15.8 \pm 2/site)	8.3 ± 4.3
64	GEORGETOWN OCEAN DREDGED MATERIAL DISPOSAL SITE, SOUTH CAROLINA	
	- no effects upon benthos species richness or abundance	<50
quilib	rium Partitioning	
13	95 percentile chronic marine permissable	
	(sediment/water partition coefficient) 99 percentile chronic marine permissable	0.6
	(sediment/water partition coefficient)	0.3
35	Lethal threshold in freshwater based on Koc coefficier	nts 17.4
Spiked	Sediment Bioassays	
34	LC50 for N. virens	≲5800
35	LC50 for C. septemspinosa	120

,

References	Background Approach	Concentrations	(ррb)
20	PSDDA guidelines (based on analytical capability) screening level concentrations	5.0	
12	USGS alert levels to flag 15-20% of samples analyzed	1 20	

References:

12.	Pavlou and Weston, 1983	60. Illinois EPA, 1988a
13.	Pavlou et al., 1987	64. Van Dolah et al., 1984
20.	U.S. ACOE, 1988	75. Qasim et al., 1980
34.	McLeese et al., 1982	* Various, please see text.
35.	McLeese and Metcalfe, 1980	• 1

.

79

Table 33.	Effects range	low and effects	range-median va	alues for chlord	ane and 12
concentra	tions used to	determine thes	e values arrange	d in ascending	order.

Concentrations (ppb)	s (ppb) End Point	
0.3	EP 99 percentile chronic marine	
0.5	ER-L	
0.6	EP 95 percentile chronic marine	
2.0	San Francisco Bay, California, AET	
3.5	San Francisco Bay, California, bioassay COA	
3.5	San Francisco Bay, California, bioassay COA	
4.1	San Francisco Bay, California, bioassay COA	
6.0	ER-M	
6.4	San Francisco Bay, California bioassay COA	
17.4	EP freshwater lethal threshold	
25.0	DuPage River, Illinois, benthos COA	
31.3	Trinity River, Texas, bioassay COA	
120.0	SSB LC50 for C. septemspinosa	
<5800.0	SSB LC50 for N. virens	

Heptachlor

The 96-h. LC50s for heptachlor in water range from 0.03 to 3.8 ug/L (ppm) for estuarine organisms (Mayer, 1987). The LC50 for heptachlor epoxide, a degradation product of heptachlor, was 0.04 ppm in a bioassay with pink shrimp (Mayer, 1987).

Sediment effects data are available only from one SLC, one SSB (with a cricket nymph), and two uses of the EP approach (Table 34). The PSDDA screening level is based upon assumed analytical capability, not an AET or some other measure of effects. The freshwater SLC (0.8 ppb dw) and the two EP thresholds (0.04, 0.06 ppb dw) are roughly within an order of magnitude of each other. The results of an 18-d bioassay of muck soil with cricket nymphs (of questionable applicability to marine and estuarine sediments) indicated an LD-50 of 4192 ppb dw, four orders of magnitude higher than the other concentrations. Because of the lack of sufficient data, ER-L and ER-M values cannot be determined.

References	Biological Approaches	Concentrations (ppb)
National Sc	reening Level Concentrations	
5	For freshwater sediments @ 1% TOC	0.8
Equilibriun	1 Partitioning	
13	 95 percentile chronic marine permissable (sediment/water partition coefficient) 99 percentile chronic marine permissable (sediment/water partition coefficient) 	0.06 0.04
Spiked-Sed	iment Bioassays	
42	LD50 for cricket nymph (G. pennsylvanicus)	4192

Table 34. Summary of sediment effects data available for heptachlor.

80

Table 34. Summary of a	sediment effe	ects data available f	or heptachlor.
------------------------	---------------	-----------------------	----------------

References	Background Approach	Concentrations (ppb)
20	PSDDA guidelines (based on analytical capabili screening level concentrations	ty) 5.0
12	USGS alert levels to flag 15-20% of samples anal	lyzed 20
23 .	Rotterdam Harbor sediment quality classification - Class 1 (slightly contaminated; ppb organic carb - Class 2 (moderately contaminated; ppb organic c - Class 3 (contaminated; ppb organic carbon) - Class 4 (heavily contaminated; ppb organic carb	oon) <200 carbon) 200-2000 2000-10000

References:

5.	Neff et al., 1986	20.	U.S. ACOE, 1988
12.	Pavlou and Weston, 1983	23.	Jansen, 1987
13.	Pavlou et al., 1987	42.	Harris, 1964.

Dieldrin

The 96-h LC50s for dieldrin range from 0.7 ug/L to 10 ug/L as determined with estuarine organisms tested in water (Mayer, 1987).

Sediment-related effects data are available from San Francisco Bay bioassays, Trinity River bioassays, DuPage River benthos studies, Kishwaukee River benthos studies, a freshwater SLC, the EP approach, and SSBs with two species (Table 35). The four San Francisco Bay samples that were highly toxic to bivalve larvae were not tested for dieldrin concentrations. There was little or no gradient in dieldrin concentrations among other San Francisco Bay samples. There also was no gradient in dieldrin concentration between Trinity River sediments that were highly toxic to *Daphnia* versus those that were not toxic. These data were not considered further (Table B-17). The lower 10 percentile of the remaining data suggest an ER-L of about 0.02 ppb, a value supported by two EP thresholds (0.01 and 0.02 ppb) (Table 36). The data suggest an ER-M of about 8 ppb, a value supported by Kishwaukee River benthic data (mean 7.4 ppb), and San Francisco Bay bioassay data (mean 8.2 ppb). No overall effects threshold is apparent.

The degree of confidence in the ER-L and ER-M values for dieldrin should be considered as low. A small amount of data are available; much of the co-occurrence data are from San Francisco Bay where the range in dieldrin concentrations is low; different uses of the EP approach resulted in predicted concentrations that differ by five orders of magnitude; and two independent spiked sediment bioassays resulted in LC50s that differed by four orders of magnitude. In addition, the ER-L is supported only by theoretical EP-derived concentrations and not verified by empirical evidence.

Table 35. Summary of sediment effects data available for dieldrin.

Referer	nces	Biological Approaches	Concentrations (ppb
Appare	nt Effects Thres	hold	
	SAN FRANCISC - bivalve larvae	CO BAY, CALIFORNIA AET	6.6
		phipod bioassay	6.6
Co-occu	arrence Analyse	25	
*	SAN FRANCIS	CO BAY, CALIFORNIA	
		$57 \pm 11.8\%$ mortality) to R. abronius	10.3 ± 9.6
		xic (33.8 \pm 4.7% mortality) to R. abronius	4.4 ± 2.3
	- least toxic (18	\pm 6.6% mortality) to R. abronius	5.2 ± 1.2
		oxic (42.9 \pm 19.2% mortality) to R. abronius	7.6 ± 7.5
	- not toxic (18.4	\pm 6.8% mortality) to R. abronius	6.2 ± 0.6
		$2.4 \pm 4.5\%$ abnormal) to bivalve larvae	no data
		xic (59.4 \pm 11.3% abnormal) to bivalve larvae	8.2 ± 8.1
	- least toxic (23.	$3 \pm 7.3\%$ abnormal) to bivalve larvae	5.2 ± 1.2
		oxic (55.7 \pm 22.7% abnormal) to bivalve larva	
	- not toxic (31.9	\pm 15.5% abnormal) to bivalve larvae	6.2 ± 0.6
	TRINITY RIVER		,
		rtality to D. magna	25.5 ± 33.2
	- low mortality	to D. magna	25.5 ± 61.1
60	DUPAGE RIVE	R, ILLINOIS	-> -> -> -> -> -> -> -> -> -> -> -> -> -
		of benthic macroinvertebrate taxa (6.7 \pm 2.5/siter of benthic macroinvertebrate taxa (15.8 \pm 2/	
	- Inducat Inning		SILC/ 5.0 ± 2.2
		RIVER, ILLINOIS of benthic macroinertebrate taxa	
	$(8.4 \pm 0.5/\text{site})$		7.4 ± 4.8
		er of benthic macroinvertebrate taxa	··· 1 10
	$(16.3 \pm 4.6/si)$		4.3 ± 2.1
64	GEORGETOWN	OCEAN DREDGED MATERIAL	
-	DISPOSAL SI	TE, SOUTH CAROLINA	
	- no effects upon	benthos species richness or abundance	<50
Nationa	al Screening Le	vel Concentrations	
5	For freshwater s	sediments @ 1% TOC	0.21
Equilib	rium Partitioni	ng	
13	95 percentile ch	ronic marine permissable	
	(sediment/w	vater partition coefficient)	0.02
		ronic marine permissable	A 44
	(sediment/1	water partition coefficient)	0.01
35	Lethal threshold	d in freshwater based on Koc coefficients	11.9
6	EPA interim me	ean marine sediment quality criteria @ 1% TO	C 57.7
-		ean freshwater sediment quality criteria @ 1%	

Table 35. Dieldrin (continued)

Refer	ences	Biological Approaches	Concentrations (ppb)
Spiked Sediment Bioassays			
34	LC50 for N. virens		13000
35	LC50 for C. septem	spinosa	4.1
Refer	ences	Background Approach	Concentrations (ppb)
20	PSDDA guideline	s (based on analytical capability)	5.0
12	USGS alert levels	to flag 15 to 20% of samples analyzed	20
43	New England inte	rim high contamination levels for dredg	e material 100

5.	Neff et al., 1986	35.	McLeese and Metcalfe, 1980
6.	EPA, 1988	43.	NERBC, 1980
12.	Pavlou and Weston, 1983	60.	Illinois EPA, 1988a
13.	Pavlou et al., 1987	61.	Illinois EPA, 1988b
20.	U.S. ACOE, 1988	64.	Van Dolah et al., 1984
34.	McLeese et al., 1982	75.	Qasim et al., 1980
		* 1	Various, please see text

Table 36. Effects range-low and effects range-median values for dieldrin and 14 concentrations used to determine these values arranged in ascending order.

Concentrations (ppb)	End Point	
0.01	EP 99 percentile chronic marine	
0.02	ER-L	
0.02	EP 95 percentile chronic marine	
0.21	Freshwater SLC @ 1% TOC	
4.1	SSB LC50 for C. septemspinosa	
6.6	San Francisco Bay, California AET	
6.6	San Francisco Bay, California AET	
7.4	Kishwaukee River, Illinois benthos COA	
8.0	ER-M	
8.2	San Francisco Bay, California bioassay COA	
10.3	San Francisco Bay, California bioassay COA	
11.9	EP freshwater lethal threshold	
16.0	DuPage River, Illinois benthos COA	
57.7	EP interim marine criteria	
199.0	EP interim freshwater criteria	
13000.0	SSB LC50 for N. virens	

.

Aldrin

The 48-h EC50s for aldrin tested with pink shrimp (*Penaeus duorarum*) and blue crab (*Callinectes sapidus*) were 0.32 and 23 ug/L, respectively; and the 48-h LC50s for spot (*Leiostomus xanthurus*) and mullet (*Mugil cephalus*) were 3.2 and 2 ug/L, respectively (Mayer, 1987). The criteria to protect freshwater and marine aquatic life are 3.0 and 1.3 ug/L, respectively (U.S. EPA, 1986).

A relatively small amount of data are available with which to assess the effects of aldrin in sediments (Table 37). These data are restricted to San Francisco Bay bioassay results and uses of the EP approach. Of the 53 San Francisco Bay sediments tested for toxicity with bivalve larvae, only 17 were analyzed for aldrin concentrations, and among those samples only 3 had detectable amounts (0.7, 1.1, and 1.9 ppb). Similarly, of the 39 samples tested with the amphipod bioassay, 15 were analyzed for aldrin content, and among those samples only the same 3 samples had detectable amounts. These data are insufficient to use in the determination of ER-L and ER-M values, as are the AET concentrations determined from them. The remaining data from four uses of the EP approach indicate a range of thresholds from 4.3 to 21 ppb dw. The EPA chronic marine concentration of 21 ppb would have been 5.2 ppb (equal to the concentration reported by Pavlou, 1987), if an assumption of a 1 percent TOC content had been made in the calculation. There do not appear to be any empirical data to compare with these predicted concentrations, so ER-L and ER-M values were not determined.

Referenc	es Biological Appro	baches	Concentrations (ppb)
Apparent	Effects Threshold		
*	SAN FRANCISCO BAY, CALIFORN - bivalve larvae bioassay - R. abronius amphipod bioassay	IIA AET	>1.9 >1.9
Co-occur	rence Analyses		
*	SAN FRANCISCO BAY, CALIFORM - highly toxic ($67 \pm 11.8\%$ mortality) - moderately toxic ($33.8 \pm 4.7\%$ mort - least toxic ($18 \pm 6.6\%$ mortality) to	to R. abronius ality) to R. abronius	0.3 ± 0.5 not detected detected in one samp
	- significantly toxic (42.9 \pm 19.2% m - not toxic (18.4 \pm 6.8% mortality) to		s 0.1 ± 0.4 1.0 ± 1.3
	- highly toxic (92.4 \pm 4.5% abnormal - moderately toxic (59.4 \pm 11.3% abn - least toxic (23.3 \pm 7.3% abnormal)	ormal) to bivalve lar	vae 0.2 ± 0.4 0.5 ± 1.0
	- significantly toxic (55.7 \pm 22.7% ab - not toxic (31.9 \pm 15.5% abnormal) t		1.0 ± 0.4 1.0 ± 1.3
Equilibri	um Partitioning		
13	95 percentile chronic marine permiss partition coefficient) 99 percentile chronic marine permiss		8.4 r
	partition coefficient)		4.3
4	EPA chronic marine EP threshold @	4% TOC	21.0

Table 37. Summary of sediment effects data available for aldrin.

Referen	ces Biological Approaches	Concentrations (ppb)
Equilibrium Partitioning		· ·	
25	Sediment safe levels based on sediment/water partitionir coefficients and acute water quality criteria @ 1% TOC	ng 5.2	-
Referen	ces Background Approach	Concentrations (pp)	
20	PSDDA guidelines (based on analytical capability)	5.0	298 B T
12	USGS alert levels to flag 15 to 20% of samples analyzed	20.0	

References:

4. Bolton *et al.*, 1985 13. Pavlou *et al.*, 1987 * Various, please see text 20. U.S. ACOE, 1988 25. Pavlou, 1987

Endrin

The 96-h LC50s for endrin tested with a variety of estuarine organisms ranged from 0.037 to 1.2 ug/L (Mayer, 1987). The concentration should not exceed 0.18 ug/L in freshwater or 0.037 ug/L in saltwater at any time (U.S. EPA, 1986).

A relatively small amount of data is available for this pesticide in sediments (Table 38), however there are data from most of the major approaches to the development of criteria. Matching chemical and toxicity data from the Trinity River are available. Data from various uses of the EP approaches and from two SSBs are available. None were eliminated from consideration in the determination of the ER-L and ER-M values (Table B-18). Effects are predicted at concentrations of 0.01 to 321 ppb by the EP approach. Spiked sediment bioassays performed with three species, indicated LC50s that differed by nearly three orders of magnitude. The ER-L and ER-M values are 0.02 and 45 ppb, respectively (Table 39). The ER-L value is supported by two EP-predicted concentrations, 0.01 and 0.02 ppb, and the ER-M value is supported by an LC50 for *Crangon septemspinosa* in spiked bioassays (47 ppb).

The ER-L value (0.02 ppb) is not supported by any empirical biological evidence from laboratory or field studies and the degree of confidence in the value should be considered as low. The ER-M value (45 ppb) is supported only by the LC50 from a SSB (47 ppb) and not by evidence from tests of mixtures, as would be experienced in the field; therefore, the degree of confidence in the ER-M should also be considered as low.

85

Refer	ences Biol	ogical Approaches	Concentrations (ppb
Co-Oc	ccurrence Analyses		
75	TRINITY RIVER, TEXAS - significant mortality to D - low mortality to D. magna	. magna 1	18.3 ± 2.0 3.8 ± 3.1
64	GEORGETOWN OCEAN D DISPOSAL SITE, SOUTH - no effects upon benthos spe	CAROLINA	<50.0
Equili	ibrium Partitioning		
15	(1% TOC) Sediment-biota partitioning	coefficient/marine chronic crite	174.0
	(1% TOC)		321.0
13	partition coefficient)	e permissable (sediment/water e permissable (sediment/water	0.02
	partition coefficient)	•	0.01
6	EPA interim marine sedime	nt quality criteria 1% TOC	2.15
6	EPA interim freshwater sec	liment quality criteria 1% TOC	10.4
35	Lethal threshold in freshwa	ter based on Koc coefficients	15.4
Spike	d-Sediment Bioassays		
34	LC50 for N. virens		28000.0
35	LC50 for C. septemspinosa		47.0
89	LC50 for <i>H. azteca</i> @ 3% TO LC50 for <i>H. azteca</i> @ 6.1% T LC50 for <i>H. azteca</i> @ 11.2%	OC	4400 4800 6000

Table 38. Summary of sediment effects data available for endrin.

Refer	nce Background Approach	Concentrations (ppb)
12	USGS alert levels to flag 15-20% of samples analyzed	20.0

References:

- EPA, 1988
 Pavlou and Weston, 1983
- 13. Pavlou et al., 1987
- 15. JRB Associates, 1984

- 34. McLeese *et al.*, 1982
 35. McLeese and Metcalfe, 1980
 64. Van Dolah *et al.*, 1984
 75. Qasim et al., 1980
 89. Nebeker *et al.*, 1989

Table 39. Effects range-low and effects range-median values for endrin and 13 concentrations used to determine these values arranged in ascending order.

Concentrations (ppb)	End Point
0.01	EP 99 percentile chronic marine
0.02	ER-L
0.02	EP 95 percentile chronic marine
2.15	EP interim marine criteria @ 1% TOC
10.4	EP interim freshwater criteria @ 1% TOC
1 5.4	EP freshwater lethal threshold
18.3	Trinity River, Texas, bioassay COA
45.0	ER-M
47.0	SSB LC50 C. septemspinosa
174.0	EP chronic sediment/water marine @ 1% TOC
321.0	EP chronic sediment/biota marine @ 1% TOC
4400	SSB LC50 with H. azteca @ 3% TOC
4800	SSB LC50 with H. azteca @ 6.1% TOC
6000	SSB LC50 with H. azteca @ 11.2% TOC
28000.0	SSB LC50 with N. virens

Mirex

Only matching bioassay and chemical data from San Francisco Bay were found for mirex. They indicated very small differences in concentrations between highly and/or significantly toxic samples versus least and/or non-toxic samples. Therefore, ER-L and ER-M values could not be determined.

Polynuclear Aromatic Hydrocarbons:

Acenaphthene

Puget Sound AET, several EP-derived concentrations, data from bioassays of dilution series of Black Rock Harbor and Eagle Harbor sediments, and co-occurrence concentrations are available for acenaphthene (Table 40). The co-occurrence data are from Commencement Bay, Eagle Harbor (an area with documented high PAH concentrations), San Francisco Bay, and southern California. The bioassay data from San Francisco Bay indicated very little concordance with acenaphthene concentrations or a small gradient in concentrations, so neither the co-occurrence analysis data nor the AET concentrations were used in the determination of ER-L and ER-M values (Table B-19). Also, the southern California bioassay data showed no concordance with the acenaphthene concentrations. Because of a small gradient in the acenapthene concentrations in Black Rock Harbor sediments, those data also were not used further. The samples from both Commencement Bay and Eagle Harbor that were moderately toxic to amphipods indicated a small elevation in acenaphthene concentrations over those that were least toxic; thus the data were not used for ER-L and ER-M M determinations.

The lower 10 percentile of the remaining data suggest an ER-L of about 150 ppb (Table 41). This value is supported by observations of moderate toxicity of Commencement Bay sediments to oyster larvae (mean 118.5 ppb) and the predicted LC50 in amphipod bioassays of a dilution series of Eagle Harbor sediments (150 ppb). Except for the observations of low and moderate toxicity to amphipods in Eagle Harbor sediments, effects were usually observed in association with acenaphthene concentrations of 150 ppb or greater. The data suggest an ER-M of about 650 ppb, a value supported by a Puget Sound AET for amphipod bioassays (630 ppb) and observations of highly toxic Commencement Bay sediments tested with amphipods (mean 654 ppb). The co-occurrence values from bioassays of Eagle Harbor and Commencement Bay sediments had very high standard deviations about the means, indicative of the very high variability in these data. All of the concentrations predicted by the EP method are in the high end of the range.

The degree of confidence in the ER-L and ER-M values should be considered as low. While an overall apparent effects threshold occurs at the ER-L concentration, there is relatively poor clustering of the data, the data are mostly from parts of Puget Sound, there are no single-chemical SSB data, and the concentrations derived from the EP methods are not consistent with those determined in tests of field-collected sediments.

Table 40. Summary of sediment effects data available for acenaphthene.

Referenc	es Biological Approaches	Concentrations (ppb)		
Apparent Effects Threshold				
1	1986 PUGET SOUND AET - R. abronius amphipod bioassay - oyster larvae (C. gigas) bioassay - benthic community composition	630 500 500		
	- Microtox [™] bioassay	500		
2	 1988 PUGET SOUND AET - R. abronius amphipod bioassay - oyster larvae (C. gigas) bioassay - benthic community composition - Microtox[™] bioassay 	2000 500 730 500		
20	PSDDA guidelines (based upon Puget Sound AET) - screening level concentration - maximum level criterion	63 630		
*	SAN FRANCISCO BAY, CALIFORNIA AET - bivalve larvae bioassay - R. abronius amphipod bioassay	9 56		
Co-Occu	rrence Analyses			
*	SAN FRANCISCO BAY, CALIFORNIA - highly toxic ($67 \pm 11.8\%$ mortality) to <i>R. abronius</i> - moderately toxic ($33.8 \pm 4.7\%$ mortality to <i>R. abronius</i> - least toxic ($18 \pm 6.6\%$ mortality) to <i>R. abronius</i>	7.6 ± 21.6 5.4 ± 12.1 9.8 ± 15.9		
	- significantly toxic (42.9 \neq 19.2% mortality) to R. abronius - not toxic (18.4 \pm 6.8% mortality) to R. abronius	5.9 ± 16.8 11.8 ± 16.8		
	- highly toxic (92.4 \pm 4.5% abnormal) to bivalve larvae - moderately toxic (59.4 \pm 11.3% abnormal) to bivalve larvae - least toxic (23.3 \pm 7.3% abnormal) to vivalve larvae	48 ± 18.4 3.3 ± 5.9 1.8 ± 4.0		
	- significantly toxic (55.7 \pm 22.7% abnormal) to bivalve larva - not toxic (31.9 \pm 15.5% abnormal) to bivalve larvae	e 9.4 ± 17.9 3.0 ± 5.2		
80	COMMENCEMENT BAY, WASHINGTON - highly toxic (15.7 \pm 3.9 dead/20) to <i>R. abronius</i> - moderately toxic (5.2 \pm 1.1 dead/20 to <i>R. abronius</i> - least toxic (2.5 \pm 0.9 dead/20) to <i>R. abronius</i>	654 ± 1049 127 ± 117 86 ± 97		
	- highly toxic (44.5 \pm 19% abnormal) to oyster larvae - moderately toxic (23 \pm 2.3% abnormal) to oyster larvae - least toxic (15.1 \pm 3.1% abnormal) to oyster larvae	306 ± 604 119 ± 105 57 ± 70		

Table 40. Acenaphthene (continued)

Reference	s Biological Approaches	Concentrations (ppb)		
Co-Occurrence Analyses				
85	EAGLE HARBOR, WASHINGTON			
	- highly toxic (19.1 \pm 1.7 dead/20) to R. abronius	39557 ± 48678		
	- moderately toxic $(3.2 \pm 1.8 \text{ dead}/20)$ to R. abronius - least toxic $(2.6 \pm 1.4 \text{ dead}/20)$ to R. abronius	6522 ± 8915 5599 ± 24392		
21	- predicted LC50 for <i>R. abronius</i> in 10-d dilution series with	0099 ± 24092		
21	Yaquina Bay, Oregon sediment	150		
56	SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA			
	- significantly toxic (51.65% mortality) to G. japonica	3.9 ± 1.6✔		
	- not toxic (23.2% mortality) to G. japonica	7 ± 11.8✔		
58	BLACK ROCK HARBOR, CONNECTICUT			
	- significant toxicity to A. abdita in 10-d bioassay	30		
Equilibriu	m Partitioning			
4	EPA chronic marine EP threshold (@ 4% TOC)	66000		
6	EPA interim freshwater sediment quality criteria based upon	EP		
	(@ 1% TOC)	7330		
25	Sediment safe level based upon sediment/water partitioning			
	coefficients and acute water quality criteria (@ 1% TOC)	23000		
	Sediment safe level based upon sediment/water partitioning			
	coefficients and chronic water quality criteria (@ 1% TOČ)	16500		

Reference	s Background Approaches C	Concentrations (ppb)
43	New England interim high contamination level for dredge ma	iterial 500
12	USGS alert levels to flag 15 to 20% of samples analyzed	20
20	EPA/ACOE Puget Sound interim criteria (central basin backgro	ound) 5
23	Rotterdam Harbor sediment quality classifications - Class 1 (slightly contaminated) - Class 2 (moderately contaminated) - Class 3 (contaminated) - Class 4 (heavily contaminated)	<200 200-2000 2000-10000 >10000

References:

1. Bell	ar et al.,	. 1986
---------	------------	--------

- PTI Environmental Services, 1988 2.
- 4. Bolton et al., 1985
- EPA, 1988 6.
- U.S. ACOE, 1988 20.
- Swartz et al., 1989 21.

25. Pavlou, 1987

56. Anderson *et al.*, 1988 58. Rogerson *et al.*, 1985 80. Tetra Tech, 1985

- 85. CH²M Hill, 1989
- * Various, please see text

Table 41. Effects range-low and effects range-median values for acenaphthene and 15 concentrations used to determine these values arranged in ascending order.

Concentrations (pp	b) End Point
119	Commencement Bay, Washington bioassay COA
150	ER-L
150	Eagle Harbor, Washington bioassay COA
306	Commencement Bay, Washington bioassay COA
500	Puget Sound, Washington AET - oyster
500	Puget Sound, Washington AET - benthic
500	Puget Sound, Washington AET - Microtox™
630	Puget Sound, Washington AET - amphipod
650	ER-M
654	Commencement Bay, Washington bioassay COA
730	Puget Sound, Washington AET - benthic
2000	Puget Sound, Washington AET - amphipod
7330	EP freshwater interim criteria @ 1% TOC
16500	EP chronic marine threshold @ 1% TOC
23000	EP acute marine threshold @ 1% TOC
39557	Eagle Harbor, Washington bioassay COA
66000	EP chronic marine threshold @ 4% TOC

Anthracene

Data available for anthracene are from studies involving Puget Sound AET; bioassays of sediments from Commencement Bay, Eagle Harbor, San Francisco Bay, Lake Union, southern California, and Elizabeth River; national SLCs; and several EP-derived concentrations (Table 42). San Francisco Bay sediments that were moderately toxic to amphipods indicated no concordance with anthracene concentrations. Also, San Francisco Bay sediments that were significantly toxic to amphipods had anthracene concentrations similar to those that were not toxic. Commencement Bay sediments that were moderately toxic to amphipods had anthracene concentrations similar to those that were moderately toxic to amphipods had anthracene concentrations. Eagle Harbor sediments moderately toxic to amphipods indicated little concordance with anthracene concentrations. These data were not used in the determination of ER-L and ER-M values (Table B-20).

Effects were associated with mean anthracene concentrations as low as 24 ppb (Table 43) in bioassays of San Francisco Bay sediments. However, since 34 out of the 39 samples tested there were significantly toxic, this concentration may not be of much significance. The lower 10 percentile of the data indicate an ER-L of about 85 ppb, a value supported by the predicted LC50 for anthracene from bioassays of a dilution series of Eagle Harbor sediments (70 ppb) and the anthracene concentrations (mean 85.3 ppb) in San Francisco Bay sediments that were moderately toxic to bivalve larvae. The 50 percentile value in the data is equivalent to about 960 ppb and is supported by two Puget Sound AETs (both 960 ppb). With the exception of bioassay data from Eagle Harbor, there appears to be an overall threshold in the effects data at about 300 ppb. Effects are almost always observed in association with anthracene concentrations gave Bay and the B-20).

The degree of confidence in the ER-L and ER-M values for anthracene should be considered as relatively low and moderate, respectively. The ER-L value is not supported by clustered, consistent data from multiple approaches. The ER-M is supported by a cluster of toxicity and AET concentrations, but these data are derived from only two regions. There is some evidence of an overall apparent effects threshold for anthracene at about 300 ppb in sediments, a concentration that lies within the ER-L/ER-M range.

Table 42. Summary of sediment effects data available for anthracene.

Referenc	es Biological Approaches	Biological Approaches Concentrations (ppb)	
Apparent	Effects Threshold		
1	1986 PUGET SOUND AET - R. abronius amphipod bioassay - oyster larvae (C. gigas) bioassay - benthic community composition - Microtox [™] bioassay	1900 960 1300 960	
2	1988 PUGET SOUND AET - R. abronius amphipod bioassay - oyster larvae (C. gigas) bioassay - benthic community composition - Microtox [™] bioassay	13000 960 4400 960	
20	PSDDA GUIDELINES (based upon Puget Sound AET) - screening level concentration - maximum level criterion	130 1300	
*	SAN FRANCISCO BAY, CALIFORNIA AET - bivalve larvae bioassay - R. abronius amphipod bioassay	24 1100	
Co-Occur	rrence Analyses		
80	COMMENCEMENT BAY, WASHINGTON - highly toxic (15.7 \pm 3.9 dead/20) to <i>R. abronius</i> - moderately toxic (5.2 \pm 1.1 dead/20) to <i>R. abronius</i> - least toxic (2.5 \pm 0.9 dead/20) to <i>R. abronius</i>	476 ± 549 265 ± 228 227 ± 198	
	- highly toxic (44.5 \pm 19% abnormal) to oyster larvae - moderately toxic (23 \pm 2.3% abnormal) to oyster larvae - least toxic (15.1 \pm 3.1% abnormal) to oyster larvae	363 ± 353 282 ± 207 148 ± 148	
85	EAGLE HARBOR, WASHINGTON - highly toxic (19.1 \pm 1.7 dead/20) to R. abronius - moderately toxic (8.2 \pm 1.8 dead/20) to R. abronius - least toxic (2.6 \pm 1.4 dead/20) to R. abronius	7597 ± 7264 1177 ± 1582 1490 ± 5389	
21	 predicted LC50 for <i>R. abronius</i> in 10-d dilution series wit Yaquina Bay, Oregon sediment 		
29	LAKE UNION, WASHINGTON - 95% mortality to <i>H. azteca</i>	120000	
*	SAN FRANCISCO BAY, CALIFORNIA - highly toxic ($67 \pm 11.8\%$ mortality) to <i>R. abronius</i> - moderately toxic ($33.8 \pm 4.7\%$ mortality) to <i>R. abronius</i> - least toxic ($18 \pm 6.6\%$ mortality) to <i>R. abronius</i>	$237 \pm 455 \\ 63 \pm 72 \\ 110 \pm 257 \\ 110 + 277 \\ 110 + 277 \\ 110 + 277 \\ 110 + 277 \\ 110 + 277 \\ 110 + 277 \\ 110 + 277 \\ 110 + 277 \\ 110 + 277 \\ 110 + 277 \\ 110 + 277 \\ 110 + 277 \\ 110 + 277 \\ 110 + 277 \\ 110 + 277 \\ 110 + 277 \\ 110 + 277 \\ 110 + 277 \\ 110 + 277 \\ 110 + 277 \\ 110 + 277 \\ 110 + 277 \\ 110 + 277 \\ 110 + 277 \\ 110 + 277 \\ 110 + 277 \\ 110 + 277 \\ 110 + 277 \\ 110 + 277 \\ 110 + 277 \\ 110 + 277 \\ 110 + 277 \\ 110 + 277 \\ 110 + 277 \\ 110 + 277 \\ 110 + 277 \\ 110 + 277 \\ 110 + 277 \\ 110 + 277 \\ 110 + 277 \\ 110 + 277 \\ 110 + 277 \\ 110 + 277 \\ 110 + 277 \\ 110 + 277 \\ 110 + 277 \\ 110 + 277 \\ 110 + 277 \\ 110 + 277 \\ 110 + 277 \\ 110 + 277 \\ 110 + 277 \\ 110 + 277 \\ 110 + 277 \\ 110 + 277 \\ 110 + 277 \\ 110 + 277 \\ 110 + 277 \\ 110 + 277 \\ 110 + 277 \\ 110 + 277 \\ 110 + 277 \\ 110 + 277 \\ 110 + 277 \\ 110 + 277 \\ 110 + 277 \\ 110 + 277 \\ 110 + 277 \\ 110 + 277 \\ 110 + 277 \\ 110 + 277 \\ 110 + 277 \\ 110 + 277 \\ 110 + 277 \\ 110 + 277 \\ 110 + 277 \\ 110 + 277 \\ 110 + 277 \\ 110 + 277 \\ 110 + 277 \\ 110 + 277 \\ 110 + 277 \\ 110 + 277 \\ 110 + 277 \\ 110 + 277 \\ 110 + 277 \\ 110 + 277 \\ 110 + 277 \\ 110 + 277 \\ 110 + 277 \\ 110 + 277 \\ 110 + 277 \\ 110 + 277 \\ 110 + 277 \\ 110 + 277 \\ 110 + 277 \\ 110 + 277 \\ 110 + 277 \\ 110 + 277 \\ 110 + 277 \\ 110 + 277 \\ 110 + 277 \\ 110 + 277 \\ 110 + 277 \\ 110 + 277 \\ 110 + 277 \\ 110 + 277 \\ 110 + 277 \\ 110 + 277 \\ 110 + 277 \\ 110 + 277 \\ 110 + 277 \\ 110 + 277 \\ 110 + 277 \\ 110 + 277 \\ 110 + 277 \\ 110 + 277 \\ 110 + 277 \\ 110 + 277 \\ 110 + 277 \\ 110 + 277 \\ 110 + 277 \\ 110 + 277 \\ 110 + 277 \\ 110 + 277 \\ 110 + 277 \\ 110 + 277 \\ 110 + 277 \\ 110 + 277 \\ 110 + 277 \\ 110 + 277 \\ 110 + 277 \\ 110 + 277 \\ 110 + 277 \\ 110 + 277 \\ 110 + 277 \\ 110 + 277 \\ 110 + 277 \\ 110 + 277 \\ 110 + 277 \\ 110 + 277 \\ 110 + 277 \\ 110 + 277 \\ 110 + 277 \\ 110 + 277 \\ 110 + 277 \\ 110 + 277 \\ 110 + 277 \\ 110 + 277 \\ 110 + 277 \\ 110 + 277 \\ 110 + 277 \\ 110 + 277 \\ 110 + 277 \\ 110 + 277 \\ 110 + 277 \\ 110 + 277 \\ 110 + 277 \\ 110 + 277 \\ 110 + 277 \\ 110 + 277 \\ 110 + 277 \\ 110 + 277 \\ 110 + 277 \\ 110 + 277 \\ 110 + 277 \\ 110 + 277 \\ 110 + $	
	- significantly toxic (42.9 \pm 19.2% mortality) to R. abronius - not toxic (18.4 \pm 6.8% mortality) to R. abronius	s 119 ± 277 120 ± 269	
	- highly toxic (92.4 \pm 4.5% abnormal) to bivalve larvae - moderately toxic (59.4 \pm 11.3% abnormal) to bivalve lar - least toxic (23.3 \pm 7.3% abnormal) to bivalve larvae	923 ± 558 vae 85 ± 119 15 ± 7.5	

•

.

Table 42. Anthracene (continued).

Referenc	es Biological Approaches	Concentrations (ppb)
Co-Occur	rence Analyses	
	- significantly toxic (55.7 \pm 22.7% abnormal) to - not toxic (31.9 \pm 15.5% abnormal) to bivalve lar	
56	SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA - significantly toxic (51.65% mortality) to G. japo - not toxic (23.2% mortality) to G. japonica	onica 225 ± 131↓ 36 ± 52↓
47	 ELIZABETH RIVER, VIRGINIA 100% mortality to <i>L. xanthurus</i> exposed to 100% Elizabeth River sediment LC50 (24-hr) for <i>L. xanthurus</i> exposed to 56% Elizabeth River sediment LC50 (28-d) for <i>L. xanthurus</i> exposed to 2.5% Elizabeth River sediment 	264000 147840 6600
ational	Screening Level Concentrations	
14	Marine sediments @ 1% TOC	163
quilibri	um Partitioning	
4	EPA chronic marine EP threshold (@ 4% TOC)	44000
13	99 percentile chronic marine permissable contami from chronic water quality criteria @ 1% TOC	inant derived 190
13	95 percentile chronic marine permissable contami from chronic water quality criteria @ 1% TOC	inant derived 380

1. Beller et al., 1986	20. U.S. ACOE, 1988	56. Anderson <i>et al.</i> , 1988
2. PTI Environmental Services, 1988	21. Swartz et al., 1989	80. Tetra Tech, 1985
4. Bolton et al., 1985	29. Yake et al., 1986	85. CH ² M Hill, 1989
13. Pavlou et al., 1987	47. Roberts et al., 1989	* Various, please see text
14. Neff et al., 1987		

Table 43. Effects range-low and effects range-median values for anthracene and 26 concentrations used to determine these values arranged in ascending order.

Concentrations (ppb) End Point		
24	San Francisco Bay, California AET	
70	Eagle Harbor, Washington bioassay COA	
85	ER-L	
85	San Francisco Bay ,California bioassay COA	
163	Marine SLC @ 1% TOC	
184	San Francisco Bay, California bioassay COA	
190	99 percentile EP chronic marine @ 1% TOC	

92

Concentrations	(ppb) End Point
225	Southern California bioassay COA
237	San Francisco Bay, California bioassay COA
282	Commencement Bay, Washington bioassay COA
363	Commencement Bay, Washington bioassay COA
380	95 percentile EP chronic marine @ 1% TOC
476	Commencement Bay, Washington bioassay COA
923	San Francisco Bay, California bioassay COA
960	Puget Sound, Washington AET - oyster
960	ER-M
960	Puget Sound, Washington AET - Microtox™
1100	San Francisco Bay, California AET
1300	Puget Sound, Washington AET - benthic
1900	Puget Sound, Washington AET - amphipod
4400	Puget Sound, Washington AET - benthic
6600	Elizabeth River, Virginia bioassay COA
75 9 7	Eagle Harbor, Washington bioassay COA
13000	Puget Sound, Washington AET - amphipod
44000	EP chronic marine @ 4% TOC
120000	Lake Union, Washington toxicity COA
147840	Elizabeth River, Virginia bioassay COA
264000	Elizabeth River, Virginia bioassay COA

Benzo(a)anthracene

Data available for this aromatic hydrocarbon include those from Puget Sound AET; San Francisco Bay AET and bioassay data; bioassay data from Commencement Bay, Eagle Harbor, Lake Union, Columbia River, southern California, and Elizabeth River; national SLCs; SSBs performed with *R. abronius* exposed to mixtures of hydrocarbons; and many EPderived values (Table 44). There were small gradients in benzo(a)anthracene concentrations between San Francisco Bay sediments that were least toxic and moderately toxic to amphipods, between San Francisco Bay sediments that were not toxic and significantly toxic to amphipods, and between Commencement Bay sediments that were least toxic and moderately toxic to amphipods (Table B-21). In bioassays of lower Columbia River sediments, no toxicity to the amphipod *H. azteca* was observed in sediments that had up to 2200 ppb benzo(a)anthracene. These data were not used in the determination of ER-L and ER-M values.

Effects are suggested in association with benzo(a)anthracene concentrations as low as 60 to 80 ppb in sediments (Table 45). The lower 10 percentile value of the data is equivalent to about 230 ppb, the ER-L value. This value is supported by San Francisco Bay bioassay data (mean 232 ppb). The 50 percentile ER-M value in the data is equivalent to 1600 ppb; a concentration supported by a San Francisco Bay AET (1100 ppb), three Puget Sound AET concentrations (1300, 1600, 1600 ppb), and a threshold predicted by EP methods (1600 ppb). With the exception of Columbia River and Eagle Harbor bioassay data, effects were usually observed in association with concentrations above about 550 ppb (Table B-21). Severe acute toxicity was observed or predicted with concentrations of 10 ppm or greater (Table 45).

The degree of confidence in the ER-L value should be considered as moderate, since that value is not strongly supported by a convergence or cluster of data. However, the ER-M value is supported by data from at least two geographic areas and from the predictive EP approach, and there are few contradictory data at concentrations exceeding the ER-M. Also,

the apparent effects threshold lies within the ER-L/ER-M range. Therefore, the degree of confidence in the ER-M value should be considered as moderate.

ferences	Biological Approaches	Concentrations (ppb)		
Apparent Effects Threshold				
1	1986 PUGET SOUND AET			
	- R. abronius amphipod bioassay	1600		
	- oyster larvae (C. gigas) bioassay	1600		
	- benthic community composition	4500		
	- Microtox TM bioassay	1300		
2	1988 PUGET SOUND AET			
	- R. abronius amphipod bioassay	5100		
	- oyster larvae (C. gigas) bioassay	1600		
	- benthic community composition	5100		
	- Microtox TM bioassay	1300		
20	PSDDA GUIDELINES (based upon Puget Sound AET)			
	- screening level concentration	450		
	- maximum level criterion	4500		
*	SAN FRANCISCO BAY, CALIFORNIA AET			
	- bivalve larvae bioassay	60		
	- R. abronius amphipod bioassay	1100		
Occurre	nce Analyses			
80	COMMENCEMENT BAY, WASHINGTON			
	- highly toxic (15.7 \pm 3.9 dead/20) to R. abronius	931 ± 1323		
	- moderately toxic (5.2 \pm 1.1 dead/20) to R. abronius	520 ± 523		
	- least toxic (2.5 \pm 0.9 dead/20) to R. abronius	476 ± 437		
	- highly toxic (44.5 \pm 19% abnormal) to oyster larvae	801 ± 866		
	- moderately toxic (23 \pm 2.3% abnormal) to oyster larvae	549 ± 384		
	- least toxic (15.1 \pm 3.1% abnormal) to oyster larvae	235 ± 247		
85	EAGLE HARBOR, WASHINGTON			
	- highly toxic (19.1 \pm 1.7 dead/20) to R. abronius	11088 ± 894		
	- moderately toxic (8.2 \pm 1.8 dead/20) to R. abronius	7370 ± 998		
	- least toxic (2.6 \pm 1.4 dead/20) to R. abronius	2496 ± 415		
21	- predicted LC50 for R. abronius in 10-d dilution series			
	with Yaquina Bay, Oregon sediment	80		
29	LAKE UNION, WASHINGTON			
	- 95% mortality to H. azteca	170000		
52	COLUMBIA RIVER, WASHINGTON/OREGON			
	- not toxic (0-13% mortality) to H. azteca	2200		
*	SAN FRANCISCO BAY, CALIFORNIA			
	- highly toxic (67 \pm 11.8% mortality) to R. abronius	300 ± 398		
	- moderately toxic (33.8 \pm 4.7% mortality) to R. abronius			

Table 44. Summary of sediment effects data available for benzo(a)anthracene.

Table 44. Benzo(a)anthracene (continued).

Refere	ences	Biological Approaches	Concentrations (ppb)
Co-Oc	currence Analyses		
,		12.9 \pm 19.2% mortality) to R. abronius % mortality) to R. abronius	s 236 ± 313 187 ± 359
	- moderately toxic (59	4.5% abnormal) to bivalve larvae $0.4 \pm 11.3\%$ abnormal) to bivalve lar 3% abnormal) to bivalve larvae	919 ± 433 vae 122 ± 126 56 ± 26
		$55.7 \pm 22.7\%$ abnormal) to bivalve la 5% abnormal) to bivalve larvae	rvae 232 ± 337 41 ± 20
56	SOUTHERN CALIFO - significantly toxic (- not toxic (23.2% mo	51.65% mortality) to G. japonica	310 ± 180 60 ± 129
47	sediment	xanthurus exposed to 100% Elizabe	350000
	sediment - LC50 (28-d) for L. x	anthurus exposed to 56% Elizabeth R anthurus exposed to 2.5% Elizabeth F	196000
Natio	sediment nal Screening Level C	oncentrations	8750
5	Marine sediments @ 1		261
14	Marine sediments @ 1	% TOC	261
Iquili	brium Partitioning		
4	EPA chronic marine	EP threshold (@ 4% TOC)	220000
17	EPA acute marine EP	threshold (@ 4% TOC)	220000
13	99 percentile chronic from chronic water of	marine permissable contaminant der quality criteria @ 1% TOC	ived 1600
13		marine permissable contaminant der quality criteria @ 1% TOC	ived 21000
6	EPA interim mean fr upon EP @ 1% TOC	eshwater sediment quality criteria ba	ased 13200
25		based upon sediment/water partition te quality criteria @ 1% TOC	ning 55000
Spike	d-Sediment Bioassays	1	
65	Significant toxicity to and chlorinated hyd	<i>R. abronius</i> with mixtures of aroma rocarbons	atic 10000

Table 44. Benzo(a)anthracene (continued)

References:

Beller et al., 1986 1. 17. Lyman et al., 1987 52. Johnson and Norton,, 1988 PTI Environmental Services, 1988 20. U.S. ACOE, 1988 2. 56. Anderson et al., 1988 4. Bolton *et al.*, 1985 21. Swartz et al., 1989 65. Plesha et al., 1988 5. Neff et al., 1986 25. Pavlou, 1987 80. Tetra Tech, 1985 85. CH²M Hill, 1989 6. EPA, 1988 29. Yake et al., 1986 *-Various, please see text 13. Pavlou et al., 1987 47. Roberts et al., 1989 14. Neff et al., 1987

Table 45. Effects range-low and effects range-median values for benzo(a)anthracene and 30 concentrations used to determine these values arranged in ascending order.

Concentrations (ppb)	End Point
60	San Francisco Bay, California AET
80	Eagle Harbor, Washington bioassay COA
122	San Francisco Bay, California bioassay
230	ER-L
232	San Francisco Bay, California bioassay COA
261	Marine SLC
300	San Francisco Bay, California bioassay COA
310	Southern California bioassay COA
549	Commencement Bay, Washington bioassay COA
801	Commencement Bay, Washington bioassay COA
919	San Francisco Bay, California bioassay COA
931	Commencement Bay, Washington bioassay COA
1100	San Francisco Bay, California AET
1300	Puget Sound, Washington AET - Microtox TM
1600	Puget Sound, Washington AET - amphipod
1600	ER-M
1600	Puget Sound, Washington AET - oyster
1600	99 percentile EP chronic marine @ 1% TOC
4500	Puget Sound, Washington AET - benthic
5100	Puget Sound, Washington AET - amphipod
5100	Puget Sound, Washington AET - benthic
7370	Eagle Harbor, Washington bioassay COA
8750	Elizabeth River, Virginia bioassay COA
10000	SSB with R. abronius: mixtures
11088	Eagle Harbor, Washington bioassay COA
13200	EP freshwater interim criteria @ 1% TOC
21000	95 percentile EP chronic marine @ 1% TOC
55000	EP acute marine threshold @ 1% TOC
170000	Lake Union, Washington toxicity COA
196000	Elizabeth River, Virginia bioassay COA
220000	EP acute marine threshold @ 4% TOC
350000	Elizabeth River, Virginia bioassay COA

96

Benzo(a)pyrene

Data are available for benzo(a)pyrene from Puget Sound AET, San Francisco Bay AET and bioassay data; bioassay data from Commencement Bay, Eagle Harbor, Lake Union, southern California, and Elizabeth River; national SLCs for marine sediments; concentrations predicted by EP methods; and SSBs performed with *R. abronius* exposed to a mixture of hydrocarbons (Table 46). Small gradients in benzo(a)pyrene concentrations were observed in bioassays of a dilution series of Eagle Harbor sediments, in San Francisco Bay sediments that were highly and moderately toxic to amphipods versus those that were least toxic, and in San Francisco Bay sediments that were significantly toxic versus those that were not toxic to amphipods. Those data were not used to determine the ER-L and ER-M values (Table B-22). The data from Eagle Harbor sediments that were highly toxic to amphipods also were not used, since they did not indicate concordance with benzo(a)pyrene concentrations:

Effects were observed in association with benzo(a)pyrene concentrations as low as 396 ppb (the national SLC for marine sediments) (Table 47). The lower 10 percentile value of the available data is equivalent to about 400 ppb, an ER-L value supported by marine SLCs of 396 and 397 and observations of significantly toxic San Francisco Bay sediments tested with bivalve larvae (mean of 404 ppb). With the exception of Eagle Harbor bioassay data, effects were usually observed in association with benzo(a)pyrene concentrations of roughly 700 ppb or more (Table B-22). The ER-M suggested by the data is about 2500 ppb, a value supported by a Puget Sound AET (2400 ppb) and the LC50 derived from bioassays of a dilution series of Elizabeth River sediments tested with spot (2462 ppb).

The degree of confidence in the ER-L and ER-M values should be considered as moderate. Although data are available from several areas and several approaches, and these values are supported by some convergence or clustering of the data, the clusters of concentrations cover a relatively wide range. The overall apparent effects threshold (about 700 ppb) lies within the ER-L/ER-M range. With very little conflicting evidence, it appears that effects are almost always associated with concentrations of about 700 ppb or more.

Referen	ces Biological Approaches	Concentrations (ppb)
Apparer	at Effects Thresholds	
1	1986 PUGET SOUND AET	
	- R. abronius amphipod bioassay	2400
	- oyster larvae (C. gigas) bioassay	1600
	- benthic community composition	6800
	- Microtox [™] bioassay	1600
2	1988 PUGET SOUND AET	
	- R. abronius amphipod bioassay	3000
	- oyster larvae (C. gigas) bioassay	1600
	- benthic community composition	3600
	- Microtox [™] bioassay	1600
20	PSDDA GUIDELINES (based upon Puget Sound AET)
	- screening level concentration	680
	- maximum level criterion	6800
*		
•	SAN FRANCISCO BAY, CALIFORNIA AET	
	- bivalve larvae bioassay	>1800
	- R. abronius amphipod bioassay	>1300

Table 46. Summary of sediment effects data available for benzo(a)pyrene.

Table 46. Benzo(a)pyrene (continued)

.

References	Biole	ogical Approaches	Concentrations (ppb)
Co-Occurre	nce Analyses		
80	COMMENCEMENT BA	Y. WASHINGTON	
		dead/20) to R. abronius	1192 ± 1643
		1.1 dead/20) to R. abronius	890 ± 1322
	- least toxic (2.5 \pm 0.9 de	ead/20) to R. abronius	596 ± 593
	- highly toxic (44.5 ± 19)	% abnormal) to oyster larvae	1261 ± 1620
		2.3% abnormal) to oyster larvae	
		abnormal) to oyster larvae	329 ± 385
85	EAGLE HARBOR, WAS	CHINICTON	
05		dead/20) to R. abronius	3485 ± 2473
		1.8 dead/20) to R. abronius	5335 ± 6488
			1959 ± 1993
01	- least toxic (2.6 \pm 1.4 de		1959 ± 1995
21		abronius in 10-d dilution series	10
	with Yaquina Bay, Ore	gon sediment	10
29	LAKE UNION, WASH		,
	- 95% mortality to H. az	teca	220000
*	SAN FRANCISCO BAY	CALIFORNIA	
		% mortality) to R. abronius	486 ± 484
		± 4.7% mortality) to R. abronius	
	- least toxic $(18 \pm 6.6\%)$	mortality) to R. abronius	400 ± 447
	significantly toxic (12)	$9 \pm 19.2\%$ mortality) to R. abroni	<i>us</i> 429 ± 382
			423 ± 352 423 ± 465
	$= 100 0000 (10.4 \pm 0.070)$	mortality) to R. abronius	423 ± 400
•	- highly toxic (92.4 \pm 4.	5% abnormal) to bivalve larvae	1091 ± 338
		± 11.3% abnormal) to bivalve la	
		6 abnormal) to bivalve larvae	129 ± 61
		-	
	 significantly toxic (55.) 	7 \pm 22.7% abnormal) to bivalve \therefore	larvae 465 ± 471
	- not toxic $(31.9 \pm 15.5\%)$	abnormal) to bivalve larvae	210 ± 237
- 56	SOUTHERN CALIFORI	NIA	
		65% mortality) to G. japonica	509 ± 354
	- not toxic (23.2% morta		63 ± 96
47	ELIZABETH RIVER, V	IRCINIA	
-1/		anthurus exposed to 100% Elizab	oth
	River sediment	uninurus exposed to 100% Elizab	
		hurus exposed to 56% Elizabeth	98500 River
	sediment	-	55160
		hurus exposed to 2.5% Elizabeth	
	sediment		2462
ational S	creening Level Concen	trations	
5	marine sediments @ 1%	TOC	396
14	marine sediments @ 1%	TOC	397

.

Reference	s Biological Approaches		Concentrations (ppb)	
Equilibrium Partitioning				
4	EPA chronic marine EP	threshold (@4% TOC)	1800000	
17	EPA acute marine EP th	reshold (@4% TOC)	1800000	
13		rine permissable contaminant water quality criteria @ 1% T		
13	95 percentile chronic man derived from chronic	rine permissable contaminant water quality criteria @1%	TOC 45000	
6	EPA interim mean fresh upon EP @ 1% TOC	water sediment quality criter	ria based 10630	
25	Sediment safe levels based upon sediment/water partitioning coefficients and acute water quality criteria 450000			
Spiked Se	diment Bioassays			
65	Significant toxicity to R. abronius with mixtures of aromatic and chlorinated hydrocarbons 4100 ± 600			
Reference	e Background Approach Concentrations (ppb organic car		oncentrations (ppb organic carbor	
23	Rotterdam Harbor Sediment Quality Classifications- Class 1 (slightly contaminated)- Class 2 (moderately contaminated)- Class 3 (contaminated)- Class 4 (heavily contaminated)- Class 4 (heavily contaminated)		0.3-0.6 OC 0.6-2 OC	
Reference	S:			
1. Beller et al., 1986 17. Lyman et al., 1987 2. PTI Environmental Services, 1988 20. U.S. ACOE, 1988 4. Bolton et al., 1985 21. Swartz et al., 1989 5. Neff et al., 1986 23. Jensen, 1987 6. EPA, 1988 25. Pavlou, 1987 13. Pavlou et al., 1987 29. Yake et al., 1986 14. Neff et al., 1987 47. Roberts et al., 1989		 U.S. ACOE, 1988 Swartz et al., 1989 Jensen, 1987 	 56. Anderson <i>et al.</i>, 1988 65. Plesha <i>et al.</i>, 1988 80. Tetra Tech, 1985 85. CH²M Hill, 1989 * Various, please see text 	

99

Table 47. Effects range-low and effects range-median values for benzo(a)pyrene and 27 concentrations used to determine these values arranged in ascending order.

Concentrations (ppb)	End Point
396	Marine SLC
397	Marine SLC
400	ER-L
404	San Francisco Bay, California bioassay COA
465	San Francisco Bay, California bioassay COA
509	Southern California bioassay COA
684	Commencement Bay, Washington bioassay COA
890	Commencement Bay, Washington bioassay COA
1091	San Francisco Bay, California bioassay COA
1192	Commencement Bay, Washington bioassay COA
1261	Commencement Bay, Washington bioassay COA
1600	Puget Sound, Washington AET - bivalve
1600	Puget Sound, Washington AET - Microtox™
2400	Puget Sound, Washington AET - amphipod
2462	Elizabeth River, Virginia bioassay COA
2500	ER-M
3000	Puget Sound, Washington AET - amphipod
3600	Puget Sound, Washington AET - benthic
4100	SSB with R. abronius: mixtures
5335	Eagle Harbor, Washington bioassay COA
6800	Puget Sound, Washington AET - benthic
10630	EP interim freshwater criteria @ 1% TOC
18000	99 percentile EP chronic marine @ 1% TOC
45000	95 percentile EP chronic marine @ 1% TOC
55160	Elizabeth River, Virginia bioassay COA
98500	Elizabeth River, Virginia bioassay COA
220000	Lake Union, Washington bioassay COA
450000	EP acute sediment safe level
1800000	EP chronic marine @ 4% TOC

Benzo(e)pyrene

The data available for benzo(e)pyrene are restricted to bioassays of sediments from San Francisco Bay, southern California, and Elizabeth River (Table 48). The amount and variety of data are insufficient to warrant the determination of ER-L and ER-M values. In San Francisco Bay, observations of effects were associated with mean concentrations of benzo(e)pyrene ranging from 194 ± 228 ppb to 624 ± 234 ppb. In southern California the mean concentration associated with high toxicity was 434 ± 318 , within the range observed in San Francisco Bay. Toxicity to *L. xanthurus* was recorded at higher concentrations in bioassays of Elizabeth River sediments. Additional data are needed to determine a preponderance of evidence of the benzo(e)pyrene concentrations associated with adverse biological effects.

Table 48. Summary of sediment effects data available for benzo(e)pyrene.

Referenc	es Biolo	gical Approaches	Concentrations (ppb)
Apparent	: Effects Threshold		
*	SAN FRANCISCO BAY, - bivalve larvae bioassay - R. abronius amphipod	У У	92 690
Co-Occur	rence Analyses		
*		6 mortality) to R. abronius ± 4.7% mortality) to R. abroniu	s 166 ± 346 166 ± 130 153 ± 184
	- significantly toxic (42.9 - not toxic (18.4 ± 6.8% n	\pm 19.2% mortality) to <i>R. abron</i> mortality) to <i>R. abron</i>	tius 268 ± 276 157 ± 206
	- moderately toxic (59.4 :	% abnormal) to bivalve larvae ± 11.3% abnormal) to bivalve l abnormal) to bivalve larvae	e 625 ± 234 arvae 194 ± 228 92 ± 44
		\pm 22.7% abnormal) to bivalve abnormal) to bivalve larvae	larvae 250 ± 263 65 ± 27
56	SOUTHERN CALIFORN - significantly toxic (51.6 - not toxic (23.2% mortal	5% mortality) to G. japonica	434 ± 318 69 ± 106
47	River sediment - LC50 (24-h) for L. xanth	RGINIA <i>nthurus</i> exposed to 100% Eliza <i>urus</i> exposed to 56% Elizabeth	78100
	River sediment - LC50 (28-d) for L. xanth River sediment	urus exposed to 2.5% Elizabeth	43736 1952

References:

47. Roberts et al., 1989

56. Anderson et al., 1988

* Various, please see text.

Biphenyl

Data for biphenyl are available from bioassays of sediments from San Francisco Bay, southern California, Black Rock Harbor, and the Elizabeth River (Table 49). These data are insufficient to determine the ER-L and ER-M values in sediments associated with effects. Mean concentrations ranging from 6.6 ± 9.0 to 26.3 ± 9.0 ppb were associated with measures of toxicity in San Francisco Bay sediments. In southern California sediments, significant toxicity was associated with a mean concentration of 443 ppb. Elizabeth River sediments that were highly toxic to *L. xanthurus* had very high biphenyl concentrations.

Referei	nces Biological Approaches	Concentrations (ppb)			
Appare	Apparent Effects Threshold				
*	SAN FRANCISCO BAY, CALIFORNIA AET - bivalve larvae bioassay - R. abronius amphipod bioassay	7 27			
Co-Occ	urrence Analyses				
*	SAN FRANCISCO BAY, CALIFORNIA - highly toxic ($67 \pm 11.8\%$ mortality) to <i>R. abronius</i> - moderately toxic ($33.8 \pm 4.7\%$ mortality) to <i>R. abroniu</i> - least toxic ($18 \pm 6.6\%$ mortality) to <i>R. abronius</i>	$\begin{array}{c} 10 \pm 13 \\ 7 \pm 9 \\ 6 \pm 8 \end{array}$			
	- significantly toxic (42.9 \pm 19.2% mortality) to R. abro- - not toxic (18.4 \pm 6.8% mortality) to R. abronius	nius 7 ± 11 7 ± 8			
	- highly toxic (92.4 \pm 4.5% abnormal) to bivalve larva - moderately toxic (59.4 \pm 11.3% abnormal) to bivalve - least toxic (23.3 \pm 7.3% abnormal) to bivalve larvae				
	- significantly toxic (55.7 \pm 22.7% abnormal) to bivalve - not toxic (31.9 \pm 15.5% abnormal) to bivalve larvae	e larvae 8 ± 10 2 ± 4			
56	SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA - significantly toxic (51.65% mortality) to G. japonica - not toxic (23.2% mortality) to G. japonica	443 ± 1080 √ 6.2 ± 8.4 √			
47	ELIZABETH RIVER, VIRGINIA - 100% mortality to <i>L. xanthurus</i> exposed to 100% Eliza sediment	85000			
	 LC50 (24-h) for L. xanthurus exposed to 56% Elizabeth sediment 	47600			
	 LC50 (28-d) for L. xanthurus exposed to 2.5% Elizabet sediment 	h River 2125			
58	BLACK ROCK HARBOR, CONNECTICUT - significant toxicity to <i>A. abdita</i> in 10-d bioassay	13.5			

References:

47.	Roberts et al., 1989	58.	Rogerson et al.,
56.	Anderson et al., 1988	*	Various, please see text

Chrysene

Data for chrysene are available from studies in which Puget Sound AETs were calculated; bioassays of sediments from Commencement Bay, Eagle Harbor, Lake Union, Columbia River, San Francisco Bay, southern California, and Elizabeth River were performed; national SLCs were determined; and various EP-derived thresholds were calculated (Table 50). Small gradients in chrysene concentrations were observed in bioassays of a dilution series of Eagle Harbor sediments and in amphipod bioassays of San Francisco Bay sediments. Also, a small gradient in chrysene concentrations was observed between Commencement Bay sediments that were moderately versus least toxic to amphipods. No toxicity was observed in Columbia River sediments that had up to 4100 ppb chrysene. These data were not used to determine ER-L and ER-M values (Table B-23).

The lower 10 percentile value of the remaining data suggest an ER-L concentration of about 400 ppb (384 rounded to 400 ppb), a value supported by a marine SLC of 384 ppb (Table 51). Some measures of effects were observed in association with chrysene concentrations as low as a mean of 368 ppb. With the exceptions of Eagle Harbor and Columbia River bioassay data, effects almost always were observed or predicted at concentrations of about 900 ppb or more. The 50 percentile value of the data suggest an ER-M of about 2800 ppb, a value supported by two Puget Sound AETs (both 2800 ppb).

The degree of confidence in the ER-L and ER-M values should be considered as moderate. Data are available from a variety of geographic areas and approaches, but are not tightly clustered around the ER-L and ER-M values. There is an overall apparent effects threshold at about 900 ppb, supported by a variety of observed and predicted concentrations associated with effects and within the ER-L/ER-M range.

Table 50. Summary of sediment effects data available for chrysene.

Referenc	es Biological Approaches	Concentrations (ppb)
Apparent	Effects Threshold	
1	1986 PUGET SOUND AET	
	- R. abronius amphipod bioassay	2800
	- oyster larvae (C. gigas) bioassay	2800
	- benthic community composition	6700
	- Microtox™ bioassay	1400
2	1988 PUGET SOUND AET	•
	- R. abronius amphipod bioassay	9200
	- oyster larvae (C. gigas) bioassay	2800
	- benthic community composition	9200
	- Microtox™ bioassay	1400
20	PSDDA guidelines (based upon Puget Sound AET)	
	- screening level concentration	670
	- maximum level criterion	6700
*	SAN FRANCISCO BAY, CALIFORNIA AET	
	- bivalve larvae bioassay	1700
	- R. abronius amphipod bioassay	2100
Co-Occur	rence Analyses	. · ·
80	COMMENCEMENT BAY, WASHINGTON	
	- highly toxic (15.7 \pm 3.9 dead/20) to R. abronius	1363 ± 1970
	- moderately toxic (5.2 \pm 1.1 dead/20) to R. abronius	821 ± 732
	- least toxic (2.5 \pm 0.9 dead/20) to R. abronius	748 ± 773
	- highly toxic (44.5 \pm 19% abnormal) to oyster larvae	1218 ± 1286
	- moderately toxic ($23 \pm 2.3\%$ abnormal) to oyster larvae	902 ± 691
	- least toxic (15.1 \pm 3.1% abnormal) to oyster larvae	358 ± 365
85	EAGLE HARBOR, WASHINGTON	
	- highly toxic (19.1 \pm 1.7 dead/20) to R. abronius	10574 ± 7337
	- moderately toxic (8.2 \pm 1.8 dead/20) to R. abronius	9203 ± 10972
	- least toxic (2.6 \pm 1.4 dead/20) to R. abronius	3165 ± 4535

•

.

Referer	nces Biological Approaches	Concentrations (ppb)
Co-Occi	urrence Analyses	
21	- predicted LC50 for <i>R. abronius</i> in 10-d dilution series with Yaquina Bay, Oregon sediment	80
29	LAKE UNION, WASHINGTON - 95% mortality to <i>H. azteca</i>	170000
52	COLUMBIA RIVER, WASHINGTON/OREGON not toxic (0-13% mortality) to H. azteca	4100
*	SAN FRANCISCO BAY, CALIFORNIA - highly toxic ($67 \pm 11.8\%$ mortality) to <i>R. abronius</i> - moderately toxic ($33.8 \pm 4.7\%$ mortality) to <i>R. abronius</i> - least toxic ($18 \pm 6.6\%$ mortality) to <i>R. abronius</i>	517 ± 729 413 ± 385 378 ± 549
	- significantly toxic (42.9 \pm 19.2% mortality) to <i>R. abronius</i> - not toxic (18.4 \pm 6.8% mortality) to <i>R. abronius</i>	423 ± 512 405 ± 571
	- highly toxic (92.4 \pm 4.5% abnormal) to bivalue larvae - moderately toxic (59.4 \pm 11.3% abnormal) to bivalue larva - least toxic (23.3 \pm 7.3% abnormal) to bivalue larvae	1679 ± 847 ae 368 ± 466 82 ± 37
	- significantly toxic (55.7 \pm 22.7% abnormal) to bivalve lar - not toxic (31.9 \pm 15.5% abnormal) to bivalve larvae	vae 500 ± 671 198 ± 276
56	SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA - significantly toxic (51.7% mortality) to <i>G. japonica</i> - not toxic (23.2% mortality) to <i>G. japonica</i>	524 ± 284 127 ± 226
47	 ELIZABETH RIVER, VIRGINIA 100% mortality to <i>L. xanthurus</i> exposed to 100% Elizabeth River sediment LC50 (24-hr) for <i>L. xanthurus</i> exposed to 56% Elizabeth River sediment LC50 (28-d) for <i>L. xanthurus</i> exposed to 2.5% Elizabeth River sediment 	n 317000 177520 7925✔
Nationa	l Screening Level Concentrations	
5	Marine sediments @ 1% TOC	384
14	Marine sediments @ 1% TOC	384
Equilib	rium Partitioning	
4	EPA chronic marine EP threshold (@ 4% TOC)	460000
17	EPA acute marine EP threshold (@ 4% TOC)	460000
13	99 percentile chronic marine permissable contaminant deriv from chronic water quality criteria @ 1% TOC	red 1200
13	95 percentile chronic marine permissable contaminant deriv from chronic water quality criteria @ 1% TOC	ved 4400

5. Neff et al., 1986

13. Pavlou et al., 1987

References **Biological Approaches** Concentrations (ppb) **Equilibrium Partitioning** Sediment safe levels based upon sediment/water partitioning 25 coefficients and acute water quality criteria 115000 **References:** 1. Beller et al., 1986 52. Johnson and Norton, 1988 17. Lyman et al., 1987 2. PTI Environmental Services, 1988 20. U.S. ACOE, 1988 56. Anderson et al., 1988 4. Bolton et al., 1985 80. Tetra Tech, 1985 21. Swartz et al., 1989

25. Pavlou, 1987

29. Yake et al., 1986

85. CH²M Hill, 1989

Various, please see text

*

 14. Neff et al., 1987
 4.7 Roberts et al., 1989

 Table 51. Effects range-low and effects range-median values for chrysene and 27 concentrations used to determine these values arranged in ascending order.

Concentrations (pp)	b) End Point
80	Predicted Eagle Harbor LC50amphipod COA
368	San Francisco Bay, California bioassay COA
384	Marine SLC
400	ER-L
500	San Francisco Bay, California bioassay COA
524	Southern California bioassay COA
902	Commencement Bay, Washington bioassay COA
1200	99 percentile EP chronic marine @ 1% TOC
1218	Commencement Bay, Washington bioassay COA
1363	Commencement Bay, Washington bioassay COA
1400	Puget Sound, Washington AET - Microtox™
1679	San Francisco Bay, California bioassay COA
1700	San Francisco Bay, California bioassay COA
2100	San Francisco Bay, California bioassay COA
2800	Puget Sound, Washington AET - bivalve
2800	ER-M
2800	Puget Sound, Washington AET- amphipod
4400	95 percentile EP chronic marine @ 1% TOC
6700	Puget Sound, Washington AET - benthic
7925✔	Elizabeth River, Virginia bioassay
9200	Puget Sound, Washington AET - amphipod
9200	Puget Sound, Washington AET - benthic
9203	Eagle Harbor, Washington bioassay COA
10574	Eagle Harbor, Washington bioassay COA
115000 170000	EP acute sediment safe level
177520	Lake Union, Washington bioassay COA
317000	Elizabeth River, Virginia bioassay COA
460000	Elizabeth River, Virginia bioassay COA EP chronic marine threshold @ 4% TOC

105

Dibenz(a,h)anthracene

Data are available for this aromatic hydrocarbon from determinations of Puget Sound and San Francisco Bay AETs, EP-derived thresholds, and evaluations of bioassay data from Commencement Bay, Eagle Harbor, and southern California (Table 52). There was either a small gradient or no concordance between dibenz(a,h)anthracene concentrations and toxicity to amphipods exposed to San Francisco Bay sediments. Commencement Bay and Eagle Harbor sediments that were highly toxic to amphipods had lower dibenz(a,h)anthracene concentrations than those respective samples that were moderately toxic. Therefore, these data were not considered in the determination of ER-L and ER-M values (Table B-24).

Effects in sediments were observed in association with mean dibenz(a,h)anthracene concentrations as low as 42 ± 46 ppb (Table 53). The lower 10 percentile of the data is equivalent to an ER-L value of about 60 ppb, a value supported by bioassay data from San Francisco Bay (mean 63 ± 80 ppb) and from southern California (mean 66 ± 46 ppb). The 50 percentile of the data suggest an ER-M of about 260 ppb, a value supported by three Puget Sound AETs (230, 230, 260 ppb), a San Francisco Bay AET (260 ppb), and Commencement Bay sediments that were highly toxic to oyster larvae (mean 263 ± 413 ppb). Except for amphipod bioassay data from Eagle Harbor and a San Francisco Bay AET for amphipod bioassays, effects were usually observed in association with concentrations of about 100 ppb or more (Table B-24). The threshold concentrations predicted by EP methods were considerably higher than those observed with measures of effects in field-collected samples.

The degree of confidence in the ER-L and ER-M values for dibenz(a,h)anthracene should be considered as moderate. A relatively small amount of data exist with which to relate chemical concentrations to measures of effects; there are no SSB data; and there was relatively poor concordance or small gradients in concentrations among samples that were toxic and those that were nontoxic. However, there was a degree of convergence among the data and there appears to be an effects threshold within the ER-L/ER-M range at about 100 ppb with few contradictory data.

Refer	ences Bi	ological Approaches	Concentrations (ppb)
Appa	rent Effects Threshold		
1	1986 PUGET SOUND AET		
	- R. abronius amphipod b		260
	- oyster larvae (C. gigas)	bioassay	230
	- benthic community comp	osition	1200
	- Microtox [™] bioassay		230
2	1988 PUGET SOUND AET	[
-	- R. abronius amphipod b		540
	- oyster larvae (C. gigas)	bioassay	230
	- benthic community comp		970
	- Microtox™ bioassay		230
20	PSDDA guidelines (based	upon Puget Sound AET)	
	- screening level concentra	tion	120
	- maximum level criterior	 L	1200
		- ·	
*	SAN FRANCISCO BAY,	CALIFORNIA AET	
	- bivalve larvae bioassay	,	260
	- R. abronius amphipod b	ioassay	300

Table 52. Summary of sediment effects data available for dibenz(a,h)anthracene.

Table 52. Dibenz(a,h)anthracene (continued)	
References	Biological Approaches

1

.

Co-Occurrence Analyses

PTI Environmental Services, 1988
 Pavlou et al., 1987

80	COMMENCEMENT BAY, WASHINGTON - highly toxic ($15.7 \pm 3.9 \text{ dead}/20$) to <i>R. abronius</i> - moderately toxic ($5.2 \pm 1.1 \text{ dead}/20$) to <i>R. abronius</i> - least toxic ($2.5 \pm 0.9 \text{ dead}/20$) to <i>R. abronius</i>	72 ± 139 183 ± 344 73 ± 71
	- highly toxic (44.5 \pm 19% abnormal) to oyster larvae - moderately toxic (23 \pm 2.3% abnormal) to oyster larvae - least toxic (15.1 \pm 3.1% abnormal) to oyster larvae	263 ± 413 101 ± 58 55 ± 41
85	EAGLE HARBOR, WASHINGTON - highly toxic (19.1 \pm 1.7 dead/20) to <i>R. abronius</i> - moderately toxic (8.2 \pm 1.8 dead/20) to <i>R. abronius</i> - least toxic (2.6 \pm 1.4 dead/20) to <i>R. abronius</i>	399 ± 252 797 ± 723 360 ± 298
	SAN FRANCISCO BAY, CALIFORNIA - highly toxic ($67 \pm 11.8\%$ mortality) to <i>R. abronius</i> - moderately toxic ($33.8 \pm 4.7\%$ mortality) to <i>R. abronius</i> - least toxic ($18 \pm 6.6\%$ mortality) to <i>R. abronius</i>	80 ± 88 44 ± 32 57 ± 77
•	- significantly toxic (42.9 \pm 19.2% mortality) to R. abronius - not toxic (18.4 \pm 6.8% mortality) to R. abronius	$55 \pm 58 \\ 62 \pm 80$
	- highly toxic (92.4 \pm 4.5% abnormal) to bivalve larvae - moderately toxic (59.4 \pm 11.3% abnormal) to bivalve larvae - least toxic (23.3 \pm 7.3% abnormal) to bivalve larvae	217 ± 88 42 ± 46 15 ± 15
	- significantly toxic (55.7 \pm 22.7% abnormal) to bivalve larvae - not toxic (31.9 \pm 15.5% abnormal) to bivalve larvae	63 ± 80 21 ± 22
56	SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA - significantly toxic (51.7% mortality) to G. japonica - not toxic (23.2% mortality) to G. japonica	66 ± 46 24 ± 36
lquili	brium Partitioning	
13	99 percentile chronic marine permissable contaminant derived from chronic water quality criteria @ 1% TOC	12000
	95 percentile chronic marine permissable contaminant derived from chronic water quality criteria @ 1% TOC	35000
25	Sediment safe levels based upon sediment/water partitioning coefficients and acute water quality criteria	240000

85. CH²M Hill, 1989
* Various, please see text

25. Pavlou, 1987 56. Anderson et al., 1988

Table 53. Effects range-low and effects range-median values for dibenz(a,h)anthracene and 18 concentrations used to determine these values arranged in ascending order.

Concentrations (ppb)	End Point
42	San Francisco Bay, California bioassay COA
60	ER-L
63	San Francisco Bay, California bioassay COA
66	Southern California bioassay COA
101	Commencement Bay, Washington bioassay COA
183	Commencement Bay, Washington bioassay COA
217	San Francisco Bay, California bioassay COA
230	Puget Sound, Washington AET - oyster
230	Puget Sound, Washington AET - Microtox™
260	Puget Sound, Washington AET - amphipod
260	ER-M
260	San Francisco Bay, California AET
263	Commencement Bay, Washington bioassay COA
540	Puget Sound, Washington AET - amphipod
797	Eagle Harbor, Washington bioassay COA
970	Puget Sound, Washington AET - benthic
1200	Puget Sound, Washington AET - benthic
12000	99 percentile EP chronic marine @ 1% TOC
35000	95 percentile EP chronic marine @ 1% TOC
240000	EP acute sediment safe level

2,6-Dimethylnaphthalene

Very few data are available with which to relate the concentrations of 2,6dimethylnaphthalene to measures of effects in sediments (Table 54). The San Francisco Bay bioassay data indicated relatively high toxicity to bivalve larvae in samples with 53 ± 29 ppb 2,6-dimethylnaphthalene; whereas in southern California, sediments with similar concentrations (56 ± 10 ppb) were not toxic to amphipods. Southern California sediments that were highly toxic to amphipods had concentrations (115 ± 278 ppb) that were similar to those in sediments spiked with hydrocarbon mixtures that were toxic to amphipods (150 ± 20 ppb). There are too few data to warrant determination of ER-L and ER-M values for this chemical.

Refere	nces Biological Approach	Concentrations (ppb)
Co-Occ	urrence Analyses	
*	SAN FRANCISCO BAY, CALIFORNIA - highly toxic ($67 \pm 11.8\%$ mortality) to <i>R. abronius</i> - moderately toxic ($33.8 \pm 4.7\%$ mortality) to <i>R. abronius</i> - least toxic ($18 \pm 6.6\%$ mortality) to <i>R. abronius</i>	18 ± 28 10 ± 15 10 ± 19
	- significantly toxic (42.9 \pm 19.2% mortality) to <i>R. abronius</i> - not toxic (18.4 \pm 6.8% mortality) to <i>R. abronius</i>	s 13 ± 22 12 ± 20

Referei	nces Biological Approach	Concentrations (ppb)
Co-Occurrence Analyses		
	- highly toxic (92.4 \pm 4.5% abnormal) to bivalue larvae - moderately toxic (59.4 \pm 11.3% abnormal) to bivalue larv - least toxic (23.3 \pm 7.3% abnormal) to bivalue larvae	$\begin{array}{ccc} 53 \pm 29 \\ 73 \pm 14 \\ 3 \pm 4 \end{array}$
	- significantly toxic (55.7 \pm 22.7% abnormal) to bivalve lar - not toxic (31.9 \pm 15.5% abnormal) to bivalve larvae	rvae 14 ± 22 5 ± 5
56	SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA - significantly toxic (51.7% mortality) to G. japonica - not toxic (23.2% mortality) to G. japonica	115 ± 278 56 ± 110
Spiked	Sediment Bioassays	ŧ
65	Significant toxicity to <i>R. abronius</i> with mixtures of aromat and chlorinated hydrocarbons	tic 150 ± 20

References:

56. Anderson *et al.*, 1988

65. Plesha et al., 1988

Various, please see text

Fluoranthene

Data are available from studies in which Puget Sound AETs were determined; toxicity thresholds were predicted using EP methods; national SLCs were calculated; SSBs were performed; and bioassays were performed with sediments from Commencement Bay, Eagle Harbor, Lake Union, Columbia River, San Francisco Bay, southern California, Palos Verdes, and Elizabeth River (Table 55). Only three of the Palos Verdes samples were analyzed for fluoranthene concentrations. There was either a small gradient or no gradient in fluoranthene concentrations between San Francisco Bay sediments that were least, moderately, and most toxic to amphipods and significantly toxic versus not toxic to amphipods. There was no gradient in fluoranthene concentrations between Commencement Bay sediments that were least and moderately toxic to amphipods. Moderately toxic Eagle Harbor sediments had a lower mean fluoranthene concentration than those that were least toxic. These data were not used to determine ER-L and ER-M values (Table B-25).

Effects in sediments were observed in association with mean fluoranthene concentrations as low as 382 ± 617 ppb (Table 56). The lower 10 percentile value in the data suggest an ER-L of about 600 ppb, a concentration supported by the predicted LC50 derived from amphipod bioassays of a dilution series of Eagle Harbor sediments (600 ppb) and a marine SLC concentration assuming 1 percent TOC content (644 ppb). The 50 percentile value in the data suggest an ER-M of about 3600 ppb. This value is supported by a chronic marine EP-derived concentration (3100 ppb), an LC50 determined in a SSB (3300 ppb), an EP-derived chronic safe level (3600 ppb), a Puget Sound AET (3700 ppb), and a San Francisco Bay AET (3900 ppb). Effects were almost always observed in association with fluoranthene concentrations of about 1000 ppb (1 ppm) or more. There were two exceptions to this apparent threshold: bioassay data from the Columbia River, in which no effects were observed in sediments with up to 2100 ppb fluoranthene; and bioassay data from Eagle Harbor, where there was no toxicity in sediments with a mean concentration of 12080 ppb (Table B-25). The degree of confidence in these ER-L and ER-M values should be considered as relatively high. Data are available from all of the major approaches; clusters of data support the values; and the overall apparent effects threshold lies within the range of ER-L and ER-M values.

eference	s Biological Approaches	Concentrations (ppb)
pparent	Effects Threshold	
1	1986 PUGET SOUND AET	
-	- R. abronius amphipod bioassay	3900
	- oyster larvae (C. gigas) bioassay	2500
	- benthic community composition	6300
	- Microtox TM bioassay	1700
2	1988 PUGET SOUND AET	
	- R. abronius amphipod bioassay	30000
	- oyster larvae (C. gigas) bioassay	2500
	- benthic community composition	24000
,	- Microtox™ bioassay	1700
20	PSDDA GUIDELINES (based upon Puget Sound AET)	
	- screening level concentration	630
	- maximum level criterion	6300
+	SAN FRANCISCO BAY, CALIFORNIA AET	,
	- bivalve larvae bioassay	2000
	- R. abronius amphipod bioassay	>3700
o-Occurr	ence Analyses	
80	COMMENCEMENT BAY, WASHINGTON	
	- highly toxic (15.7 \pm 3.9 dead/20) to R. abronius	2360 ± 3330
	- moderately toxic (5.2 \pm 1.1 dead/20) to R. abronius	925 ± 864
	- least toxic (2.5 \pm 0.9 dead/20) to R. abronius	923 ± 865
	- highly toxic (44.5 \pm 19% abnormal) to oyster larvae	1655 ± 2029
	- moderately toxic ($23 \pm 2.3\%$ abnormal) to oyster larvae	1046 ± 655
	- least toxic (15.1 \pm 3.1% abnormal) to oyster larvae	489 ± 492
85	EAGLE HARBOR, WASHINGTON	
	- highly toxic (19.1 \pm 1.7 dead/20) to R. abronius	71988 ± 95713
	- moderately toxic (8.2 \pm 1.8 dead/20) to R. abronius	8895 ± 10337
	- least toxic (2.6 \pm 1.4 dead/20) to R. abronius	12080 ± 51889
21	- predicted LC50 for R. abronius in 10-d dilution series	
	with Yaquina Bay, Oregon. sediment	600
29	LAKE UNION, WASHINGTON	
	- 95% mortality to H. azteca	570000
	COLUMPTA DIVED WACUINCTON ODECON	
52	COLUMBIA RIVER, WASHINGTON/OREGON	

Table 55. Summary of sediment effects data available for fluoranthene.

 Table 55.
 Fluoranthene (continued)

•

Reference	s Biological Approaches Conce	ntrations (ppb)
Co-Occurr	ence Analyses	
*	SAN FRANCISCO BAY, CALIFORNIA - highly toxic (67 \pm 11.8% mortality) to <i>R. abronius</i> - moderately toxic (33.8 \pm 4.7% mortality) to <i>R. abronius</i> - least toxic (18 \pm 6.6% mortality) to <i>R. abronius</i>	794 ± 1210 509 ± 481 539 ± 842
	- significantly toxic (42.9 \pm 19.2% mortality) to <i>R. abronius</i> - not toxic (18.4 \pm 6.8% mortality) to <i>R. abronius</i>	584 ± 789 572 ± 880
	- highly toxic (92.4 \pm 4.5% abnormal) to bivalve larvae - moderately toxic (59.4 \pm 11.3% abnormal) to bivalve larvae - least toxic (23.3 \pm 7.3% abnormal) to bivalve larvae	$\begin{array}{c} 2737 \pm 1617 \\ 451 \pm 562 \\ 136 \pm 107 \end{array}$
	- significantly toxic (55.7 \pm 22.7% abnormal) to bivalve larvae - not toxic (31.9 \pm 15.5% abnormal) to bivalve larvae	$\begin{array}{c} 682 \pm 1043 \\ 382 \pm 617 \end{array}$
56	SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA - significantly toxic (51.7% mortality) to <i>G. japonica</i> - not toxic (23.2% mortality) to <i>G. japonica</i>	382 ± 241 153 ± 307
49	PALOS VERDES SHELF, CALIFORNIA - significantly toxic to R. abronius - not toxic to R. abronius	193 ± 143 98
47	 ELIZABETH RIVER, VIRGINIA 100% mortality to <i>L. xanthurus</i> exposed to 100% Elizabeth River sediment LC50 (24-h) for <i>L. xanthurus</i> exposed to 56% Elizabeth River sediment LC50 (28-d) for <i>L. xanthurus</i> exposed to 2.5% Elizabeth River sediment 	er 2,370,000 1,327,200◊ 59,250
National S	Screening Level Concentrations	
5	Marine sediments @ 1% TOC	432
14	Marine sediments @ 1% TOC	644
Equilibriu	m Partitioning	
. 17	EPA acute marine EP threshold (@ 4% TOC)	36,000
13	99 percentile chronic marine permissable contaminant derived fro chronic water quality criteria @ 1% TOC	om 1600
13	95 percentile chronic marine permissable contaminant derived fro chronic water quality criteria @ 1% TOC	om 3100
6	EPA interim mean freshwater sediment quality criteria based up EP @ 1% TOC	on 18,800
25	Sediment safe levels based upon sediment/water partitioning coefficients and acute water quality criteria	9000

Table 55. Fluoranthene (continued)

Referenc	ces Biological	Approaches	Concentrations (ppb)
Equilibri	ium Partitioning		
25		ed upon sediment/water partition vic water quality criteria	ing 3600
Spiked S	Sediment Bloassays		
65	Significant toxicity to R. and chlorinated hydroca	<i>abronius</i> with mixtures of aroma rbons	tic 15000
18	LC50 (10-d) for R. abroni	us	4200
19	LC50 for R. abronius @ 0 LC50 for R. abronius @ 0 LC50 for R. abronius @ 0	.3% TOC	3300 6200 10500
Referenc	ce Back	Background Approach	
23	Rotterdam Harbor Sedima - Class 1 (slightly contam - Class 2 (moderately cont - Class 3 (contaminated) - Class 4 (heavily contami	inated) aminated)	<0.4 OC 0.4-1 OC 1-4.5 OC >4.5 OC
Referenc	ces:	•	
2. PTI E	r et al., 1986 Invironmental Services, 1988 et al., 1986 1988	20. U.S. ACOE, 1988 21. Swartz et al., 1989	 Swartz et al., 1985 Johnson and Norton, 1988 Anderson et al., 1988 Plesha et al., 1988 Mater Theory 1988

- 13. Pavlou et al., 1987
- 14. Neff et al., 1987
- 17. Lyman et al., 1987
- 18 Swartz et al., 1988

25. Pavlou, 1987 29. Yake et al., 1986 47. Roberts et al., 1989 80. Tetra Tech, 1985 85. CH²M Hill, 1989 * Various, please see text

Table 56. Effects range-low and effects range-median values for fluoranthene and 33 concentraations used to determine these values arranged in ascending order.

Concentrations (ppb)	End Point
382	Southern California bioassay COA
432	Marine SLC
451	San Francisco Bay, California bioassay COA
600	ER-L
600	Eagle Harbor, Washington bioassay COA
644	Marine SLC
682	San Francisco Bay, California bioassay COA

112

Concentrations (ppb)	End Point	
1046	Commencement Bay, Washington bioassay COA	
1600	99 percentile EP chronic marine @ 1% TOC	
1655	Commencement Bay, Washington bioassay COA	
1700	Puget Sound, Washington AET - Microtox TM	
2000	San Francisco Bay, California AET	
2360	Commencement Bay, Washington bioassay COA	
2500	Puget Sound, Washington AET - oyster	
2737	San Francisco Bay, California bioassay COA	
3100	95 percentile EP chronic marine @ 1% TOC	
3300	SSB LC50 for R. abronius @ 0.2% TOC	
3600	ER-M	
3600	EP chronic sediment safe level	
3900	Puget Sound, Washington AET - amphipod	
4200	SSB LC50 for R. abronius	
6200 .	SSB LC50 for R. abronius @ 0.3% TOC	
6300	Puget Sound, Washington AET - benthic	
9000	EP acute sediment safe level	
10500	SSB LC50 for R. abronius @ 0.5% TOC	
15000	SSB with R. abronius: mixtures	
18800	EP interim freshwater criteria @ 1% TOC	
24000	Puget Sound, Washington AET - benthic	
30000	Puget Sound, Washington AET - amphipod	
36000	EP acute marine threshold @ 4% TOC	
59250	Elizabeth River, Virginia bioassay COA	
71988	Eagle Harbor, Washington bioassay COA	
570000	Lake Union, Washington bioassay COA	
1,327,200	Elizabeth River, Virginia bioassay COA	
2,370,000	Elizabeth River, Virginia bioassay COA	

Fluorene

Data for fluorene are available from studies in which Puget Sound AETs were calculated; national SLCs were determined; EP-derived thresholds were predicted; effects upon fish were determined in SSBs; and bioassays were performed with sediments from Commencement Bay, Eagle Harbor, Lake Union, San Francisco Bay, southern California, Elizabeth River, and Black Rock Harbor (Table 57). Data from SSBs with winter flounder (*Pseudopleuronectes americanus*) are available. The winter flounder were exposed to Venezuelan crude mixed into sediments placed in a layer in large aquaria for 4 months (Payne *et al.*, 1988). There was little or no concordance between fluorene concentrations and toxicity to amphipods in San Francisco Bay. There was a small gradient in fluorene concentrations between Commencement Bay and Eagle Harbor sediments that were least and moderately toxic to amphipods. These data were not used to determine the ER-L and ER-M values (Table B-26).

Effects determined with bivalve larvae bioassays of San Francisco Bay sediments were observed in association with very low levels of fluorene (Table 58). These data influenced the determination of the ER-L value of 35 ppb. The 50 percentile value in the data suggest an ER-M of 640 ppb, a value supported by three Puget Sound AETs (all 540 ppb), a Puget Sound AET for benthic communities (640 ppb), and high toxicity in Commencement Bay (mean 707 ppb). Except for the Eagle Harbor amphipod bioassay data, there is an overall apparent effects threshold at about 350 ppb. However, this apparent threshold is highly influenced by only Puget Sound and Commencement Bay data and not by other supporting data. The degree of confidence in the ER-L and ER-M values for fluorene should be considered as low and moderate, respectively. Although there are data from several approaches and matching effects and chemical data from many geographic areas, the data indicate poor convergence around the ER-L value. The ER-L is supported by data only from San Francisco Bay and the ER-M is supported by data only from Puget Sound (including Commencement Bay). Some of the concentrations derived from the EP and SSB approaches suggest that the threshold for effects occurs at much higher concentrations than indicated by the ER-L and ER-M values.

Reference	s Biological Approaches	Concentrations (ppb)		
Apparent Effects Threshold				
1	1986 PUGET SOUND AET			
_	- R. abronius amphipod bioassay	540		
	- oyster larvae (C. gigas) bioassay	540		
	- benthic community composition	640		
	- Microtox™ bioassay	540		
2	1988 PUGET SOUND AET			
	- R. abronius amphipod bioassay	3600		
	- oyster larvae (Ĉ. <i>ģigas</i>) bioassay	540		
	- benthic community composition	1000		
·	- Microtox TM bioassay	540		
20	PSDDA guidelines (based upon Puget Sound AET)			
	- screening level concentration	64		
	- maximum level criterion	640		
*	SAN FRANCISCO BAY, CALIFORNIA AET			
	- bivalve larvae bioassay	11		
	- R. abronius amphipod bioassay	210		
Co-Occurr	ence Analyses			
80	COMMENCEMENT BAY, WASHINGTON			
	- highly toxic (15.7 \pm 3.9 dead/20) to R. abronius	707 ± 1341		
	- moderately toxic (5.2 \pm 1.1 dead/20) to R. abronius	147 ± 131		
	- least toxic (2.5 \pm 0.9 dead/20) to R. abronius	117 ± 113		
	- highly toxic (44.5 \pm 19% abnormal) to oyster larvae	353 ± 746		
	- moderately toxic ($23 \pm 2.3\%$ abnormal) to oyster larvae	143 ± 119		
	- least toxic (15.1 \pm 3.1% abnormal) to oyster larvae	75 ± 76		
85	EAGLE HARBOR, WASHINGTON			
	- highly toxic (19.1 \pm 1.7 dead/20) to R. abronius	22811 ± 65559		
	- moderately toxic (8.2 \pm 1.8 dead/20) to R. abronius	187 ± 234		
	- least toxic (2.6 \pm 1.4 dead/20) to R. abronius	1017 ± 4679		
21	- predicted LC50 for R. abronius in 10-d dilution series			
	with Yaquina Bay, Oregon sediment	210		
29	LAKE UNION, WASHINGTON			
	- 95% mortality to H. azteca	40000		

Table 57. Summary of sediment effects data available for fluorene.

Table 57. Fluorene (continued)

.

Referenc	ces Biological Approaches	Concentrations (ppb)		
Co-Occurrence Analyses				
*	SAN FRANCISCO BAY, CALIFORNIA - highly toxic ($67 \pm 11.8\%$ mortality) to <i>R. abronius</i> - moderately toxic ($33.8 \pm 4.7\%$ mortality) to <i>R. abronius</i> - least toxic ($18 \pm 6.6\%$ mortality) to <i>R. abronius</i>			
.•	- significantly toxic (42.9 \pm 19.2% mortality) to R. - not toxic (18.4 \pm 6.8% mortality) to R. <i>abronius</i>	abronius 29 ± 48 43 ± 51		
	- highly toxic (92.4 \pm 4.5% abnormal) to bivalve la - moderately toxic (59.4 \pm 11.3% abnormal) to biva - least toxic (23.3 \pm 7.3% abnormal) to bivalve large	lve larvae 19 ± 30		
	- significantly toxic (55.7 \pm 22.7% abnormal) to biv - not toxic (31.9 \pm 15.5% abnormal) to bivalve larva	valve larvae 35 ± 64 ae 16 ± 23		
56	SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA - significantly toxic (51.7% mortality) to G. japonic - not toxic (23.2% mortality) to G. japonica	$\begin{array}{c} 11.3 \pm 8.2 \checkmark \\ 8 \pm 16 \checkmark \end{array}$		
47	ELIZABETH RIVER, VIRGINIA - 100% mortality to L. xanthurus exposed to 100% sediment	1250000		
	 LC50 (24-h) for L. xanthurus exposed to 56% Eliza sediment 	beth River 700000		
	 LC50 (28-d) for L. xanthurus exposed to 2.5% Eliz sediment 	abeth River 31250✔		
58	BLACK ROCK HARBOR, CONNECTICUT - significant toxicity to <i>A. abdita</i> in 10-d bioassay	93		
National	l Screening Level Concentrations			
14	Marine sediments @ 1% TOC	101		
Equilibri	ium Partitioning			
4	EPA chronic marine EP threshold(@ 4% TOC)	28000		
13	99 percentile chronic marine permissable contamina chronic water quality criteria @ 1% TOC	ant derived from 59		
13	95 percentile chronic marine permissable contamina chronic water quality criteria @ 1% TOC	ant derived from 160		
25	Sediment safe levels based upon sediment/water p coefficients and acute water quality criteria @ 1			
Spiked-S	Sediment Bioassays			
59	Liver somatic condition indices elevated in winter MFO induction in winter flounder liver significant MFO induction in winter flounder kidney significa	ly elevated 176510		

.

Table 57. Fluorene (continued)

References:

1. Beller et al., 1986 21. Swartz et al., 1989 58. Rogerson et al., 1985 2. PTI Environmental Services, 1988 25. Pavlou, 1987 59. Payne et al., 1988 4. Bolton et al., 1985 29. Yake et al., 1986 80. Tetra Tech, 1985 85. CH²M Hill, 1989 13. Pavlou et al., 1987 47. Roberts et al., 1989 14. Neff et al., 1987 56. Anderson et al., 1988 Various, please see text 20. U.S. ACOE, 1988

Table 58. Effects range-low and effects range-median values for fluorene and t	
concentrations used to determine these values arranged in ascending order.	

Concentrations (ppb) End Point		
11	San Francisco Bay, California AET	
19	San Francisco Bay, California bioassay COA	
35	ER-L	
35	San Francisco Bay, California bioassay COA	
59	99 percentile EP chronic marine @ 1% TOC	
93	Black Rock Harbor, Connecticut bioassay COA	
101	Marine SLC	
143	Commencement Bay, Washington bioassay COA	
160	95 percentile EP chronic marine @ 1% TOC	
162	San Francisco Bay, California bioassay COA	
210	Eagle Harbor, Washington bioassay COA	
353	Commencement Bay, Washington bioassay COA	
540	Puget Sound, Washington AET - amphipod	
540	Puget Sound, Washington AET - oyster	
540	Puget Sound, Washington AET - Microtox™	
640	ER-M	
640	Puget Sound, Washington AET - benthic	
707	Commencement Bay, Washington bioassay COA	
1000	Puget Sound, Washington AET - benthic	
3600	Puget Sound, Washington AET - amphipod	
7000	EP acute sediment safe level	
22811	Eagle Harbor, Washington bioassay COA	
28000	EP chronic marine @ 4% TOC	
31250	Elizabeth River, Virginia bioassay COA	
40000	Lake Union, Washington bioassay COA	
176510	SSB with flounder	
220550	SSB with flounder	
285290	SSB with flounder	
700000	Elizabeth River, Virginia bioassay COA	
1250000	Elizabeth River, Virginia bioassay COA	

1-methylnaphthalene

The data available for 1-methylnaphthalene are from bioassays of sediments from San Francisco Bay and southern California and amphipod bioassays of sediments spiked with mixtures of hydrocarbons. Many of the San Francisco Bay samples were not analyzed for 1-methylnaphthalene; the small amount of data available indicated poor concordance between toxicity and chemical concentrations. The mean concentration in southern California samples that were significantly toxic to amphipods was 192.8 ± 461.1 ppb versus 36.2 ± 65.6 ppb in

non-toxic samples. The concentration of 1-methylnaphthalene was 500 ppb in a mixture of hydrocarbons that was toxic to amphipods. There are too little data to determine ER-L and ER-M values for this hydrocarbon.

2-methylnaphthalene

There are somewhat more data available for 2-methylnaphthalene (Table 59) than for 1methylnaphthalene. They are from determinations of Puget Sound AET; bioassays of sediments from Commencement Bay, San Francisco Bay, southern California, and Elizabeth River; and amphipod bioassays of sediments spiked with hydrocarbon mixtures. There was a small gradient in 2-methylnaphthalene concentrations between San Francisco Bay samples that were least and moderately toxic to bivalve larvae. There was no concordance between toxicity to amphipods and 2-methylnaphthalene concentrations in San Francisco Bay. Commencement Bay sediments that were moderately toxic to both bivalve larvae and amphipods had 2-methylnaphthalene concentrations similar to those that were least toxic. These data were not used to determine the ER-L and ER-M values (Table B-27).

The lower 10 percentile of the data suggest an ER-L of about 65 ppb, a value supported by high toxicity in southern California sediments (mean 65 ± 154 ppb) (Table 60). The 50 percentile of the data suggest an ER-M of about 670 ppb, a value supported by four Puget Sound AETs (all 670 ppb). There appears to be an overall effects threshold at about 300 ppb, but it is supported by relatively few data and data mainly from Commencement Bay and other parts of Puget Sound (Table B-27).

The degree of confidence in the ER-L and ER-M values for 2-methylnaphthalene should be considered as low and moderate, respectively. They are supported by small clusters of data. There are no single-chemical, spiked-sediment data, no thresholds predicted by EP methods, and the matching biological and chemical data are from only a few geographic areas. However, the apparent effects threshold lies within the ER-L/ER-M range and is not contradicted by observations of no effects at greater concentrations.

References	Biological Approach	Concentrations (ppb)		
Apparent Effects Threshold				
1	1986 PUGET SOUND AET - R. abronius amphipod bioassay	670		
	- oyster larvae (C. gigas) bioassay	670		
	- benthic community composition	670		
	- Microtox™ bioassay	670		
2	1988 PUGET SOUND AET			
_	- R. abronius amphipod bioassay	1900		
	- oyster larvae (C. gigas) bioassay	670		
	- benthic community composition	1400		
	- Microtox™ bioassay	670		
20	PSDDA guidelines (based upon Puget Sound AET)			
	- screening level concentration	67		
	- maximum level criterion	670		
*	SAN FRANCISCO BAY, CALIFORNIA AET			
	- bivalve larvae bioassay	27		
	- R. abronius amphipod bioassay	>130		

Table 59. Summary of sediment effects data available for 2-methylnaphthalene.

 Table 59.
 2-methylnaphthalene (continued).

References	Biological Approach C	Concentrations (ppb)
Co-Occurre	nce Analyses	
80	COMMENCEMENT BAY, WASHINGTON - highly toxic (15.7 \pm 3.9 dead/20) to R. abronius	546 ± 490
	- moderately toxic (5.2 \pm 1.1 dead/20) to <i>R. abronius</i> - least toxic (2.5 \pm 0.9 dead/20) to <i>R. abronius</i>	213 ± 129 168 ± 169
	- highly toxic (44.5 \pm 19% abnormal) to oyster larvae - moderately toxic (23 \pm 2.3% abnormal) to oyster larvae - least toxic (15.1 \pm 3.1% abnormal) to oyster larvae	326 ± 313 207 ± 169 165 ± 121
*	SAN FRANCISCO BAY, CALIFORNIA - highly toxic ($67 \pm 11.8\%$ mortality) to R. abronius	32 ± 41
	- moderately toxic (33.8 \pm 4.7% mortality) to <i>R. abronius</i> - least toxic (18 \pm 6.6% mortality) to <i>R. abronius</i>	34 ± 27 34 ± 33
	- significantly toxic (42.9 \pm 19.2% mortality) to <i>R. abroniu</i> - not toxic (18.4 \pm 6.8% mortality) to <i>R. abronius</i>	us 31 ± 33 39 ± 35
	- highly toxic (92.4 \pm 4.5% abnormal) to bivalve larvae - moderately toxic (59.4 \pm 11.3% abnormal) to bivalve lar - least toxic (23.3 \pm 7.3% abnormal) to bivalve larvae	98 ± 41 vae 26 ± 23 20 ± 7
	- significantly toxic (55.7 \pm 22.7% abnormal) to bivalve la - not toxic (31.9 \pm 15.5% abnormal) to bivalve larvae	
56	SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA - significantly toxic (51.7% mortality) to G. japonica - not toxic (23.2% mortality) to G. japonica	65 ± 154 16 ± 33
 47 ELIZABETH RIVER, VIRGINIA - 100% mortality to L. xanthurus exposed to 100% Elizabeth River sediment - LC50 (24-h) for L. xanthurus exposed to 56% Elizabeth 		th 31800
	River sediment - LC50 (28-d) for L. xanthurus exposed to 2.5% Elizabeth	17808
	River sediment	795
Spiked-Sedi	ment Bioassays	s.
65	Significant toxicity to <i>R. abronius</i> with mixtures of aroma and chlorinated hydrocarbons	tic 500
References:		
1. Beller <i>et a</i> 2. PTI Enviro 0. U.S. ACO	onmental Services, 1988 56. Anderson et al., 1988 *). Tetra Tech, 1985 Various, please see text

.

 Table 60.
 Effects range-low and effects range-median values for 2-methylnaphthalene

 and 15 concentrations used to determine those values arranged in ascending order.

Concentrations (ppb)	End Point	
27	San Francisco Bay, California AET	
65	ER-L	
65	Southern California bioassay COA	
98	San Francisco Bay, Californía bioassay COA	
326	Commencement Bay, Washington bioassay COA	
500	SSB with R. abronius: mixtures	
546	Commencement Bay, Washington bioassay COA	
670	Puget Sound, Washington AET - amphipod	
670	Puget Sound, Washington AET - oyster	
670	Puget Sound, Washington AET - benthic	
670	ER-M	
670	Puget Sound, Washington AET - Microtox™	
795	Elizabeth River, Virginia bioassay COA	
1400	Puget Sound, Washington AET - benthic	
1900	Puget Sound, Washington AET - amphipod	
17808	Elizabeth River, Virginia bioassay COA	
31800	Elizabeth River, Virginia bioassay COA	

1-methylphenanthrene

There are no data available with which to relate effects in sediments to the concentrations of this hydrocarbon in sediments.

Naphthalene

Puget Sound and San Francisco Bay AET concentrations, freshwater and saltwater SLCs, and three EP-derived concentrations are available for naphthalene (Table 61). Also, co-occurrence analyses were performed with bioassay data from Commencement Bay, Eagle Harbor, Puget Sound, San Francisco Bay, Lake Union, southern California, and benthic community data from the Trinity River. Concentrations predicted or projected to co-occur with toxicity in dilution series of sediments from Black Rock Harbor and Eagle Harbor are available. Data from SSBs with winter flounder and spot (*Leistomus xanthurus*) are also available. The winter flounder were exposed to Venezuelan crude mixed into sediments placed in a layer in large aquaria for 4 months (Payne *et al.*, 1988). The spot were held for 28 days in cages that were placed upon and slightly immersed in Elizabeth River sediments added to large aquaria (Roberts *et al.*, 1989).

Naphthalene represented a small proportion of the total PAH in Black Rock Harbor and Eagle Harbor sediments that were tested in dilution series. There was either no concordance or a small gradient in naphthalene concentrations among San Francisco Bay sediments tested with amphipods. Moderately toxic Eagle Harbor sediments had lower naphthalene concentrations than least toxic samples. These data were not used to determine the ER-L and ER-M values (Table B-28).

The available data (Table 62) suggest an ER-L of about 340 ppb (the lower 10 percentile of the data), a value supported by moderate toxicity in Puget Sound. There is an overall apparent threshold in the data at about 500 ppb; effects have been almost always observed above that concentration in sediments. The 50 percentile value in the data (the ER-M) is about 2100 ppb, a value supported by four Puget Sound AETs (2100 ppb) and an LC50 from a series of bioassays of Elizabeth River sediments tested with spot (2375 ppb).

There is a relatively large amount of data and they are from all the major approaches. There is a consistent cluster of data from two approaches supporting the ER-M value, but not the ER-L value. The ER-L and ER-M values were influenced mainly by San Francisco Bay and Puget Sound data, respectively. The degree of confidence in these values should be considered as moderate and high, respectively. Except for the Commencement Bay samples least toxic to amphipods and the Trinity River bioassay data, the majority of the data indicate that effects almost always occur at concentrations above about 500 ppb (0.5 ppm) napthalene. This overall apparent effects threshold is suggested by an EP-derived concentration (500 ppb) and moderately toxic Commencement Bay samples (mean 593 \pm 505 ppb) and lies within the ER-L/ER-M range

Table 61. Summary of	sediment	effects	data available	for naphthalene.
----------------------	----------	---------	----------------	------------------

Referer -	ce Biological Approach	Concentrations (ppb)		
Apparent Effects Threshold				
1	1986 PUGET SOUND AET			
	- R. abronius amphipod bioassay	2100		
	- oyster larvae (C. gigas) bioassay	2100		
	- benthic community composition	2100		
	- Microtox™ bioassay	2100		
	1988 PUGET SOUND AET			
	- R. abronius amphipod bioassay	2400		
	- oyster larvae (C. gigas) bioassay	2100		
	- benthic community composition	2700		
	- Microtox™ bioassay	. 2100		
20	PSDDA guidelines (based upon Puget Sound AET)	~		
	- screening level concentration	210		
	- maximum level criterion	2100		
*	SAN FRANCISCO BAY, CALIFORNIA AET			
	- bivalve larvae bioassay	>160		
	- R. abronius amphipod bioassay	>160		
Co-Occ	urrence Analyses			
57 1	PUGET SOUND WASHINGTON	•		
	- highly toxic (15-minute EC50; 0.31 \pm 0.13) to P. phosphoreum	3934 ± 8864		
	- moderately toxic (15-minute EC50; 2.1 \pm 0.8) to P. phosphoreu	$m = 343 \pm 388$		
	- least toxic (15-minute EC50; 8.9 \pm 3.3) to P. phosphoreum	36 ± 50		
80	COMMENCEMENT BAY, WASHINGTON			
	- highly toxic (15.7 \pm 3.9 dead/20) to R. abronius	1564 ± 1735		
	- moderately toxic (5.2 \pm 1.1 dead/20) to R. abronius	594 ± 424		
	- least toxic (2.5 \pm 0.9 dead/20) to R. abronius	510 ± 499		
•	- highly toxic (44.5 \pm 19% abnormal) to oyster larvae	973 ± 1041		
	- moderately toxic (23 \pm 2.3% abnormal) to oyster larvae	593 ± 505		
	- least toxic (15.1 \pm 3.1% abnormal) to oyster larvae	358 ± 326		
85	EAGLE HARBOR, WASHINGTON			
	- highly toxic (19.1 \pm 1.7 dead/20) to R. abronius	1501 ± 2064		
	- moderately toxic (8.2 \pm 1.8 dead/20) to R. abronius	288 ± 201		
	- least toxic (2.6 \pm 1.4 dead/20) to R. abronius	456 ± 682		
21	- predicted LC50 for R. abronius in 10-d dilution series with			
	Yaquina Bay, Oregon sediment	. 30		

 Table 61. Naphthalene (continued).

Refere	ence	Biological Approach	Concentrations (ppb)
Co-Oc	currence Analys	es	
29	LAKE UNION, - 95% mortality	WASHINGTON to H. azteca	40000
4	 highly toxic (6 moderately tox 	CO BAY, CALIFORNIA 7 \pm 11.8% mortality) to R. abronius kic (33.8 \pm 4.7% mortality) to R. abroniu \pm 6.6% mortality) to R. abronius	$\begin{array}{cccc} 64 \ \pm \ 46 \\ s & 48 \ \pm \ 25 \\ 58 \ \pm \ 51 \end{array}$
		to R. abror \pm 19.2% mortality) to R. abror \pm 6.8% mortality) to R. abronius	$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$
	- moderately to:	2.4 \pm 4.5% abnormal) to bivalve larvae xic (59.4 \pm 11.3% abnormal) to bivalve l 3 \pm 7.3% abnormal) to bivalve larvae	127 ± 32 arvae 43 ± 26 63 ± 57
	- significantly to - not toxic (31.9	to bivalve \pm 22.7% abnormal) to bivalve \pm 15.5% abnormal) to bivalve larvae	larvae 53 ± 40 89 ± 64
56	SOUTHERN CA - significantly to - not toxic (23.2	ALIFORNIA oxic (51.7% mortality) to G. japonica % mortality) to G. japonica	77 ± 181 8 ± 16
51	TRINITY BAY - low benthic sp - high benthic s	, TEXAS ecies richness (28.2 ± 2.9) pecies richness (33.3 ± 4.0)	11500 ± 5600 5250 ± 1500
47	 100% mortality sediment LC50 (24-h) for sediment 	VER, VIRGINIA y to L. xanthurus exposed to 100% Elizab r L. xanthurus exposed to 56% Elizabeth r L. xanthurus exposed to 2.5% Elizabeth	95000 River 53200
58		HARBOR, CONNECTICUT icity to <i>A. abdita</i> in 10-d bioassay	4.25
Natio	nal Screening Le	vel Concentrations	
5	Marine sedimen	ts @ 1% TOC	367.0
14	Marine sedimen	ts @ 1% TOC	414
Equili	brium Partitioni	ng	
4	EPA chronic ma	rine EP threshold (@ 4% TOC)	42000
17	EPA acute mar	ine EP threshold (@ 4% TOC)	42000
13		ronic marine permissable contaminant de quality criteria @ 1% TOC	rived from 500

,

Table 61. Naphthalene (continued).

Refe	tence B	iological Approach	Concentrations (ppb)	
Equilibrium Partitioning				
13	95 percentile chronic man chronic water quality c	rine permissable contaminant rriteria @ 1% TOC	derived from 720	
Spike	ed-Sediment Bioassays			
59	MFO induction in winter	ndices elevated in winter flou r flounder liver significantly e r flounder kidney significantly	elevated 6200	

¹ Total concentration includes sum of naphthalene, 1-methylnaphthalene, 2methylnaphthalene, 2,6-dimethylnaphthalene, and 2,3,5-trimethylnaphthalene.

References:

1.	Beller et al., 1986	17. Lyman et al., 1987	56. Anderson et al., 1988
2.	PTI Environmental Services, 1988	20. U.S. ACOE, 1988	57. Schiewe et al., 1985
4.	Bolton et al., 1985	21. Swartz et al., 1989	58. Rogerson et al., 1985
5.	Neff et al., 1986	29. Yake et al., 1986	59. Payne et al., 1988
13.	Pavlou et al., 1987	47. Roberts et al., 1989	80. Tetra Tech, 1985
	Neff et al., 1987 Various, please see text	51. Armstrong et al., 1979	85. CH ² M Hill, 1989

Table 62. Effects range-low and effects range-median values for naphthalene and 28 concentrations used to determine these values arranged in ascending order.

Concentrations	(ppb) End Point
77	Southern California bioassay COA
127	San Francisco Bay, California bioassay COA
340	ER-L
343	Puget Sound, Washington bioassay COA
367 🖌	Marine SLC
414	Marine SLC
500	99 Percentile EP chronic marine @ 1% TOC
593	Commencement Bay, Washington bioassay COA
- 594	Commencement Bay, Washington bioassay COA
720	95 percentile EP chronic marine @ 1% TOC
973	Commencement Bay, Washington bioassay COA
1501	Eagle Harbor, Washington bioassay COA
1564	Commencement Bay, Washington bioassay COA COA
2100	Puget Sound, Washington AET- amphipod
2100	Puget Sound, Washington AET - oyster
2100	ER-M
2100	Puget Sound, Washington AET - benthic
2100	Puget Sound, Washington AET - Microtox™
2375	Elizabeth River, Virginia bioassay COA
2400	Puget Sound, Washington AET - amphipod
2700	Puget Sound, Washington AET - benthic

Concentrations	(ppb) End Point
3934	Puget Sound, Washington bioassay COA
6200	SSB with flounder
7370	SSB with flounder
10710	SSB with flounder
11500	Trinity River, Texas benthos COA
40000	Lake Union, Washington bioassay COA
42000	EP acute marine threshold @ 4% TOC
53200	Elizabeth River, Virginia bioassay COA
95000	Elizabeth River, Virginia bioassay COA

Perylene

Data available for perylene are from studies in which bioassays of San Francisco Bay, southern California, and Elizabeth River sediments were performed (Table 63). There are too little data to warrant determination of ER-L and ER-M values, however, some of the available data suggest a degree of convergence. The San Francisco Bay AET for amphipod bioassays, San Francisco Bay sediments highly toxic to amphipods and bivalve larvae, and southern California sediments significantly toxic to amphipods had similar perylene concentrations (230, and means of 173, 212, and 175 ppb, respectively). The perylene concentrations in Elizabeth River sediments that were toxic to *L. xanthurus* were much higher (means of 1677 ppb and greater).

Table 63. Summary of sediment effects data available for perylene.

Referenc	es Biological Approaches	Concentrations (ppb)
Apparent Effects Thresholds		
*	SAN FRANCISCO BAY, CALIFORNIA AET - bivalve larvae bioassay - R. abronius amphipod bioassay	95 230
Co-Occur	rence Analyses	
*	SAN FRANCISCO BAY, CALIFORNIA - highly toxic ($67 \pm 11.8\%$ mortality) to <i>R. abronius</i> - moderately toxic ($33.8 \pm 4.7\%$ mortality) to <i>R. abroniu</i> - least toxic ($18 \pm 6.6\%$ mortality) to <i>R. abronius</i>	us 173 ± 124 139 ± 43 98 ± 68
	- significantly toxic (42.9 \pm 19.2% mortality) to R. abro - not toxic (18.4 \pm 6.8% mortality) to R. abronius	nius 159 ± 92 85 ± 68
	- highly toxic (92.4 \pm 4.5% abnormal) to bivalve larvae - moderately toxic (59.4 \pm 11.3% abnormal) to bivalve - least toxic (23.3 \pm 7.3% abnormal) to bivalve larvae	e 212 ± 39 larvae 132 ± 92 81 ± 78
	- significantly toxic (55.7 \pm 22.7% abnormal) to bivalue - not toxic (31.9 \pm 15.5% abnormal) to bivalue larvae	e larvae 146 ± 86 32 ± 55

Referen	ces Biological Approaches	Concentrations (ppb)
Co-Occu	rrence Analyses	
56	SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA - significantly toxic (51.65% mortality) to G. japonica - not toxic (23.2% mortality) to G. japonica	175 ± 120 82 ± 118
47	ELIZABETH RIVER, VIRGINIA - 100% mortality to L. xanthurus exposed to 100% Eliza - LC50 (24-h) for L. xanthurus exposed to 56% Elizabeth - LC50 (28-d) for L. xanthurus exposed to 2.5% Elizabeth	h River sediment 28392

References:

47. Roberts et al., 1989

56. Anderson et al., 1988

Various, please see text

Phenanthrene

Data available for phenanthrene are from studies in which Puget Sound AETs were determined; SSBs were performed with amphipods and winter flounder; national SLCs were calculated; EP-derived thresholds were predicted; and bioassays of sediments from Commencement Bay, Eagle Harbor, Lake Union, San Francisco Bay, southern California, Columbia River, and Elizabeth River were performed (Table 64). San Francisco Bay sediments that were least, moderately, and highly toxic to amphipods had similar phenanthrene concentrations. San Francisco Bay sediments that were significantly toxic to bivalve larvae had similar concentrations of phenanthrene compared to those that were not toxic. Eagle Harbor sediments that were moderately toxic to amphipods had a lower mean phenenathrene concentration than those that were least toxic. These data were not used to determine ER-L and ER-M values (Table B-29).

The lower 10 percentile value of the data suggests an ER-L of about 225 ppb, a value supported by southern California and San Francisco Bay bioassay data (means of 222 ± 136 ppb and 224 ± 203 ppb, respectively) (Table 65). The 50 percentile of the data suggest an ER-M of about 1380 ppb, a value supported by highly toxic Commencement Bay samples (mean of 1379 ± 2546 ppb) and an EP-derived criterion of 1390 ppb. There is an overall apparent effects threshold at about 260 ppb, but there are data from Commencement Bay, Eagle Harbor, and the Columbia River that contradict that observation.

The degree of confidence in the ER-L and ER-M values for phenanthrene should be considered as moderate. There are data from all of the major approaches and there is convergence within this range, but the data from a SSB with an amphipod suggest that the effects threshold among sensitive species may occur at concentrations much greater than the ER-L/ER-M range. The AET lies within the ER-L/ER-M range, but is contradicted by observations of no effects at higher concentrations determined in three study areas.

Table 64. Summary of sediment effects data available for phenanthrene. References Biological Approaches Concentrations (ppb) Apparent Effects Thresholds

Apparent	t Effects Thresholds	
1	1986 PUGET SOUND AET - R. abronius amphipod bioassay - oyster larvae (C. gigas) bioassay - benthic community composition - Microtox [™] bioassay	5400 1500 3200 1500
2	1988 PUGET SOUND AET - R. abronius amphipod bioassay - oyster larvae (C. gigas) bioassay - benthic community composition - Microtox [™] bioassay	6900 1500 5400 1500
20	PSDDA guidelines (based upon Puget Sound AET) - screening level concentration - maximum level criterion	320 3200
*	SAN FRANCISCO BAY, CALIFORNIA AET - bivalve larvae bioassay - R. abronius amphipod bioassay	88 510
Co-Occu	rrence Analyses	
80	COMMENCEMENT BAY, WASHINGTON - highly toxic (15.7 \pm 3.9 dead/20) to <i>R. abronius</i> - moderately toxic (5.2 \pm 1.1 dead/20) to <i>R. abronius</i> - least toxic (2.5 \pm 0.9 dead/20) to <i>R. abronius</i> - highly toxic (44.5 \pm 19% abnormal) to oyster larvae	2838 ± 4603 597 ± 513 478 ± 367 1379 ± 2546
	- moderately toxic (23 \pm 2.3% abnormal) to oyster larvae - least toxic (15.1 \pm 3.1% abnormal) to oyster larvae	593 ± 365 297 ± 263
85	EAGLE HARBOR, WASHINGTON - highly toxic (19.1 \pm 1.7 dead/20) to <i>R. abronius</i> - moderately toxic (8.2 \pm 1.8 dead/20) to <i>R. abronius</i> - least toxic (2.6 \pm 1.4 dead/20) to <i>R. abronius</i>	33603 ± 84430 2142 ± 2404 2600 ± 10009
21	 predicted LC50 for R. abronius in 10-d dilution series with Yaquina Bay, Oregon sediment 	950
29	LAKE UNION, WASHINGTON - 95% mortality to <i>H. azteca</i>	410000
52	COLUMBIA RIVER, WASHINGTON/OREGON - not toxic (0-13% mortality) to <i>H. azteca</i>	580
*	SAN FRANCISCO BAY, CALIFORNIA - highly toxic ($67 \pm 11.8\%$ mortality) to <i>R. abronius</i> - moderately toxic ($33.8 \pm 4.7\%$ mortality) to <i>R. abronius</i> - least toxic ($18 \pm 6.6\%$ mortality) to <i>R. abronius</i>	242 ± 203 228 ± 146 188 ± 197
	- significantly toxic (42.9 \pm 19.2% mortality) to <i>R. abronius</i> - not toxic (18.4 \pm 6.8% mortality) to <i>R. abronius</i>	220 ± 163 199 ± 205

Table 64. Summary of sediment effects data available for phenanthrene.

Referen	ces Bio	logical Approaches	Concentrations (ppb)
Co-Occu	rrence Analyses		······································
	- moderately toxic (59.4	5% abnormal) to bivalve larvae 4 ± 11.3% abnormal) to bivalve la % abnormal) to bivalve larvae	$\begin{array}{rrr} 475 \pm 160 \\ 224 \pm 203 \\ 65 \pm 30 \end{array}$
		.7 ± 22.7% abnormal) to bivalve l % abnormal) to bivalve larvae	larvae 233 ± 208 159 ± 216
56	SOUTHERN CALIFOR - significantly toxic (51 - not toxic (23.2% mort	.7% mortality) to G. japonica	222 ± 136 119 ± 242
47	River sediment - LC50 (24-h) for L. xan sediment	VIRGINIA xanthurus exposed to 100% Elizab athurus exposed to 56% Elizabeth athurus exposed to 2.5% Elizabeth	220000 River 2363200
National	Screening Level Conce	ntrations	
5	Marine sediments @ 1%	6 TOC	259
14	Marine sediments @ 19	6 ТОС	368
Equilibr	ium Partitioning		
4	EPA chronic marine EI	? threshold (@ 4% TOC)	56000
17	EPA acute marine EP t	hreshold (@ 4% TOC)	56000
13		arine permissable contaminant de quality criteria @ 1% TOC	erived 110
13	95 percentile chronic m from chronic water o	arine permissable contaminant de quality criteria @ 1% TOC	erived 240
25		ised upon sediment/water partitic te water quality criteria @ 1% TO	
6	EPA interim mean fres @ 1% TOC	shwater sediment quality criteria	1390
	EPA interim mean mar @ 1% TOC	rine sediment quality criteria	1020
Spiked-	Sediment Bioassays		
65	Significant toxicity to and chlorinated hyd	R. <i>abronius</i> with mixtures of aron rocarbons	natic 10000¥
59	MFO induction in win	indices elevated in winter flound ter flounder liver significantly ele ter flounder kidney significantly e	evated 270

References Bio	logical Approaches	Concentrations (ppb)
Spiked-Sediment Bioassays		
21 LC50 (10-d) with R. ab	ronius	3680
References:		
1. Beller et al., 1986	17. Lyman et al., 1987	56. Anderson et al., 1988
2. PTI Environmental Services, 1988	20. U.S. ACOE, 1988	59. Payne et al., 1988
4. Bolton et al., 1985	21. Swartz et al., 1989	65. Plesha et al., 1988
5. Neff et al., 1986	25. Pavlou, 1987	85. CH ² M Hill, 1989
6. EPA, 1988	29. Yake et al., 1986	80. Tetra Tech, 1985
13. Pavlou et al., 1987	47. Roberts et al., 1989	 Various, please see text
14. Neff et al., 1987	52. Johnson et al., 1988	. •

Table 65. Effects range-low and effects range-median values for phenanthrene and 34 concentrations used to determine these values arranged in ascending order.

Concentrations (ppb)	End Point
88	San Francisco Bay, California AET
110	99 percentile EP chronic marine @ 1% TOC
222	Southern California bioassay COA
224	San Francisco Bay, Californía bioassay COA
225	ER-L
240	95 percentile EP chronic marine @ 1% TOC
259	Marine SLC
270	SSB with flounder
340	SSB with flounder
368	Marine SLC
429	SSB with flounder
475	San Francisco Bay, California bioassay COA
500	SSB with R. abronius: mixtures
510	San Francisco Bay, California AET
593	Commencement Bay, Washington bioassay COA
597	Commencement Bay, Washington bioassay COA
950	Eagle Harbor, Washington bioassay COA
1020	EP interim marine criteria @ 1% TOC
1379	Commencement Bay, Washington bioassay COA
1380	ER-M
1390	EP interim freshwater criteria @ 1% TOC
1500	Puget Sound, Washington AET - oyster
1500	Puget Sound, Washington AET - Microtox™
2838	Commencement Bay, Washington bioassay COA
3200	Puget Sound, Washington AET - benthic
3680	SSB with R. abronius LC50
5400	Puget Sound, Washington AET- amphipod
5400	Puget Sound, Washington AET - benthic
6900	Puget Sound, Washington AET - amphipod
14000	EP acute sediment safe level

127

33603	Eagle Harbor, Washington bioassay COA
56000	EP chronic marine @ 4% TOC
105500	Elizabeth River, Virginia bioassay COA
220000	Elizabeth River, Virginia bioassay COA
410000	Lake Union, Washington bioassay COA
2363200	Elizabeth River, Virginia bioassay COA

Pyrene

Data available for pyrene are from studies in which Puget Sound AETs were determined; national SLCs were calculated; EP-derived thresholds were predicted; SSBs with winter flounder were conducted; and bioassays of sediments from Commencement Bay, Eagle Harbor, Lake Union, San Francisco Bay, southern California, and Elizabeth River were performed (Table 66). San Francisco Bay sediments that were significantly toxic to both amphipods and bivalve larvae had pyrene concentrations similar to the samples that were not toxic. San Francisco Bay sediments that were highly toxic to amphipods had pyrene concentrations similar to those that were least toxic. Commencement Bay sediments that were least toxic. Commencement Bay sediments that were least toxic. Columbia River sediments with up to 2500 ppb pyrene were not toxic to amphipods. One each of the Puget Sound and San Francisco Bay AETs was not definitive. These data were not used to determine ER-L and ER-M values (Table B-30).

The lower 10 percentile of the data suggest an ER-L of about 350 ppb pyrene, a value supported by a predicted LC50 (350 ppb) for Eagle Harbor sediments tested with amphipods and observations of altered liver somatic condition in winter flounder exposed to petroleum (360 ppb) (Table 67). The 50 percentile value in the data suggest an ER-M of about 2200 ppb, a value supported by San Francisco Bay bioassay data (mean of 2188 ppb). Except for the Columbia River bioassay data, most of the data suggest an overall effects threshold at about 1000 ppb (1 ppm) pyrene. However, as with the other aromatic hydrocarbons, this apparent effects threshold is highly influenced by the Puget Sound AET values.

The degree of confidence in the ER-L and ER-M values should be considered as moderate. Data are available from a number of approaches and geographic areas, an apparent effects threshold lies within the ER-L/ER-M range, and there is consistency and clustering of the available data. However, there are no data from single-chemical SSBs and most of the thresholds predicted by EP methods are much higher than the concentrations within the ER-L/ER-M range.

Table 66. Summary of sediment effects data available for pyrene.

Referen	Biological Approaches	Concentrations (ppb)
Apparer	nt Effects Threshold	
1	1986 PUGET SOUND AET - <i>R. abronius</i> amphipod bioassay - oyster larvae (<i>C. gigas</i>) bioassay - benthic community composition - Microtox [™] bioassay	4300 3300 >7300 2600

Table 66. Pyrene (continued).

Referen	ces Biological Approaches	Concentrations (ppb)	
Apparent Effects Threshold			
2	1988 PUGET SOUND AET		
2		16000	
	- R. abronius amphipod bioassay	16000	
	- oyster larvae (C. gigas) bioassay	3300	
	- benthic community composition	16000	
	- Microtox™ bioassay	2600	
20	PSDDA guidelines (based upon Puget Sound AET)		
	- screening level concentration	430	
	- maximum level criterion	7300	
*	SAN FRANCISCO BAY, CALIFORNIA AET		
	- bivalve larvae bioassay	>3400	
	- R. abronius amphipod bioassay	2600	
	•••		
Co-Occi	irrence Analyses		
80	COMMENCEMENT BAY, WASHINGTON		
- •	- highly toxic (15.7 \pm 3.9 dead/20) to R. abronius	1820 ± 2252	
	- moderately toxic (5.2 \pm 1.1 dead/20) to R. abronius	865 ± 719	
	- least toxic (2.5 \pm 0.9 dead/20) to R. abronius	978 ± 996	
	highly taxis (44.5 \pm 10% showing)) to avote large	1520 ± 1501	
	- highly toxic (44.5 \pm 19% abnormal) to oyster larvae	1538 ± 1501 1078 ± 806	
	- moderately toxic ($23 \pm 2.3\%$ abnormal) to oyster larvae	1078 ± 800 434 ± 442	
	- least toxic (15.1 \pm 3.1% abnormal) to oyster larvae	404 I 442	
21	EAGLE HARBOR, WASHINGTON		
	- predicted LC50 for R. abronius in 10-d dilution series		
	with Yaquina Bay, Oregon sediment	350	
29	LAKE UNION, WASHINGTON		
-	- 95% mortality to H. azteca	750000	
52	COLUMBIA RIVER, WASHINGTON/OREGON	,	
52	- not toxic (0-13% mortality) to H. azteca	2500	
	* not toxic (0-15% mortanty) to 11. uziecu	2000	
+	SAN FRANCISCO BAY, CALIFORNIA		
٤	- highly toxic (67 \pm 11.8% mortality) to R. abronius	777 ± 908	
	- moderately toxic (33.8 \pm 4.7% mortality) to R. abronius	1110 ± 904	
	- least toxic (18 \pm 6.6% mortality) to R. abronius	701 ± 866	
	- significantly toxic (42.9 \pm 19.2% mortality) to R. abronius	896 ± 870	
	- not toxic (18.4 \pm 6.8% mortality) to <i>R. abronius</i>	743 ± 902	
-11	highly take (00 $A \pm A E \alpha$ above 1) to him in 1	0100 + 667	
	- highly toxic (92.4 \pm 4.5% abnormal) to bivalve larvae	2188 ± 776	
	- moderately toxic (59.4 \pm 11.3% abnormal) to bivalve larvae		
	- least toxic (23.3 \pm 7.3% abnormal) to bivalve larvae	216 ± 102	
	- significantly toxic (55.7 \pm 22.7% abnormal) to bivalve larve	ae 806 ± 975	
	- not toxic (31.9 \pm 15.5% abnormal) to bivalve larvae	719 ± 1123	
56	SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA		
50	- significantly toxic (51.7% mortality) to G. japonica	532 ± 372	
	- not toxic (23.2% mortality) to G. japonica	184 ± 318	

Table 66. Pyrene (continued).

Reference	s Biological Approaches	Concentrations (ppb)
Co-Occurr	rence Analyses	
47	 ELIZABETH RIVER, VIRGINIA 100% mortality to <i>L. xanthurus</i> exposed to 100% River sediment LC50 (24-hr) for <i>L. xanthurus</i> exposed to 56% E sediment LC50 (28-d) for <i>L. xanthurus</i> exposed to 2.5% El sediment 	1350000 lizabeth River 756000
National S	Screening Level Concentrations	
5	Marine sediments @ 1% TOC	434
14	Marine sediments @ 1% TOC	665
Equilibriu	m Partitioning	
4	EPA chronic marine EP threshold (@4% TOC)	198000
17	EPA acute marine EP threshold (@ 4% TOC)	198000
13	99 percentile chronic marine permissable contami derived from chronic water quality criteria @	
13	95 percentile chronic marine permissable contami derived from chronic water quality criteria @	
6	EPA interim mean freshwater sediment quality based upon EP@ 1% TOC	criteria 13100
25	Sediment safe levels based upon sediment/water coefficients and acute water quality criteria	partitioning 49500
Spiked Se	ediment Bioassays	
59	Liver somatic condition indices elevated in winte MFO induction in winter flounder liver significa MFO induction in winter flounder kidney signifi	ntly elevated 300

1. Beller et al., 1986 14. Neff et al., 1987 47. Roberts et al., 1989 2. PTI Environmental Services, 1988 17. Lyman et al., 1987 52. Johnson et al., 1988 4. Bolton et al., 1985 20. U.S. ACOE, 1988 56. Anderson et al., 1988 5. Neff et al., 1986 . 21. Swartz et al., 1989 59. Payne et al., 1988 6. EPA, 1988 , 25. Pavlou, 1987 80. Tetra Tech, 1985 . 13. Pavlou et al., 1983 29. Yake et al., 1986 ∗ Various, please see text

Table 67. Effects range-low and effects range-median values for pyrene and 28 concentrations used to determine these values arranged in ascending order.

Concentrations (ppb)	End Point		
182	SSB with flounder		
300	SSB with flounder		
350	Eagle Harbor, Washington bioassay COA		
350	ER-L		
360	SSB with flounder		
434	Marine SLC		
532	Southern California bioassay COA		
665	Marine SLC		
724	San Francisco Bay, California bioassay COA		
850	99 percentile EP chronic marine @ 1% TOC		
1078	Commencement Bay, Washington bioassay COA		
1110	San Francisco Bay, California bioassay COA		
1538	Commencement Bay, Washington bioassay COA		
1820	Commencement Bay, Washington bioassay COA		
1900	95 percentile EP chronic marine @ 1% TOC		
2188	San Francisco Bay, California bioassay COA		
2200	ER-M		
2600	Puget Sound, Washington AET - Microtox™		
2600	San Francisco Bay, California AET		
3300	Puget Sound, Washington AET - oyster		
4300	Puget Sound, Washington AET - amphipod		
13100	EP freshwater interim criteria @ 1% TOC		
16000	Puget Sound, Washington AET - amphipod		
16000	Puget Sound, Washington AET - benthic		
33750	Elizabeth River, Virginia bioassay COA		
49500	EP acute sediment safe level		
198000	EP chronic marine @ 4% TOC		
750000	Lake Union, Washington bioassay COA		
756000	Elizabeth River, Virginia bioassay COA		
1350000	Elizabeth River, Virginia bioassay COA		

2,3,5-trimethylnaphthalene

No data were located with which to relate 2,3,5-trimethylnaphthalene concentrations in sediments to measures of biological effects.

Total Polynuclear Aromatic Hydrocarbons (PAH)

The data available for total PAH include those from SSBs and co-occurrence analyses of matching bioeffects and chemical data from various investigations in the field (Table 68). The SSBs were performed with amphipods, bivalve larvae, and the fish *L. xanthurus*. The matching data are from San Francisco Bay, southern California, Eagle Harbor, Puget Sound, Commencement Bay, Mississippi Sound, Forth Estuary (Scotland), Hampton Roads, Lower Columbia River, Massachusetts Bay, and Hudson-Raritan Bay. In addition to the COA, the Mississippi Sound data from two types of bioassays (amphipod *Gammarus mucronatus* and mysid *Mysidopsis almyra*) were evaluated to determine AET concentrations.

Some of the data were not used to determine the ER-L and ER-M values (Table B-31). Some of the data from San Francisco Bay bioassays performed with amphipods, from studies of meiofauna in Forth Estuary, from bioassays of Mississippi Sound performed with mysids and with amphipods, and from moderately toxic Hampton Roads sediments tested with shrimp were not used because they either lacked a gradient in concentration or lacked concordance between the biological and the chemical data. One each of the San Francisco Bay and Mississippi Sound AETs were not definitive.

The category of total PAH is difficult to evaluate since different individual PAHs have been quantified by different investigators and reported as total PAH (Table B-31). Therefore. the data available for evaluation are not necessarily equivalent. For example, some of the data were reported as total PAH or total hydrocarbons and the identity and number of quantified hydrocarbons were not specified. Among the data sets evaluated, a minimum of 4 PAHs and a maximum of 21 PAHs were quantified. However, there is enough similarity among the data to warrant a cautious review of the concentrations associated with measures of effects in sediments. Most investigators reported the sums of 13 to 18 individual hydrocarbons. No Puget Sound AET has been reported for the category of total PAH. Also, since the Commencement Bay data were reported as sums of these two categories (low molecular weight and high molecular weight PAH), COA were performed with sums of the two mean concentrations as an approximation of total PAH. The AET concentrations determined with the Mississippi Sound data also were of questionable value. No definitive AET for the amphipod bioassay could be determined; the sample with the highest PAH concentration that was significantly toxic had 205,000 ppb PAH. Only one other sample that was significantly toxic to mysids exceeded the AET concentration of 99,400 ppb PAH in the sample.

Effects were associated with total PAH concentrations as low as 870 ppb, the AET determined for San Francisco Bay sediments tested with bivalve larvae bioassays (Table 69). The lower 10 percentile value of the data is equivalent to about 4000 ppb (3800 rounded to 4000 ppb), the ER-L concentration. This value is supported by observations in San Francisco Bay of the concentration associated with minimum measures of bioeffects (3800 ppb) and significant toxicity to bivalve larvae (mean 4022 ppb). With several exceptions, effects were usually observed in association with total PAH concentrations of about 11000 ppb or greater. There is an apparent effects threshold among the data at about 22000 ppb; effects were usually observed at higher total PAH concentrations. The 50 percentile value in the data suggests an ER-M concentration of about 35000 ppb. This concentration is supported by the observations of low Massachusetts Bay species richness (mean of 35000 ppb) and high toxicity in Hampton Roads sediments (mean of 35700 ppb).

The majority of the data are available from matching biological and chemical analyses of field-collected samples, and, therefore, are subject to the weaknesses outlined earlier in this document. The data from the few SSBs in which individual PAH were quantified indicated very high LC50s (e.g., >180,000 ppb). The individual PAH that were quantified and the number of PAH that were quantified and summed differed among investigators. There are no effects thresholds predicted by EP methods available for a category of total PAH. Small clusters of data supported the ER-L and ER-M values. The total data set had an extremely wide range in concentrations. Because of these problems, the degree of confidence in the ER-L and ER-M values for total PAH should be considered as relatively low. However, there did appear to be a relatively clear overall threshold in the data. A much more standardized method of reporting results and more data are needed to determine the total PAH concentrations associated with measures of effects in sediments.

Table 68. Summary of sediment effects data available for total PAHs.

References		Biological Approaches	Concentrations (ppb)	
Appa	rent Effects Thre	shold		
1	1986 PUGET S	OUND AET FOR LOW MOLECULAR V		
	- ovster larvae	mphipod bioassay (C. gigas) bioassay unity composition ioassay	5200 5200	
	- benthic comm	unity composition	6100	
	- Microtox™ b	ioassay	5200	

Refer	ences Biological Approaches	Concentrations (ppb)
Appa	rent Effects Threshold	
1	1986 PUGET SOUND AET FOR HIGH MOLECU	LAR WEIGHT PAH
-	- R. abronius amphipod bioassay	18000
	- oyster larvae (C. gigas) bioassay	17000
	- benthic community composition	>51000
	- Microtox™ bioassay	12000
2	AR WEIGHT PAH	
	- R. abronius amphipod bioassay	24000
	- oyster larvae (C. gigas) bioassay	5200
	- benthic community composition	13000
	- Microtox™ bioassay	5200
2	1988 PUGET SOUND AET FOR HIGH MOLECU	
	- R. abronius amphipod bioassay	69000
	- oyster larvae (C. gigas) bioassay	17000
	- benthic community composition	69000
	- Microtox™ bioassay	12000
20	- PSDDA screening level - low molecular weight	PAH 610
	- PSDDA screening level - high molecular weigh	t PAH 1800
	- PSDDA maximum level - low molecular weight	
	- PSDDA maximum level - high molecular weigh	nt PAH 51000
*	SAN FRANCISCO BAY, CALIFORNIA AET	070
	- bivalve larvae bioassay	870
	- R. abronius amphipod bioassay	>15000
84	MISSISSIPPI SOUND, MISSISSIPPI AET	- 10E000
	- AET for amphipod bioassay	>205000
	- AET for mysid bioassay	99400
Co-O	ccurrence Analyses	
80	COMMENCEMENT BAY, WASHINGTON: LOV WEIGHT PAH	V MOLECULAR
	- highly toxic (15.7 \pm 3.9 dead/20) to R. abronius	6977 ± 8437
	- moderately toxic (5.2 \pm 1.1 dead/20) to R. abron	<i>ius</i> 2031 ± 1316
	- least toxic (2.5 \pm 0.9 dead/20) to R. abronius	1602 ± 1411
	- highly toxic (44.5 \pm 19% abnormal) to oyster la	
	- moderately toxic ($23 \pm 2.3\%$ abnormal) to oyste	
	- least toxic (15.1 \pm 3.1% abnormal) to oyster large	vae 1019 ± 943
80	COMMENCEMENT BAY, WASHINGTON: HIG WEIGHT PAH	H MOLECULAR
	- highly toxic (15.7 \pm 3.9 dead/20) to R. abronius	9794 ± 12821
	- moderately toxic (5.2 \pm 1.1 dead/20) to R. abrom	
	- least toxic (2.5 \pm 0.9 dead/20) to <i>R. abronius</i>	4865 ± 4800
	- highly toxic (44.5 \pm 19% abnormal) to oyster la	
	- moderately toxic (23 \pm 2.3% abnormal) to oyste	
	- least toxic (15.1 \pm 3.1% abnormal) to oyster lar	vae 2686 ± 2631

References		Biological Approaches	Concentrations (ppb)	
Co-Occurrence Analyses				
#	 highly toxic (67 moderately toxic 	O BAY, CALIFORNIA $2 \pm 11.8\%$ mortality) to <i>R. abronius</i> ic (33.8 \pm 4.7% mortality) to <i>R. abronius</i> = 6.6% mortality) to <i>R. abronius</i>	4227 ± 5025 3966 ± 3524 3323 ± 4337	
		xic (42.9 ± 19.2% mortality) to <i>R. abron</i> = 6.8% mortality) to <i>R. abronius</i>	<i>ius</i> 3832 ± 3927 3527 ± 4520	
	- moderately toxi	2.4 \pm 4.5% abnormal) to bivalve larvae ic (59.4 \pm 11.3% abnormal) to bivalve la \pm 7.3% abnormal) to bivalve larvae		
		xic (55.7 \pm 22.7% abnormal) to bivalve \pm 15.5% abnormal) to bivalve larvae	larvae 4022 ± 4908 2557 ± 3816	
7		y triad significant bioeffects y triad minimum bioeffects	≥9500 ≤3800	
57	- moderately toxi	WASHINGTON Microtox™ bioassay c in Microtox™ bioassay icrotox™ bioassay	55630 ± 112530 13933 ± 17427 763 ± 727	
26	- moderately toxi	% LPL) to <i>R. abronius</i> c (<87.5% survival to <95% LPL) to <i>R.</i> 5% survival) to <i>R. abronius</i>	abronius 11752 ± 14548 4201 ± 4612	
52		ER, WASHINGTON 13% mortality) to H. azteca	19000	
84	 highly toxic (90 moderately toxi 	UND, MISSISSIPPI $0 \pm 11.7\%$ mortality) to mysid <i>M. almyr</i> ic (53.5 \pm 7.4% mortality) to mysid <i>M.</i> 8.8% mortality) to mysid <i>M. almyra</i>		
·		tality (71.8 \pm 21.4%) to mysid <i>M. almyr</i> 3 \pm 8.8%) to mysidd <i>M. almyra</i>	a 41790 ± 66160 8550 ± 22990	
		$0.9 \pm 24.1\%$ mortality) to amphipod G. $\pm 5.9\%$ mortality) to amphipod G. m		
	Ğ. mucronatus	xic (80.7 \pm 23.2% mortality) to amphipo 9.4% mortality) to amphipod <i>G. mucror</i>	21600 ± 31000	
79	- negative growth	TAN ESTUARY, NEW YORK 1 in nematode bioassay 1 in nematode bioassay	42769 ± 46084 21467 ± 31160	
81	- moderate meiof	Y, SCOTLAND density (112.4 ± 123/sample) aunal density (1334 ± 396/sample) l density (37574 ± 18044 /sample)	83800 ± 57900 11800 ± 9700 10200 ± 9950	

Refer	ences Biole	ogical Approaches	Concentrations (ppb)
Co-O	ccurrence Analyses		
82	MASSACHUSETTS BAY, M - low macrofaunal species ri - moderate macrofaunal spec - high macrofaunal species r	chness (31 \pm 6.5) cies richness (58.1 \pm 10.4)	35000 ± 25400 23100 ± 15400 8700 ± 12600
31	HAMPTON ROADS, VIRG - highly toxic ($70 \pm 20.3\%$ m - moderately toxic (8.8 ± 1.8 - least toxic ($2.2 \pm 1.8\%$ mor	nortality) to <i>P. pugio</i> shrimp % mortality) to <i>P. pugio</i> shrimp	35700 ± 42181 12325 ± 10425 16921 ± 20976
37	ELIZABETH RIVER, VIRGI - 56% overall mortality amo - 100% fin erosion among spo	ng spot L. xanthurus	3900000 3900000
47	sediment - LC50 (24-h) for L. xanthuru sediment	urus exposed to 100% Elizabeth as exposed to 56% Elizabeth Rive as exposed to 2.5% Elizabeth Rive	21200000✔ er 11872000✔
56	SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA - significantly toxic (51.7% n - not toxic (23.2% mortality)	mortality) to G. japonica	8363 2242
58	BLACK HARBOR, CONNE - projected concentrations si	CTICUT gnificantly toxic to A. abdita amp	hipod 11273
21	EAGLE HARBOR, WASHIN - predicted LC50 concentrati		2590
Spike	ed-Sediment Bioassays		
59	- elevated liver MFO inducti	ices in winter flounder <i>P. americ</i> ion in winter flounder <i>P. america</i> ction in winter flounder <i>P. america</i>	nus 183060
28	- Bunker C oil LC50 for R. al	bronius	2240000
30	- low (7.4%) abnormality in to petroleum products	oyster larvae (C. gigas) exposed	10000

<u>References:</u>

	Beller et al., 1986 PTI Environmental Services, 1988	31. Alden and Butt, 1987 37. Hargis <i>et al.</i> , 1984	59. Payne <i>et al.</i> , 1988 79. Tietjen <i>et al.</i> , 1984
7.	Chapman et al., 1987	47. Roberts et al., 1989	80. Tetra Tech, 1985
20.	U. S. ACOE, 1988	52. Johnson and Norton, 1988	81. Long, 1987
21.	Swartz et al., 1989	56. Anderson et al., 1988	82. Gilbert et al., 1976
26.	DeWitt et al., 1988	57. Schiewe et al., 1984	84. Lytle and Lytle, 1985
28.	Kemp et al., 1986	58. Rogerson et al., 1988	 various, see text
30.	E. V. S. Consultants, 1988		

Table 69. Effects range-low and effects range-median values for total PAHs and 34concentrations used to determine these values arranged in ascending order.

Concentrations (ppb)	End Point		
870	San Francisco Bay AETbivalve		
2590	Predicted LC50 Eagle Harbor-amphipod COA		
3343	San Francisco Bay moderately toxic-bivalve COA		
3800	San Francisco Bay triad minimum bioeffects COA		
4000	ER-L		
4022	San Francisco Bay significantly toxicbivalve COA		
7627	Puget Sound moderately toxic-amphipod COA		
7841	Commencement Bay moderately toxic-oyster COA		
8363	Southern California significantly toxicamphipod COA		
9500	San Francisco Bay triad significant bioeffects COA		
11273	Black Rock Harbor significantly toxicamphipod COA		
11735	San Francisco Bay highly toxicbivalve COA		
11752	Puget Sound highly toxicamphipod COA		
12877	Commencement Bay highly toxic-oyster COA		
13933	Puget Sound moderately toxic-Microtox™ COA		
16771	Commencement Bay highly toxic-amphipod COA		
23100	Massachusetts Bay moderate species richness COA		
35000	Massachusetts Bay low species richness COA		
35000	ER-M		
35700	Hampton Roads highly toxic-shrimp COA		
41790	Mississippi Sound significantly toxicmysid COA		
42769	Hudson-Raritan highly toxic-nematode COA		
47760	Mississippi Sound highly toxicamphipod COA		
55630	Puget Sound highly toxic-Microtox [™] COA		
66100	Mississippi Sound moderately toxic-mysid COA		
83800	Forth Estuary low meiofauna density COA		
99400	Mississippi Sound AETmysid bioassay		
183060	SSB with winter flounder liver MFO		
228722	SSB with winter flounder liver condition		
295860	SSB with winter flounder kidney MFO		
530000	LC50 2.5% Elizabeth Riverspot COA		
2240000	SSB with LC50 Bunker C oilamphipod		
390000	56% mortality Elizabeth River-spot COA		
3900000	100% fin erosion Elizabeth River-spot COA		
11872000	LC50 56% Elizabeth River-spot COA		
21200000	LC100 100% Elizabeth River-spot COA		

DISCUSSION

Review of ER-L and ER-M values

The ER-L and ER-M concentrations for each chemical and chemical group are summarized and listed in Table 70. Also, the ratios between the respective ER-L and ER-M values for each chemical are listed as a measure of the spread or range in the chemical concentrations. This ratio was generally lowest (average of 4.2 to 1) for the trace metals (especially cadmium, chromium, arsenic, nickel, and zinc) and highest (average of 8.1 to 1) for the organic compounds (excluding total DDT, endrin, and dieldrin).

The available data for some chemicals indicate agreements among the various approaches and the various data sets that were evaluated. For example, there is a relatively large amount of data available for cadmium generated from a variety of methods. The Puget Sound AET concentrations range from 5.1 ppm to 9.6 ppm; the 10-d LC50

concentrations from many SSBs with amphipods range from 5.6 to 11.5 ppm; and significant toxicity to amphipods and reduced echinoderm abundance in Southern California sediments occurred in samples with mean cadmium concentrations of 5.3 and 6.2 ppm, respectively. Effects were not observed in sediments with cadmium concentrations of less than about 4 ppm. With some exceptions, biological effects were usually observed in association with cadmium concentrations of 5 ppm or greater. The preponderance of evidence from these data suggest that effects are likely or expected as cadmium concentrations in sediments reach about 5 ppm. Also, the effect of adding or deleting data upon the ER-L and ER-M values for cadmium would likely be relatively small.

For some other chemicals, there was less agreement among the data from various approaches and the degree of confidence in the accuracy of the resulting ER-L and ER-M values was relatively low. For example, the Puget Sound AET concentrations for chromium are 260 and 270 ppm, whereas effects were observed elsewhere in association with mean concentrations as low as 61 ppm and as high as 1646 ppm. Many of the biological measures of effects were not in concordance with chromium concentrations, suggesting that chromium had a minimal role or no role in causation. In another example, the SLCs for total PCBs range from 2.9 ppb to 42.6 ppb based upon a relatively large amount of data; whereas, the Puget Sound AET concentrations range from 130 ppb to 3100 ppb, the San Francisco Bay AET range from 54 to 260 ppb, the chronic marine threshold predicted by EP methods is 280 ppb, and the LC50 from a SSB performed with amphipods is 10800 ppb. The effect of adding or deleting data upon the ER-L or ER-M values could be significant for some of the chemicals for which there is little consistency or clustering in the data. Obviously, for many chemicals there is yet much to be learned as regards the chemical concentrations in sediments that cause biological effects.

The chemical concentrations associated with no effects often were as informative as the concentrations associated with measures of effects. Sediment bioassays performed with relatively highly contaminated sediments from San Diego Bay, New York Harbor, and Eagle Harbor indicated low toxicity; whereas, sediments from other areas or tested with other approaches with similar or lower chemical concentrations were very toxic. Assuming that these tests were conducted with proper methods, the data may suggest different degrees of availability of the sediment-sorbed chemicals. Based upon the methods described, we had no reason to eliminate these data.

Overall, the degree of confidence in the accuracy of the ER-L and ER-M values should be considered as moderate for the metals group and PCBs and low for the pesticide and PAH groups. Much more data are needed to support or refute the ER-L and ER-M values for all groups and for individual analytes within the groups.

Also included in Table 70 is a summary of the subjectively determined, overall apparent effects threshold for each chemical; the concentrations at and above which biological effects were usually or always observed. The ER-L and ER-M values were established objectively with a priori selection criteria, i.e., the lower 10 percentiles and 50 percentiles of the available data. They were not established following review and evaluation of the data for each chemical. However, following a review of the available data for each chemical, apparent effects thresholds were often observed and noted. These thresholds were established with a subjective approach. Therefore, they were identified and listed as evidence to support the accuracy of the ER-L/ER-M values and as hypotheses to be evaluated with additional data. They were not used to rank the NS&T Program sites. For several chemical analytes (i.e., chromium, total DDT, dieldrin), there was no apparent effects threshold. For many of the pesticides and aromatic hydrocarbons, there were insufficient data to determine a threshold, noted as not sufficient data (NSD) in Table 70. For many of the analytes, e.g., mercury, there were inconsistent data at concentrations above the apparent effects thresholds, i.e., data from some studies indicated no effects at relatively high concentrations of the analyte. The apparent effects thresholds for most of the trace metals, PCBs, DDT, and some of the aromatic hydrocarbons were very similar to the respective ER-M values or within the ER-L/ ER-M range. However, the apparent threshold was outside the ER-L/ER-M range for antimony and lead. The apparent effects threshold for antimony was 25 ppm, a concentration equivalent to the ER-M concentration. The apparent effects threshold for lead (300 ppm) on

Chemical Analyte	ER-L Concentration	ER-M Concentration	ER-L:ER-M Ratio	Overall Apparent Effects Threshold	Subjective Degree of Confidence in <u>ER-L/ER-M</u> Values
Frace Elements (ppm)					
Antimony	2	25	12.5	25	Moderate/moderate
Arsenic	33	85	2.6	50	Low/moderate
Cadmium	5	9	1.8	5	High/high
Chromium	80	145	1.8	No	Moderate/moderate
Copper	70	390	5.6	300	High/high
Lead	35	110	3.1	300	Moderate/high
Mercury	0.15	1.3	8.7	i + 1	Moderate/high
Nickel	30	50	1.7	NSD*	Moderate/moderate
Silver	1	2.2	2.2	1.7	Moderate/moderate
Tin	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Zinc	120	270	2.2	260	High/high
Polychiorinated Biphenyls	(ppb)				
Total PCBs	50	400	7.6	370	Moderate/moderate
DDT and Metabolites (ppb))				
DDT	i	7	7	6	Low/low
DDD	2	20	10	NGD	Moderate/low
DDE	2	15	7.5	NSD	Low/low
Fotal DDT	3	350	117	No	Moderate/moderate
Other Pesticides (ppb)					
Lindane	NA	NA	NA	NSD	NA**
Chlordane	0.5	6	12	2	Low/low
Heptachlor	NA	NA	NA	NSD	NA
Dieldrin	0.02	8	400	No	Low/low
Aldrin	NA	NA	NA	NSD	NA
Endrin	0.02	45	2250	NSD	Low/low
Mirex	NA	NA	NA	NSD	NA
Polynuclear Aromatic Hyd	rocarbons (ppb)				
Acenaphthene	150	650	4.3	150	Low/low
Anthracene	85	960	11.3	300	Low/moderate
Benzo(a)anthracene	230	1600	7	550	Low/moderate
Benzo(a)pyrene	400	2500	6.2	700	Moderate/moderate
Benzo(e)pyrene	NA	NA	NA	NSD	NA
Biphenyl	NA	NA	NA	NSD	NA
Chrysene	400	2800	7	900	Moderate/moderate
Dibenz(a,h)anthracene	60	260	4.3	100	Moderate/moderate
2,6-dimethylnaphthylene	NA	NA	NA	NSD	NA
Fluoranthene	600	3600	6	1000	High/high
Fluorene	35	640	18.3	350	Low/low
1-methylnaphthalene	NA	NA	NA	NSD	NA
2-methyinaphthalene	65	670	10.3	300	Low/moderate
1-methylphenanthrene	NA	NA	NA	NSD	NA
Naphthalene	340	2100	6.2	500	Moderate/high
Perylene	NA	NA	NA	NSD	NA
Phenanthrene	225	1380	6.1	260	Moderate/moderate
Pyrene	350	2200	6.3	1000	Moderate/moderate
2,3,5-trimethyInaphthalene		NA	NA	NSD	NA
Total PAH	4000	35000	8.8	22000	Low/low

Table 70. Summary of ER-L, ER-M, and overall apparent effects thresholds concentrations for selected chemicals in sediment (dry weight).

* NSD = not sufficient data ** NA = not available

the other hand, was considerably higher than the respective ER-M concentration (110 ppm), resulting in a somewhat lower degree of confidence in the ER-M value for lead.

Evaluation of NS&T Program Data

The ER-L and ER-M concentrations were compared with the ambient concentrations measured by both the Benthic Surveillance Project (3-letter site location codes) and Mussel Watch Project (4-letter site description codes) of the NS&T Program. The data from the NS&T Program were assembled from (usually) 2 successive years of measurements at numerous sites around the coastal United States. Overall average concentrations were calculated for each analyte measured in sediments from each site. Those sites in which the average analyte concentrations exceeded the respective ER-M values are listed in Table 71. Those sites in which the average analyte concentrations exceeded the respective ER-M values, but not the ER-M values, are listed in Table 72.

The ER-L and ER-M values for arsenic were not reached or exceeded at any NS&T sampling site. The average ambient concentrations of antimony, cadmium, copper, and total PAH did not exceed the respective ER-M values at any of the sites.

Among the trace metals, the ER-M value for chromium was exceeded by sediments from the most sites (25 out of about 200 sites). The average chromium concentration of 2114 ppm observed in the sediments from site SAL (located in Salem Harbor, Massachusetts) was the highest, exceeding the ER-M value by over an order of magnitude. Chromium concentrations also were very high at sites PAB (in San Pablo Bay, California) and HMB (in Humboldt Bay, California). Average lead concentrations were highest in site OEIH (in the Oakland estuary, California), exceeding the ER-M by about twofold. The ER-M of 1.3 ppm for mercury was exceeded by the average concentrations at six sites, including an average of 3.3 ppm at site HRUB (located in the Hudson/Raritan estuary, New Jersey). The average nickel concentrations at 21 sites exceeded the ER-M value for nickel. The average silver concentration of 7.2 ppm at site BOS (located in Boston Harbor, Massachusetts) exceeded the ER-M by about threefold. All but one of the sites that exceeded the silver ER-M were located in Northeast estuaries or bays.

The ER-M concentrations for many of the aromatic hydrocarbons were either not exceeded by the average ambient concentrations or exceeded at only one or two sites. Site HRUB exceeded many of the ER-M values for individual PAH and nearly exceeded the ER-M value for total PAH. Site BOS also had relatively high concentrations of some PAHs.

The average PCB concentration in site BOS was about 20 times higher than the ER-M for PCB. PCB concentrations also were high at site SAWB (located in Saint Andrew Bay in western Florida). The ER-M for total DDT was exceeded by four sites in southern California located near each other (PVRP, SPFP, SPB, SPC) and a site (CBSP) in Choctawatchee Bay, Florida. Chlordane concentrations at site CBSP and at site OEIH, located in the Oakland Inner Harbor, California, were over two-fold higher than the ER-M value.

The ER-L concentration for arsenic was not exceeded at any of the sites. The ER-L values for many of the metals, notably, chromium, copper, lead, mercury, nickel, and zinc, were exceeded by the ambient concentrations at many of the sites (Table 72). The average cadmium concentrations and acenaphthene concentrations exceeded the respective ER-L values at only two sites each. Average ambient concentrations of dieldrin, total DDT, anthracene, benzo(a)anthracene, fluoranthene, phenanthrene, and pyrene at many sites exceeded the respective ER-L values. The ER-L concentrations were sufficiently low for dieldrin and total DDT, that the average concentrations at the majority of the NS&T Program sites exceeded them. The dieldrin and total DDT data from the NS&T Program suggest that the ER-L values for these two contaminants are possibly unrealistically low, since the concentrations at such a large number of sites exceeded them.

Tables 73 and 74 summarize and rank the sites in which the average analyte concentrations exceeded the most ER-M and ER-L values, respectively. Those sites that had the greatest numbers of exceedances were those in which the potential for adverse effects

were assumed to be the highest. The sediment collected at the OEIH and HRUB sites exceeded the most ER-M concentrations (Table 73). Sites HRRB and NYSH (both in the Hudson/Raritan estuary), LITN (western Long Island Sound), and BOS also exceeded many of the ER-M concentrations.

Sites BHDI (Boston Harbor), LISI, LIMR, LIHH (all Long Island Sound), and CBMP (Chesapeake Bay) exceeded the most ER-L concentrations (Table 74). As expected, the sediments from many more sites exceeded the ER-L concentrations than exceeded the ER-M values.

Overall cumulative ranks of the top 30 sites are listed in Table 75. These ranks were determined by considering exceedances of both the ER-L and ER-M concentrations. One point was assigned for each ER-L concentration exceeded by the sediments at each site. The average ratio of the ER-L values to the ER-M values in Table 70 was 4.2 for the metals and 8.1 for the organics (excluding total DDT, dieldrin, and endrin). Using these average ratios, 4.4 points were assigned for each metal ER-M that was exceeded at a site and 8.4 points for each organic ER-M that was exceeded. Then, the sum of the points for the ER-L and ER-M exceedances at each site was determined and used to formulate an overall rank of the sites.

Based upon this approach, site HRUB ranked highest in overall potential for inducing sediment-related effects (Table 75), followed by sites BOS, OEIH, and LITN. Sites LISI and LIMR sediments exceeded 20 ER-L concentrations each, but exceeded none of the ER-M concentrations. Sites PVRP, SPFP, SPB, and SPC, all located near Los Angeles, California, exceeded relatively few ER-L values, but exceeded some of the ER-M concentrations for DDT, its derivatives, and other organics. Only one site along the Gulf of Mexico coastline, site CBSP in Choctawatchee Bay, Florida, ranked among the top 30 sites. It had high concentrations of pesticides.

The sampling sites with the highest potential for adverse effects are located within the Hudson/Raritan estuary, western Long Island Sound, Boston Harbor, Chesapeake Bay, New York Bight, Oakland Inner Harbor of San Francisco Bay, St. Andrew Bay, Salem Harbor, and in parts of southern California near Los Angeles and San Pedro. Out of a total of 212 sampling sites, 172 sites exceeded at least one ER-L value. Most of the sites that did not exceed ER-L values were located along the Gulf Coast and along the outer coastal regions of the Pacific Coast. Site UISB, located in a very remote portion of Alaska and assumed to be a relatively pristine area, exceeded the ER-L values for antimony, chromium, and nickel.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Effects-based national sediment quality criteria are not currently available for all of the NS&T Program analytes. Three major approaches to the determination of effects-based sediment quality standards have been used to generate an estimate of the concentrations of selected toxicants in sediments that may be associated with or the cause of biological effects. The three approaches involve the use of equilibrium-partitioning principles, spiked-sediment bioassays, and various methods of evaluating matching biological effects and chemical data from analyses of field-collected samples. The resulting sediment quality values derived from all three approaches were used in the present document and treated as equal. A preponderance of evidence from the various approaches was used to establish informal guidelines for use in the evaluation of NOAA NS&T Program sediment chemical data. By using a preponderance of evidence, the influence of any single value in setting guidelines was minimized. These guidelines were in two forms: concentrations at the low end of the range and equivalent to the median of the range within which biological effects were observed.

ER-L values were determined as the concentrations equivalent to the lower 10 percentile of the available data in which effects were detected. These values represent an approximation of the concentrations at which adverse effects were first detected. The ER-M values were determined as the concentrations equivalent to the median (50 percentile) of the available data in which effects were detected. These values represent an estimate of the concentrations at or above which effects were often detected. Both the ER-L and ER-M values were established objectively by determining the lower 10 percentile and 50 percentile points in the data. This approach followed that of Klapow and Lewis (1979) in which marine water quality standards for California were established. In that effort, Klapow and Lewis (1979) evaluated only spiked water bioassay data, i.e., they compared apples with apples. In the present effort, data from a variety of approaches and from studies performed in areas with significantly different pollution histories were evaluated, equivalent to comparing grapes and watermelons. The necessity to compare grapes and watermelons is symptomatic of the current status of knowledge regarding the degree of sediment contamination that is associated with measures of biological effects.

ER-L and ER-M guidelines were identified for most (31) of the chemical analytes that are quantified by the NS&T Program. However, no guidelines could be established for some analytes due to a lack of sufficient data. For some analytes, there was a very low degree of confidence in the accuracy of the guidelines, due mainly to relatively poor consistency among the data from the various approaches and/or due to a lack of data from multiple complimentary approaches. For a few analytes, such as cadmium, there was good consistency among the data. Data from many approaches converged upon a relatively small range in concentrations and an overall apparent effects threshold agreed with or was within the effects range, and, therefore, there was a relatively high degree in confidence in the informal guidelines. Except for these latter few analytes, it is very obvious that more data are needed to reduce the uncertainty in the data.

Table 71. ER-M concentrations for each NS&T Program analyte, NS&T Program sites that exceed the ER-M concentrations, geographic locations of those sites, and the average concentrations (dry weight) of the analyte at the site.

bite Description	Location	Concentration
Antimony (≥25 ppm) *		
Arsenic (≥85 ppm) *		
Cadmium (≥9 ppm) *		
Chromium (≥145 ppm)		ppm
BBSM	Bellingham Bay, Washington	203.0
BHDI	Boston Harbor, Massachusetts	190.7
BHDB	Boston Harbor, Massachusetts	186.7
HRLB	Hudson-Raritan Estuary, New Jersey	147.2
HRRB	Hudson-Raritan Estuary, New Jersey	170.0
LITN	Long Island Sound, New York	161.4
NYSH	New York Bight, New Jersey	166.7
PVRP	Palos Verdes, California	156.7
PVMC	Port Valdez, Alaska	156.7
SFDB	San Francisco Bay, California	170.0
SFEM	San Francisco Bay, California	178.3
SFSM	San Francisco Bay, California	167.5
SPSP	San Pablo Bay, Čalifornia	185.0
TBSR	Tomales Bay, California	218.3
YHSS	Yaquina Bay, Oregon	176.7
OEIH	Oakland Estuary, California	186.7
BOD	Bodega Bay, California	349.7
BOS	Boston Harbor, Massachusetts	263.3
HMB	Humboldt Bay, California	453.7
HUN	San Francisco Bay, California	269.7
OAK	Oakland Estuary, California	196.0
PAB	San Pablo Bay, California	521.8
RAR	Raritan Bay, New Jersey	188.9
SAL	Salem Harbor, Massachusetts	2114.7
SHS	San Francisco Bay, California	259.2

Site Description	Location	Concentration
Copper (≥390 ppm) *		•
Lead (≥110 ppm)		ppm
BHDI	Boston Harbor, Massachusetts	110.0
BHDB	Boston Harbor, Massachusetts	132.3
HRLB	Hudson/Raritan Estuary, New Jersey	143.7
HRUB	Hudson/Raritan Estuary, New Jersey	137.3
HRRB	Hudson/Raritan Estuary, New Jersey	196.7
LIHH	Long Island Sound, New York	140.0
LITN	Long Island Sound, New York	172.2
NYSH	New York Bight, New Jersey	154.5
OEIH	Oakland Estuary, California	206.7
BOS	Boston Harbor, Massachusetts	127.0
LNB	Long Beach Harbor, California	126.3
RAR	Raritan Bay, New Jersey	182.3
SAL	Salem Harbor, Massachusetts	167.2
Mercury (≥1.3 ppm)		ppm.
HRLB	Hudson/Raritan Estuary, New Jersey	1.6
HRUB	Hudson/Raritan Estuary, New Jersey	3.3
HRRB	Hudson/Raritan Estuary, New Jersey	2.4
NYSH	New York Bight, New Jersey	1.8
OEIH	Oakland Estuary, California	2.3
RAR	Raritan Bay, New Jersey	2.3
	Marian Day, INCH Jersey	2.0
Nickel (≥50 ppm)		ppm
BBSM	Bellingham Bay, Washington	168 .3
BPBP	Barber's Point, Hawaii	58.3
CBHP	Chesapeake Bay, Maryland	55.0
CBMP	Chesapeake Bay, Maryland	64.7
OEIH	Oakland Estuary, California	133.3
PVMC	Port Valdez, Alaska	65.7
SFDB	San Francisco Bay, California	90.8
SFEM	San Francisco Bay, California	110.0
SFSM	San Francisco Bay, California	112.5
SPFP	San Pedro Bay, California	55.0
SPSP	San Pablo Bay, California	121.8
TBSR	Tomales Bay, California	166.7
WIPP	Whidbey Island, Washington	56.4
BOD	Bodega Bay, California	54.8
HMB	Humboldt Bay, California	60.1
HUN	San Francisco Bay, California	100.3
OAK	Oakland Estuary, California	104.0
PAB	San Pablo Bay, California	87.8
SHS	San Francisco Bay, California	72.1
UCB	Chesapeake Bay, Maryland	62.2
Silver (≥2.2 ppm)		ppm
BHDI	Boston Harbor, Massachusetts	3.1
BHDB	Boston Harbor, Massachusetts	3.1
HRJB	Hudson/Raritan Estuary, New Jersey	2.4
HRLB	Hudson/Raritan Estuary, New Jersey	4.6

Table 71. (continued)

ite Description	Location	Concentration
ilver (continued)		ppm
HRUB	Hudson/Raritan Estuary, New Jersey	3.4
HRRB	Hudson/Raritan Estuary, New Jersey	4.8
LIHH	Long Island Sound, New York	4.9
LITN	Long Island Sound, New York	5.7
		2.2
NBMH	Narragansett Bay, Rhode Island	
NYSH	New York Bight	4.0
PVRP	Palos Verdes, California	2.8
BOS	Boston Harbor, Massachusetts	7.2
RAR	Raritan Bay, New Jersey	4.7
inc (≥270 ppm)		ppm
CBHP	Chesapeake Bay, Maryland	300.0
CBMP	Chesapeake Bay, Maryland	385.0
HRRB	Hudson/Raritan Estuary, New Jersey	366.7
LIHH	Long Island Sound, New York	283.3
NYSH	New York Bight, New Jersey	281.7
OEIH	Oakland Estuary, California	330.0
RAR		421.5
SDA	Raritan Bay, New Jersey San Diego Bay, California	421.5 324.2
CBs (≥380 ppb)		ррЪ
BBAR	Buzzards Bay, Massachusetts	451.2
		642.2
BHDB	Boston Harbor, Massachusetts	
HRRB	Hudson/Raritan Estuary, New Jersey	393.7
LITN	Long Island Sound, Connecticut	499.2
NYSH	New York Bight, New Jersey	431.2
PVRP	Palos Verdes, California	568.6
SAWB	Saint Andrew Bay, Florida	940.8
BOS	Boston Harbor, Massachusetts	7852
ELL	Elliott Bay, Washington	415
RAR	Hudson/Raritan Bay, New Jersey	529
SAL	Salem Harbor, Massachusetts	403
SDA	San Diego Harbor, California	399
ieldrin (≥8 ppb)		ppb
BHDB	Boston Harbor, Massachusetts	12.9
OEIH	Oakland Estuary, California	12.0
LITN	Long Island Sound, New York	9.6
DT (p,p' + 0,p'-DDT)	(≥7 ppb)	ppb
CBSP	Choctawatchee Bay, Florida	182.0
HRLB	Hudson/Raritan Estuary, New Jersey	9.1
MBTP	Matagorda Bay, Texas	9.6
MBTH	Moriches Bay, New York	14.9
OSBJ	Oceanside, California	7.6
OEIH		10.1
	Oakland Estuary, California	
PVRP	Palos Verdes, California	556.0
SPFP	San Pedro Harbor, California	7.1
SAWB	Saint Andrew Bay, Florida	8.3
RAR	Raritan Bay, New Jersey	8

.

.

lite Description	Location	Concentration	. '
DDT (p,p' + o,p'-DDT) (continued)		pp
SPB	San Pedro Bay, California	31.7	
SPC	San Pedro Canyon, California	11.3	
DDD (p,p' + 0,p' - DD	D) (≥20 ppb)	ррь	
BHDB	Boston Harbor, Massachusetts	23.0	
CBSP	Choctawatchee Bay, Florida	555.7	
HRRB	Hudson/Raritan Estuary, New Jersey	27.3	
HRLB	Hudson/Raritan Estuary, New Jersey	21.6	
LIHH	Long Island Sound, Connecticut	24.6	2
LITN	Long Island Sound, Connecticut	47.8	
NYSH	New York Bight, New Jersey	21.6	
	Oakland Estuary California	58.1	
OEIH	Oakland Estuary, California		
PVRP	Palos Verdes, California	815.2	
SPFP	San Pedro Harbor, California	90.5	
BOS	Boston Harbor, Massachusetts	44.2	
LNB	Long Beach Harbor, California	30.7	
SAL	Salem Harbor, Massachusetts	21.3	
SPB	San Pedro Bay, California	45.7	
SPC	San Pedro Canyon, California	54.0	
DDE (p,p' + 0,p' - DD	E) (≥15 ppb)	ppb	
ABWJ	Anaheim Bay, California	20.5	
BHDB	Boston Harbor, Massachusetts	19.1	
CBSP	Choctawatchee Bay, Florida	80.6	
		15.7	
HRRB	Hudson/Raritan Estuary, New Jersey		
HRLB	Hudson/Raritan Estuary, New Jersey	15.0	
LITN	Long Island Sound, New York	21.7	
MDSJ	Marina del Rey, California	57.4	
NYSH	New York Bight, New York	19.3	
NBBC	Newport Beach, California	19.4	
OSBJ	Oceanside, California	27.8	
PVRP	Palos Verdes, California	2063.3	
SBSB	Point Santa Barbara, California	21.3	
SPFP	San Pedro Harbor, California	663.5	
BOS	Boston Harbor, Massachusetts	58.2	
		76.6	
LNB	Long Beach Harbor, California		
SEA	Seal Beach, California	22.2	
SMB	Santa Monica Bay, California	19.0	
SPB	San Pedro Bay, California	408.3	
SPC	San Pedro Canyon, California	621.3	
Fotal DDT (≥350 ppb)	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	ppb	6 .
CBSP	Choctawatchee Bay, Florida	818.3	
PVRP	Palos Verdes, California	2936.4	
SPFP	San Pedro Harbor, California	769.1	
SPB	San Pedro Bay, California	485.4	
	UNIX & UNIX WATT WATTER		

Site Description	Location	Concentration
Chlordane (≥6 ppb)		ppb
CBSP	Choctawatchee Bay, Florida	18.9
HRJB	Hudson/Raritan Estuary, New Jersey	6.8
LIHH	Long Island Sound, New York	7.3
OEIH	Oakland Estuary, California	14.3
LITN	Long Island Sound, New York	8.5
Acenaphthene (≥650 pp]	b) *	ррь
Anthracene (≥960 ppb)		ppb
HRUB	Hudson/Raritan Estuary, New Jersey	1983.3
SAWB	Saint Andrew Bay, Florida	1082.3
SAL	Salem Harbor, Massachusetts	1100.6
Senzo(a)anthracene (≥16	500 ppb)	ррь
HRUB	Hudson/Raritan Estuary, New Jersey	3258.3
Senzo(a)pyrene (≥2500	ppb)*	
Chrysene (≥2800 ppb) *	· .	
Fluoranthene (≥3600 pp)	b)	ррь
HRUB	Hudson/Raritan Estuary, New Jersey	4616.7
Fluorene (≥640 ppb) *		
Naphthalene (≥2100 ppł	») *	
Phenanthrene (≥1380 pp	ь)	ррь
HRUB	Hudson/Raritan Estuary, New Jersey	2505.8
Pyrene (≥2200 ppb)		ррь
HRUB	Hudson/Raritan Estuary, New Jersey	6096.7
2-methylnaphthalene (≥	670 ppb)	ppb
HRUB	Hudson/Raritan Estuary, New Jersey	830.0
BOS	Boston Harbor, Massachusetts	3774.3
Dibenz(a,h)anthracene	(≥260 ppb)	ppb
BOS	Boston Harbor, Massachusetts	385.6

Table 71. (continued)

* Ambient concentrations at none of the sites exceeded or equaled the ER-M for these chemical analytes.

145

Table 72. ER-L and ER-M concentrations for each NS&T Program analyte, NS&T Program sites at which the average concentrations exceeded the ER-L concentrations but not the ER-M concentrations, geographic locations of those sites, and the average concentrations (dry weight) of the analyte at the site.

Site Description	Location	Concentration
Antimony (≥2 <10 ppm)		ppm
BBSM	Bellingham Bay, Washington	3.6
BHDI	Boston Harbor, Massachusetts	6.5
BHDH	Boston Harbor, Massachusetts	7.4
вннв	Boston Harbor, Massachusetts	3.9
CBMP	Chesapeake Bay, Maryland	3.9
CBTP	Commencement Bay, Washington	4.6
EBFR	Elliott Bay, Washington	6.4
HRJB	Hudson/Raritan Estuary, New Jersey	3.3
HRLB	Hudson/Raritan Estuary, New Jersey	
	Nuclean / Ramitan Estuary, New Jersey	3.6
HRUB	Hudson/Raritan Estuary, New Jersey	5.0
HRRB	Hudson/Raritan Estuary, New Jersey	6.0
LIHH	Long Island Sound, New York	3.2
LITN	Long Island Sound, New York	4.4
NBMH	Narragansett Bay, Rhode Island	2.4
NYSH	New York Bight, New Jersey	5.5
PVMC	Port Valdez, Alaska	2.9
SSBI	South Puget Sound, Washington	4.4
SIWP	Sinclair Inlet, Washington	9.7
UISB	Unakwit Inlet, Alaska	2.5
WIPP	Whidbey Island, Washington	3.4
BOS	Boston Harbor, Massachusetts	7.7
RAR	Raritan Bay, New Jersey	3.2
SAL	Salem Harbor, Massachusetts	3.2
UCB	Upper Chesapeake Bay, Maryland	2.1
	opper chesipeare bay, maryanta	2.1
Arsenic (≥33 <70 ppm) *	:	
Cadmium (≥5 <9 ppm)	· · ·	ppm
PVRP	Palos Verdes, California	6.7
SAL	Salem Harbor, Massachusetts	6.2
Chromium (≥80 <145 ppm)		ppm
CBHP	Chesapeake Bay, Maryland	113
CBRP	Coos Bay, Oregon	89.2
DBAP	Delaware Bay, Delaware	90.7
DBBD	Delaware Bay, Delaware	87.0
EBFR	Elliott Bay, Washington	89.7
HRJB	Hudson-Raritan Estuary, New Jersey	113.7
HRUB	Hudson-Raritan Estuary, New Jersey	90.3
HMBJ	Humboldt Bay, California	98.3
LISI	Long Island Sound, Connecticut	81.7
LIHH	Long Island Sound, New York	131.7
LIHU	Long Island Sound, New York	80.6
LIMR	Long Island Sound, New York	109.6
BUZ	Buzzards Bay, Massachusetts	85.6
		81.1
CHS	Charleston Harbor, South Carolina	
	Coos Bay, Oregon	81.0
COO		00.7
CSC ELL	Casco Bay, Maine Elliott Bay, Washington	92.6 91.8

Site Description	Location	Concentration
Chromium (continued))		ppm
FRN	Frenchman Bay, Maine	90.1
GRB	Great Bay, New Jersey	115.3
MOB	Mobile Bay, Alabama	91.7
NAR	Narragansett Bay, Rhode Island	101.6
NIS	Puget Sound, Washington	114.9
PEN	Pensacola Bay, Florida	102.1
PNB	Penobscot Bay, Maine	106.1
NBMH		140.0
	Narragansett Bay, Rhode Island	
PBSI	Penobscot Bay, Maine	93.8
PRPR	Point Roberts, Washington	89.5
SPFP	San Pedro Harbor, California	123.3
SIWP	Sinclair Inlet, Washington	135.0
TBHP	Tillamook Bay, Oregon	134.3
UISB	Unakwit Inlet, Alaska	128.3
WIPP	Whidbey Island, Washington	105.1
YBOP	Yaquina Bay, Oregon	107.3
JFNB	Neah Bay, Washington	114.7
SDA	San Diego Bay, California	129.8
SEA	Seal Beach, California	108.3
SPB	San Pedro Bay, California	93.0
SPC	San Pedro Canyon, California	106.5
UCB	Upper Chesapeake Bay, Maryland	125.2
WLI	West Long Island Sound, New York	134.2
Copper (≥70 <310 ppm)		ppm
BHDI	Boston Harbor, Massachusetts	103.3
BHDH	Boston Harbor, Massachusetts	118.0
HRLB	Hudson/Raritan Estuary, New Jersey	115.3
HRUB	Hudson/Raritan Estuary, New Jersey	101.0
HRRB	Hudson/Raritan Estuary, New Jersey	150.0
LINR	Long Island Sound, Connecticut	167.0
LIHH	Long Island Sound, New York	160.0
LIHU	Long Island Sound, New York	78.0
LIMR	Long Island Sound, New York	95.8
LITN	Long Island Sound, New York	178.8
	Narragansett Bay, Rhode Island	07.3
NBMH	Narragansett Bay, Rhode Island New York Bight New Jersey	82.3 126.7
NBMH NYSH	New York Bight, New Jersey	126.7
NBMH NYSH PVRP	New York Bight, New Jersey Palos Verdes, California	126.7 75.0
NBMH NYSH PVRP SPFP	New York Bight, New Jersey Palos Verdes, California San Pedro Harbor, California	126.7 75.0 181.7
NBMH NYSH PVRP SPFP SIWP	New York Bight, New Jersey Palos Verdes, California San Pedro Harbor, California Sinclair Inlet, Washington	126.7 75.0 181.7 72.5
NBMH NYSH PVRP SPFP SIWP OEIH	New York Bight, New Jersey Palos Verdes, California San Pedro Harbor, California Sinclair Inlet, Washington Oakland Estuary, California	126.7 75.0 181.7 72.5 173.3
NBMH NYSH PVRP SPFP SIWP OEIH BOS	New York Bight, New Jersey Palos Verdes, California San Pedro Harbor, California Sinclair Inlet, Washington Oakland Estuary, California Boston Harbor, Massachusetts	126.7 75.0 181.7 72.5 173.3 157.1
NBMH NYSH PVRP SIWP OEIH BOS ELL	New York Bight, New Jersey Palos Verdes, California San Pedro Harbor, California Sinclair Inlet, Washington Oakland Estuary, California Boston Harbor, Massachusetts Elliott Bay, Washington	126.7 75.0 181.7 72.5 173.3 157.1 93.0
NBMH NYSH PVRP SIWP OEIH BOS ELL NAR	New York Bight, New Jersey Palos Verdes, California San Pedro Harbor, California Sinclair Inlet, Washington Oakland Estuary, California Boston Harbor, Massachusetts Elliott Bay, Washington Narragansett Bay, Rhode Island	126.7 75.0 181.7 72.5 173.3 157.1 93.0 79.2
NBMH NYSH PVRP SIWP OEIH BOS ELL NAR OAK	New York Bight, New Jersey Palos Verdes, California San Pedro Harbor, California Sinclair Inlet, Washington Oakland Estuary, California Boston Harbor, Massachusetts Elliott Bay, Washington Narragansett Bay, Rhode Island Oakland Estuary, California	126.7 75.0 181.7 72.5 173.3 157.1 93.0 79.2 71.7
NBMH NYSH PVRP SIWP OEIH BOS ELL NAR OAK RAR	New York Bight, New Jersey Palos Verdes, California San Pedro Harbor, California Sinclair Inlet, Washington Oakland Estuary, California Boston Harbor, Massachusetts Elliott Bay, Washington Narragansett Bay, Rhode Island	126.7 75.0 181.7 72.5 173.3 157.1 93.0 79.2 71.7 178.0
NBMH NYSH PVRP SIWP OEIH BOS ELL NAR OAK	New York Bight, New Jersey Palos Verdes, California San Pedro Harbor, California Sinclair Inlet, Washington Oakland Estuary, California Boston Harbor, Massachusetts Elliott Bay, Washington Narragansett Bay, Rhode Island Oakland Estuary, California	126.7 75.0 181.7 72.5 173.3 157.1 93.0 79.2 71.7
NBMH NYSH PVRP SIWP OEIH BOS ELL NAR OAK RAR	New York Bight, New Jersey Palos Verdes, California San Pedro Harbor, California Sinclair Inlet, Washington Oakland Estuary, California Boston Harbor, Massachusetts Elliott Bay, Washington Narragansett Bay, Rhode Island Oakland Estuary, California Raritan Bay, New Jersey Salem Harbor, Massachusetts	126.7 75.0 181.7 72.5 173.3 157.1 93.0 79.2 71.7 178.0
NBMH NYSH PVRP SPFP SIWP OEIH BOS ELL NAR OAK RAR SAL	New York Bight, New Jersey Palos Verdes, California San Pedro Harbor, California Sinclair Inlet, Washington Oakland Estuary, California Boston Harbor, Massachusetts Elliott Bay, Washington Narragansett Bay, Rhode Island Oakland Estuary, California Raritan Bay, New Jersey	126.7 75.0 181.7 72.5 173.3 157.1 93.0 79.2 71.7 178.0 82.3

te Description	Location	Concentration
ead (≥35 <110 ppm)		ppm
ABWJ	Anaheim Bay, California	36.2
BHHB	Boston Harbor, Massachusetts	35.5
BBAR	Buzzards Bay, Massachusetts	48.5
CBHP	Chesapeake Bay, Maryland	72.2
CBSP	Choctawatchee Bay, Florida	86.7
HRJB	Hudson/Raritan Estuary, New Jersey	95.3
		39.2
LICR	Long Island Sound, Connecticut	
LISI	Long Island Sound, Connecticut	53.8
LIHU	Long Island Sound, New York	60.7
LIMR	Long Island Sound, New York	82.2
MBTH	Moriches Bay, New York	44.8
NBMH	Narragansett Bay, Rhode Island	91.7
NBCI	Narragansett Bay, Rhode Island	40.7
PVRP	Palos Verdes, California	49.7
SAWB	Saint Andrew Bay, Florida	40.9
SFDB	San Francisco Bay, California	38.7
SFEM	San Francisco Bay, California	35.0
SFSM	San Francisco Bay, California	35.8
SPFP		48.8
	San Pedro Harbor, California	
SIWP	Sinclair Inlet, Washington	61.8
SSBI	South Puget Sound, Washington	35.2
ТВНВ	Tampa Bay, Florida	62.8
GRB	Great Bay, New Jersey	36.6
NAR	Narragansett Bay, Rhode Island	60.0
OAK	Oakland Estuary, California	43.5
PEN	Pensacola Bay, Florida	41.7
SDA	San Diego Bay, California	86 . 9
SPB	San Pedro Bay, California	47.1
UCB	Upper Chesapeake Bay, Maryland	51.1
WLI	West Long Island Sound, New York	71.1
fercury (≥0.15<1.0 ppm)		ppm
BBSM	Bellingham Bay, Washington	0.23
BHDI	Boston Harbor, Massachusetts	.69
BHDH	Boston Harbor, Massachusetts	.83
вннв	Boston Harbor, Massachusetts	.21
CBHP	Chesapeake Bay, Maryland	.21
CBMP	Chesapeake Bay, Maryland	.21
DBBD		.15
	Delaware Bay, Delaware Honolulu Harbor, Housaii	
HHKL	Honolulu Harbor, Hawaii	.16
LICR	Long Island Sound, Connecticut	.16
LISI	Long Island Sound, Connecticut	.31
LIHH	Long Island Sound, New York	.60
LIHU	Long Island Sound, New York	.27
LIMR	Long Island Sound, New York	.37
MBGP	Matagorda Bay, Texas	.22
MBTH	Moriches Bay, New York	.29
NBDI	Narragansett Bay, Rhode Island	.15
NBMH	Narragansett Bay, Rhode Island	.81
NBCI	Narragansett Bay, Rhode Island	
	ivaitagansen Day, KIIOGe Island	.16
		10
PVRP PBSI	Palos Verdes, California Penobscot Bay, Maine	.40 .21

ite Description	Location	Concentration
fercury (continued)		ppm
SAWB	Saint Andrew Bay, Florida	.32
SDHI	San Diego Bay, Ćalifornia	.34
SFDB	San Francisco Bay, California	.28
SFEM	San Francisco Bay, California	.32
SFSM	San Francisco Bay, California	.30
SPSP	San Pablo Bay, California	.27
SPFP	San Pedro Harbor, California	.46
SIWP	Sinclair Inlet, Washington	.80
SSBI	South Puget Sound, Washington	.21
TBSR	Tomales Bay, California	.37
DAN	Dana Point, California	.18
ELL	Elliott Bay, Washington	.10
GRB	Great Bay, New Jersey	.40
HUN	San Francisco Bay, California	.18
LUT	Lutak Inlet, Alaska	.24
NAH	Nahku Bay, Alaska	.23
NAR	Narragansett Bay, Rhode Island	.30
NIS	Puget Sound, Washington	.17
OAK	Oakland Estuary, California	.50
OLI	Oliktok Point, Alaska	.27
PAB	San Pablo Bay, California	.37
lickel (≥30 <50 ppm)		ppm
inter and the French		
	Boston Harbor, Massachusetts	
BHDH	Boston Harbor, Massachusetts Charleston Harbor, South Carolina	30.8
BHDH CHFJ	Charleston Harbor, South Carolina	
BHDH CHFJ DBAP	Charleston Harbor, South Carolina Delaware Bay, Delaware	30.8 33.0
BHDH CHFJ DBAP DBBD	Charleston Harbor, South Carolina Delaware Bay, Delaware Delaware Bay, Delaware	30.8 33.0 30.3
BHDH CHFJ DBAP DBBD HRLB	Charleston Harbor, South Carolina Delaware Bay, Delaware Delaware Bay, Delaware Hudson/Raritan Estuary, New Jersey	30.8 33.0 30.3 32.0
BHDH CHFJ DBAP DBBD HRLB HRUB	Charleston Harbor, South Carolina Delaware Bay, Delaware Delaware Bay, Delaware Hudson/Raritan Estuary, New Jersey Hudson/Raritan Estuary, New Jersey	30.8 33.0 30.3 32.0 33.5 35.3
BHDH CHFJ DBAP DBBD HRLB	Charleston Harbor, South Carolina Delaware Bay, Delaware Delaware Bay, Delaware Hudson/Raritan Estuary, New Jersey Hudson/Raritan Estuary, New Jersey Hudson/Raritan Estuary, New Jersey	30.8 33.0 30.3 32.0 33.5
BHDH CHFJ DBAP DBBD HRLB HRUB HRRB	Charleston Harbor, South Carolina Delaware Bay, Delaware Delaware Bay, Delaware Hudson/Raritan Estuary, New Jersey Hudson/Raritan Estuary, New Jersey Hudson/Raritan Estuary, New Jersey Long Island Sound, New York Long Island Sound, New York	30.8 33.0 30.3 32.0 33.5 35.3 40.3
BHDH CHFJ DBAP DBBD HRLB HRUB HRRB LIHH	Charleston Harbor, South Carolina Delaware Bay, Delaware Delaware Bay, Delaware Hudson/Raritan Estuary, New Jersey Hudson/Raritan Estuary, New Jersey Hudson/Raritan Estuary, New Jersey Long Island Sound, New York Long Island Sound, New York	30.8 33.0 30.3 32.0 33.5 35.3 40.3 41.2
BHDH CHFJ DBAP DBBD HRLB HRUB HRRB LIHH LIMR LITN	Charleston Harbor, South Carolina Delaware Bay, Delaware Delaware Bay, Delaware Hudson/Raritan Estuary, New Jersey Hudson/Raritan Estuary, New Jersey Hudson/Raritan Estuary, New Jersey Long Island Sound, New York Long Island Sound, New York Long Island Sound, New York	30.8 33.0 30.3 32.0 33.5 35.3 40.3 41.2 38.7
BHDH CHFJ DBAP DBBD HRLB HRUB HRRB LIHH LIMR LITN PRPR	Charleston Harbor, South Carolina Delaware Bay, Delaware Delaware Bay, Delaware Hudson/Raritan Estuary, New Jersey Hudson/Raritan Estuary, New Jersey Hudson/Raritan Estuary, New Jersey Long Island Sound, New York Long Island Sound, New York Long Island Sound, New York Point Roberts, Washington	30.8 33.0 30.3 32.0 33.5 35.3 40.3 41.2 38.7 43.4
BHDH CHFJ DBAP DBBD HRLB HRUB HRRB LIHH LIMR LITN PRPR SIWP	Charleston Harbor, South Carolina Delaware Bay, Delaware Delaware Bay, Delaware Hudson/Raritan Estuary, New Jersey Hudson/Raritan Estuary, New Jersey Hudson/Raritan Estuary, New Jersey Long Island Sound, New York Long Island Sound, New York Long Island Sound, New York Point Roberts, Washington Sinclair Inlet, Washington	30.8 33.0 30.3 32.0 33.5 35.3 40.3 41.2 38.7 43.4 39.8
BHDH CHFJ DBAP DBBD HRLB HRUB HRRB LIHH LIMR LITN PRPR SIWP SSBI	Charleston Harbor, South Carolina Delaware Bay, Delaware Delaware Bay, Delaware Hudson/Raritan Estuary, New Jersey Hudson/Raritan Estuary, New Jersey Hudson/Raritan Estuary, New Jersey Long Island Sound, New York Long Island Sound, New York Long Island Sound, New York Point Roberts, Washington Sinclair Inlet, Washington South Puget Sound, Washington	30.8 33.0 30.3 32.0 33.5 35.3 40.3 41.2 38.7 43.4 39.8 47.0
BHDH CHFJ DBAP DBBD HRLB HRUB HRRB LIHH LIMR LITN PRPR SIWP SSBI TBHP	Charleston Harbor, South Carolina Delaware Bay, Delaware Delaware Bay, Delaware Hudson/Raritan Estuary, New Jersey Hudson/Raritan Estuary, New Jersey Hudson/Raritan Estuary, New Jersey Long Island Sound, New York Long Island Sound, New York Long Island Sound, New York Point Roberts, Washington Sinclair Inlet, Washington South Puget Sound, Washington Tillamook Bay, Oregon	30.8 33.0 30.3 32.0 33.5 35.3 40.3 41.2 38.7 43.4 39.8 47.0 49.0
BHDH CHFJ DBAP DBBD HRLB HRUB HRRB LIHH LIMR LITN PRPR SIWP SSBI TBHP BOS	Charleston Harbor, South Carolina Delaware Bay, Delaware Delaware Bay, Delaware Hudson/Raritan Estuary, New Jersey Hudson/Raritan Estuary, New Jersey Long Island Sound, New York Long Island Sound, New York Long Island Sound, New York Point Roberts, Washington Sinclair Inlet, Washington South Puget Sound, Washington Tillamook Bay, Oregon Boston Harbor, Massachusetts	30.8 33.0 30.3 32.0 33.5 35.3 40.3 41.2 38.7 43.4 39.8 47.0 49.0 42.7
BHDH CHFJ DBAP DBBD HRLB HRUB HRRB LIHH LIMR LITN PRPR SIWP SSBI TBHP BOS ELL	Charleston Harbor, South Carolina Delaware Bay, Delaware Delaware Bay, Delaware Hudson/Raritan Estuary, New Jersey Hudson/Raritan Estuary, New Jersey Long Island Sound, New York Long Island Sound, New York Long Island Sound, New York Point Roberts, Washington Sinclair Inlet, Washington South Puget Sound, Washington Tillamook Bay, Oregon Boston Harbor, Massachusetts Elliott Bay, Washington	30.8 33.0 30.3 32.0 33.5 35.3 40.3 41.2 38.7 43.4 39.8 47.0 49.0 42.7 33.4 36.5
BHDH CHFJ DBAP DBBD HRLB HRUB HRRB LIHH LIMR LITN PRPR SIWP SSBI TBHP BOS ELL FRN	Charleston Harbor, South Carolina Delaware Bay, Delaware Delaware Bay, Delaware Hudson/Raritan Estuary, New Jersey Hudson/Raritan Estuary, New Jersey Hudson/Raritan Estuary, New Jersey Long Island Sound, New York Long Island Sound, New York Long Island Sound, New York Point Roberts, Washington Sinclair Inlet, Washington South Puget Sound, Washington Tillamook Bay, Oregon Boston Harbor, Massachusetts Elliott Bay, Washington Frenchman Bay, Maine	30.8 33.0 30.3 32.0 33.5 35.3 40.3 41.2 38.7 43.4 39.8 47.0 49.0 42.7 33.4
BHDH CHFJ DBAP DBBD HRLB HRUB HRRB LIHH LIMR LITN PRPR SIWP SSBI TBHP BOS ELL FRN LNB	Charleston Harbor, South Carolina Delaware Bay, Delaware Delaware Bay, Delaware Hudson/Raritan Estuary, New Jersey Hudson/Raritan Estuary, New Jersey Hudson/Raritan Estuary, New Jersey Long Island Sound, New York Long Island Sound, New York Long Island Sound, New York Long Island Sound, New York Point Roberts, Washington Sinclair Inlet, Washington South Puget Sound, Washington Tillamook Bay, Oregon Boston Harbor, Massachusetts Elliott Bay, Washington Frenchman Bay, Maine Long Beach, California	30.8 33.0 30.3 32.0 33.5 35.3 40.3 41.2 38.7 43.4 39.8 47.0 49.0 42.7 33.4 36.5 31.9 41.7
BHDH CHFJ DBAP DBBD HRLB HRUB HRRB LIHH LIMR LITN PRPR SIWP SSBI TBHP BOS ELL FRN LNB MOB	Charleston Harbor, South Carolina Delaware Bay, Delaware Delaware Bay, Delaware Hudson/Raritan Estuary, New Jersey Hudson/Raritan Estuary, New Jersey Hudson/Raritan Estuary, New Jersey Long Island Sound, New York Long Island Sound, New York Long Island Sound, New York Point Roberts, Washington Sinclair Inlet, Washington South Puget Sound, Washington Tillamook Bay, Oregon Boston Harbor, Massachusetts Elliott Bay, Washington Frenchman Bay, Maine Long Beach, California Mobile Bay, Alabama	30.8 33.0 30.3 32.0 33.5 35.3 40.3 41.2 38.7 43.4 39.8 47.0 49.0 42.7 33.4 36.5 31.9 41.7 35.3
BHDH CHFJ DBAP DBBD HRLB HRUB HRRB LIHH LIMR LITN PRPR SIWP SSBI TBHP BOS ELL FRN LNB MOB NIS	Charleston Harbor, South Carolina Delaware Bay, Delaware Delaware Bay, Delaware Hudson/Raritan Estuary, New Jersey Hudson/Raritan Estuary, New Jersey Hudson/Raritan Estuary, New Jersey Long Island Sound, New York Long Island Sound, New York Long Island Sound, New York Point Roberts, Washington Sinclair Inlet, Washington South Puget Sound, Washington Tillamook Bay, Oregon Boston Harbor, Massachusetts Elliott Bay, Washington Frenchman Bay, Maine Long Beach, California Mobile Bay, Alabama Puget Sound, Washington	30.8 33.0 30.3 32.0 33.5 35.3 40.3 41.2 38.7 43.4 39.8 47.0 49.0 42.7 33.4 36.5 31.9 41.7 35.3 33.5
BHDH CHFJ DBAP DBBD HRLB HRUB HRRB LIHH LIMR LITN PRPR SIWP SSBI TBHP BOS ELL FRN LNB MOB NIS OLI	Charleston Harbor, South Carolina Delaware Bay, Delaware Delaware Bay, Delaware Hudson/Raritan Estuary, New Jersey Hudson/Raritan Estuary, New Jersey Long Island Sound, New York Long Island Sound, New York Long Island Sound, New York Point Roberts, Washington Sinclair Inlet, Washington South Puget Sound, Washington Tillamook Bay, Oregon Boston Harbor, Massachusetts Elliott Bay, Washington Frenchman Bay, Maine Long Beach, California Mobile Bay, Alabama Puget Sound, Washington Oliktok Point, Alaska	30.8 33.0 30.3 32.0 33.5 35.3 40.3 41.2 38.7 43.4 39.8 47.0 49.0 42.7 33.4 36.5 31.9 41.7 35.3 33.5 36.5
BHDH CHFJ DBAP DBBD HRLB HRUB HRRB LIHH LIMR LITN PRPR SIWP SSBI TBHP BOS ELL FRN LNB MOB NIS OLI PNB	Charleston Harbor, South Carolina Delaware Bay, Delaware Delaware Bay, Delaware Hudson/Raritan Estuary, New Jersey Hudson/Raritan Estuary, New Jersey Long Island Sound, New York Long Island Sound, New York Long Island Sound, New York Point Roberts, Washington Sinclair Inlet, Washington South Puget Sound, Washington Tillamook Bay, Oregon Boston Harbor, Massachusetts Elliott Bay, Washington Frenchman Bay, Maine Long Beach, California Mobile Bay, Alabama Puget Sound, Washington Oliktok Point, Alaska Penobscot Bay, Maine	30.8 33.0 30.3 32.0 33.5 35.3 40.3 41.2 38.7 43.4 39.8 47.0 49.0 42.7 33.4 36.5 31.9 41.7 35.3 33.5 36.5 32.6
BHDH CHFJ DBAP DBBD HRLB HRUB HRRB LIHH LIMR LITN PRPR SIWP SSBI TBHP BOS ELL FRN LNB MOB NIS OLI	Charleston Harbor, South Carolina Delaware Bay, Delaware Delaware Bay, Delaware Hudson/Raritan Estuary, New Jersey Hudson/Raritan Estuary, New Jersey Long Island Sound, New York Long Island Sound, New York Long Island Sound, New York Point Roberts, Washington Sinclair Inlet, Washington South Puget Sound, Washington Tillamook Bay, Oregon Boston Harbor, Massachusetts Elliott Bay, Washington Frenchman Bay, Maine Long Beach, California Mobile Bay, Alabama Puget Sound, Washington Oliktok Point, Alaska	30.8 33.0 30.3 32.0 33.5 35.3 40.3 41.2 38.7 43.4 39.8 47.0 49.0 42.7 33.4 36.5 31.9 41.7 35.3 33.5 36.5

•

•

.

ppb

Site Description	Location	Concentrati	ion
		· · · ,	
Silver (≥1.0 <2.2 ppm)		ppm	
BHHB	Boston Harbor, Massachusetts	1.1	
CBSP	Choctawatchee Bay, Florida	1.0	
LIMR	Long Island Sound, New York	1.4	
MDSJ	Marina del Rey, California	1.0	
SPFP	San Pedro Bay, California	1.0	
OEIH	Oakland Estuary, California	1.3	
NAR	Narragansett Bay, Rhode Island	1.2	
SAL	Salem Harbor, Massachusetts	1.8	
WLI		1.6	
AA 1 71	West Long Island Sound, New York	1.0	
Zinc (≥120 <260 ppm)		ppm	-
BBSM	Bellingham Bay, Washington	128.3	
BHDI	Boston Harbor, Massachusetts	145.2	;
BHDH	Boston Harbor, Massachusetts	182.8	
DBAP	Delaware Bay, Delaware	139.0	
HRJB	Hudson/Raritan Estuary, New Jersey	143.7	
HRUB	Hudson/Raritan Estuary, New Jersey	204.7	
LICR	Long Island Sound, Connecticut	127.2	
LISI	Long Island Sound, Connecticut	161.5	
LIHU	Long Island Sound, New York	181.3	,
LIMR	Long Island Sound, New York	213.3	
NBMH	Narragansett Bay, Rhode Island	190.0	
PVRP	Palos Verdes, California	193.3	
PVMC	Port Valdez, Alaska	150.0	
SDHI	San Diego Bay, California	124.3	
SFDB	San Francisco Bay, California	136.7	
SFSM		127.5	
SPSP	San Francisco Bay, California	131.7	
	San Pablo Bay, California	131.7	,
SIWP	Sinclair Inlet, Washington		
SSBI	South Puget Sound, Washington	123.3	
TBSR	Tomales Bay, California	120.0	
ELL	Elliott Bay, Washington	176.8	
GRB	Great Bay, New Jersey	159.0	1
HUN	San Francisco Bay, California	127.3	•
LNB	Long Beach, California	195.7	
LUT	Lutak Inlet, Alaska	180.8	
MOB	Mobile Bay, Alabama	159.2	
NAH	Nahku Bay, Alaska	191.3	
NAR	Narragansett Bay, Rhode Island	143.4	
OAK	Oakland Estuary, California	171.7	4.2
PEN	Pensacola Bay, Florida	138.2	
SAL	Salem Harbor, Massachusetts	218.5	
SEA	Seal Beach, California	125.0	
SPB	San Pedro Bay, California	155.0	
UCB	Upper Chesapeake Bay, Maryland	240.8	
WLI	West Long Island Sound, New York	234.2	

Acenaphthene (≥150 <650 ppb)

HRUB	Hudson/Raritan Bay, New Jersey	368.3
BOS	Boston Harbor, Massachusetts	158.8

te Description	Location	Concentration
nthracene (≥85 <900 ppb)		ppb
BHDI	Boston Harbor, Massachusetts	97 0
BHDH	Boston Harbor, Massachusetts	160.7
CBHP	Chesapeake Bay, Maryland	145.0
CBMP	Chesapeake Bay, Maryland	168.3
HRJB	Hudson/Raritan Estuary, New Jersey	160.0
HRLB	Hudson/Raritan Estuary, New Jersey	441.7
LICR	Long Island Sound, Connecticut	113.1
LIHR	Long Island Sound, Connecticut	140.0
LISI	Long Island Sound, Connecticut	262.0
LIHH	Long Island Sound, Connecticut	125.5
LITN	Long Island Sound, Connecticut	458.7
MSBB	Mississippi Sound, Mississippi	153.0
NBMH	Narragansett Bay, Rhode Island	85.7
NYSH	New York Bight, New York	228.3
PBPI	Penobscot Bay, Maine	93.3
PBSI	Penobscot Bay, Maine	89.7
SIWP	Sinclair Inlet, Washington	116.7
OEIH	Oakland Estuary, California	170.0
BOS	Boston Harbor, Massachusetts	804.9
BUZ	Buzzards Bay, Massachusetts	143.4
CHS	Charleston Harbor, South Carolina	135.6
CSC	Casco Bay, Maine	152.2
DEL	Delaware Bay, Delaware	110.0
ELL	Elliott Bay, Washington	156.7
GRB	Great Bay, New Jersey	120.8
HUN	San Francisco Bay, California	100.2
NAR	Narragansett Bay, Rhode Island	187.9
RAR	Raritan Bay, New Jersey	260.0
SDA	San Diego Bay, California	830.7
UCB	Upper Chesapeake Bay, Maryland	97.4
WLI	West Long Island Sound, New York	354.4
enzo(a)anthracene (2	≥230 <1600 ppb)	ppb
BHDI	Boston Harbor, Massachusetts	470.0
BHDH	Boston Harbor, Massachusetts	816.7
BHDH BBAR	Boston Harbor, Massachusetts Buzzards Bay, Massachusetts	816.7 397.0
BHDH BBAR CBMP	Boston Harbor, Massachusetts Buzzards Bay, Massachusetts Chesapeake Bay, Maryland	816.7 397.0 308.3
BHDH BBAR CBMP CBSP	Boston Harbor, Massachusetts Buzzards Bay, Massachusetts	816.7 397.0
BHDH BBAR CBMP	Boston Harbor, Massachusetts Buzzards Bay, Massachusetts Chesapeake Bay, Maryland	816.7 397.0 308.3
BHDH BBAR CBMP CBSP	Boston Harbor, Massachusetts Buzzards Bay, Massachusetts Chesapeake Bay, Maryland Choctawatchee Bay, Florida	816.7 397.0 308.3 398.2
BHDH BBAR CBMP CBSP HRJB	Boston Harbor, Massachusetts Buzzards Bay, Massachusetts Chesapeake Bay, Maryland Choctawatchee Bay, Florida Hudson/Raritan, New Jersey	816.7 397.0 308.3 398.2 261.7
BHDH BBAR CBMP CBSP HRJB HRLB	Boston Harbor, Massachusetts Buzzards Bay, Massachusetts Chesapeake Bay, Maryland Choctawatchee Bay, Florida Hudson/Raritan, New Jersey Hudson/Raritan, New Jersey	816.7 397.0 308.3 398.2 261.7 993.3
BHDH BBAR CBMP CBSP HRJB HRLB LICR	Boston Harbor, Massachusetts Buzzards Bay, Massachusetts Chesapeake Bay, Maryland Choctawatchee Bay, Florida Hudson/Raritan, New Jersey Hudson/Raritan, New Jersey Long Island Sound, Connecticut Long Island Sound, Connecticut	816.7 397.0 308.3 398.2 261.7 993.3 462.1
BHDH BBAR CBMP CBSP HRJB HRLB LICR LIHR LIMR	Boston Harbor, Massachusetts Buzzards Bay, Massachusetts Chesapeake Bay, Maryland Choctawatchee Bay, Florida Hudson/Raritan, New Jersey Hudson/Raritan, New Jersey Long Island Sound, Connecticut Long Island Sound, New York	816.7 397.0 308.3 398.2 261.7 993.3 462.1 443.3 335.0
BHDH BBAR CBMP CBSP HRJB HRLB LICR LIHR	Boston Harbor, Massachusetts Buzzards Bay, Massachusetts Chesapeake Bay, Maryland Choctawatchee Bay, Florida Hudson/Raritan, New Jersey Hudson/Raritan, New Jersey Long Island Sound, Connecticut Long Island Sound, Connecticut Long Island Sound, New York Long Island Sound, Connecticut	816.7 397.0 308.3 398.2 261.7 993.3 462.1 443.3
BHDH BBAR CBMP CBSP HRJB HRLB LICR LIHR LIMR LISI	Boston Harbor, Massachusetts Buzzards Bay, Massachusetts Chesapeake Bay, Maryland Choctawatchee Bay, Florida Hudson/Raritan, New Jersey Hudson/Raritan, New Jersey Long Island Sound, Connecticut Long Island Sound, Connecticut Long Island Sound, New York Long Island Sound, Connecticut Long Island Sound, Connecticut	816.7 397.0 308.3 398.2 261.7 993.3 462.1 443.3 335.0 530.7
BHDH BBAR CBMP CBSP HRJB HRLB LICR LIHR LIMR LISI LIHH LITN	Boston Harbor, Massachusetts Buzzards Bay, Massachusetts Chesapeake Bay, Maryland Choctawatchee Bay, Florida Hudson/Raritan, New Jersey Hudson/Raritan, New Jersey Long Island Sound, Connecticut Long Island Sound, Connecticut Long Island Sound, New York Long Island Sound, Connecticut Long Island Sound, Connecticut Long Island Sound, Connecticut Long Island Sound, Connecticut	816.7 397.0 308.3 398.2 261.7 993.3 462.1 443.3 335.0 530.7 370.0 1107.9
BHDH BBAR CBMP CBSP HRJB HRLB LICR LIHR LIMR LISI LIHH LITN NYSH	Boston Harbor, Massachusetts Buzzards Bay, Massachusetts Chesapeake Bay, Maryland Choctawatchee Bay, Florida Hudson/Raritan, New Jersey Hudson/Raritan, New Jersey Long Island Sound, Connecticut Long Island Sound, Connecticut Long Island Sound, New York Long Island Sound, Connecticut Long Island Sound, Connecticut Long Island Sound, Connecticut New York Bight, New Jersey	816.7 397.0 308.3 398.2 261.7 993.3 462.1 443.3 335.0 530.7 370.0 1107.9 468.3
BHDH BBAR CBMP CBSP HRJB HRLB LICR LIHR LIMR LISI LIHH LITN NYSH PBPI	Boston Harbor, Massachusetts Buzzards Bay, Massachusetts Chesapeake Bay, Maryland Choctawatchee Bay, Florida Hudson/Raritan, New Jersey Hudson/Raritan, New Jersey Long Island Sound, Connecticut Long Island Sound, Connecticut Long Island Sound, New York Long Island Sound, Connecticut Long Island Sound, Connecticut New York Bight, New Jersey Penobscot Bay, Maine	816.7 397.0 308.3 398.2 261.7 993.3 462.1 443.3 335.0 530.7 370.0 1107.9 468.3 369.7
BHDH BBAR CBMP CBSP HRJB HRLB LICR LIHR LIMR LISI LIHH LITN NYSH PBPI PBSI	Boston Harbor, Massachusetts Buzzards Bay, Massachusetts Chesapeake Bay, Maryland Choctawatchee Bay, Florida Hudson/Raritan, New Jersey Hudson/Raritan, New Jersey Long Island Sound, Connecticut Long Island Sound, Connecticut Long Island Sound, New York Long Island Sound, Connecticut Long Island Sound, Connecticut Long Island Sound, Connecticut New York Bight, New Jersey Penobscot Bay, Maine Penobscot Bay, Maine	816.7 397.0 308.3 398.2 261.7 993.3 462.1 443.3 335.0 530.7 370.0 1107.9 468.3 369.7 238.3
BHDH BBAR CBMP CBSP HRJB HRLB LICR LIHR LIMR LISI LIHH LITN NYSH PBPI	Boston Harbor, Massachusetts Buzzards Bay, Massachusetts Chesapeake Bay, Maryland Choctawatchee Bay, Florida Hudson/Raritan, New Jersey Hudson/Raritan, New Jersey Long Island Sound, Connecticut Long Island Sound, Connecticut Long Island Sound, New York Long Island Sound, Connecticut Long Island Sound, Connecticut New York Bight, New Jersey Penobscot Bay, Maine	816.7 397.0 308.3 398.2 261.7 993.3 462.1 443.3 335.0 530.7 370.0 1107.9 468.3 369.7

ite Description	Location	Concentration
Benzo(a)anthracene(continued))		ppm
OEIH	Oakland Estuary, California	356.7
BOS	Boston Harbor, Massachusetts	971.7
ELL	Elliott Bay, Washington	308.3
HUN	San Francisco Bay, California	230.0
RAR	Raritan Bay, New Jersey	428.5
SAL	Salem Harbor, Massachusetts	635.7
SDA	San Diego Bay, California	361.7
WLI	West Long Island Sound, New York	246.4
enzo(a)pyrene (≥400 ↔	<2600 ppb)	ppb
BBAR	Buzzards Bay Massachusetts	434.3
BHDH	Boston Harbor, Massachusetts	838.3
BHDI	Boston Harbor, Massachusetts	433.3
CBSP	Choctawatchee Bay, Florida	620.1
HHKL	Honolulu Harbor, Hawaii	413.3
HRLB	Hudson/Raritan Estuary, New Jersey	1005.0
HRUB	Hudson/Raritan Estuary, New Jersey	2958.3
LICR	Long Island Sound, Connecticut	477.9
LIHR	Long Island Sound, Connecticut	446.7
LIHK		
	Long Island Sound, New York	505.0
LIMR	Long Island Sound, New York	418.8
LISI	Long Island Sound, Connecticut	551.7
LITN	Long Island Sound, Connecticut	1305.0
NYSH	New York Bight, New Jersey	513.3
SAWB	Saint Andrew Bay, Florida	848.1
OEIH	Oakland Estuary, California	763.3
BOS	Boston Harbor, Massachusetts	555.2
HUN	San Francisco Bay, California	436.7
RAR	Raritan Bay, New Jersey	514.5
SAL	Salem Harbor, Massachusetts	504.8
SDA	San Diego Bay, California	935.0
WLI	West Long Island Sound, New York	409.2
hrysene (≥400 <2800 j	opb)	ppb
BBAR	Buzzards Bay, Massachusetts	422.7
BHDI	Boston Harbor, Massachusetts	545.0
BHDH	Boston Harbor, Massachusetts	960.0
CBMP	Chesapeake Bay, Maryland	483.3
HRLB	Hudson/Raritan Estuary, New Jersey	1000.0
HRUB	Hudson/Raritan Estuary, New Jersey	2653.3
LICR	Long Island Sound, Connecticut	510.0
LIHR	Long Island Sound, Connecticut	563.3
LIMR	Long Island Sound, New Y ork	490.0
LISI	Long Island Sound, Connecticut	683.8
LIHH	Long Island Sound, Connecticut	561.7
LITN	Long Island Sound, Connecticut	1244.2
NYSH	Long Island Sound, Connecticut	541.7
OEIH	Oakland Estuary, California	566.7
SAWB	Saint Andrews Bay, Florida	419.8
BOS	Boston Harbor, Massachusetts	777.1
ELL	Elliott Bay, Washington	653.3

Table 72 (continued)

• • •

ite Description	Location	Concentration
Chrysene (continued))		ppm
RAR	Raritan Bay, New Jersey	519.8
SAL	Salem Harbor, Massachusetts	595.0
SDA	San Diego Bay, California	920.0
Fluoranthene (≥600 <3600 ppb)		ррь
BHDI	Boston Harbor, Massachusetts	723.3
BHDH	Boston Harbor, Massachusetts	1031.7
CBMP	Chesapeake Bay, Maryland	1338.8
CBSP	Choctawatchee Bay, Florida	646.7
HRLB	Hudson/Raritan Estuary, New Jersey	1481.7
LICR	Long Island Sound, Connecticut	778.3
LIHR	Long Island Sound, Connecticut	1216.7
LISI	Long Island Sound, Connecticut	1323.3
LIHH	Long Island Sound, Connecticut	835.0
	Long Island Sound, Connecticut	846.7
LITN	Long Island Sound, Connecticut	1576.2
NYSH	New York Bight, New Jersey	698.3
PBPI	Penobscot Bay, Maine	926.7
SAWB	Saint Andrew Bay, Florida	1503.7
OEIH	Oakland Estuary, California	826.7
BOS	Boston Harbor, Massachusetts	1401.4
ELL	Elliott Bay, Washington	618.3
RAR	Raritan Bay, New Jersey	615.7
SAL	Salem Harbor, Massachusetts	1031.9
⁷ luorene (≥35 <540 ppb)		ppb
BHDI	Boston Harbor, Massachusetts	37.0
BHDH	Boston Harbor, Massachusetts	54.8
СВНР	Chesapeake Bay, Maryland	134.5
CBMP	Chesapeake Bay, Maryland	145.0
HRJB	Hudson/Raritan Estuary, New Jersey	55.7
HRLB	Hudson/Raritan Estuary, New Jersey	114.8
HRUB	Hudson/Raritan Estuary, New Jersey	358.3
LISI	Long Island Sound, Connecticut	130.0
LIHH	Long Island Sound, Connecticut	66.8
LITN	Long Island Sound, Connecticut	109.9
		68.8
MSBB	Mississippi Sound, Mississippi	68.3
NYSH	New York Bight, New Jersey	
SAWB	Saint Andrew Bay, Florida	109.5
BOS	Boston Harbor, Massachusetts	246.0
ELL	Elliott Bay, Washington	83.8
RAR	Raritan Bay, New Jersey	49.2
SDA	San Diego Bay, California	129.0
SJR	Saint Johns River, Florida	43.2
ÚCB	Upper Chesapeake Bay, Maryland	87.8
Naphthalene (≥340 <2100	ppb)	ррь
CBMP	Chesapeake Bay, Maryland	415.0
HRUB	Hudson/Raritan Estuary, New Jersey	698.3
	Saint Andrew Bay, Florida	459.3

Table 72 (continued)

Naphthalene (continued) BOS UCB	Boston Harbor, Massachusetts Upper Chesapeake Bay, Maryland	ppb
		1415.7
		403.2
Phenanthrene (≥225 <1380 ppb)		ррь
BBSM	Bellingham Bay, Washington	285.0
BHDI	Boston Harbor, Massachusetts	353.3
BHDH	Boston Harbor, Massachusetts	543.3
BBRH	Buzzards Bay, Massachusetts	310.0
CBHP	Chesapeake Bay, Maryland	511.7
CBMP	Chesapeake Bay, Maryland	611.7
	Chestewetches Pers Floride	
CBSP	Choctawatchee Bay, Florida	247.0
HRJB	Hudson/Raritan Estuary, New Jersey	269.0
HRLB	Hudson/Raritan Estuary, New Jersey	683.3
LICR	Long Island Sound, Connecticut	355.8
LIHR	Long Island Sound, Connecticut	600.0
LISI	Long Island Sound, Connecticut	872.7
LIHH	Long Island Sound, Connecticut	391.7
LIMR	Long Island Sound, Connecticut	345.0
LITN	Long Island Sound, Connecticut	753.3
MSBB	Mississippi Sound, Mississippi	295.8
NBDI	Narragansett Bay, Rhode Island	303.7
NYSH	New York Bight, New Jersey	366.7
PBPI		398.0
	Penobscot Bay, Maine	
PBSI	Penobscot Bay, Maine	261.7
SAWB	Saint Andrew Bay, Florida	448.8
OEIH	Oakland Estuary, California	326.7
BOS	Boston Harbor, Massachusetts	979.0
ELL	Elliott Bay, Washington	461.7
HUN	San Francisco Bay, Čalifornia	321.7
RAR	Raritan Bay, New Jersey	310.4
SAL	Salem Harbor, Massachusetts	605.9
SDA	San Diego Bay, California	295.8
UCB	Upper Chesapeake Bay, Maryland	367.6
Pyrene (≥350 <2200 ppb)		ppb
BBMB	Barataria Bay, Louisiana	357.2
BPBP	Barbers Point, Hawaii	417.0
BIBI		356.7
	Block Island, New Jersey Boston Harbor, Massachusotta	
BHDI	Boston Harbor, Massachusetts	670.0
BHDH	Boston Harbor, Massachusetts	962.8
BBAR	Buzzards Bay, Massachusetts	458.3
BBRH	Buzzards Bay, Massachusetts	3 9 0.0
CBHP	Chesapeake Bay, Maryland	575.0
CBMP	Chesapeake Bay, Maryland	1058.3
CBSP	Choctawatchee Bay, Florida	572.8
HRJB	Hudson/Raritan Estuary, New Jersey	450.0
HRLB	Hudson/Raritan Estuary, New Jersey	1726.7
LICR	Long Island Sound, Connecticut	822.9
LICK	Long Island Sound, Connecticut	1516.7
LISI		1226.7
LISI	Long Island Sound, Connecticut Long Island Sound, Connecticut	841.7

ite Description	Location	Concentration
yrene (continued)		ррь
LIMR	Long Island Sound, Connecticut	781.7
LITN	Long Island Sound, Connecticut	1927.1
NBDI	Narragansett Bay, Rhode Island	451.7
NBMH	Narragansett Bay, Rhode Island	426.7
NYSH	New York Bight, New Jersey	820.0
PBPI		673.3
PBSI	Penobscot Bay, Maine Bonobscot Bay, Maine	416.7
	Penobscot Bay, Maine	
SAWB	Saint Andrew Bay, Florida	1659.0
SFDB	San Francisco Bay, California	543.3
SFSM	San Francisco Bay, California	617.5
SPFP	San Pedro Harbor, California	986.7
SIWP	Sinclair Inlet, Washington	590.0
OEIH	Oakland Estuary, California	1026.7
BOS	Boston Harbor, Massachusetts	1076.9
ELL	Elliott Bay, Washington	781.7
HUN	San Francisco Bay, California	773.3
OAK		386.7
	Oakland Estuary, California	
RAR	Raritan Bay, New Jersey	821.1
SAL	Salem Harbor, Massachusetts	1760.0
SDA	San Diego Bay, California	803.3
WLI	West Long Island Sound, New York	791.5
e-methylnaphthalene (≥65 <670 ppb)		ppb
BHDI	Boston Harbor, Massachusetts	87.7
BHDH	Boston Harbor, Massachusetts	107.8
BBAR	Buzzards Bay, Massachusetts	79.0
CBHP	Chesapeake Bay, Maryland	253.3
	Chosepeake Bay, Maryland	255.5
CBMP	Chesapeake Bay, Maryland	
CBBP	Commencement Bay, Washington	76.0
HRJB	Hudson/Raritan Estuary, New Jersey	96.7
HRLB	Hudson/Raritan Estuary, New Jersey	195.0
LISI	Long Island Sound, Connecticut	66.7
LIHH	Long Island, Sound, Connecticut	67.5
LITN	Long Island Sound, Connecticut	258.8
NYSH	New York Bight, New Jersey	178.3
PBSI	Penobscot Bay, Maine	142.5
SAWB	Saint Andrew Bay, Florida	203.5
SPFP	San Pedro Harbor, California	120.7
COM	Commencement Bay, Washington	80.0
		79.3
ELL	Elliott Bay, Washington	
OLI	Oliktok Point, Alaska	142.7
RAR	Raritan Bay, New Jersey	116.3
UCB	Upper Chesapeake Bay, Maryland	248.0
Dibenz(a,h)anthracene (≥60 <260 ppb)		ррь
BAR	Barataria Bay, Louisiana	101.7
ELL	Elliott Bay, Washington	66.2
PEN	Pensacola Bay, Florida	85.8
RAR	Raritan Bay, New Jersey	111.5
KAK		111

Site Description	Location	Concentration
Dibenz(a,h)anthracene (continued)		ррь
SDA	San Diego Bay, California	162.0
WLI	West Long Island Sound, New York	71.6
[otal PAH (≥4000 <3500) ppb)	ррЪ
BHDI	Boston Harbor, Massachusetts	4054
BHDH	Boston Harbor, Massachusetts	6603
CBMP	Chesapeake Bay, Maryland	5950
HRLB	Hudson/Raritan Estuary, New Jersey	9388
HRUB	Hudson/Raritan estuary	29324
LICR	Long Island Sound, Connecticut	4000
LIHR	Long Island Sound, Connecticut	5573
LISI	Long Island Sound, Connecticut	5660
LIHH	Long Island Sound, Connecticut	4592
LITN	Long Island Sound, Connecticut	10395
NYSH	New York Bight, New Jersey	5070
OEIH	Oakland Estuary, California	5065
SAWB	Saint Andrew Bay, Florida	9233
BOS	Boston Harbor, Massachusetts	15045
ELL	Elliott Bay, Washington	4477
RAR	Raritan Bay, New Jersey	4649
SAL	Salem Harbor, Massachusetts	7180
SDA	San Diego Bay, California	5915
Chlordane (≥0.5 <6 ppb)		ррь
A RIAIT	Anchoim Box California	0.0
	Anaheim Bay, California Boston Harbor, Massachusatta	0.9
BHDB	Boston Harbor, Massachusetts	2.4
BHDI	Boston Harbor, Massachusetts	3.2
BHHD	Boston Harbor, Massachusetts	0.7
BBRH	Buzzards Bay, Massachusetts	0.5
CASI	Cape Ann, Massachusetts	0.5
CHIFJ	Charleston Harbor, South Carolina	0.5
CBHP	Chesapeake Bay, Maryland	1.8
CBMP	Chesapeake Bay, Maryland	1.1
CBIB	Chesapeake Bay, Maryland	0.6
DBAP	Delaware Bay, Delaware	0.6
DBKI	Delaware Bay, Delaware	0.5
GBYC	Galveston Bay, Texas	0.6
HRRB	Hudson/Raritan Estuary, New Jersey	4.2
HRLB	Hudson/Raritan estuary, New Jersey	5.0
HRUB	Hudson/Raritan Estuary, New Jersey	1.7
LICR	Long Island Sound, Connecticut	2.4
	Long Island Sound, Connecticut	
LIHR	Long Island Sound, Connecticut	2.5
LISI	Long Island Sound, Connecticut	1.0
LIHU	Long Island Sound, Connecticut	1.5
	Long Island Sound, Connecticut	3.0
LIMR		1.1
MDSJ	Marina del Rey, California	
MDSJ MSBB	Mississippi Sound, Mississippi	1.0
MDSJ	Marina del Rey, California Mississippi Sound, Mississippi Mississippi Sound, Mississippi	

e Description	Location	Concentration
ulordane (continued)		ppb
NYSH	New York Bight, New York	3.8
NBNB	Naples Bay, Florida	1.2
NBCI	Narragansett Bay, Rhode Island	0.7
NBDI	Narragansett Bay, Rhode Island	0.9
NBMH	Narragansett Bay, Rhode Island	0.9
OSBJ	Oceanside, California	0.6
PVRP	Palos Verdes, California	1.9
PBPI		0.8
	Penobscot Bay, Maine	
PBSI	Penobscot Bay, Maine	0.6
SBSB	Point Santa Barbara, California	1.0
RBHC	Rookery Bay, Florida	0.6
SPSM	San Pablo Bay, California	1.0
SPSP	San Pablo Bay, California	0.6
SPFP	San Pedro Harbor, California	2.6
SAWB	Saint Andrew Bay, Florida	2.2
SJCB	Saint Johns River, Florida	0.9
TBMK	Tampa Bay, Florida	1.6
TBPB	Tampa Bay, Florida	2.5
DT (p,p' + o,p'-DDT)	(≥1 <7 ppb)	ррь
BHDB	Boston Harbor, Massachusetts	2.2
BHDI	Boston Harbor, Massachusetts	4.2
CBHP	Chesapeake Bay, Maryland	1.8
CBMP	Chesapeake Bay, Maryland	1.3
CBSR	Choctawatchee Bay, Florida	6.6
CRYB	Columbia River, Oregon	1.4
DBAP	Delaware Bay, Delaware	1.2
DBFE	Delaware Bay, Delaware	5.6
HRRB	Hudson/Raritan Estuary, New Jersey	2.6
HRJB	Hudson/Raritan Estuary, New Jersey	5.3
		5.8
HRUB	Hudson/Raritan Estuary, New Jersey	
LICR	Long Island Sound, Connecticut	5.0
LIHR	Long Island Sound, Connecticut	6.9
LIHH	Long Island Sound, Connecticut	5.5
LIHU	Long Island Sound, Connecticut	1.6
LIMR	Long Island Sound, Connecticut	2.2
LITN	Long Island Sound, Connecticut	6.1
MDSJ	Marina del Rey, California	2.0
MBSC	Monterey Bay, California	1.5
NYSH	New York Bight, New York	4.6
NBMH	Narragansett Bay, Rhode Island	1.2
PBSI	Penobscot Bay, Maine	1.2
PLLH	Point Loma, California	2.8
SBSB	Point Santa Barbara, California	1.5
SFDB	San Francisco Bay, California	3.3
SFEM	San Francisco Bay, California	4.9
		4.9
SPSM	San Pablo Bay, California	
SPSP	San Pablo Bay, California	2.0
SIWP	Sinclair Inlet, Washington	5.5
SSBI	South Puget Sound, Washington	3.2
твнв	Tampa Bay, Florida	1.5
TBPB	Tampa Bay, Florida	2.0
IDID	Tampa Day, Honda	3.0

Site Description	Location	Concentration
DDT (p,p' + 0,p'-DDT) (continued)		ppb
BOS	Boston Harbor, Massachusetts	2.1
GRB	Great Bay, New Jersey	1.3
LNB	Long Beach Harbor, California	2.7
SAL	Salem Harbor, Massachusetts	2.6
SMB	Santa Monica Bay, California	1.0
DDD (p,p' + 0,p'-DDD) (≥2 <20 ppb)		ррь
ABWJ	Anaheim Bay, California	4.6
BBAŘ	Buzzards Bay, Massachusetts	2.1
BBSM	Bellingham Bay, Washington	2.4
BHDI	Boston Harbor, Massachusetts	12.6
вннв	Boston Harbor, Massachusetts	3.3
CBHP	Chesapeake Bay, Maryland	8.5
CBMP	Chesapeake Bay, Maryland	8.0
CBSR	Choctawatchee Bay, Florida	2.6
CRYB	Columbia River, Oregon	2.3
DBAP ·	Delaware Bay, Delaware	7.5
DBFE	Delaware Bay, Delaware	6.3
DBKI	Delaware Bay, Delaware	3.9
ECSP	East Cote Blanche, Louisiana	2.0
HRJB	Hudson/Raritan Estuary, New Jersey	19.0
HRUB	Hudson/Raritan Estuary, New Jersey	13.2
LIHR	Long Island Sound, Connecticut	19.7
LISI	Long Island Sound, Connecticut	4.7
LIHU	Long Island Sound, Connecticut	7.7
LIMR	Long Island Sound, Connecticut	13.7
MDSJ	Marina del Rey, California	13.2
MBLR	Matagorda Bay, Texas	5.5
MBTD	Matagorda Bay, Texas	2.8
MSBB	Mississippi Sound, Mississippi	2.5
MBCP		3.5
	Mobile Bay, Alabama Morishes Bay, New York	9.2
BMTH NBCI	Moriches Bay, New York	3.5
	Narragansett Bay, Rhode Island	
NBMH	Narragansett Bay, Rhode Island	5.1
NBBC	Narragansett Bay, Rhode Island	3.7
OSBJ	Oceanside, California	14.8
PBSI	Penobscot Bay, Maine	2.6
SBSB	Point Santa Barbara, California	10.1
SDHI	San Diego Bay, California	4.7
SFDB	San Francisco Bay, California	8.4
SFEM	San Francisco Bay, California	18.0
SFSM	San Francisco Bay,. California	3.4
SPSM	San Pablo Bay, California	14.7
SPSP	San Pablo Bay, California	6.9
SIWP	Sinclair Inlet, Washington	2.8
SSBI	South Puget Sound, Washington	2.0
SAWB	Saint Andrew Bay, Florida	16.2
SJCB	Saint Johns River, Florida	5.8
TBHB	Tampa Bay, Florida	5.0
TBPB	Tampa Bay, Florida	3.1
WIPP	Whidbey Island, Washington	3.4
COM	Commencement Bay, Washington	2.7
ĊŚĊ	Casco Bay, Maine	2.0

Site Description	Location	Concentration
DDD (p,p' + 0,p'-DDD) (continued)		ppb
ELL	Elliott Bay, Washington	8.2
GRB	Great Bay, New Jersey	3.8
	See Ereneisse Pari California	
HUN	San Francisco Bay, California	3.0
MRD	Mississippi Delta, Mississippi	3.8
NAR	Narragansett Bay, Rhode Island	2.4
OAK	Oakland Estuary, California	3.7
RAR	Raritan Bay, New Jersey	19.3
SDA	San Diego Bay, California	5.6
SEA	Seal Beach, California	5.1
SJR	Saint Johns River, Florida	2.2
SMB	Santa Monica Bay, California	4.9
UCB	Upper Chesapeake Bay, Maryland	3.1
WLI	West Long Island Sound, New York	3.7
DDE (p,p' + o,p'-DDE)	(≥2 <15 ppb)	ppb
APDB	Apalachicola Bay, Florida	3.2
BBAR	Buzzards Bay, Massachusetts	6.1
BBRH	Buyzzards Bay, Massachusetts	2.8
BHDI	Boston Harbor, Massachusetts	7.3
вннв	Boston Harbor, Massachusetts	2.1
		3.7
CBHP	Chesapeake Bay, Maryland	
CBMP	Chesapeake Bay, Maryland	4.2
CBSR	Choctawatchee Bay, Florida	3.3
DBAP	Delaware Bay, Delaware	6.5
DBBD	Delaware Bay, Delaware	3.1
DBFE	Delaware Bay, Delaware	4.1
DBKI	Delaware Bay, Delaware	3.8
HRJB	Hudson/Raritan Estuary, New Jersey	14.0
HRUB	Hudson/Raritan Estuary, New Jersey	6.5
LJLJ	La Jolla, California	6.5
LICR	Long Island Sound, Connecticut	5.2
LIHR	Long Island Sound, Connecticut	2.8
LISI	Long Island Sound, Connecticut	2.0
		11.1
LIHH	Ling Island Sound, Connecticut	
LIHU	Long Island Sound, Connecticut	3.9
LIMR	Long Island Sound, Connecticut	5.3
MBTP	Matagordo Bay, Texas	2.1
MBVB	Mission Bay, Callifornia	4.3
MBCP	Mobile Bay, Alabama	5.3
MBTH	Moriches Bay, New York	2.4
MBSC	Monterey Bay, California	3.8
NBMH	Narragansett Bay, Rhode Island	3.9
PLLH	Point Loma, California	12.9
SFDB	San Francisco Bay, California	4.9
SFEM	San Francisco Bay, California	5.1
SFSM		3.1
	San Francisco Bay, California	6.3
SPSM	San Pablo Bay, California	
SPSP	San Pablo Bay, California	3.8
SAWB	Saint Andrew Bay, Florida	14.7
TBPB	Tampa Bay, Florida	5.4
WIPP	Whidbey Island, Washington	3.3
APA	Apalachicola Bay, Florida	2.1

2. N 1

ite Description	Location	Concentration
DDE (p,p' + 0,p'-DDE) (continued)		ррь
SDHI	San Diego Bay, California	3.7
GRB	Great Bay, New Jersey	2.3
MOB	Mobile Bay, Alabama	3.0
NAR	Narragansett Bay, Rhode Island	2.6
RAR	Raritan Bay, New Jersey	8.6
SAL	Salem Harbor, Massachusetts	7.3
SDA	San Diego Bay, California	3.5
SDF	San Diego Bay, California	13.6
WLI	West Long Island Sound, New York	2.4
otal DDT (≥3 <350 pp	b)	ррь
ABWJ	Anaheim Bay, California	25.8
APDB	Apalachicola Bay, Florida	5.2
ABOB	Atchafalaya Bay, Louisiana	4.1
BBAR	Buzzards Bay, Massachusetts	8.2
BBSM	Bellingham Bay, Washington	4.5
BHHB	Boston Harbor, Massachusettz	5.9
BHDI	Boston Harbor, Massachusetts	24.1
BHDB	Boston Harbor, Massachusetts	44.4
CASI	Cape Ann, Massachusetts	3.3
CBMP	Chesapeake Bay, Maryland	13.5
CBHP	Chesapeake Bay, Maryland	13.9
CBSR	Choctawhatchee Bay, Florida	12.5
CRYB	Columbia River, Oregon	4.9
DBBD		4.9 5.9
DBBD DBKI	Delaware Bay, Delaware	7.8
DBAP	Delaware Bay, Delaware	
	Delaware Bay, Delaware	15.2
DBFE	Delaware Bay, Delaware	17.2
ECSP	East Cote Blanche, Louisiana	3.2 45 6
HRRB	Hudson/Raritan Estuary, New Jersey	45.6
HRUB	Hudson/Raritan Estuary, New York	25.4
HRJB	Hudson/Raritan Estuary, New York	38.3
HRLB	Hudson/Raritan Estuary, New Jork	45.6
LJLJ	La Jolla, California	8.6
LISI	Long Island Sound, Connecticut	7.0
LICR	Long Island Sound, Connecticut	120.0
LIHR	Long Island Sound, Connecticut	290.4
LIHU	Long Island Sound, New York	13.2
LIMR	Long Island Sound, New York	21.2
LIHH	Long Island Sound, New York	41.3
LITN	Long Island Sound, New York	75.6
MDSJ	Marina del Rey, California	72.6
MBLR	Matagorda Bay, Texas	7.9
MSTP	Matagorda Bay, Texas	14.5
MBVB	Mission Bay, California	5.1
MBCP	Mobile Bay, Alabama	9.4
MBSC	Monterey Bay, California	7.4
MBTH	Moriches Bay, New York	26.5
NYSH	New York Bight, New Jersey	45.5
NBDI	Narragansett Bay, Rhode Island	4.0
NBCI	Narragansett Bay, Rhode Island	5.1
NBMH	Narragansett Bay, Rhode Island	10.2
NBBC	Newport Beach, California	24.9

te Description	Location	Concentration
otal DDT (continued)		ppb
OEIH	Oakland Estuary, California	88.5
OSBJ	Oceanside, California	50.1
PBPI	Penobscot Bay, Maine	3.7
PBSI	Penobscot Bay, Maine	4.5
PLLH	Point Loma, California	17.7
SBSB	Point Santa Barbara, California	32.9
SDHI		9.0
	San Diego Bay, California	
SFSM	San Francisco Bay, California	6.8
SFDB	San Francisco Bay, California	16.6
SFEM	San Francisco Bay, California	38.0
SPSP	San Pablo Bay, California	12.6
SPSM	San Pablo Bay, California	25.6
SIWP	Sinclair Inlet, Washington	9.3
SSBI	South Puget Sound, Washington	6.4
SAWB	Saint Andrew Bay, Florida	41.1
SJCB	Saint Johns River, Florida	8.2
ТВНВ	Tampa Bay, Florida	8.4
TBPB	Tampa Bay, Florida	10.4
WIPP	Whidbey Island, Washington	9.6
BOS	Boston Harbor, Massachusetts	104.5
CHS	Charleston Harbor, South Carolina	3.5
COM	Commencement Bay, Washington	3.5
ELL	Elliott Bay, Washington	9.1
GRB	Great Bay, New Jersey	7.4
HUN	San Francisco Bay, California	3.8
LNB	Long Beach Harbor, California	110.0
MOB	Mobile Bay, Alabama	3.2
MRD	Mississippi Delta, Mississippi	4.7
NAR	Narragansett Bay, Rhode Island	5.2
OAK	Oakland Estuary, California	5.3
RAR	Raritan Bay, New Jersey	35.9
SAL	Salem Harbor, Massachusetts	31.2
SAP		3.2
	Sapelo Sound, Georgia	
SDA	San Diego Harbor, California	9.3
SDF	San Diego Bay, California	14.6
SEA	Seal Beach, California	27.6
SMB	Santa Monica Bay, California	24.9
UCB	Upper Chesapeake Bay, Maryland	5.8
WLI	West Long Island Sound, New York	6.6
CBs (≥50 <380 ppb)		ppb
BBGH	Buzzards Bay, Massachusetts	51.3
BBRH	Buzzards Bay, Massachusetts	231.0
BHDI	Boston Harbor, Massachusetts	231.4
CBHP	Chesapeake Bay, Maryland	111.4
CBMP	Chesapeake Bay, Maryland	90.1
CBSP	Chesapeake Bay, Maryland	109.8
HRJB	Hudson/Raritan Estuary, New Jersey	327.7
HRLB	Hudson/Raritan Estuary, New Jersey	370.5
HRUB	Hudson/Raritan Estuary, New Jersey	177.7
LICR	Long Island Sound, Connecticut	137.7
LIHH	Long Island Sound, Connecticut	229.2
LIHR	Long Island Sound, Connecticut	190.5

ite Description	Location	Concentration
CBs (continued)		ррь
LIMR	Long Island Sound, Connecticut	119.9
LISI	Long Island Sound, Connecticut	63.6
MBTH	Moriches Bay, New York	81.7
OEIH	Oakland Estuary, California	361.5
SDHI	San Diego Bay, California	99.8
SFDB	San Francisco Bay, California	71.9
SFEM	San Francisco Bay, California	74.9
SFSM	San Francisco Bay, California	70.7
BUZ	Buzzards Bay, Massachusetts	192
CSC		58
	Casco Bay, Maine	
DEL	Delaware Bay, Delaware	131
GRB	Great Bay, New Jersey	79
LNB	Long Beach, California	205
	Narragansett Bay, Rhode Island	221
OAK	Oakland Estuary, California	61
SJR	Saint Johns River, Florida	98
SPB	San Pedro Bay, California	194
SPC	San Pedro Canyon, California	159
UCB	Upper Chesapeake Bay, Maryland	9 0
WLI	West Long Island Sound, New York	174
Dieldrin (≥0.02 <8 ppb)		ppb
ABWJ	Anaheim Bay, California	0.3
APCP	Apalachicola Bay, Florida	0.2
APDB	Apalachicola Bay, Florida	0.3
ABOB	Atchafalaya Bay, Louisiana	0.7
BBMB	Barataria Bay, Louisiana	0.2
BBSD	Barataria Bay, Louisiana	0.3
BIBI	Block Island, Rhode Island	0.6
BBBE	Bodega Bay, California	0.05
HBDI	Boston Harbor, Massachusetts	4.0
ВННВ	Boston Harbor, Massachusetts	1.2
BSBG	Breton Sound, Louisiana	0.1
BSSI	Breton Sound, Louisiana	0.1
BBAR	Buzzards Bay, Massachusetts	5.0
BBGN	Buzzards Bay, Massachusetts	0.9
BBRH	Buzzards Bay, Massachusetts	2.7
CLCL	Caillou Lake, Louisiana	0.1
		0.4
CLSJ	Calcasieu Lake, Louisiana	0.1
CKBP	Cedar Key, Florida	
CBBI	Charlotte Harbor, Florida	0.2
CBHP	Chesapeake Bay, Maryland	3.0
CBMP	Chesapeake Bay, Maryland	1.1
CBDP	Chesapeake Bay, Maryland	0.1
CBIB	Chesapeake Bay, Maryland	0.1
CBCI	Chincoteague Bay, Virginia	0.1
CBSP.	Choctawatchee Bay, Florida	4.4
CBSR	Choctawatchee Bay, Florida	0.4
CRYB	Columbia River, Oregon	0.5
CBRP	Coos Bay, Oregon	0.1
		1.3

Dieldrin (continued)DBBDDelaware Bay, DelawareDBFEDelaware Bay, DelawareDBKIDelaware Bay, DelawareECSPEast Cote Blanche, LouisianaESBDEspiritu Santo, TexasESSPEspiritu Santo, TexasGBCRGalveston Bay, TexasGBTDGalveston Bay, TexasGBYCGalveston Bay, Texas	ppb
DBFEDelaware Bay, DelawareDBKIDelaware Bay, DelawareECSPEast Cote Blanche, LouisianaESBDEspiritu Santo, TexasESSPEspiritu Santo, TexasGBCRGalveston Bay, TexasGBTDGalveston Bay, TexasGBYCGalveston Bay, Texas	
DBFEDelaware Bay, DelawareDBKIDelaware Bay, DelawareECSPEast Cote Blanche, LouisianaESBDEspiritu Santo, TexasESSPEspiritu Santo, TexasGBCRGalveston Bay, TexasGBTDGalveston Bay, TexasGBYCGalveston Bay, Texas	0.6
DBKIDelaware Bay, DelawareECSPEast Cote Blanche, LouisianaESBDEspiritu Santo, TexasESSPEspiritu Santo, TexasGBCRGalveston Bay, TexasGBTDGalveston Bay, TexasGBYCGalveston Bay, Texas	2.2
ECSPEast Cote Blanche, LouisianaESBDEspiritu Santo, TexasESSPEspiritu Santo, TexasGBCRGalveston Bay, TexasGBTDGalveston Bay, TexasGBYCGalveston Bay, Texas	0.7
ESBDEspiritu Santo, TexasESSPEspiritu Santo, TexasGBCRGalveston Bay, TexasGBTDGalveston Bay, TexasGBYCGalveston Bay, Texas	0.3
ESSPEspiritu Santo, TexasGBCRGalveston Bay, TexasGBTDGalveston Bay, TexasGBYCGalveston Bay, Texas	0.03
GBCRGalveston Bay, TexasGBTDGalveston Bay, TexasGBYCGalveston Bay, Texas	0.1
GBTDGalveston Bay, TexasGBYCGalveston Bay, Texas	0.2
GBYC Galveston Bay, Texas	0.3
	0.4
	0.05
BHWJ Gray's Harbor, Washington HHKL Honolulu Harbor, Hawaii	0.05
HRRB Hudson/Raritan Estuary, New J	
HRJB Hudson/Raritan Estuary, New J	
HRLB Hudson/Raritan Estuary, New J	
HRUB Hudson/Raritan Estuary, New J	
HMBJ Hudson/Raritan Estuary, New J	
JHJH Joseph Harbor Bayou, Louisiana	
LJLJ Point La Jolla, California	0.2
LBMP Lake Borgne, Louisiana	0.1
LICR Long Island Sound, Connecticut	3.5
LIHR Long Island Sound, Connecticut	3.0
LISI Long Island Sound, Connecticut	1.1
LIHH Long Island Sound, Connecticut	7.1
LIHU Long Island Sound, Connecticut	1.5
LIMR Long Island Sound, New York	3.0
MDSJ Marina del Rey, California	0.5
MBEM Matagorda Bay, Texas	0.03
MBGP Matagorda Bay, Texas	0.1
MBLR Matagorda Bay, Texas	0.3
MBTP Matagorda Bay, Texas	0.03
MBAR Mesquite Bay, Texas	0.1
MBYB Mission Bay, Texas	0.1
MSBB Mississippi Sound, Mississippi	0.2
MSPC Mississippi Sound, Mississippi	0.2
MBCP Mobile Bay, Alabama	0.4
MBSC Monterey Bay, California	0.3
MBTH Moriches Bay, New York	0.5
NYSH New York Bight, New Jersey	6.8
NBNB Naples Bay, Florida	0.6
NBCI Narragansett Bay, Rhode Islan	
NBDI Narragansett Bay, Rhode Islan	
NBMH Narragansett Bay, Rhode Islan	
NBBC Newport Beach, California	0.2
OSBJ Oceanside, California	0.5
PGLP Pacific Grove, California	0.2
PVRP Palos Verdes, California PBPI Palos Verdes, California	6.2
PBPI Penobscot Bay, Maine	0.2
PBSI Penobscot Bay, Maine	0.5
PLLH Point Loma, California PBPB Boint Bohatta Washington	0.5
PRPR Point Roberts, Washington	0.3
SBSB Point Santa Barbara, Californi	
QIUB Quinby Inlet, Virginia	0.5
RBHCRookery Bay, FloridaSLBBSabine Lake, Texas	0.1 0.03

Site Description	Location	Concentration	
Dieldrin (continued)		ppb	
SAMP	San Antonio Bay, Texas	0.03	
SDHI	San Diego Bay, California	1.9	
SFDB	San Francisco Bay, California	2.8	
SFEM	San Francisco Bay, California	1.5	
SFSM	San Francisco Bay, California	0.4	
SLSL	San Luis Obispo, California	0.1	
SPSP	San Pablo Bay, California	0.8	
SPFP	San Pedro Harbor, California	2.4	
SRTI	Savannah River, Georgia	0.2	
SSBI	South Puget Sound, Washington	0.2	
SAWB	Saint Andrew Bay, Florida	0.6	
SJCB	Saint Johns River, Florida	1.5	
TBCB	Tampa Bay, Florida	0.1	
TBHB	Tampa Bay, Florida	0.1	
TBMK	Tampa Bay, Florida	0.2	
TBPB	Tampa Bay, Florida	0.3	
TBLF	Terrebonne Bay, Louisiana	0.1	
TBSR	Tomales Bay, California	0.2	
VBSP	Vermillion Bay, Louisiana	0.3	
BOS	Boston Harbor, Massachusetts	3.2	
BUZ	Buzzards Bay, Massachusetts	0.07	
COM	Commencement Bay, Washington	0.33	
DEL	Delaware Bay, Delaware	0.71	
HUN	San Francisco Bay, California	0.27	
LCB	Lower Chesapeake Bay, Virginia	0.12	
LNB	Long Beach Harbor, California	1.30	
MOB	Mobile Bay, Alabama	0.21	
MRD	Mississippi Delta, Mississippi	1.16	
NAR	Narragansett Bay, Rhode Island	1.68	
PAB	San Pablo Bay, California	0.13	
RAR	Raritan Bay, New Jersey	1.72	
WLI	West Long Island Sound, New York	0.15	

* Ambient concentrations at none of the sites exceeded or equaled the ER-L for these chemical analytes.

Table 73. The NS&T Program sediment sampling sites in which the average chemical concentrations exceeded the respective ER-M values, ranked in descending order of the number of times exceeded.

Number of times	exceeded Site Codes*
10	OEIH
9	HRUB
8	HRRB, LITN, NYSH, BOS
7	BHDB, HRLB, PVRP, RAR
5	CBSP, LIHH, SPFP, SAL
4	SPB, SPC
3	BHDI, SAWB, LNB
2	BBSM, CBHP, CBMP, HRJB, OSBJ, PVMC, SFEM SFSM, SPSP, TBSR, BOD, HMB, HUN, OAK, PAB, SDA, SHS, UCB
1	ABWJ, BBAR, BPBP, MBTH, MBTP, MDSJ, NBBC, NBMH, SFDB, WIPP, YHSS, ELL, SEA, SMB

* Specific locations are listed in the glossary.

Table 74. The NS&T Program sediment sampling sites in which the average chemical concentrations exceeded the respective ER-L values, ranked in descending order of the number of times exceeded.

Number of	times	exceeded	Sit	e Codes*		
21		BHDI				
20		LIHH, LI	MR. LISI			
18		CBMP				
17			CR, HRLB, SAW	VB. ELL. RA	R. SAL	
16			HR, NYSH, BOS			
15			HDB, LITN, WL			•
14		NBMH, S		-		
13		SIWP				
12		OEIH, PE	SI. UCB			
11		LIHU, SF				
10	l		DB, SPFP, GRB,	NAR		
9			IHB, SPSP, SSBI			
8			BTH, PBPI, SFEN			•
7			SBB, SDHI, TBP			
6			DSI, NBCI, NBI		SBI. SPB	
5						CB, TBHB, LNB,
4	:		BCP, MBTP, MBS EA	SC, OSBJ, PI	LH, PRPR, SP	SM, BUZ, CSC,
3	1	APDB, EC			BYB, NBBC, TB	SR, CHS, COM,
2	•	ABOB, BI	BGN, CASI, CBII	B, CHFJ, EB		GP, NBNB, PVMC, D, PNB, SAP, SDF
1		APCP, BI CBBP, ESSP, I PGLP,	3BE, BBSD, BIBI CBDP, CBCI, CE ESBD, GBCR, GE	, BBMB, BB 3MP, CBRP, 3TD, GBYC, LBB, SLSL, 1	NR, BPBP, BSJ CBTP, CBRP, (GHWJ, MBAR, SRTI, TBCB, TI	BG, BSSI, CBBI, CLCL, CLSJ, CKBP,

* Specific locations are listed in the glossary.

The accuracy of the guidelines for metals often exceeded that for organic compounds. Many of the metals are likely more water soluble than the organics, possibly resulting in relatively higher and more consistent bioavailability, and, therefore, less variability in the data.

The ER-L and ER-M guidelines were used to evaluate and rank the relative potential for biological effects at the NS&T Program sampling sites. Those sites in which the ambient chemical concentrations exceeded the most ER-L and ER-M values were identified as having the highest potential for adverse effects. The sites with the highest potential for effects were sites HRUB, located in the Hudson-Raritan Estuary; site LITN, located in western Long Island Sound; site BOS, in Boston Harbor; and site OEIH, in the Oakland Estuary of San Francisco Bay. Sites with the highest potential for effects were generally located within the Hudson-Raritan Estuary, Long Island Sound, Boston Harbor, Chesapeake Bay, New York Bight, Salem Harbor, Saint Andrew Bay, and parts of southern California near Los Angeles and San Pedro.

The potential for contaminated sediments causing adverse biological effects should be verified by either an examination of available data or implementation of a survey at the high-potential sites. Biological effects data are available for one of the highly ranked NS&T Program sites: site OEIH in Oakland Harbor, California. Site OEIH was tested with five sediment bioassays (Long and Buchman, 1989) and the benthic community was examined at that site (unpublished data). Most of the bioassay end-points indicated relatively high toxicity in the site OEIH sediments and the benthic community had lower total abundance and crustacean abundance than at many other nearby sites in San Francisco Bay.

The data examined in the present document were the results of the use of widely varying methods. Subsequent evaluations of data such as these would be facilitated if the data were from the use of similar methods. That is, spiked-sediment bioassays should be performed with one species or, at least, with species from the same taxonomic groups (such as amphipods). Bioassays of field-collected sediments should be performed with multiple species, but at least one of the species should be used universally. The use of standardized methods is recommended.

Sediment quality values from EP, AET, and SLC methods usually are presented as absolutes, i.e., a chemical concentration not accompanied by any measure of uncertainty or variability. Values generated in spiked-sediment bioassays often are accompanied by the 95 percent confidence interval. The data reviewed in this document and with which the cooccurrence analyses were performed often indicated relatively high variability in analyses of field-collected samples (i.e., the standard deviations frequently equalled or exceeded the means). While these indications of variability may be discouraging, they do provide a suggestion as to the degree of confidence currently available for attributing biological effects to sediment-sorbed contaminants without using a preponderance of evidence from multiple approaches.

The data assembled and reported herein were evaluated by objectively determining the lower 10 percentiles and the medians in the data and by subjectively determining the overall apparent effects thresholds in the data. The same data could be evaluated using many other approaches, depending upon study objectives. For example, the screened sorted data could be used to identify the contaminant concentrations below which effects have never been observed. Also, percentiles in the data other than the lower 10 and 50 percentiles could be determined. For example, the lower 5 percentile value of the data could be examined and assumed to be analogous to a level that may protect 95 percent of the species. The ER-L, ER-M, and overall apparent effects thresholds derived from the available data could be used as hypotheses to be tested in empirical toxicity experiments. The present evaluation should be updated with additional data as they become available and should be supplemented with an evaluation of the chemical data normalized to TOC, AVS, and any other appropriate parameters in addition to dry weight.

Site	No. of ER-L values exceeded	ER-M values exceeded for metals No. $x 4.2 = points$		ER-M values exceeded for organics <u>No. x 8.1 = points</u>		Total points	Overall rank	
HRUB	HRUB	17	3	13	6	49	79	1
BOS	16	3 3	13	5 5	41	70	2	
LITN	15	3	13	5	41	69	2 3 3 5	
OEIH	12	6 5 3	25	4	32	69	3	
NYSH	16	5	21	3	24	61	5	
BHDB	15	3	13	4	32	60	6	
HRLB	17	4	17	3	24	58	7	
PVRP	6	2	8	5	41	55	8	
RAR	17	5	21	2	16	54	9	
HRRB	7	5 5	21	5 2 3 5 2	24	52	10	
CBSP	9	0	0	5	41	50	11	
LIHH	20	3	13	2	16	49	12	
SAL	16	2	8	3	24	48	13	
SPFP	10	1	4	4 3	32	6	14	
SAWB	17	0	0	3	24	41	15	
SPB	6	Ō	0	4	32	38	16	
BHDI	21	3	13	0	0	34	17	
SPC	0	0	0	4	32	32	18	
HRJB	16	1	4	1	8	28	19	
SDÁ	14	1	4	1	8	26	20	
ELL	17	Ō	0	1	8	25	21	
LNB	5	1	4	2	16	25	21	
СВНР	15	2	8	0	0	23	23	
LISI	20	ō	ō	Õ	Õ	20	25	
OSBI	4	Õ	ŏ	· 2	16	20	25	
LIMR	20	ŏ	ŏ	ō	Ū,	$\tilde{20}$	25	
SFSM	11	2	8	ŏ	Õ	19	27	
SPSP	9	2	8	ŏ	ŏ	17	28	
OAK	8	$\tilde{2}$	š	ŏ	Ň	16	29	
SFEM	8 8	2	8 8	ŏ	ŏ	16	29	

Table 75. Overall cumulative ranks of NS&T Program sites, based upon exceedances of ER-L and ER-M values. One point was assigned for each ER-L exceeded, 4.2 points for each metal ER-M exceeded, and 8.1 points for each organic ER-M exceeded.

Acknowledgements

This report was edited and typed by Charlene Swartzell. Andrew Robertson (NOAA/OAD), Catherine Krueger (U. S. EPA, Region 10), Keith Phillips (Washington Department of Ecology), Robert Dexter (E. V. S. Consultants), and Peter Landrum (NOAA/GLERL) reviewed the document and provided helpful comments. Alan Mearns (NOAA/OAD) provided ideas regarding the overall approach. Jay Fields (NOAA/OAD) provided assistance during the data evaluation.

REFERENCES

Alden, R. W. III and A. J. Butt. 1987. Statistical classification of the toxicity and polynuclear aromatic hydrocarbon contamination of sediments from a highly industrialized seaport. <u>Environmental Toxicology and Chemistry 6</u>: 673-684.

Anderson, J. M., S. M. Bay, and B. E. Thompson. 1988. Characteristics and effects of contaminated sediments from southern California. SCCWRP Contribution No. C-297. Long Beach, CA: Southern California Coastal Water Research Project. 120 pp.

Armstrong, H. W., K. Fucik, J. W. Anderson, and J. M. Neff. 1979. Effects of oilfield brine effluent on sediments and benthic organisms in Trinity Bay, Texas. <u>Marine Environmental</u> <u>Research 2</u>: 55-69.

Bahnick, D. A., W. A. Swensen, T. P. Markee, D. J. Call, C. A. Anderson, and R. T. Morris. 1981. Development of bioassay procedures for defining pollution of harbor sediments. EPA-600/S3-81-025. Duluth, MN. United States Environmental Protection Agency. 4 pp.

Beller, H., R. Barrick, and S. Becker. 1986. Development of sediment quality values for Puget Sound. Prepared by Tetra Tech, Inc. for Resource Planning Associates/U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Seattle District for the Puget Sound Dredged Disposal Analysis Program. Tetra Tech, Inc., Bellevue, WA.

Barrick, R., S. Becker, L. Brown, H. Beller, and Pastorok. 1988. Volume 1. Sediment quality values refinement: 1988 update and evaluation of Puget Sound AET. EPA Contract No. 68-01-4341. PTI Contract No. C717-01. Bellevue, WA: PTI Environmental Services. 144 pp.

Bolton, S. H., R. J. Breteler, B. W. Vigon, J. A. Scanlon, and S. L. Clark. 1985. National perspective on sediment quality. EPA Contract No. 68-01-6986 Battelle Project No. G-8834-0100. Washington, DC: United States Environmental Protection Agency. 194 pp.

Byrkit, D. R. 1975. <u>Elements of Statistics. An introduction to probability and statistical inference</u>. New York, NY: D. Van Nostrand Company. 431 pp.

Cairns, M. A., A. V. Nebeker, J. H. Gakstatter, and W. L. Griffis. 1984. Toxicity of copperspiked sediments to freshwater invertebrates. <u>Environmental Toxicology and Chemistry 3</u>: 435-445.

 CH^2M Hill. 1989. Data Report. Volume I sediment data Part 1 of 3. Remedial investigation Eagle Harbor site. Kitsap County, Washington. U.W. EPA Hazardous Site Control Division Contract No. 68-01-7251. Bellevue, WA: CH^2M Hill. 151 pp.

CH²M Hill. 1989. Data Report. Volume I sediment data Part 2 of 3. Remedial investigation Eagle Harbor site. Kitsap County, Washington. U.W. EPA Hazardous Site Control Division Contract No. 68-01-7251. Bellevue, WA: CH²M Hill. 215 pp.

CH²M Hill. 1989. Data Report. Volume I sediment data Part 3 of 3. Remedial investigation Eagle Harbor site. Kitsap County, Washington. U.W. EPA Hazardous Site Control Division Contract No. 68-01-7251. Bellevue, WA: CH²M Hill. 316 pp.

Chapman, P. M. 1986. Sediment quality criteria from the sediment quality triad: An example. <u>Environmental Toxicology and Chemistry 5</u>: 957-964.

Chapman, P. M. 1989. Current approaches to developing sediment quality criteria. Environmental Toxicology and Chemistry 8: 589-599.

Chapman, P. M., J. M. Barrick, J. M. Neff, and R. C. Swartz. 1987. Four independent approaches to developing sediment quality criteria yield similar values for model contaminants. <u>Environmental Toxicology and Chemistry 6</u>: 723-725.

Chapman, P. M., R. N. Dexter, S. F. Cross, and D. G. Mitchell. 1986. A field trial of the sediment quality triad in San Francisco Bay. NOAA Technical Memorandum NOS OMA 25. Rockville, MD: National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. 133 pp.

Dewitt, T. H., G. R. Ditsworth, and R. C. Swartz. 1988. Effects of natural sediment features on survival of the phoxocephalid amphipod, *Rhepoxynius abronius*. <u>Marine Environmental</u> <u>Research 25</u>: 99-124.

DiToro, D. M. 1988. Briefing report to the Science Advisory Board equilibrium partitioning approach for generating sediment criteria. United States Environmental Protection Agency.

Eisler, R. 1985. Cadmium hazards to fish, wildlife, and invertebrates: a synoptic review. Biological Report 85(1.2). Laurel, MD: United States Fish and Wildlife Service, United States Department of the Interior. 46 pp.

Eisler, R. 1986. Chromium hazards to fish, wildlife, and invertebrates: a synoptic review. Biological Report 85(1.6). Laurel, MD: United States Fish and Wildlife Service, United States Department of the Interior. 60 pp.

Eisler, R. 1987. Mercury hazards to fish, wildlife, and invertebrates: a synoptic review. Biological Report 10. Laurel, MD: United States Fish and Wildlife Service, United States Department of the Interior. 90 pp.

Eisler, R. 1988a. Arsenic hazards to fish, wildlife, and invertebrates: a synoptic review. Contaminant Hazard Reviews Report No. 12. Laurel, MD: United States Fish and Wildlife Service, United States Department of the Interior. 92 pp.

Eisler, R. 1988b. Lead hazards to fish, wildlife, and invertebrates: a synoptic review. Biological Report 14. Laurel, MD: United States Fish and Wildlife Service, United States Department of the Interior. 134 pp.

E.V.S. Consultants. 1988. Bivalve larvae sediment bioassays. P.O. No. 50-ABNC-00023, TD-6. Tests of sediments from Guemes Channel, WA. Letter report to Mr. Don Kane, USFWS.

Francis, P. C., W. J. Birge, and J. A. Black. 1984. Effects of cadmium-enriched sediment on fish and amphibian embryo-larval stages. <u>Ecotoxicology and Environmental Safety 8</u>: 378-387.

Gilbert, T., A. Clay, and C. A. Karp. 1976. Distribution of polluted materials in Massachusetts Bay. Boston, MA: New England Aquarium. 173 pp.

Hargis, W. J., M. H. Roberts Jr., and D. E. Zwerner. 1984. Effects of contaminated sediments and sediment-exposed effluent water on an estuarine fish: acute toxicity. <u>Marine Environmental Research 14</u>: 337-354.

Harris, C. R. 1964. Influence of soil type and soil moisture on the toxicity of insecticides in soils to insects. <u>Nature 202</u>: 724-7225.

Illinois Environmental Protection Agency. 1988a. An intensive survey of the Dupage River Basin 1983. IEPA/WPC/88-010. Springfield, IL: Division of Water Pollution Control Illinois Environmental Protection Agency. 61 pp. Illinois Environmental Protection Agency. 1988b. An intensive survey of the Kishwaukee River and its tributaries 1983. IEPA/WPC/88-009. Springfield, IL: Division of Water Pollution Control Illinois Environmental Protection Agency. 60 pp.

Ingersoll, C. G. and M. K. Nelson. In press. Testing the toxicity of solid-phase sediments with *Hyalella azteca* (amphipoda) and *Chironomus riparius* (Diptera), 1989. 39 pp.

Jansen, A. 1987. Criteria for sediments. In: Application and interpretation bioassay and biomonitoring: A planning document. S. H. Kay and J. M. Marquenie, eds. Report no. R 87/266. London: European Research Office of the United States Army. pp. 4-48-4-52.

Johnson, A. and D. Norton. 1988. Screening survey for chemical contaminants and toxicity in sediments at five Lower Columbia River ports September 22-24, 1987. Segment No.: 26-00-01. Olympia, WA: Washington State Department of Ecology. 20 pp.

JRB Accociates. 1984. Background and review document of the development of sediment criteria. EPA Contract No. 68-01-6388. JRB Project No. 2-813-03-852-84. Washington, DC: United States Environmental Protection Agency. 35 pp.

Kemp, P. F., R. C. Swartz, and J. O. Lamberson. 1986. Response of the phoxocephalid amphipod, *Rhepoxynius abronius*, to a small oil spill in Yaquina Bay, Oregon. <u>Estuaries</u> <u>9</u>(48): 340-347.

Klapow, L. A. and R. H. Lewis. 1979. Analysis of toxicity data for California marine water quality standards. <u>Journal Water Pollution Control Federation 51</u>(8): 2051-2070.

Kraft, K. J. and R. H. Sypniewski. 1981. Effect of sediment copper on the distribution of benthic macroinvertebrates in the Keweenaw Waterway. <u>Journal Great Lakes Res. 7(3)</u>: 258-263.

Lee, G. F. and G. M. Mariani. 1977. Evaluation of the significance of waterway sedimentassociated contaminants on water quality at the dredged material disposal site. In: <u>Aquatic</u> <u>Toxicology and Hazard Evaluation</u>. F. L. Mayer and J. L. Hamelink, Eds. ASTM STP 634. Philadelphia, PA: American Society for Testing and Materials. pp. 196-213.

Long, E. R. 1989. The use of the sediment quality triad in classification of sediment contamination. In: Symposium/Workshop on Contaminated Marine Sediments-Assessment and Remediation. Tampa, FL, May 31 - Jun 3, 1988. Washington, DC: National Research Council. pp. 78-93.

Long, E. R. and M. F. Buchman. 1989. An evaluation of candidate measures of biological effects for the National Status and Trends Program. NOAA Technical Memorandum NOS OMA 45. Seattle, WA: National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. 105 pp.

Long, Shabdin B. Mohd. 1987. The impact of pollution on the meiofaunal densities of an estuarine mudflat. <u>Pertanika 10</u>(2): 197-208.

Lyman, W. J., A. E. Glazer, J. H. Ong, and S. F. Coons. 1987. An overview of sediment quality in the United States Final Report. Contract No. 68-01-6951, Task 20[°]. Washington, DC: United States Environmental Protection Agency Region V. 18 pp.

Lytle, T. F. and J. S. Lytle. 1985. Pollutant transport in Mississippi Sound. Sea Grant Publ. No. MASGP-82-038. Ocean Springs, MS: Gulf Coast Research Laboratory. 124 pp.

Magnuson, J. J., A. M. Forbes, and R. J. Hall. 1976. Final Report. An assessment of the environmental effects of dredged material disposal in Lake Superior. Volume 3 Biological studies: Duluth-Superior and Keweenaw study areas. Contract Number DACW37-74-C-0013. Madison, WI: Marine Studies Center University of Wisconsin-Madison. 88 pp.

Malueg, K. W., G. S. Schuytema, D. F. Krawczyk, and J. H. Gakstatter. 1984a. Laboratory sediment toxicity tests, sediment chemistry and distribution of benthic macroinvertebrates in sediments from the Keweenaw Waterway, Michigan. <u>Environmental Toxicology and Chemistry 3</u>: 233-242.

Malueg, K. W., G. S. Schuytema, J. H. Gakstatter, and D. F. Krawczyk. 1984b. Toxicity of sediments from three metal-contaminated areas. <u>Environmental Toxicology and Chemistry 3</u>: 279-291.

Marking, L. L., V. K. Dawson, J. L. Allen, T. D. Bills, and J. J. Rach. 1981. Biological activity and chemical characteristics of dredge material from 10 sites on the upper Mississippi River. La Crosse, WI: United States Fish and Wildlife Service. 146 pp.

Mayer, F. L., Jr. 1987. Acute toxicity handbook of chemicals to estuarine organisms. EPA/ 600-8-87/017. Gulf Breeze, FL: United States Environmental Protection Agency. 274 pp.

McGreer, E. R. 1982. Factors affecting the distribution of the bivalve, *Macoma balthicea* (L.) on a mudflat receiving sewage effluent, Fraser River estuary, British Columbia. <u>Marine Environmental Research 7</u>: 131-149.

McGreer, E. R. 1979. Sublethal effects of heavy metal contaminated sediments on the bivalve Macoma balthica (L.). Marine Pollution Bulletin 10(9): 259-262.

McLeese, D. W., L. E. Burridge, and J. Van Dinter. 1982. Toxicities of five organochlorine compounds in water and sediment to *Nereis virens*. <u>Bulletin of Environmental Contamination</u> and <u>Toxicology 28</u>: 216-220.

McLeese, D. W. and C. D. Metcalfe. 1980. Toxicities of eight organochlorine compounds in sediment and seawater to *Crangon septemspinosa*. <u>Bulletin of Environmental Contamination</u> and <u>Toxicology 25</u>: 921-928.

Mearns, A. J., R. C. Swartz, J. M. Cummins, P. A. Dinnel, P. Plesha, and P. M. Chapman. 1986. Inter-laboratory comparison of a sediment toxicity test using the marine amphipod, *Rhepoxynius abronius*. <u>Marine Environmental Research 19</u>: 13-37.

Mohlenberg, F. and T. Kiorboe. 1983. Burrowing and avoidance behaviour in marineorganisms exposed to pesticide-contaminated sediment. <u>Marine Pollution Bulletin 14</u>(2): 57-60.

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. 1987. National Status & Trends Program for Marine Environmental Quality Progress report and preliminary assessment of findings of the Benthic Surveillance Project--1984. Rockville, MD: Office of Oceanography and Marine Assessment, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. 81 pp.

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. 1988. Progress Report. A summary of selected data on chemical contaminants in sediments collected during 1984, 1985, 1986, and 1987. NOAA Technical Memorandum NOS OMA 44. Rockville, MD: National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. 15 pp.

Nebeker, A. V., G. S. Schuytema, W. L. Griffis, J. A. Barbitta, and L. A. Carey. 1989. Effect of sediment organic carbon on survival of *Hyalella azteca* exposed to DDT and endrin. <u>Environmental Toxicology and Chemistry 8</u>: 705-718.

Neff, J. M., D. J. Bean, B. W. Cornaby, R. M. Vaga, T. C. Gulbransen, and J. A. Scanlon. 1986. Sediment quality criteria methodology validation: Calculation of screening level concentrations from field data. Work Assignment 56, Task IV. Washington, DC: United States Environmental Protection Agency. 225 pp.

Neff, J. M., J. Q. Word, and T. C. Gulbransen. 1987. Recalculation of screening level concentrations for nonpolar organic contaminants in marine sediments Final report. Washington, DC: United States Environmental Protection Agency Region V. 18 pp.

New England River Basins Commission. 1980. Interim plan for the disposal of dredged material from Long Island Sound. I. Boston, MA: New England River Basins Commission. 56 pp.

Nimmo, D. R., P. D. Wilson, R. R. Blackman, and A. J. Wilson, Jr. 1971. Polychlorinated biphenyl absorbed from sediments by fiddler crabs and pink shrimp. <u>Nature 231</u>: 50-52.

Oakden, J. M., J. S. Oliver, and A. R. Flegal. 1984a. Behavioral responses of a phoxocephalid amphipod to organic enrichment and trace metals in sediment. <u>Marine Ecology Progress Series</u> 14: 253-257.

Oakden, J. M., J. S. Oliver, and A. R. Flegal. 1984b. EDTA chelation and zinc antagonism with cadmium in sediment: effects on the behavior and mortality of two infaunal amphipods. <u>Marine Biology 84</u>: 125-130.

Ott, F. S. 1986. Amphipod sediment bioassays: Effects on reponse of methodology, grain size, organic content, and cadmium. Ph.D. Seattle, WA: University of Washington. Chapter 5 81-135 pp.

Olla, B. L., V. B. Estelle, R. C. Swartz, G. Braun, and A. L. Studholme. 1988. Responses of polychaetes to cadmium-contaminated sediment: comparison of uptake and behavior. <u>Environmental Toxicology and Chemistry 7</u>: 587-592.

Pavlou, S. P. 1987. The use of the equilibrium partitioning approach in determining safe levels of contaminants in marine sediments. In: <u>Fate and effects of sediment-bound chemicals</u> <u>in aquatic systems. Proceedings of the Sixth Pellston Workshop</u>. Florissant, CO, August 13, 17, 1984. K. L. Dickson, A. W. Maki and W. A. Brungs, Eds. New York, Oxford, Beijing, Frankfurt, Sao Paulo, Sydney, Tokyo, Toronto: Pergamon Press. pp. 388-395.

Pavlou, S., R. Kadeg, A. Turner, and M. Marchlik. 1987. Sediment quality criteria methodology validation: Uncertainty analysis of sediment normalization theory for nonpolar organic contaminants. Work Assignment 56, Task 3. Washington, DC: Battelle. 95 pp.

Pavlou, S. P. and D. P. Weston. 1983. Initial evaluation of alternatives for development of sediment related criteria for toxic contaminants in marine waters (Puget Sound). Phase I: Development of conceptual framework. Final Report. Bellevue, WA: JRB Associates. 56 pp.

Payne, J. F., J. Kiceniuk, L. L. Fancey, and Williams. 1988. What is a safe level of polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons for fish: subchronic toxicity study on winter flounder (*Pseudopleuronectes americanus*). <u>Canadian Journal of Aquatic Science</u>(45)

Phelps, H. L., J. T. Hardy, W. H. Pearson, and C. W. Apts. 1983. Clam burrowing behaviour: Inhibition by copper-enriched sediment. <u>Marine Pollution Bulletin 14(12)</u>: 452-455.

Plesha, P. D., J. E. Stein, M. H. Schiewe, B. B. McCain, and U. Varanasi. 1988. Toxicity of marine sediments supplemented with mixtures of selected chlorinated and aromatic hydrocarbons to the infaunal amphipod *Rhepoxynius abronius*. <u>Marine Environmental</u> <u>Research 25</u>: 855-977.

PTI Environmental Services. 1988. Sediment quality values refinement: Tasks 3 and 5--1988 update and evaluation of Puget Sound AET. EPA Contract No. 68-02-4341 to Tetra Tech, Inc. Seattle, WA: United States Environmental Protection Agency Region 10. 127 pp.

Puget Sound Dredged Disposal Analysis. 1988. Evaluation procedures technical appendix--Phase 1 (central Puget Sound) Sampling, testing, and test interpretation of dredged material proposed for unconfined, open-water disposal in central Puget Sound. PSDDA Reports. Olympia, WA: Washington State Department of Natural Resources. 476 pp.

Qasim, S. R., A. T. Armstrong, J. Corn, and B. L. Jordan. 1980. Quality of water and bottom sediments in the Trinity River. <u>Water Resources Bulletin 16(3)</u>: 522-531.

Roberts, M. H., Jr., W. J. Hargis, C. J. Strobel, and P. F. DeLisle. 1989. Acute toxicity of PAH contaminated sediments to the estuarine fish, *Leiostomus xanthurus*. <u>Bulletin of Environmental Contamination and Toxicology 42</u>: 142-149.

Robinson, A. M., J. O. Lamberson, F. A. Cole, and R. C. Swartz. 1988. Effects of culture conditions on the sensitivity of a phoxodephalid amphipod, *Rhepoxynius abronius*, to cadmium in sediment. <u>Environmental Toxicology and Chemistry 7</u>: 953-959.

Rogerson, P. F., S. C. Schimmel, and G. Hoffman. 1985. Chemical and biological characterization of Black Rock Harbor dredged material. Technical Report D-85-9. Narragansett, RI: United States Environmental Protection Agency. 123 pp.

Ross, P., M. Henebry, L. Burnett, and W. Wang. 1988. Assessment of the ecotoxicological hazard of sediments in Waukegan Harbor, Illinois. Grant No. HWR-86010. Savoy, IL: Illinois Department of Energy and Natural Resources. 68 pp.

Rubinstein, N. I., E. Lores, and N. Gregory. 1983. Accumulation of PCBs, mercury, and cadmium by *Nereis virens*, *Mercenaria mercenaria*, and *Palaemonetes pugio* from contaminated harbor sediments. Long-term effects of dredging operations program. Technical Report D-83-4. Gulf Breeze, FL: United States Environmental Protection Agency. 74 pp.

Rygg, B. 1985. Effect of sediment copper on benthic fauna. <u>Marine Ecology Progress Series 25</u>: 83-89.

Salazar, M. H. and S. M. Salazar. 1985. Ecological evaluation of organotin-contaminated sediment. Technical Report 1050. San Diego, CA: Naval Ocean Systems Center. 21 pp.

Salazar, M. H., S. C. U'ren, and S. A. Steinert. 1980. Sediment bioassays for NAVSTA San Diego dredging project. Technical Report 570. San Diego, CA: Naval Ocean Systems Center. 46 pp.

Schiewe, M. H., E. G. Hawk, D. I. Actor, and M. M. Krahn. 1985. Use of a bacterial bioluminescence assay to assess toxicity of contaminated marine sediments. <u>Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences 42</u>(7): 1244-1248.

Simmers, J. W., R. G. Rhett, and C. R. Lee. 1984. Application of a wetland animal bioassay for determining toxic metal uptake from dredged material. In: <u>Ecotoxicological Testing for the Marine Environment</u>. G. Persoone, E. Jaspers and C. Claus, Eds. Bredene, Belguim: Inst. Mar. Scient. Res. pp. 457-464.

Sundelin, B. 1984. Single and combined effects of lead and cadmium on *Pontoporeia affiniis* (crustacea, amphipoda) in laboratory soft-bottom microcosms. In: Ecotoxicological testing for the marine environment. G. Persoone, E. Jaspers, and C. Claus. Eds. Bredene, Belgium: State University Ghent and Institute Mar. Scient. Res. pp. 237-259.

Swartz, R. C., G. R. Ditsworth, D. W. Schults, and J. O. Lamberson. 1985a. Sediment toxicity to a marine infaunal amphipod: cadmium and its interaction with sewage sludge. <u>Marine Environmental Research 18</u>: 133-153.

Swartz, R. C., D. W. Schults, G. R. Ditsworth, W. A. DeBen, and F. A. Cole. 1985b. Sediment toxicity, contamination, and macrobenthic communities near a large sewage outfall. In: Validation and predictability of laboratory methods for assessing the fate and effects of contaminants in aquatic ecosystems. T. P. Boyle, Ed. ASTM STP 865. Philadelphia, PA: American Society for Testing Materials. pp. 152-175.

Swartz, R. C., D. W. Schults, G. R. Ditsworth, W. A. DeBen, and F. A. Cole. 1986. Ecological changes in the Southern California Bight near a large sewage outfall: benthic conditions in 1980 and 1983. <u>Marine Ecology Progress Series 31</u>: 1-13. Swartz, R. C., D. W. Schults, T. H. DeWitt, G. R. Ditsworth, and J. O. Lamberson. 1987. Toxicity of fluoranthene in sediment to marine amphipods: A test of the equilibrium partitioning approach to sediment quality criteria. <u>89th Annual Meeting</u>, <u>Society for</u> <u>Environmental Toxicology and Chemistry</u>. Pensacola, FL, November 1987. 12 pp.

Swartz, R. C., P. F. Kemp, D. W. Schults, and J. O. Lamberson. 1988. Effects of mixtures of sediment contaminants on the marine infaunal amphipod, *Rhepoxynius abronius*. <u>Environmental Toxicology and Chemistry 7</u>: 1013-1020.

Swartz, R. C., P. F. Kemp, D. W. Schults, G. R. Ditsworth, and R. J. Ozretich. 1989. Acute toxicity of sediment from Eagle Harbor, Washington, to the infaunal amphipod *Rhepoxynius* abronius. <u>Environmental Toxicology and Chemistry 8</u>: 215-222.

Tatem, H. E. 1986. Bioaccumulation of polychlorinated biphenyls and metals from contaminated sediment by freshwater prawns, *Macrobrachium rosenbergii* and clams, *Corbicula fluminea*. <u>Archives of Environmental Contamination and Toxicology 15</u>: 1771-183.

Tessier, A.P. and G. C. Campbell. 1987. Partitioning of trace metals in sediments: Relationships with bioavailability. In: <u>Ecological Effects of In Situ Sediment</u> <u>Contaminants</u>. Aberystwyth, Wales, 1984. R. Thomas, R. Evanms, A. Hamilton, M. Munawar, T. Reynoldson, and H. Sadar, Eds. Dordrecht, Boston, Lancaster: DR W. Junk. <u>Developments in Hydrobiology 39</u> pp. 43-52.

Tetra Tech, Inc. 1985a. Commencement Bay nearshore/tideflats remedial investigation. Volume 3. Appendices I-V. TC-3752. Bellevue, WA: Tetra Tech, Inc. 371 pp.

Tetra Tech, Inc. 1985b. Commencement Bay nearshore/tideflats remedial investigation. Volume 4. Appendices VI-XV. Bellevue, WA: Tetra Tech, Inc. 556 pp.

Tietjen, J. H. and J. J. Lee. 1984. The use of free-living nematodes as a bioassay for estuarine sediments. <u>Marine Environmental Research 11</u>: 233-251.

Tsai, C., J. Welch, K. Chang, J. Shaeffer, and Cronin/L. E. 1979. Bioassay of Baltimore Harbor sediments. <u>Estuaries 2</u>(3): 141-153.

United States Army Corps of Engineers. 1988. Evaluation procedures technical appendix -Phase I (central Puget Sound). PSDDA Reports. Seattle, WA: Washington State Department of Natural Resources. 476 pp.

United States Environmental Protection Agency. 1988. Interim sediment criteria values for nonpolar hydrophobic organic contaminants. SCD 17. Washington DC: United States Environmental Protection Agency. 36 pp.

United States Environmental Protection Agency. 1986. Quality criteria for water 1986. Washington, DC: United States Environmental Protection Agency. 456 pp.

Van Dolah, R. F., D. M. Knott, E. L. Wenner, T. D. Mathews, and M. P. Katuna. 1984. Benthic and sedimentological studies of the Georgetown ocean dredged material disposal site. South Carolina Marine Resources Center Technical Report Number 59. Charleston, SC: Marine Resources Research Institute South Carolina Wildlife and Marine Resources Department. 97 pp.

Word, J. Q. and A. J. Mearns. 1979. 60-meter control survey off southern California. TM 229. El Segundo, CA: Southern California Coastal Water Research Project. pp. 27-31.

Word, J. Q., J. A. Ward, C. W. Apts, D. L. Woodruff, M. E. Barrows, V. I. Cullinan, J. L. Hyland, and J. F. Campbell. 1988. Confirmatory sediment analyses and solid and suspended particulate phase bioassays on sediment from Oakland Inner Harbor, San Francisco, California. PNL-6794 UC-11. San Francisco, CA: Prepared by Battelle for San Francisco District, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. 250 pp.

Word, J. Q., J. A. Ward, L. M. Franklin, V. I. Cullinan, and S. L. Kiesser. 1987. Evaluation of the equilibrium partitioning theory for estimating the toxicity of the nonpolar organic compound DDT to the sediment dwelling amphipod *Rhepoxynius abronius*. WA56, Task 1. Washington, D. C.: Battelle, Washington Environmental Program Office. 60 pp.

Yake, B., D. Norton, and M. Stinson. 1986. Application of the triad approach to freshwater sediment assessment: An initial investigation of sediment quality near Gas Works Park, Lake Union. Segment No. 04-08-01 04-08-03. Olympia, WA: Water Quality Investigations Section Washington Department of Ecology. 31 pp.

Zagatto, P. A., E. Gherardi-Goldstein, E. Bertoletti, C. C. Lombardi, M. H. R. B. Martins, and M. L. L. C. Ramos. 1987. Bioassays with aquatic organisms: toxicity of water and sediment from Cubatao River basin. <u>Water Science and Technology 19</u>(11): 95-106.

.

APPENDIX A

CO-OCCURRENCE ANALYSES DATA

Appendix A

Description of Data Sets Used in Co-occurrence Analyses

The data sets in which biological measures of effects and concentrations of chemicals in sediments were made with the same samples are described in this appendix, along with the description of how the data were manipulated and analyzed for use in this document.

Gilbert *et al.* (1976) sampled sediments at 37 stations in Massachusetts Bay and performed chemical analyses of portions of the samples that were also examined for benthic community composition. The samples were collected with a 0.1 m^2 Smith-McIntyre grab sampler and sieved with 2.0 and 0.5 mm screens. Data from quantification of trace metals and selected organic groups were reported. Their data suggested the occurrence of three modes in species richness among the stations: High (mean 93.6 ± 9.4 SD, range 81-106), intermediate (mean 58.1 ± 10.4 SD, range 40-78), and low (mean 31 ± 6.5 SD, range 22-37). The means and standard deviations in chemical concentrations that co-occurred with these modes were calculated.

McGreer (1979) observed burrowing time in the bivalve Macoma balthica exposed to five samples (one of which was used as a control) collected in the Fraser River estuary, British Columbia. The samples were also analyzed for the concentrations of various trace metals. The 95 percent confidence limits for effective burrowing time (ET50) for Sample C were outside the 95 percent confidence limits of the ET50 for the control. The chemical data for Sample C were used in this document. McGreer (1979) also examined avoidance behavior of *M. balthica* exposed to these sediment samples. A statistically significant avoidance response was found for Sample A, therefore, the data for Sample A were used in this document.

McGreer (1982) sampled 23 sites along the Strait of Georgia, British Columbia and determined the presence and abundance of *M. balthica* and the concentrations of various trace metals. The means and standard deviations of concentrations in samples devoid of *M. balthica* and in samples with *M. balthica* present were compared.

Yake, et al. (1986) sampled three sites in Lake Union, Washington and tested for toxicity with the amphipod Hyalella azteca and determined the concentrations of many chemicals in an area known to have high PAH concentrations. Undiluted sediment from one of the sites (GWP) caused an average of 95 percent mortality; the chemical data for that site were used in this document.

Anderson *et al.* (1988) sampled 12 sites in southern California and tested for toxicity with the amphipod *Grandidierella japonica* and for the concentration of hydrocarbons and trace metals. Half of the sites was significantly toxic (mean 48.3 \pm 14.6 percent survival); and half were not significantly toxic (mean 76.8 \pm 11.1 percent survival) relative to controls. The chemical concentrations were compared between toxic and non-toxic samples.

Kraft and Sypniewski (1981) sampled 15 sites each in the north and south regions of the Keweenaw Waterway, Michigan and determined macroinverterbrate taxa richness and copper content in the sediments in all 30 sites. The mean copper concentrations in the northern sites (average of 8.4 taxa per site) were compared with those in the southern sites (average of 19.8 taxa per site).

The Illinois Environmental Protection Agency (1983a) sampled 21 sites in the DuPage River Basin and determined benthic taxa abundance and concentrations of hydrocarbons and trace metals. Concentrations in 18 sites with relatively high abundance (mean 15.8 ± 2.0 SD taxa per Hester-Dendy artificial sampler) were compared with those in 3 sites (mean 6.7 ± 2.5 SD taxa) with relatively low abundance.

The Illinois Environmental Protection Agency (1983b) sampled 25 sites in the Kishwaukee River and determined the number of benthic taxa and concentrations of hydrocarbons and trace metals. The chemical concentrations in 20 sites associated with relatively high numbers of taxa (mean 16.3 ± 4.6 SD per site) were compared with concentration in 5 sites with relatively low numbers of taxa (8.4 \pm 0.5 per site).

Tsai et al. (1979) sampled nine stations in Baltimore Harbor, Maryland and determined toxicity to mummichogs (Fundulus heteroclitus), spot (Leiostomus xanthurus), and soft-shell clams (Mya arenaria) and the concentrations of PCBs and trace metals. Five of the stations were relatively highly toxic (mean 48-h TLm of 5.1 ± 3.5) to mummichogs and four were relatively less toxic (mean TLm of 43.2 ± 31.3). The means and standard deviations of chemical concentrations among the most and least toxic samples were compared.

VanDolah *et al.* (1984) sampled 15 stations in and near a dredged material disposal site off Georgetown, South Carolina and determined benthic community composition and concentrations of PCBs and trace metals. The maximum sediment concentrations of chemicals at sites in which no demonstrable effects upon summer benthic community species richness and total abundance was observed were used in this document.

Tatem (1986) determined bioaccumulation of PCBs and trace metals in the prawn (*Macrobrachium rosenbergii*) exposed to Sheboygan River, Wisconsin sediments. He observed that the sediments were toxic to the prawns after 22 days' exposure. The concentrations of chemicals in the toxic sediments were used in this document.

Lee and Mariani (1977) reported results of sediment toxicity tests and chemical analyses for many prospective dredge areas throughout the United States. The chemical concentrations reported associated with the observations of relatively high toxicity to the grass shrimp *Palaemonetes pugio* were used in this document.

Zagatto *et al.* (1987) reported results of toxicity tests with *D. similis* and chemical concentrations in sediments from 18 stations in Cubatao River Basin, Brazil. Minimum chemical concentrations associated with samples that were reported as significantly toxic were used in this report.

Malueg et al. (1984a) sampled sediments from six sites in Phillips Chain of Lakes, Wisconsin, one site in Torch Lake, Michigan, and ten sites in the Little Grizzly Creek system, California and tested for toxicity to Daphnia magna and Hexagenia limbata and the concentrations of trace metals. The chemical concentrations in the one site in Phillips Chain of Lakes that was significantly toxic were compared with those in the five other samples that were reported as not significantly toxic. The chemical concentrations in the toxic Torch Lake sample also was listed and used in this document. The chemical concentrations in the eight samples from the Little Grizzly Creek system that were reported as significantly toxic were compared with those that were not toxic and used in this document.

Malueg et al. (1984b) sampled five sites each in the northern and southern reaches of the Keweenaw Waterway, Michigan and determined toxicity to *D. magna* and *Hexagenia limbata* and the concentrations of trace metals. The chemical concentrations in highly toxic northern sediments were compared with those in less toxic southern sediments.

Long and Buchman (1989) sampled 15 stations in San Francisco and Tomales bays and determined toxicity to the amphipod *Rhepoxynius abronius* and mussel embryos (*Mytilus edulis*) and concentrations of trace metals and organic compounds. U.S. Navy (1987) sampled 22 stations in San Francisco Bay and performed many of the same analyses, except they used the embryos of the oyster *C. gigas*. Chapman *et al.* (1987) sampled nine stations in San Francisco Bay and performed the same analyses as Long and Buchman (1989). Word *et al.* (1988) sampled 22 stations in the Oakland Inner Harbor of San Francisco Bay and performed the same analyses as U.S. Navy (1987). The data from these four studies were combined and

three types of analyses were performed. First, AET values were calculated using SedQual software developed by PTI Environmental Services (1988) and a sorting routine on Microsoft Excel spreadsheets on a Macintosh computer. Second, the mean concentrations of chemicals associated with relatively highly toxic samples (mean 67 ± 11.8 percent mortality among *R. abronius*, mean 92.4 ± 4.5 percent abnormal bivalve embryos) were compared with those that were moderately toxic (33.8 ± 4.7 percent mortality among *R. abronius*, 59.4 ± 11.3 percent abnormal bivalve embryos) and least toxic (18 ± 6.6 percent mortality among *R. abronius*, 23.3 ± 7.3 percent abnormal bivalve embryos). Third, the chemical concentrations in samples reported as significantly toxic were compared with those that were reported as not significantly toxic, however, since most of the samples were significantly different from controls, this last approach appeared to be the least satisfactory of the three.

Tetra Tech (1985) sampled 55 sites in the Commencement Bay, Washington waterways and vicinity and determined toxicity to *R. abronius* and *C. gigas* embryos and concentrations of trace metals and organic compounds. The mean concentrations in samples that were most toxic (15.7 \pm 3.9 dead *R. abronius* out of 20, 44.5 \pm 19 percent abnormal *C. gigas* embryos) were compared with those in samples that were moderately toxic (5.2 \pm 1.1 dead *R. abronius* out of 20, 23 \pm 2.3 percent abnormal *C. gigas* embryos) and least toxic (2.5 \pm 0.9 dead *R. abronius* out of 20, 15.1 \pm 3.1 percent abnormal *C. gigas* embryos).

Word and Mearns (1979) sampled 71 sites along a 60-m depth contour off southern California and determined benthic community composition and concentrations of trace metals and selected hydrocarbons. The chemical concentrations associated with samples that had relatively high, intermediate, and low abundances of echinoderms and arthropod were compared. The chemical concentrations associated with relatively high, intermediate, and low species richness and total abundance were also compared. They were compared, for example, between sites with high echinoderm abundance (mean 191.3 \pm 70.1/0.1 square meters), intermediate abundance (56.2 \pm 23.0/0.1 square meters), and lowest abundance (6.1 \pm 7.2/0.1 square meters).

Schiewe *et al.* (1984) sampled 18 sites in Puget Sound, Washington. and determined toxicity to *Photobacterium phosphoreum* in a MicrotoxTM test of organic extracts of sediments and concentrations of petroleum hydrocarbons. Chemical concentrations in highly toxic samples (mean EC50 0.31 ± 0.13), moderately toxic samples (mean EC50 2.14 ± 0.83), and least toxic samples (mean EC50 8.9 ± 3.3) were compared for use in this document.

Swartz *et al.* (1985 and 1986) sampled seven sites in 1980 and six sites in 1983 in the Southern California Bight off Palos Verdes and determined toxicity with a R. *abronius* bioassay, macroinvertebrate community composition, and concentrations of trace metals and selected organic compounds. The data from the two surveys were combined for use in this document. The chemical concentrations in samples that were significantly toxic to R *abronius* were compared with those that were not toxic. Also, the chemical concentrations in sites reported as having "major degradation" to the macrobenthos were listed and used in the present document.

Rygg (1985) reported the relationship between sediment copper concentrations in Norwegian fjords and benthic community composition sampled at 71 stations. He reported that a 50 percent reduction in Hurlbert's diversity index was correlated with 200 ppm copper in the sediments.

Johnson and Norton (1988) sampled 12 sites in ports along the lower Columbia River, Washington and determined toxicity to the amphipod *H. azteca* and concentrations of trace metals and organic compounds. PAH concentrations differed the most among sampling sites. No significant toxicity was observed, therefore, the maximum PAH concentration in which no toxicity was observed was listed and used in this document.

Armstrong et al., (1979) sampled 15 stations in Trinity Bay, Texas in a grid associated with an oilfield brine effluent and determined benthic community composition and PAH

concentration. The PAH concentrations in 10 stations with relatively high species richness (mean 33.3 per station) and total abundance (mean 5178 per station) were compared with those in 7 stations with relatively low species richness (mean 28.2 per station) and abundance (mean 1285 per station).

Qasim *et al.* (1980) sampled 13 sites in the Trinity River, Texas and tested for toxicity with *D. magna* and for the concentrations of hydrocarbons and trace metals. The chemical concentrations in five sites in which significant mortality (mean 92.5 \pm 11.6 percent SD) was observed were compared with those from eight sites in which lower (nonsignificant) mortality (mean 16 \pm 8.9 percent SD) was observed.

Ingersoll and Nelson (in press) sampled three sites and a control in Waukegan Harbor, Illinois and vicinity and determined toxicity to *H. azteca* and concentrations of trace metals and hydrocarbons. Chemical concentrations in the least contaminated of two samples that were significantly toxic (mean 13.8 percent survival) were compared to those with higher survival (mean 88.8 percent survival).

Simmers *et al.* (1984) reported 100 percent mortality in *N. virens* exposed for 14 days to Black Rock Harbor, Connecticut dredged material. The bioassays were performed with mixtures of 25 percent dredged material and 75 percent clean material and chemical analyses were performed with the diluted material. Therefore, the reported concentrations were multiplied by a factor of four for use in this document.

Salazar and Salazar (1985) and Salazar (1980) reported results of toxicity tests and chemical analyses of various numbers of samples in San Diego Bay, California. A variety of animals were used; all indicated relatively high survival (generally, over 82 percent survival). For this document, the highest concentrations in which these high degrees of survival were observed were listed and used.

Rogerson *et al.* (1985) reported the results of toxicity tests of Black Rock Harbor, Connecticut sediments performed with the amphipod *A. abdita* and chemical data for PAH. The projected concentrations of PAH in undiluted sediments that caused significant mortality were listed and used in this document.

Tietjen and Lee (1984) sampled 17 sites in the Hudson-Raritan Bay estuary and determined toxicity in 14-d tests of growth of the nematode *Chromadorina germanica* and concentrations of hydrocarbons and trace metals. The chemical concentrations in samples that caused a negative intrinsic rate of growth were compared with those that caused a positive rate of growth.

Long (1987) determined PAH concentrations in mudflat sediments and densities of meiofaunal organisms in 10 square centimeters cores at 28 stations in the Forth estuary, Scotland. The chemical concentrations associated with high meiofaunal densities (mean 3741 \pm 1773) were compared with those that had intermediate densities (mean 1335 \pm 396) and lowest densities (mean 112 \pm 123).

CH²M-Hill (1989) sampled 86 stations in Eagle Harbor, Washington during June 1988 and determined toxicity to *R. abronius* and concentrations of PAH in bulk sediments. Chemical concentrations in 49 least toxic samples (mean of 17.4 ± 1.4 survivors out of 20) were compared with those in 7 moderately toxic samples (mean of 11.8 ± 1.8 survivors out of 20) and 12 highly toxic samples (mean of 0.9 ± 1.7 survivors out of 20).

APPENDIX B

SEDIMENT EFFECTS DATA

•

.

Table B-1. Sediment effects data available for ANTIMONY arranged in ascending order with remarks regarding use of the concentrations to determine ER-L and ER-M values.

centration (j	opm dw) Biological Test	Remarks
).9 ± 1	Commencement Bay least toxicamphipod	No effect
l±1.4	Commencement Bay least toxic-oyster	No effect
>1.9	San Francisco Bay AETbivalve	Not definitive
2	ER-L	10 percentile
2±5	Commencement Bay moderately toxic-amphipod	* *
2±5.5	Commencement Bay moderately toxic-oyster	*
2.3 ± 6.3	San Francisco Bay significantly toxicamphipod	No concordance
2.6	PSDDA screening level	No effect
2.7 ± 6.7	San Francisco Bay moderately toxicamphipod	No concordance
>2.9	San Francisco Bay AETamphipod	No concordance
3.2	1986 Puget Sound AET-benthic	*
5±11.2	San Francisco Bay least toxic—bivalve	No effect
5.3	1986 Puget Sound AETamphipod	*
6.6±1	San Francisco Bay moderately toxic-bivalve	*
6.7 ± 12.3	San Francisco Bay not toxic-bivalve	No effect
8.6 ± 11.9	San Francisco Bay significantly toxic-bivalve	*
9 ± 11.6	San Francisco Bay least toxicamphipod	No effect
9.9 ± 11.8	San Francisco Bay not toxic-amphipod	No effect
25	ER-M	50 percentile
25±0	San Francisco Bay highly toxic-bivalve	* -
26	1986 Puget Sound AET-oyster	*
26	1986 Puget Sound AETMicrotox™	•
	 Commencement Bay highly toxic-oyster 	*
91.5 ± 184	Commencement Bay highly toxicamphipod	*
150	1988 Puget Sound AET-Microtox TM	*
200	1988 Puget Sound AETamphipod	*
ND	San Francisco Bay highly toxic-amphipod	No concordance

* 13 concentrations used in ER-L and ER-M estimates. ND = not detected

1 1.3 1.36 1.9 2.2 \pm 1.2 2.7 \pm 0.2 2.8 3.4 \pm 1.8 3.4 3.7 \pm 1 5 \pm 1.8 5.8 \pm 6.4 5.9 \pm 1.1 7.4 \pm 2.2	Stamford not toxicshrimp Duwamish River nontoxicshrimp Georgetown benthic community Black Rock Harbor toxic <i>Nereis</i> Trinity River not toxic <i>Daphnia</i> Sheboygan River significantly toxicprawn Newport not toxicshrimp	No effect No effect Small gradient No effect Small gradient No effect
1.3 1.36 1.9 2.2 \pm 1.2 2.7 \pm 0.2 2.8 3.4 \pm 1.8 3.4 3.7 \pm 1 5 \pm 1.8 5.8 \pm 6.4 5.9 \pm 1.1	Duwamish River nontoxic—shrimp Georgetown benthic community Black Rock Harbor toxic— <i>Nereis</i> Trinity River not toxic— <i>Daphnia</i> Sheboygan River significantly toxic—prawn	No effect No effect Small gradient No effect Small gradient
1.9 2.2 \pm 1.2 2.7 \pm 0.2 2.8 3.4 \pm 1.8 3.4 3.7 \pm 1 5 \pm 1.8 5.8 \pm 6.4 5.9 \pm 1.1	Georgetown benthic community Black Rock Harbor toxic <i>—Nereis</i> Trinity River not toxic <i>—Daphnia</i> Sheboygan River significantly toxic—prawn	No effect Small gradient No effect Small gradient
2.2 ± 1.2 2.7 ± 0.2 2.8 3.4 ± 1.8 3.4 3.7 ± 1 5 ± 1.8 5.8 ± 6.4 5.9 ± 1.1	Black Rock Harbor toxic <i>—Nereis</i> Trinity River not toxic <i>—Daphnia</i> Sheboygan River significantly toxic—prawn	Small gradient No effect Small gradient
2.2 ± 1.2 2.7 ± 0.2 2.8 3.4 ± 1.8 3.4 3.7 ± 1 5 ± 1.8 5.8 ± 6.4 5.9 ± 1.1	Trinity River not toxic <i>Daphnia</i> Sheboygan River significantly toxicprawn	No effect Small gradient
2.7 ± 0.2 2.8 3.4 ± 1.8 3.4 3.7 ± 1 5 ± 1.8 5.8 ± 6.4 5.9 ± 1.1	Sheboygan River significantly toxic-prawn	Small gradient
2.8 3.4 \pm 1.8 3.7 \pm 1 5 \pm 1.8 5.8 \pm 6.4 5.9 \pm 1.1		
3.4 ± 1.8 3.4 3.7 ± 1 5 ± 1.8 5.8 ± 6.4 5.9 ± 1.1		No effect
$3.43.7 \pm 15 \pm 1.85.8 \pm 6.45.9 \pm 1.1$	Trinity River significant toxic-Daphnia	Small gradient
3.7±1 5±1.8 5.8±6.4 5.9±1.1	Norwalk not toxic-shrimp	No effect
5±1.8 5.8±6.4 5.9±1.1	Kishwaukee River least taxa	No effect
5.8±6.4 5.9±1.1	Kishwaukee River most taxa	Small gradient
5.9 ± 1.1	Southern California not toxic-amphipod	No effect
	DuPage River most taxa	Small gradient
	DuPage River least taxa	Small gradient
8.32 ± 5.2	Southern California significantly toxic-amphipod	Small gradient
10.4 ± 13.4	San Francisco Bay moderately toxic-amphipod	No concordance
12.8	Los Angeles Harbor toxic-shrimp	Small gradient
13.7 ± 14.8	San Francisco Bay least toxic-bivalve	No effect
14.6 ± 13.8		No concordance
	San Francisco Bay significantly toxic-amphipod	No concordance
17.5 ± 14.1	San Francisco Bay highly toxic-amphipod	
22 ± 18.7	San Francisco Bay not toxic-bivalve	No effect
22.1 ± 19.4	San Francisco Bay moderately toxic-bivalve	No offers
22.6 ± 28.1	Puget Sound non-toxic-amphipod	No effect
22.8 ± 22.1	San Francisco Bay significantly toxic-bivalve	No gradient
25.1 ± 23.1	Puget Sound moderately toxicamphipod	Small gradient
27.8 ± 30.8	Commencement Bay least toxicoyster	No effect
28 ± 21.5	San Francisco Bay least toxic-amphipod	No effect
28.3 ± 26.6	Commencement Bay least toxic-amphipod	No effect
30.3 ± 22.4	San Francisco Bay not toxic-amphipod	No effect
32 ± 14.3	Baltimore Harbor least toxic-fish	No effect
33	ER-L	10 percentile
33	EP chronic marine	•
<47.2	Waukegan Harbor highly toxic—amphipod	Below detection
50.7 ± 29.3	San Francisco Bay highly toxicbivalve	•
54	San Francisco Bay AET-bivalve	*
57	1988 Puget Sound AET-benthic	*
58.7 ± 148.1	Commencement Bay moderately toxic-oyster	*
63.2 ± 148	Commencement Bay moderately toxicamphipod	*
64	EP acute marine	*
70	PSDDA screening level	No effect
70	San Francisco Bay AETamphipod	No concordance
85	ER-M	50 percentile
85	1986 Puget Sound AET-benthic	*
91.9 ± 78.6	Baltimore Harbor most toxic-fish	*
93	1986 Puget Sound AETamphipod	*
689.9 ± 2350.9	Commencement Bay highly toxic-oyster	+
700	1986 Puget Sound AET-oyster	*
700	1986 Puget Sound AET-Microtox TM	*
1005 ± 2777	Puget Sound highly toxic-amphipod	*
2257.1 ± 4213.7	Commencement Bay highly toxic-amphipod	*

Table B-2. Sediment effects data available for ARSENIC arranged in ascending order with remarks regarding use of the concentrations to determine ER-L and ER-M values.

* 16 concentrations used to determine ER-L and ER-M values

Concentration	(ppm) Biological Test	Remarks
<0.04	Fraser River feral clams present	no effects
0.05 ± 0	Kishwaukee River least taxa	Below detection
<0.1	Georgetown no benthic effects	No effects
0.2	Cubatao River highly toxic-Daphnia	Small gradient
0.3 ± 0.8	Kishwaukee River most taxa	Below detection
).4	Macoma burrowing bioassay	Small gradient
0.4 ± 0.1	San Francisco Bay least toxic-bivalve	No effect
0.4 ± 0.3	Southern California high echinoderm abundance	No effect
$).4 \pm 0.1$	Massachusetts Bay high species richness	No effect
<0.5	Duwamish River low toxicity-shrimp	No effect
0.5 ± 0.3	San Francisco Bay moderately toxicamphipod	No gradient
0.5 ± 0.3	Southern California moderate echinoderm abundance	No gradient
).5 ± 0.4✔	Keweenaw Waterway least toxicDaphnia	No effect
<0.5	Newport not toxicshrimp	No effect
0.6 ± 0.3	San Francisco Bay least toxicamphipod	No effect
0.6 ± 0.4	San Francisco Bay significantly toxicamphipod	No gradient
0.6 ± 0.3	San Francisco Bay not toxicamphipod	No effect
0.6 ± 0.4	San Francisco Bay significantly toxic-bivalve	No gradient
0.6 ± 0.3	San Francisco Bay not toxic-bivalve	No effect
0.6 ± 0.7	Southern California moderate species richness	No concordance
1.6 ± 0.3	Keweenaw Waterway not toxicDaphnia	No effect
$.7 \pm 0.3$	San Francisco Bay highly toxicbivalve	No gradient
0.7 ± 0.5	San Francisco Bay moderately toxicbivalve	Small gradient
0.7 ± 0.7	Southern California moderate arthropod abundance	No concordance
1.7 ± 0.6	Massachusetts Bay moderate species richness	Small gradient
0.8 ± 0.5	San Francisco Bay highly toxicamphipod	Small gradient
0.8 ± 1.1	Southern California moderate total abundance	No concordance
.9±1	Southern California high arthropod abundance	No effect
).9).9	San Diego Bay low toxicityvarious	No effect
.96	San Diego Bay low toxicityvarious	No effect
± 1.1	PSDDA screening level	No effect
.1 ± 2	<i>R. abronius</i> LC50spiked bioassay Southern California low total abundance	Sand
$.1 \pm 1.1$	Massachusetts Bay least species richness	No concordance
$.2 \pm 1$	Fraser River feral clams absent	Small gradient
.2	San Francisco Bay AETamphipod	Small gradient
$.2 \pm 0.3$	Little Grizzly Creek high toxicityDaphnia	No concordance Small gradient
$.3 \pm 0.6$	DuPage River least taxa	no concordance
.4	Macoma avoidance bioassay	Small gradient
.5±4	Southern California high species richness	No effect
.5±0.9	DuPage River most taxa	No effect
.5 ± 0.2✔	Keweenaw Waterway most toxicDaphnia	
.6	Black Rock Harbor highly toxicNereis	Small gradient
.7	San Francisco Bay AETbivalve	Small gradient
.7 ± 0.3	Keweenaw Waterway significantly toxicDaphnia	Small gradient
$.9 \pm 1.1$	Commencement Bay least toxicoyster	Small gradient No effect
.98	Lake Union toxicamphipod	
	Baltimore Harbor least toxicfish	Small gradient No effect
.3 ± 1.3	Commencement Bay least toxicamphipod	No effect
.5	Waukegan Harbor high toxicityamphipod	
.5	Torch Lake significantly toxic-Daphnia	Small gradient
.7 ± 2	Commencement Bay moderately toxicoyster	Small gradient Small gradient

Table B-3. Sediment effects data available for CADMIUM arranged in ascending order with remarks regarding use of the concentrations to determine ER-L and ER-M values.

.

.

28 ± 0.5 Sheboygan River high toxicity—prawn Small gradient 29 ± 2.3 Commencement Bay moderately toxic—amphipod Small gradient 31 ± 0.6 Phillips Chain low toxicity—Daphnia No effect 3.1 ± 0.6 Phillips Chain low toxicity—Daphnia No effect 3.1 ± 0.6 Phillips Chain low toxicity—Daphnia No effect 4.1 Norwalk low toxicity—Daphnia No effect 4.1 Norwalk low toxicity—Daphnia No effect 4.3 ± 11.4 Southern California low arthropod abundance • 4.7 ± 12.2 Southern California low arthropod abundance • 5.1 1988 Puget Sound AET—benthic * 5.2 ± 11.4 Southern California significantly toxic—amphipod * 5.8 R. abronius =Diked bioassay * 6.7 1986 Puget Sound AET—benthic * 5.8 R. abronius LCSO—spiked bioassay * 6.7 1986 Puget Sound AET—mphipod * 6.7 1986 Puget Sound AET—mphipod * 6.8 R. abronius LCSO—spiked bioassay * 8.9 R. abronius LCSO—spiked bioassay * 8.11.4	Concentration	(ppm)	Biological Test	Remarks
28 Stamford low toxicity-shrinp No effect 31 ± 0.6 Phillips Chain low toxicity-orphring Small gradient 31 ± 0.6 Phillips Chain low toxicity-orphring Small gradient 32 ± 6 Southern California not toxic-amphipod No effect 32 ± 6 Southern California low arthropod abundance * 41 Norwalk low toxicity-orphring No effect 32 ± 6 Southern California low arthropod abundance * 41 Norwalk low toxicity-orphring No effect 42 ± 11.4 Southern California low arthropod abundance * 45 ER-L Snall gradient 51 1986 Puget Sound AET-benthic * 52 ER-L * * 53 11.4 Southern California low achinodern abundance * 64 R. abronius EC50-spiked bioassay * * 65 R. abronius LC50-spiked bioassay * * 64 E. sencilius LC96-spiked bioassay * * 78.8 R. abronius LC76-spiked bioassay * * 65 R. abronius LC76-spiked bioassay * * 79.0 R. Abronius LC76-spiked bioassay * * 84 E. sencilius LC76-spiked bioassay <td< th=""><th>2.8±0.5</th><th>Sheboygan Rive</th><th>er high toxicity-prawn</th><th>Small gradient</th></td<>	2.8±0.5	Sheboygan Rive	er high toxicity-prawn	Small gradient
29 ± 2.3 Commencement Bay moderately toxic-amphipod Small gradient 31 ± 0.6 Phillips Chain low toxicityophnin Small gradient 32 ± 6 Southern California not toxicyamphipod No effect 32 ± 6 Southern California low species richness No effect 41 Norwalk low toxicityshrim No effect 42 ± 12.2 Southern California low species richness * 43 ± 11.4 Southern California significantly toxic-amphipod * 45 FR.L Small gradient 51 1988 Puget Sound AET-benthic * 52 ± 11.4 Southern California isgnificantly toxic-amphipod * 54 1.4 Southern California low echinoderm abundance * 55 R. abronius EC50-spiked bioassay * * 65 R. abronius LC76-spiked bioassay * * 65 R. abronius LC76-spiked bioassay * * 65 R. abronius LC50-spiked bioassay * * 65 R. abronius LC50-spiked bioassay * * 65 R. abronius LC50-spiked bioassay * * 7		Stamford low to	xicity-shrimp	
Jate 0.6 Phillips Chain low toxicityaphria Small state 32.2.6 Southern California not toxicamphipod No effect 32.2.6 Southern California not toxicamphipod No effect 32.2.6 Southern California low arthropod abundance * 4.1 Norwak low toxicitybaphria No effect 32.2.6 Trinity River not toxicDaphria No effect 34.2.6 Trinity River not toxicDaphria No effect 5.1 1988 Puget Sound AETbenthic Small gradient 5.3 1.1.4 Southern California significantly toxic-amphipod * 5.6 R. abronius a significantly toxic-amphipod * 5.7 R. abronius LCS0-spiked bioassay * 5.7	2.9 ± 2.3			Small gradient
31 ± 0.6 Phillips Chain low toxicity-Daphnia No effect 11 Norwalk low toxicity-anthipod No effect 13 ± 11.4 Southern California low species richness • 13 ± 11.4 Southern California low species richness • 13 ± 11.4 Southern California low species richness • 14 ± 0.6 Phillips Chain high toxicity-Daphnia Small gradient 15 ER-L 10 percentile 16 R. abronius-spiked bioassay • 1798 Puget Sound AET-benthic • 18 * • 19 Southern California is significantly toxic-amphipod • 16 R. abronius-spiked bioassay • 17 1966 Puget Sound AET-benthic • 18 A. abronius LCS0-spiked bioassay • 19 R. abronius LCS0-spiked bioassay • 19 R. abronius LCS0-spiked bioassay • 19 R. abronius LCS0-spiked bioassay • 10 R. abronius LCS0-spiked bioassay • 10 R. abronius ECS0-spiked bioassay • 11 R. abronius LCS0-spiked bioassay<	3	Los Angeles Ha	rbor high toxicity-shrimp	
32±6Southern California not toxic-amphipodNo effect13±11.4Southern California low arthropod abundance		Phillips Chain l	ow toxicity-Daphnia	
43 ± 11.4 Southern California low arthropod abundance * 43 ± 51.6 Trinity River not toxic-Daphnia No effect 50 FR-L 10 percentile 51 1988 Puget Sound AET-benthic * 52 ± 11.4 Southern California significantly toxic-amphipod * 53 ± 11.4 Southern California significantly toxic-amphipod * 54.6 R. abronius-spiked bioassay * 53 ± 11.4 Southern California low echinoderm abundance * 54.7 1986 Puget Sound AET-benthic * 55.8 R. abronius LCSO-spiked bioassay * 54.7 1986 Puget Sound AET-amphipod * 55.7 R. abronius LCSO-spiked bioassay * 56.7 1986 Puget Sound AET-amphipod * 57.7 1986 Puget Sound AET-amphipod * 58.8 R. abronius LCSO-spiked bioassay * 59.9 R. abronius LCSO-spiked bioassay * 50 R. abronius LCSO-spiked bioassay * 59.8 R. abronius ECSO-spiked bioassay * 50 percentile * 51 92	3.2±6	Southern Califo	rnia not toxicamphipod	No effect
17 ± 12.2 Southern California low species richness * 18 ± 5.6 Trinity River not toxic-Daphnia No effect 19 BR-L Small gradient 5 BR-L 10 percentile 5 IP38 Puget Sound AET-benthic * 5.3 1986 Puget Sound AET-benthic * 5.4 11.4 Southern California significantly toxic-amphipod * 5.6 R. abronius-spiked bioassay * * 5.8 R. abronius-spiked bioassay * * 5.2 13.1 Southern California low echinoderm abundance * 5.5 R. abronius LC50-spiked bioassay * * 5.7 R. abronius LC50-spiked bioassay * * 5.7 R. abronius LC50-spiked bioassay * * 5.7 R. abronius LC50-spiked bioassay * * 5.8 R. abronius LC50-spiked bioassay * * 5.9 R. abronius bc50-spiked bioassay * * 5.7 R. abronius bc50-spiked bioassay * * 5.8 R. abronius bc50-spiked bioassay * <td>.1</td> <td>Norwalk low to:</td> <td>xicity-shrimp</td> <td>No effect</td>	.1	Norwalk low to:	xicity-shrimp	No effect
18 ± 5.6 Trinity River not toxic-Daphnia No effect 19 Phillips Chain high toxicity-Daphnia Small gradient 10 Percentile 10 5 ER-L 10 51 11.4 Southern California significantly toxic-amphipod * 53 11.4 Southern California box echinoderm abundance * 53 R. abronius-spiked bioassay * 53 R. abronius ECSO-spiked bioassay * 54 R. abronius LCSO-spiked bioassay * 55 R. abronius LCSO-spiked bioassay * 54 R. abronius LCSO-spiked bioassay * 55 R. abronius LCSO-spiked bioassay * 56 R. abronius LCSO-spiked bioassay * 57 R. abronius LCSO-spiked bioassay * 58 R. abronius LCSO-spiked bioassay * 59 R. abronius ECSO-spiked bioassay * 50 Percentile * 51 R. abronius ECSO-spiked bioassay * 52 Palo Verdes not toxic-amphipod No effect 50 Percentile * <td>1.3 ± 11.4</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>-</td>	1.3 ± 11.4			-
19 Phillips Chain high toxicity-Daphnia Small gradient 10 Percentile 10 11 1988 Puget Sound AET-benthic * 13 ± 11.4 Southern California significantly toxic-amphipod * 16.6 R. abronius-spiked bioassay * 17.8 1986 Puget Sound AET-benthic * 18.8 R. abronius-spiked bioassay * 19.2 2.1 13.1 Southern California low echinoderm abundance * 19.5 R. abronius EC50-spiked bioassay * * 19.7 1986 Puget Sound AET-amphipod * * 19.8 R. abronius LC50-spiked bioassay * * 19.0 R. abronius LC50-spiked bioassay * * 19.3 R. abronius LC50-spiked bioassay * * 19.4 R. abronius LC50-spiked bioassay * * 19.4 R. abronius EC50-spiked bioassay * * 19.4 R. abronius EC50-spiked bioassay * * 19.4 R. abronius EC50-spiked bioassay * * 19.4 R. abronius EC50-s	1.7 ± 12.2			*
5ER-L10percentile5.11988 Puget Sound AET-benthic*5.3 \pm 11.4Southern California significantly toxic-amphipod*5.6R. abronius-spiked bioassay*5.81986 Puget Sound AET-benthic*5.8R. abronius-spiked bioassay*5.71986 Puget Sound AET-amphipod*5.71986 Puget Sound AET-amphipod*5.71986 Puget Sound AET-amphipod*5.8R. abronius LC50-spiked bioassay*5.9R. abronius LC50-spiked bioassay*5.1R. abronius LC50-spiked bioassay*5.2Palos Verdes not toxic-amphipod*5.3R. abronius LC50-spiked bioassay*5.4R. abronius LC50-spiked bioassay*5.5R. abronius LC50-spiked bioassay*5.6R. abronius LC50-spiked bioassay*5.7R. abronius CC50-spiked bioassay*5.8R. abronius CC50-spiked bioassay*5.9P.0ER-M505.1R. abronius EC50-spiked bioassay*5.21986 Puget Sound AET-MicrotoxTM*5.41986 Puget Sound AET-MicrotoxTM*5.5R. abronius LC50-spiked bioassay*5.61986 Puget Sound AET-Oxyster*5.7R. abronius LC50-spiked bioassay*5.8R. abronius LC50-spiked bioassay*5.9R. abronius LC50-spiked bioassay*5.61986 Puget Sound AET-Oxyster <t< td=""><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></t<>				
5.1 1988 Puget Sound AET-benthic * 6.3 ± 11.4 Southern California significantly toxic-amphipod * 6.6 R. abronius-spiked bioassay * 7.8 1986 Puget Sound AET-benthic * 7.8 R. abronius-spiked bioassay * 7.1 1986 Puget Sound AET-amphipod * 7.7 1986 Puget Sound AET-amphipod * 7.9 R. abronius LC50-spiked bioassay * 7.1 1986 Puget Sound AET-amphipod * 7.9 R. abronius LC50-spiked bioassay * 7.1 R. abronius LC50-spiked bioassay * 7.2 R. abronius LC50-spiked bioassay * 7.8 R. abronius LC50-spiked bioassay * 7.8 R. abronius CC50-spiked bioassay * 7.8 R. abronius CC50-spiked bioassay * 7.9.0 ER-M S0 percentile 7.1 9.0 ER-M S0 percentile 7.4 R. abronius LC50-spiked bioassay * 7.7 R. abronius LC50-spiked bioassay * 7.8 R. abronius LC50-spiked bioassay *	_		high toxicity-Daphnia	
53 ± 11.4 Southern California significantly toxic-amphipod * 56 R. abronius-spiked bioassay * 58 1986 Puget Sound AET-benthic * 58 R. abronius-spiked bioassay * 52 ± 13.1 Southern California low echinoderm abundance * 55 R. abronius EC50-spiked bioassay * 57 1986 Puget Sound AET-amphipod * 58 R. abronius IC50-spiked bioassay * 59 R. abronius LC50-spiked bioassay * 84 E. sencillus LC30-spiked bioassay * 85 R. abronius LC50-spiked bioassay * 84 E. sencillus LC50-spiked bioassay * 85 R. abronius LC50-spiked bioassay * 86 R. abronius DC50-spiked bioassay * 87 R. abronius DC50-spiked bioassay * 89 R. abronius EC50-spiked bioassay * 90 ER-M * * 91 R. abronius EC50-spiked bioassay * * 924 17.3 Southern California high total abundance No effect 926 <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>10 percentile</td>				10 percentile
5.6 R. abronius-spiked bioassay * 5.8 1986 Puget Sound AET-benthic * 5.2 ± 13.1 Southern California low echinoderm abundance * 5.7 1986 Puget Sound AET-amphipod * 5.7 1986 Puget Sound AET-amphipod * 5.9 R. abronius EC50-spiked bioassay * 5.4 E. sencillus LC50-spiked bioassay * 5.4 E. sencillus LC50-spiked bioassay * 5.7 R. abronius LC50-spiked bioassay * 5.8 R. abronius LC50-spiked bioassay * 5.7 R. abronius LC50-spiked bioassay * 5.8 R. abronius LC50-spiked bioassay * 5.8 R. abronius C50-spiked bioassay * 5.9 R. abronius C50-spiked bioassay * 5.9 R. abronius EC50-spiked bioassay * 5.0 ER-M 50 percentile 5.1 R. abronius EC50-spiked bioassay * 5.4 1986 Puget Sound AET-oyster * 5.4 1986 Puget Sound AET-oyster * 5.1 R. abronius EC50-spiked bioassay * </td <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>-</td>				-
5.8 1986 Puget Sound AET-benthic * 5.8 R. abronius-expliked bioassay * 5.5 R. abronius ECS0-spiked bioassay * 5.7 1986 Puget Sound AET-amphipod * 5.9 R. abronius LCS0-spiked bioassay * 5.4 R. abronius LCS0-spiked bioassay * 5.4 R. abronius LCS0-spiked bioassay * 5.4 R. abronius LC50-spiked bioassay * 5.7 R. abronius LC50-spiked bioassay * 5.8 R. abronius LC50-spiked bioassay * 5.9 R. abronius cutokic-amphipod No effect 5.9 R. abronius EC50-spiked bioassay * 5.0 percentile * 5.1 R. abronius EC50-spiked bioassay * 5.4 1986 Puget Sound AET-Microtx TM * 5.6 1986 Puget Sound AET-Microtx TM *				*
5.8 R. abronius-spiked bioassay * 5.1 Southern California low echinoderm abundance * 5.5 R. abronius BCS0-spiked bioassay * 5.7 1986 Puget Sound AET-amphipod * 5.9 R. abronius LCS0-spiked bioassay * 5.4 E. sencillus LC98- spiked bioassay * 5.5 R. abronius LC50-spiked bioassay * 5.7 R. abronius LC50-spiked bioassay * 5.8 R. abronius LC50-spiked bioassay * 5.8 R. abronius LC50-spiked bioassay * 5.9 R. abronius LC50-spiked bioassay * 5.9 R. abronius LC50-spiked bioassay * 5.0 B. R. abronius EC50-spiked bioassay * 5.0 B. R. abronius EC50-spiked bioassay * 5.4 17.3 Southern California high total abundance No effect 5.4 17.3 Southern California high total abundance * 5.4 1986 Puget Sound AET-Microtox TM * * 5.4 17.3 Southern California high total abundance * *		R. abronius-spi	ked bloassay	₹
5.2 ± 13.1 Southern California low echinoderm abundance * 5.7 1986 Puget Sound AET-amphipod * 5.7 1986 Puget Sound AET-amphipod * 5.9 R. abronius LC50-spiked bioassay * 8.4 E. sencilus LC38-spiked bioassay * 8.5 R. abronius LC50-spiked bioassay * 8.7 R. abronius LC50-spiked bioassay * 8.8 R. abronius UC50-spiked bioassay * 8.9 R. abronius UC50-spiked bioassay * 8.8 R. abronius overall LC50-spiked bioassay * 9.0 ER-M S0 percentile 9.1 R. abronius EC50-spiked bioassay * 9.0 ER-M S0 percentile 9.1 R. abronius EC50-spiked bioassay * 9.2 Palos Verdes Nott AET-oyster * 9.4 17.3 Southern California high total abundance No effect 9.6 1986 Puget Sound AET-Microtox TM * * 9.8 R. abronius LC50-spiked bioassay * * 9.8 R. abronius LC50-spiked bioassay * *				.
5.5R. abronius EC50-spiked bioassay*5.71986 Puget Sound AET-amphipod*5.9R. abronius LC50-spiked bioassay*5.2R. abronius LC50-spiked bioassay*5.4E. sencillus LC98-spiked bioassay*5.5R. abronius LC50-spiked bioassay*5.6R. abronius LC50-spiked bioassay*5.7R. abronius LC50-spiked bioassay*5.8R. abronius LC50-spiked bioassay*5.9Palos Verdes not toxic-amphipodNo effect5.9R. abronius cC50-spiked bioassay*5.0ER-M50 percentile5.1R. abronius EC50-spiked bioassay*5.2A. abronius EC50-spiked bioassay*5.417.3Southern California high total abundanceNo effect5.61986 Puget Sound AET-oyster*5.7R. abronius EC50-spiked bioassay*5.8R. abronius LC50-spiked bioassay*5.9R. abronius LC50-spiked bioassay*5.9R. abronius EC50-spiked bioassay*5.0F. affinis lethality -spiked bioassay*5.1Commencement Bay highly toxic-oryster*5.345.1Commencement Bay highly toxic-amphipo				¥
5.7 1986 Puget Sound ÅET-amphipod * 5.9 R. abronius LCS0-spiked bioassay * 3.4 E. sencillus LC98- spiked bioassay * 3.5 R. abronius LC50-spiked bioassay * 3.7 R. abronius LC50-spiked bioassay * 3.8 R. abronius LC50-spiked bioassay * 3.8 R. abronius overall LC50-spiked bioassay * 3.9 R. abronius coverall LC50-spiked bioassay * 3.9 R. abronius C50-spiked bioassay * 3.1 R. abronius EC50-spiked bioassay * 3.4 17.3 Southern California high total abundance No effect 3.6 1986 Puget Sound AET-MicrotoxTM * * 3.6 R. abronius LC50-spiked bioassay * * 3.6 R. abronius LC50-spiked bioassay * * 3.6 R. abronius LC50-spiked bioassay * * 3.1 B.ationius LC50-spiked bioa	6.2 ± 13.1			*
6.9 R. abronius LC50-spiked bioassay * 8.2 R. abronius LC50-spiked bioassay * 8.4 E. sencilius LC98-spiked bioassay * 8.5 R. abronius LC50-spiked bioassay * 8.7 R. abronius LC50-spiked bioassay * 8.8 R. abronius LC50-spiked bioassay * 8.9 R. abronius CC50-spiked bioassay * 9.0 ER-M 50 percentile 9.1 R. abronius EC50-spiked bioassay * 9.4 ± 17.3 Southern California high total abundance No effect 9.6 1986 Puget Sound AET-oyster * 9.6 1986 Puget Sound AET-oyster * 9.7 R. abronius LC50-spiked bioassay * 9.8 R. abronius LC50-spiked bioassay * 9.7 R. abronius LC50-spiked bioassay * 9.8 R. abronius LC50-spiked bioassay * 9.7 R. abronius LC50-spiked bioassay * 10 R. abronius LC50-spiked bioassay * 11.5 R. abronius LC50-spiked bioassay * 12.5 R. abronius LC50-spiked bioassay	6.5			*
8.2 R. abronius LC50-spiked bioassay * 8.4 E. sencillus LC98-spiked bioassay * 8.5 R. abronius LC50-spiked bioassay * 8.7 R. abronius LC50-spiked bioassay * 8.8 R. abronius LC50-spiked bioassay * 8.9 ± 9.2 Palos Verdes not toxic-amphipod No effect 8.9 R. abronius overall LC50-spiked bioassay * 9.0 ER-M 50 percentile 9.1 R. abronius EC50-spiked bioassay * 9.4 17.3 Southern California high total abundance No effect 9.6 1986 Puget Sound AET-oyster * * 9.6 1986 Puget Sound AET-oyster * * 9.7 R. abronius LC50-spiked bioassay * * 9.8 R. abronius LC50-spiked bioassay * * 9.8 R. abronius LC50-spiked bioassay * * 9.8 R. abronius LC50-spiked bioassay * * 10.6 F.8.7 Trinity River significantly toxic-opathnia * 11.5 R. abronius LC50-spiked bioassay * * </td <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>*</td>				*
8.4 E. sencillus LC98- spiked bioassay * 8.5 R. abronius LC50-spiked bioassay * 8.7 R. abronius LC50-spiked bioassay * 8.8 R. abronius LC50-spiked bioassay * 8.9 ± 9.2 Palos Verdes not toxic-amphipod No effect 8.9 R. abronius overall LC50-spiked bioassay * 9.0 ER-M 50 percentile 9.1 R. abronius EC50-spiked bioassay * 9.4 ± 17.3 Southern California high total abundance No effect 9.6 1986 Puget Sound AET-oyster * 9.6 1986 Puget Sound AET-oyster * 9.7 R. abronius LC50-spiked bioassay * 9.8 R. abronius LC50-spiked bioassay * 11.1 P. affinis lethality -spiked bioassay * 11.8 ± 6.6 Hudson	6.9			*
8.5R. abronius LC76-spiked bioassay*8.7R. abronius LC50-spiked bioassay*8.8R. abronius LC50-spiked bioassay*8.9 ± 9.2Palos Verdes not toxicamphipodNo effect8.9R. abronius overall LC50-spiked bioassay*9.0ER-M50 percentile9.1R. abronius EC50-spiked bioassay*9.4 ± 17.3Southern California high total abundanceNo effect9.61986 Puget Sound AET-oyster*9.7R. abronius EC50-spiked bioassay*9.8R. abronius EC50-spiked bioassay*9.7R. abronius LC50-spiked bioassay*9.8R. abronius LC50-spiked bioassay*9.8R. abronius LC50-spiked bioassay*10.6 ± 8.7Trinity River significantly toxic-Daphnia*11P. affinis lethality -spiked bioassay*11.8 ± 6.6Hudson-Raritan least toxic-mematodeNo effect15.3 ± 45.1Commencement Bay highly toxic-oyster*18.6 ± 8.9Hudson-Raritan least toxic-mematode*22.8R. abronius LC50-spiked bioassay*23.9R. abronius EC50-spiked bioassay*24.4 ± 19.8Baltimore Harbor most toxic-mematode*25.9R. abronius LC50-spiked bioassay*26.4San Diego Bay low toxicity-mysidNo effect27.7San Diego Bay low toxicity-mysid*28.5San Diego Bay low toxicity-clamNo effect27.7San Diego Bay low toxicity-c	8.2	R. abronius LC5	0-spiked bioassay	*
8.7R. abronius LC50-spiked bioassay*8.8R. abronius LC50-spiked bioassay*8.9 ± 9.2Palos Verdes not toxic-amphipodNo effect8.9R. abronius overall LC50-spiked bioassay*9.0ER-M50 percentile9.1R. abronius EC50-spiked bioassay*9.4 ± 17.3Southern California high total abundanceNo effect9.61986 Puget Sound AETMicrotox TM *9.61986 Puget Sound AETMicrotox TM *9.7R. abronius EC50-spiked bioassay*9.8R. abronius LC50-spiked bioassay*10R. abronius LC50-spiked bioassay*11.1P. affinis lethality -spiked bioassay*11.5R. abronius LC50-spiked bioassay*11.8 ± 6.6Hudson-Raritan least toxic-nematodeNo effect11.8 ± 6.6Hudson-Raritan highly toxic-oyster*12.8 ± 19.8Baltimore Harbor most toxic-fish*22.7San Diego Bay low toxicity-mysidNo effect23.7 ± 3.1Palos Verdes significantly toxic-amphipod*25.9R. abronius LC50-spiked bioassay*26.4San Diego Bay low toxicity-mysidNo effect23.5San Diego Bay low toxicity-clamNo effect25.5San Diego Bay low toxicity-clamNo effect25.5San Diego Bay low toxicity-variousNo effect25.5San Diego Bay low toxicity-variousNo effect25.5San Diego Bay low toxicity-variousNo effect2		E. sencillus LC9	8- spiked bioassay	*
8.8 R. abronius LC50-spiked bioassay * 8.9 ± 9.2 Palos Verdes not toxic-amphipod No effect 8.9 R. abronius overall LC50-spiked bioassay * 9.0 ER-M 50 percentile 9.1 R. abronius EC50-spiked bioassay * 9.4 ± 17.3 Southern California high total abundance No effect 9.6 1986 Puget Sound AET-Oyster * 9.6 1986 Puget Sound AET-Microtox TM * 9.7 R. abronius EC50-spiked bioassay * 9.8 R. abronius LC50-spiked bioassay * 9.7 R. abronius LC50-spiked bioassay * 9.8 R. abronius LC50-spiked bioassay * 10 R. abronius LC50-spiked bioassay * 11 P. affinis lethality -spiked bioassay * 11.8 ± 6.6 Hudson-Raritan least toxicnematode No effect 11.8 ± 6.6 Hudson-Raritan highly toxic-oyster * 12.5 & A. abronius LC50-spiked bioassay * * 22.7 San Diego Bay low toxicity-polychaete No effect 22.8 ± 19.8 Baltimore Harbor most toxic-fish * <				*
A. ubronius LCSO-spiked bioassayNo effect8.9 ± 9.2Palos Verdes not toxic-amphipodNo effect8.9R. abronius overall LCSO-spiked bioassay*9.0ER-M50 percentile9.1R. abronius ECSO-spiked bioassay*9.4 ± 17.3Southern California high total abundanceNo effect9.61986 Puget Sound AET-oyster*9.61986 Puget Sound AET-Microtox TM *9.61986 Puget Sound AET-Microtox TM *9.7R. abronius LCSO-spiked bioassay*9.8R. abronius LCSO-spiked bioassay*10R. abronius LCSO-spiked bioassay*11.5R. abronius LCSO-spiked bioassay*11.8 ± 6.6Hudson-Raritan least toxic-nematodeNo effect11.8 ± 6.6Hudson-Raritan least toxic-nematode*22.7San Diego Bay low toxicity-plychaeteNo effect22.8 ± 19.8Baltimore Harbor most toxic-fish*28.San Diego Bay low toxicity-mysid*28.7 ± 3.1Palos Verdes significantly toxic-amphipod*28.7 ± 3.1Palos Verdes major benthic degradation*31EP chronic marine*32.5San Diego Bay low toxicity-clamNo effect32.5San Diego Bay low toxicity-variousNo effect32.5San Diego Bay low toxicity-variousNo effect32.5San Diego Bay low toxicity-variousNo effect33.6M Wy Kr Harbor low toxicity-variousNo effect34.6New York	8.7			*
8.9R. abronius overall LC50spiked bioassay*9.0ER-M50 percentile9.1R. abronius EC50spiked bioassay*9.4 ± 17.3Southern California high total abundanceNo effect9.61986 Puget Sound AEToyster*9.61986 Puget Sound AETmicrotox TM *9.7R. abronius EC50spiked bioassay*9.8R. abronius EC50spiked bioassay*10.6 ± 8.7Trinity River significantly toxicDaphnia*11.P. affinis lethality -spiked bioassay*11.5R. abronius LC50spiked bioassay*11.5R. abronius LC50spiked bioassay*11.5R. abronius LC50spiked bioassay*12.5R. abronius LC50spiked bioassay*13.5R. abronius LC50spiked bioassay*14.6 ± 8.9Hudson-Raritan least toxicnematodeNo effect15.3 ± 45.1Commencement Bay highly toxicoyster*18.6 ± 8.9Hudson-Raritan highly toxicnematode*22.7San Diego Bay low toxicitypolychaeteNo effect22.8San Diego Bay low toxicitymosid*23.1Palos Verdes significantly toxicamphipod*24.1 ± 19.8Baltimore Harbor most toxicamphipod*25.5San Diego Bay low toxicityclamNo effect26.7 ± 3.1Palos Verdes major benthic degradation*31EP chronic marine*32.5San Diego Bay low toxicityvariousNo effect32.5 </td <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>				
9.0ER-M50 percentile9.1R. abronius EC50spiked bioassay*9.4 \pm 17.3Southern California high total abundanceNo effect9.61986 Puget Sound AEToyster*9.61986 Puget Sound AETMicrotoxTM*9.7R. abronius EC50spiked bioassay*9.8R. abronius LC50spiked bioassay*9.8R. abronius LC50spiked bioassay*10.6 \pm 8.7Trinity River significantly toxic-Daphnia*11.5R. abronius LC50-spiked bioassay*11.5R. abronius LC50-spiked bioassay*11.5R. abronius LC50-spiked bioassay*11.5R. abronius LC50-spiked bioassay*11.5R. abronius LC50-spiked bioassay*12.5R. abronius LC50-spiked bioassay*13.5R. abronius LC50-spiked bioassay*14.6 \pm 8.9Hudson-Raritan least toxic-nematodeNo effect15.3 \pm 45.1Commencement Bay highly toxic-oyster*18.6 \pm 8.9Hudson-Raritan highly toxic-oplychaeteNo effect22.7San Diego Bay low toxicitypolychaeteNo effect22.8 \pm 19.8Baltimore Harbor most toxic-fish*23.9R. abronius LC50-spiked bioassay*24.1Palos Verdes significantly toxicamphipod*25.9R. abronius LC50-spiked bioassay*25.1Palos Verdes major benthic degradation*31EP chronic marine*32.5San Diego Bay low toxici	8.9 ± 9.2 '	Palos Verdes no	ot toxicamphipod	No effect
9.1R. abronius EC50spiked bioassay*9.4 \pm 17.3Southern California high total abundanceNo effect9.61986 Puget Sound AEToyster*9.61986 Puget Sound AETMicrotox TM *9.61986 Puget Sound AETMicrotox TM *9.7R. abronius EC50spiked bioassay*9.8R. abronius LC50spiked bioassay*10R. abronius LC50spiked bioassay*11P. affinis lethality -spiked bioassay*12.5R. abronius LC50spiked bioassay*13.5R. abronius LC50spiked bioassay*14.5R. abronius LC50spiked bioassay*15.5R. abronius LC50spiked bioassay*16.6 ± 8.7Trinity River significantly toxicnematodeNo effect15.3 ± 45.1Commencement Bay highly toxicnematode*18.6 ± 8.9Hudson-Raritan least toxicnematode*22.7San Diego Bay low toxicityplychaeteNo effect22.8 ± 19.8Baltimore Harbor most toxic-fish*28San Diego Bay low toxicitymysidNo effect28.7 ± 3.1Palos Verdes significantly toxicamphipod*31EP chronic marine*32.5San Diego Bay low toxicityclamNo effect32.5San Diego Bay low toxicityvariousNo effect32.5San Diego Bay low toxicityvariousNo effect32.5San Diego Bay low toxicityvariousNo effect33.6New York Harbor low toxicityvariousNo	8.9	R. abronius over	all LC50spiked bioassay	*
9.4 ± 17.3 Southern California high total abundanceNo effect 9.6 1986 Puget Sound AEToyster* 9.6 1986 Puget Sound AETMicrotox TM * 9.7 R. abronius EC50spiked bioassay* 9.8 R. abronius LC50spiked bioassay* 10 R. abronius LC50spiked bioassay* 10 R. abronius LC50spiked bioassay* 11 P. affinis lethality -spiked bioassay* 11.8 ± 6.6 Hudson-Raritan least toxicnematodeNo effect 11.8 ± 6.6 Hudson-Raritan least toxicnematode* 11.8 ± 6.6 Hudson-Raritan highly toxicoyster* 18.6 ± 8.9 Hudson-Raritan bighly toxicoyster* 20.8 R. abronius EC50spiked bioassay* 22.7 San Diego Bay low toxicitypolychaeteNo effect 22.8 ± 19.8 Baltimore Harbor most toxic-fish* 28 San Diego Bay low toxicitymysidNo effect 28.7 ± 3.1 Palos Verdes significantly toxicamphipod* 31 EP chronic marine* 32.5 San Diego Bay low toxicityclamNo effect 32.5 San Diego Bay low toxicityvariousNo effect 32.5 San Diego Bay low toxicity-variousNo effect 32.5 San Diego Bay low toxicity-variousNo effect 33.6 New York Harbor low toxicity-variousNo effect 33.6 New York Harbor low toxicity-variousNo effect 34.6 New York Harbor low toxicity-variousNo effect <td>9.0</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>50 percentile</td>	9.0			50 percentile
9.61986 Puget Sound AET-oyster*9.61986 Puget Sound AET-MicrotoxTM*9.7R. abronius EC50-spiked bioassay*9.8R. abronius LC50-spiked bioassay*10R. abronius LC50-spiked bioassay*10.6 \pm 8.7Trinity River significantly toxic-Daphnia*11P. affinis lethality -spiked bioassay*11.5R. abronius LC50-spiked bioassay*11.5R. abronius LC50-spiked bioassay*11.5R. abronius LC50-spiked bioassay*11.5R. abronius LC50-spiked bioassay*11.8 \pm 6.6Hudson-Raritan least toxic-nematodeNo effect15.3 \pm 45.1Commencement Bay highly toxic-oyster*18.6 \pm 8.9Hudson-Raritan highly toxic-prematode*20.8R. abronius EC50-spiked bioassay*22.7San Diego Bay low toxicity-polychaeteNo effect22.8 \pm 19.8Baltimore Harbor most toxic-fish*22.9R. abronius LC50-spiked bioassay*28San Diego Bay low toxicity-mysidNo effect28.7 \pm 3.1Palos Verdes significantly toxic-amphipod*31EP chronic marine*32.5San Diego Bay low toxicity-clamNo effect32.5San Diego Bay low toxicity-variousNo effect38.6New York Harbor low toxicity-variousNo effect38.6New York Harbor low toxicity-variousNo effect40N. virens-spiked bioassayNo effect <td></td> <td>R. abronius EC5</td> <td>0spiked bioassay</td> <td>*</td>		R. abronius EC5	0spiked bioassay	*
9.61986 Puget Sound AET-Microtox*9.7R. abronius EC50-spiked bioassay*9.8R. abronius LC50-spiked bioassay*10R. abronius LC50-spiked bioassay*10.6 \pm 8.7Trinity River significantly toxic-Daphnia*11P. affinis lethality -spiked bioassay*12.5R. abronius LC50-spiked bioassay*13.6 \pm 8.7Trinity River significantly toxic-Daphnia*14.1P. affinis lethality -spiked bioassay*15.5R. abronius LC50-spiked bioassay*16.6 Hudson-Raritan least toxic-nematodeNo effect15.3 \pm 45.1Commencement Bay highly toxic-nematode*20.8R. abronius EC50-spiked bioassay*22.7San Diego Bay low toxicity-polychaeteNo effect22.8 \pm 19.8Baltimore Harbor most toxic-fish*25.9R. abronius LC50-spiked bioassay*28San Diego Bay low toxicity-mysidNo effect28.7 \pm 3.1Palos Verdes significantly toxic-amphipod*28.7 \pm 3.1Palos Verdes major benthic degradation*31EP chronic marine*32.5San Diego Bay low toxicity-clamNo effect32.5San Diego Bay low toxicity-variousNo effect33.6New York Harbor low toxicity-variousNo effect34.6New York Harbor low toxicity-variousNo effect34.6New York Harbor low toxicity-variousNo effect	9.4 ± 17.3	Southern Califo	ornia high total abundance	No effect
9.7R. abronius EC50spiked bioassay*9.8R. abronius LC50spiked bioassay*10R. abronius LC50spiked bioassay*10.6 ± 8.7Trinity River significantly toxicDaphnia*11P. affinis lethality -spiked bioassay*11.5R. abronius LC50spiked bioassay*11.8 ± 6.6Hudson-Raritan least toxicnematodeNo effect11.8 ± 6.6Hudson-Raritan least toxicnematode*11.8 ± 6.6Hudson-Raritan least toxicnematode*20.8R. abronius EC50spiked bioassay*21.7San Diego Bay low toxicitypolychaeteNo effect22.7San Diego Bay low toxicitypolychaeteNo effect22.8 ± 19.8Baltimore Harbor most toxicfish*28San Diego Bay low toxicitymysidNo effect28.7 ± 3.1Palos Verdes major benthic degradation*31EP chronic marine*32.5San Diego Bay low toxicityclamNo effect32.5San Diego Bay low toxicityvariousNo effect33.6New York Harbor low toxicityvariousNo effect34.6New York Harbor low toxicityvariousNo effect34.6New York Harbor low toxicityvariousNo effect34.0N. virensspiked bioassayNo effect	9.6	1986 Puget Sour	nd AET-oyster	*
9.8R. abronius LC50spiked bioassay*10R. abronius LC50spiked bioassay*10.6 ± 8.7Trinity River significantly toxicDaphnia*11P. affinis lethality -spiked bioassay*11.5R. abronius LC50spiked bioassay*12.3 ± 45.1Commencement Bay highly toxicnematode*18.6 ± 8.9Hudson-Raritan highly toxicnematode*20.8R. abronius EC50spiked bioassay*22.7San Diego Bay low toxicitypolychaeteNo effect22.8 ± 19.8Baltimore Harbor most toxicfish*25.9R. abronius LC50spiked bioassay*28San Diego Bay low toxicitymysidNo effect28.7 ± 3.1Palos Verdes significantly toxicamphipod*31EP chronic marine*32.5San Diego Bay low toxicityclamNo effect32.5San Diego Bay low toxicityvariousNo effect32.5San Diego Bay low toxicityvariousNo effect32.5San Diego Bay low toxicityvariousNo effect33.6New York Harbor low toxicity-variousNo effect40N. virensspiked bioassayNo effect				*
10R. abronius LC50-spiked bioassay*10.6 \pm 8.7Trinity River significantly toxic-Daphnia*11P. affinis lethality -spiked bioassay*11.5R. abronius LC50-spiked bioassay*11.5R. abronius LC50-spiked bioassay*11.8 \pm 6.6Hudson-Raritan least toxicnematodeNo effect15.3 \pm 45.1Commencement Bay highly toxic-oyster*18.6 \pm 8.9Hudson-Raritan highly toxic-nematode*20.8R. abronius EC50-spiked bioassay*22.7San Diego Bay low toxicitypolychaeteNo effect22.8 \pm 19.8Baltimore Harbor most toxic-fish*25.9R. abronius LC50-spiked bioassay*28San Diego Bay low toxicity-mysidNo effect28.7 \pm 3.1Palos Verdes significantly toxicamphipod*31EP chronic marine*32.5San Diego Bay low toxicityclamNo effect32.5San Diego Bay low toxicity-variousNo effect33.6New York Harbor low toxicity-variousNo effect40N. virens-spiked bioassayNo effect	9.7	R. abronius EC5	0-spiked bioassay	*
10.6 \pm 8.7Trinity River significantly toxic—Daphnia*11P. affinis lethality -spiked bioassay*11.5R. abronius LC50—spiked bioassay*11.8 \pm 6.6Hudson-Raritan least toxic—nematodeNo effect15.3 \pm 45.1Commencement Bay highly toxic—oyster*18.6 \pm 8.9Hudson-Raritan highly toxic—nematode*20.8R. abronius EC50—spiked bioassay*22.7San Diego Bay low toxicity—polychaeteNo effect22.8 \pm 19.8Baltimore Harbor most toxic—fish*28San Diego Bay low toxicity—mysidNo effect28.7 \pm 3.1Palos Verdes significantly toxic—amphipod*31EP chronic marine*32.5San Diego Bay low toxicity—clamNo effect33.6New York Harbor low toxicity—variousNo effect34.6New York Harbor low toxicity—variousNo effect40N. virens—spiked bioassayNo effect	9.8			*
11P. affinis lethality -spiked bioassay*11.5R. abronius LC50-spiked bioassay*11.8 \pm 6.6Hudson-Raritan least toxicnematodeNo effect15.3 \pm 45.1Commencement Bay highly toxic-oyster*18.6 \pm 8.9Hudson-Raritan highly toxic-nematode*20.8R. abronius EC50-spiked bioassay*22.7San Diego Bay low toxicity-polychaeteNo effect22.8 \pm 19.8Baltimore Harbor most toxic-fish*25.9R. abronius LC50-spiked bioassay*28San Diego Bay low toxicity-mysidNo effect28.7 \pm 3.1Palos Verdes significantly toxicamphipod*31EP chronic marine*32.5San Diego Bay low toxicityclamNo effect32.5San Diego Bay low toxicity-variousNo effect38.6New York Harbor low toxicity-variousNo effect40N. virens-spiked bioassayNo effect				•
11.5R. abronius LC50-spiked bioassay*11.8 \pm 6.6Hudson-Raritan least toxicnematodeNo effect15.3 \pm 45.1Commencement Bay highly toxic-oyster*18.6 \pm 8.9Hudson-Raritan highly toxic-nematode*20.8R. abronius EC50-spiked bioassay*22.7San Diego Bay low toxicity-polychaeteNo effect22.8 \pm 19.8Baltimore Harbor most toxic-fish*28San Diego Bay low toxicity-mysidNo effect28.7 \pm 3.1Palos Verdes significantly toxicamphipod*31EP chronic marine*32.5San Diego Bay low toxicity-clamNo effect32.5San Diego Bay low toxicity-variousNo effect38.6New York Harbor low toxicity-variousNo effect40N. virens-spiked bioassayNo effect	10.6 ± 8.7			*
11.8 \pm 6.6Hudson-Raritan least toxicnematodeNo effect15.3 \pm 45.1Commencement Bay highly toxicoyster*18.6 \pm 8.9Hudson-Raritan highly toxicnematode*20.8R. abronius EC50spiked bioassay*22.7San Diego Bay low toxicitypolychaeteNo effect22.8 \pm 19.8Baltimore Harbor most toxic-fish*25.9R. abronius LC50-spiked bioassay*28San Diego Bay low toxicitymysidNo effect28.7 \pm 3.1Palos Verdes significantly toxicamphipod*28.7 \pm 3.1Palos Verdes major benthic degradation*31EP chronic marine*32.5San Diego Bay low toxicityclamNo effect32.5San Diego Bay low toxicityvariousNo effect38.6New York Harbor low toxicity-variousNo effect40N. virensspiked bioassayNo effect				*
15.3 \pm 45.1Commencement Bay highly toxic-oyster*18.6 \pm 8.9Hudson-Raritan highly toxic-nematode*20.8R. abronius EC50-spiked bioassay*22.7San Diego Bay low toxicity-polychaeteNo effect22.8 \pm 19.8Baltimore Harbor most toxic-fish*25.9R. abronius LC50-spiked bioassay*28San Diego Bay low toxicity-mysidNo effect28.7 \pm 3.1Palos Verdes significantly toxic-amphipod*28.7 \pm 3.1Palos Verdes major benthic degradation*31EP chronic marine*32.5San Diego Bay low toxicity-variousNo effect32.5San Diego Bay low toxicity-variousNo effect33.6New York Harbor low toxicity-variousNo effect40N. virens-spiked bioassayNo effect	11.5	R. abronius LC5	0-spiked bloassay	•
18.6 \pm 8.9Hudson-Raritan highly toxic-nematode*20.8R. abronius EC50spiked bioassay*22.7San Diego Bay low toxicitypolychaeteNo effect22.8 \pm 19.8Baltimore Harbor most toxicfish*25.9R. abronius LC50spiked bioassay*28San Diego Bay low toxicitymysidNo effect28.7 \pm 3.1Palos Verdes significantly toxicamphipod*28.7 \pm 3.1Palos Verdes major benthic degradation*31EP chronic marine*32.5San Diego Bay low toxicityclamNo effect32.5San Diego Bay low toxicityvariousNo effect38.6New York Harbor low toxicity-variousNo effect40N. virensspiked bioassayNo effect				No effect
20.8R. abronius EC50-spiked bioassay*22.7San Diego Bay low toxicity-polychaeteNo effect22.8 ± 19.8Baltimore Harbor most toxic-fish*25.9R. abronius LC50-spiked bioassay*28San Diego Bay low toxicity-mysidNo effect28.7 ± 3.1Palos Verdes significantly toxicamphipod*28.7 ± 3.1Palos Verdes major benthic degradation*31EP chronic marine*32.5San Diego Bay low toxicityclamNo effect32.5San Diego Bay low toxicity-variousNo effect38.6New York Harbor low toxicity-variousNo effect40N. virensspiked bioassayNo effect	15.3 ± 45.1	Commencemen	t Bay highly toxic—oyster	¥
22.7San Diego Bay low toxicitypolychaeteNo effect 22.8 ± 19.8 Baltimore Harbor most toxic-fish* 25.9 R. abronius LC50-spiked bioassay* 28 San Diego Bay low toxicitymysidNo effect 28.7 ± 3.1 Palos Verdes significantly toxicamphipod* 28.7 ± 3.1 Palos Verdes major benthic degradation* 31 EP chronic marine* 32.5 San Diego Bay low toxicityclamNo effect 32.5 San Diego Bay low toxicity-variousNo effect 38.6 New York Harbor low toxicity-variousNo effect 40 N. virensspiked bioassayNo effect				*
22.8 ± 19.8Baltimore Harbor most toxic—fish*25.9R. abronius LC50—spiked bioassay*28San Diego Bay low toxicity—mysidNo effect28.7 ± 3.1Palos Verdes significantly toxic—amphipod*28.7 ± 3.1Palos Verdes major benthic degradation*31EP chronic marine*32.5San Diego Bay low toxicity—clamNo effect32.5San Diego Bay low toxicity—variousNo effect38.6New York Harbor low toxicity—variousNo effect40N. virens—spiked bioassayNo effect		R. abronius EC5	50-spiked bioassay	*
225.9R. abronius LC50-spiked bioassay*28San Diego Bay low toxicitymysidNo effect28.7 ± 3.1Palos Verdes significantly toxicamphipod*28.7 ± 3.1Palos Verdes major benthic degradation*31EP chronic marine*32.5San Diego Bay low toxicityclamNo effect32.5San Diego Bay low toxicityvariousNo effect38.6New York Harbor low toxicity-variousNo effect40N. virensspiked bioassayNo effect	22.7	San Diego Bay I	low toxicity-polychaete	No effect
28San Diego Bay low toxicitymysidNo effect28.7 ± 3.1Palos Verdes significantly toxicamphipod*28.7 ± 3.1Palos Verdes major benthic degradation*31EP chronic marine*32.5San Diego Bay low toxicityclamNo effect32.5San Diego Bay low toxicityvariousNo effect38.6New York Harbor low toxicity-variousNo effect40N. virensspiked bioassayNo effect		Baltimore Harb	or most toxic—fish	*
28.7 ± 3.1Palos Verdes significantly toxicamphipod28.7 ± 3.1Palos Verdes major benthic degradation31EP chronic marine32.5San Diego Bay low toxicityclam32.5San Diego Bay low toxicityvarious38.6New York Harbor low toxicity-various40N. virensspiked bioassay				*
28.7 ± 3.1Palos Verdes significantly toxicamphipod*28.7 ± 3.1Palos Verdes major benthic degradation*31EP chronic marine*32.5San Diego Bay low toxicityclamNo effect32.5San Diego Bay low toxicityvariousNo effect38.6New York Harbor low toxicity-variousNo effect40N. virensspiked bioassayNo effect	28	San Diego Bay l	low toxicity-mysid	No effect
28.7 ± 3.1Palos Verdes major benthic degradation*31EP chronic marine*32.5San Diego Bay low toxicityclamNo effect32.5San Diego Bay low toxicityvariousNo effect38.6New York Harbor low toxicity-variousNo effect40N. virensspiked bioassayNo effect		Palos Verdes si	gnificantly toxicamphipod	*
31EP chronic marine*32.5San Diego Bay low toxicityclamNo effect32.5San Diego Bay low toxicityvariousNo effect38.6New York Harbor low toxicity-variousNo effect40N. virensspiked bioassayNo effect	28.7 ± 3.1			*
32.5San Diego Bay low toxicityvariousNo effect38.6New York Harbor low toxicity-variousNo effect40N. virensspiked bioassayNo effect				*
32.5San Diego Bay low toxicityvariousNo effect38.6New York Harbor low toxicity-variousNo effect40N. virensspiked bioassayNo effect				No effect
38.6New York Harbor low toxicity-variousNo effect40N. virens-spiked bioassayNo effect				No effect
40 N. virens-spiked bioassay No effect				
				*
96 EP acute marine *				*

* 36 concentrations used to determine ER-L and ER-M values

Concentration	(ppm) Biological Test	Remarks
 2.5	Georgetown benthic community	No effect
11.8 ± 3.7	Commencement Bay least toxicoyster	No effect
5.3	Duwamish River low toxicity	No effect
6.2 ± 8.1	Commencement Bay least toxicamphipod	No effect
7.7 ± 7.3	Commencement Bay moderately toxic amphipod	No gradient
7.7 ± 7.3	Commencement Bay moderately toxicoyster	Small gradient
8.1 ± 16.8	Trinity River not toxic-Daphnia	No effect
9.7 ± 11.3	Commencement Bay highly toxicamphipod	Small gradient
9.9	Newport low toxicityshrimp	No effect
0	Lake Union highly toxicamphipod	Small gradient
2.2 ± 9	Commencement Bay highly toxic-oyster	Small gradient
6	San Diego Bay low toxicityvarious	No effect
6	San Diego Bay low toxicityvarious	No effect
7±11.1	Massachusetts Bay high species richness	No effect
9±14✔	Keweenaw Waterway least toxicDaphnia	No effect
9.2 ± 9.1	Kishwaukee River most taxa	No effect
9.6 ± 15.6	Southern California high echinoderm abundance	No effect
2.3 ± 17.5	Southern California moderate echinoderm abundance	No gradient
4 ± 5.9	DuPage River most taxa	No effect
6.3 ± 21.9	Keweenaw Waterway not toxicDaphnia	No effect
8.1 ± 36.3	Southern California moderate species richness	No concordance
8.5	Waukegan Harbor highly toxicamphipod	Small gradient
0.7 ± 30.9	Southern California high arthropod abundance	No effect
2±11	Fraser River Macoma present	No effect
2 ± 39.8	Southern California moderate total abundance	No concordance
3.4 ± 22.5	Kishwaukee River least taxa	
6.3 ± 43.3		Small gradient
7.6	Southern California moderate arthropod abundance Los Angeles Harbor high toxicity	Small gradient
4 ± 83.5		No concordance
9.7 ± 28.7	Southern California low total abundance	Weak concordance
0	DuPage River least taxa	
0.9 ± 27.5	Macoma burrowing bioassay	Small gradient *
	Massachusetts Bay moderate species richness	No effect
2.3 ± 139.2 7.5	Southern California high species richness	No effect
	Norwalk low toxicity-shrimp	*
2.6 ± 60.6	Trinity River significantly toxicDaphnia	No effect
3 ± 124.4	Southern California not toxicamphipod ER-L	
0 1 ± 20 2		10 percentile
1 ± 29.3	Massachusetts Bay low species richness	*
1.4 ± 88.5	Southern California significantly toxicamphipod	No offers
6	Stamford low toxicityshrimp	No effect
7 ± 47	Little Grizzly Creek high toxicityDaphnia	*
7.3 ± 22.1	Fraser River Macoma absent	
8.2 ± 82.7	San Francisco Bay least toxicbivalve	No effect
	Macoma avoidance bioassay	No concertonos
7.5 ± 66.7	San Francisco Bay highly toxic-bivalve	No concordance
01.6 ± 23✓	Keweenaw Waterway highly toxicDaphnia	*
08.7 ± 19.6	Keweenaw Waterway significantly toxicDaphnia	*
28 ± 4	Sheboygan River significant toxicityprawn	
33.7 ± 94.2	San Francisco Bay significantly toxicbivalve	No effect
41.8 ± 86.5	San Francisco Bay highly toxicamphipod	No concordance
44.6 ± 88.6	Hudson-Raritan least toxicnematode	No effect
45	ER-M	50 percentile
45.8±307.9	Southern California low arthropod abundance	*
50.2 ± 85.9	San Francisco Bay not toxicbivalve	No effect
54.9 ± 102.1	San Francisco Bay significantly toxicamphipod	No concordance
56.6 ± 320.9	Southern California low species richness	*
60.3 ± 85.4	Hudson-Raritan most toxicnematode	*

Table B-4. Sediment effects data available for CHROMIUM arranged in ascending order with remarks regarding use of the concentrations to determine ER-L and ER-M values.

.

.

Concentration	(ppm) Biological Test	Remarks
163.3 ± 116.7	San Francisco Bay moderately toxic-amphipod	No concordance
164 ± 91.4	San Francisco Bay moderately toxic-bivalve	No concordance
180	Torch Lake significantly toxic-Daphnia	*
195 ± 93.9	San Francisco Bay least toxic-amphipod	No effect
201.3 ± 349	Southern California low echinoderm abundance	*
202.6 ± 97.3	San Francisco Bay not toxicamphipod	No effect
254.8	San Diego Bay low toxicity-shrimp	No effect
260	1988 Puget Sound AETbenthic	*
270	1988 Puget Sound AETamphipod	*
280	San Francisco Bay AET-bivalve	No concordance
292.6 ± 459.3	Southern California high total abundance	No effect
299.5	San Diego Bay low toxicity-clam	No effect
299.5	San Diego Bay low toxicity-polychaete	No effect
299.5	San Diego Bay low toxicity—fish	No effect
315.4 ± 236	Phillips Chain least toxicDaphnia	No effect
335 ± 179.7	Baltimore Harbor least toxic-fish	No effect
369.2	Black Rock Harbor high toxicity	*
370	San Francisco Bay AETamphipod	No concordance
669.3	Palos Verdes major benthic degradation	*
980	Phillips Chain significantly toxic-Daphnia	
1646 ± 1628	Baltimore Harbor most toxic-fish	*

* 21 concentrations used to determine ER-L and ER-M values

· :

Concentration	(ppm) Biological Test	Remarks
1.02	Georgetown benthic community	No effect
4 ± 3	Mississippi River high toxicitymidge	No concordance
5±2	Massachusetts Bay high species richness	No effect
7.9 ± 5	Mississippi River low toxicity	No effect
8.9 ± 4	Mississippi River low toxicity	No effect
12 ± 6	Southern California high echinoderm abundance	No effect
12.2		No effect
13.4 ± 14	Newport low toxicityshrimp Southern California moderate echinoderm abundance	
		No gradient
15±7 16±7	Massachusetts Bay moderate species richness	No oredient
16 ± 7	Massachusetts Bay low species richness	No gradient
17.8	Mississippi River low toxicity	No effect
17.8	ET50 burrowing time bioassayclam	Р Т
18 ± 15		No effect
19.5	Waukegan Harbor highly toxicamphipod	
19.5 ± 6	Kishwaukee River high number of taxa	Small gradient
23.6 ± 11 √	Keweenaw Waterway least toxicity	No effect
27.5 ± 16	Feral Fraser River Macoma present	No effect
33	Keweenaw Waterway high number of taxa	No effect
34.5 ± 17	San Francisco Bay least toxicbivalve	No effect
42.8	Duwamish River nontoxicshrimp	No effect
43 ± 49	Keweenaw Waterway nontoxicDaphnia	No effect
45.4 ± 53	Kishwaukee River low number of taxa	*
46.9 ± 26	San Francisco Bay not toxicbivalve	No effect
62.1 ± 25	DuPage River high number of taxa	No effect
62.3 ± 78	Southern California nontoxicamphipod	No effect
64 ± 40	San Francisco Bay moderately toxicamphipod	No concordance
67	Macoma burrowing bioassay	*
68.2 ± 48	San Francisco Bay significantly toxicbivalve	*
68.4 ± 62	Trinity River significant toxicityDaphnia	*
70	ER-L	10 percentile
70 ± 47	San Francisco Bay significantly toxicamphipod	Small gradient
72.1 ± 41	San Francisco Bay least toxicamphipod	No effect
72.6 ± 75	Commencement Bay least toxicoyster	No effect
74.6 ± 43	San Francisco Bay not toxic amphinod	No effect
	San Francisco Bay not toxicamphipod	*
76 ± 51	San Francisco Bay moderately toxicbivalve	Cmall and domb
77.3 ± 39	DuPage River low number of taxa	Small gradient
51 P4 C 1 C 2	PSDDA screening level	No effect
84.6 ± 63	San Francisco Bay highly toxicamphipod	" NT (C /
85.1 ± 69	Commencement Bay least toxicamphipod	No effect
87.7 ± 33	San Francisco Bay highly toxicbivalve	*
96.7 ± 177	Southern California low echinoderm abundance	*
98 ± 90	Puget Sound nontoxicamphipod	No effect
106.3 ± 93	Commencement Bay moderately toxicoyster	*
110	San Francisco Bay AETbivalve	*
117.8 ± 98	Commencement Bay moderately toxicamphipod	*
134.6 ± 57	Feral Fraser River Macoma absent	*
135.2 ± 118	Phillips Chain nontoxicDaphnia	No effect
136	EP chronic marine @4% TOC	*
138 ± 124	Puget Sound moderately toxicamphipod	*
145 ± 2	Sheboygan River toxicprawn	*
147	Los Angeles Harbor toxicshrimp	*

Table B-5. Sediment effects data available for COPPER arranged in ascending order with remarks regarding use of the concentrations to determine ER-L and ER-M values.

Concentration (pp	om) Biological Test	Remarks
150	Macoma avoidance bioassay	*
156	Lake Union high toxicityamphipod	*
157.5 ± 29	Baltimore Harbor least toxicfish	No effect
180	San Francisco Bay AETamphipod	*
181.3 ± 173	Southern California significant toxicityamphipod	*
200	Norwegian benthos species diversity	*
210	San Diego Bay nontoxicvarious	No effect
216	EP acute marine @4% TOC	*
217.8	Stamford nontoxicshrimp	No effect
223.7	Norwalk nontoxicshrimp	No effect
250.5 ± 232	Hudson-Raritan nontoxicnematode	No effect
251 ± 227	Palos Verdes nontoxicamphipod	No effect
310	1986 Puget Sound AETbenthic	*
312.3	San Diego Bay nontoxicmysid	No effect
390	ER-M	50 percentile
390	1986 Puget Sound AEToyster	*
390	1986 Puget Sound AET- Microtox [™]	*
453 ± 311	Hudson-Raritan highly toxicnematode	*
530	1988 Puget Sound AETbenthic	*
540	Phillips Chain significant toxicityDaphnia	*
589	Keweenaw Waterway least number of taxa	*
591.7 ± 126	Palos Verdes major benthic degradation	*
591.7 ± 126	Palos Verdes significant toxicityamphipod	*
612	Black Rock Harbor highly toxic	*
612 ± 318✔	Keweenaw Waterway highly toxicDaphnia	*
681	LC50 Daphnia spiked bioassaySoap Creek	*
730	Keweenaw Waterway significant toxicityDaphnia	+
810	1986 Puget Sound AETamphipod	*
857	LC50 midge spiked bioassay-Soap Creek	*
917.8 ± 2750	Commencement Bay highly toxicoyster	*
937	LC50 Daphnia spiked bioassayTualatin River	*
964	LC50 amphipod spiked bioassay- Soap Creek	*
995	San Diego Bay nontoxicclam	No effect
995	San Diego Bay nontoxicpolychaete	No effect
1071 ± 948	Baltimore Harbor most toxic-fish	*
1078	LC50 amphipod spiked bioassaySoap Creek	*
1260 ± 3251	Puget Sound highly toxicamphipod	*
1300	1988 Puget Sound AETamphipod	*
1374 ± 809	Little Grizzly Creek toxicDaphnia	*
1800	Torch Lake highly toxicDaphnia	*
2296	LC50 midge spiked bioassayTualatin River	*
2820 ± 4881	Commencement Bay highly toxicamphipod	*

Table B-5. (continued)

* 51 concentrations used to determine ER-L and ER-M values

Concentration	(ppm) Biological Test	Remarks
<0.5	Georgetown disposal site benthos	No effect
9.5 ± 9	Southern California moderate echinoderm abundance	No concordance
9.5 ± 10.3✔	Keweenaw least toxicDaphnia	No effect
10.7 ± 10	Keweenaw nontoxic-Daphnia	No effect
1.3 ± 8	Southern California moderate species richness	No concordance
1.7 ± 13	Southern California high echinoderm abundance	No effect
2.4 ± 9	Southern California high arthropod abundance	No effect
2.5 ± 4	Massachusetts Bay high benthhic species richness	No effect
2.5 ± 10	Southern California moderate arthropod abundance	No gradient
2.6 ± 10	Southern California moderate total abundance	No concordance
4 ± 9	Feral Fraser River Macoma present	No effect
6.6 ± 24	Southern California low total abundance	No concordance
8	Cubatao River Brazil high toxicityDaphnia	Small gradient
9.8 ± 34	Southern California high species richness	No effect
1.2 ± 11	Kishwaukee River high number of taxa	No effect
5.2 ± 17	San Francisco Bay least toxic-bivalve	No effect
7 ± 9✔	Keweenaw Waterway highly toxicDaphnia	*
7.1	Duwamish River nontoxicshrimp	No effect
9 ± 8	Keweenaw significantly toxicDaphnia	*
0.6 ± 26	Kishwaukee River least number of taxa	*
2 ± 18	Little Grizzly Creek significant toxicity	No concordance
2	Macoma burrowing bioassay	*
32.4	Waukegan Harbor highly toxicamphipod	Detection limits
5	Norway benthos diversity	*
5	ER-L	10 percentile
5.1 ± 22	Trinity River least toxicityDaphnia	No effect
1.3	Los Angeles Harbor >50% mortalityshrimp	*
2.1 ± 27	San Francisco Bay moderately toxicamphipod	*
2.4 ± 26	Massachusetts Bay moderate species richness	*
3.1 ± 33	San Francisco Bay nontoxicbivalve	No effect
5.6 ± 59	Southern California nontoxicamphipod	No effect
6.7 ± 17	Massachusetts Bay low benthic species richness	*
6.9 ± 31	Puget Sound nontoxicamphipod	No effect
7.8 ± 103	Southern California low arthropod abundance	*
50	San Francisco Bay triad minimum bioeffects	*
51 ± 34	San Francisco Bay least toxic-amphipod	No effect
51 ± 111	Southern California low energies richness	*
3.7 ± 27	Southern California low species richness Trinity River significantly toxicDaphnia	*
4.4 ± 36	San Francisco Bay nontoxic amphinod	
7.1 ± 20	San Francisco Bay nontoxicamphipod	No effect
58.3 ± 61	DuPage River high number of taxa	No effect
58.9 ± 63	San Francisco Bay significantly toxicamphipod	Small gradient
	San Francisco Bay significantly toxicbivalve	*
×60 3 4 + 63	FWPCA heavy: benthos absent	
3.4 ± 63	San Francisco Bay moderately toxicbivalve	*
4.4 ± 118	Southern California low echinoderm abundance	
$\frac{1}{2}$	PSDDA screening level	No effect
73.1 ± 42	Southern California significantly toxicamphipod	π
74 77 6 ± 75	Macoma avoidance bioassay	T // ·
77.6 ± 75	Commencement Bay least toxicamphipod	No effect
78.6 ± 34	Phillips Chain low toxicityDaphnia	No effect
81.7 ± 49	Feral Fraser River Macoma absent	a

Table B-6. Sediment effects data available for LEAD arranged in ascending order with remarks regarding use of the concentrations to determine ER-L and ER-M values.

Concentration (ppm)	Biological Test	Remarks
89.6	Black Rock Harbor 100% mortalityNereis	*
94.9 ± 154	Southern California high total abundance	No effect
95.7 ± 93	San Francisco Bay highly toxicamphipod	*
104.5 ± 87	San Francisco Bay highly toxicbivalve	*
104.7 ± 173	Commencement Bay least toxicoyster	No effect
110	ER-M	50 percentile
110	Torch Lake significantly toxic	*
113.1 ± 123	Commencement Bay moderately toxic-oyster	*
120	San Francisco Bay AET amphipod	*
122.9	Stamford nontoxicshrimp	No effect
≥130	San Francisco Bay triad significant bioeffects	*
132	EP chronic marine @4% TOC	*
136.6 ± 140	Puget Sound moderately toxicamphipod	*
140	San Francisco Bay AETbivalve	*
143.7 ± 110	DuPage River low number of taxa	*
145.2 ± 132	Hudson-Raritan not toxicnematode	No effect
160	Phillips Chain significantly toxic	*
170.8 ± 192	Commencement Bay moderately toxicamphipod	*
213 ± 131	Baltimore Harbor least toxicfish	No effect
253 ± 47	Sheboygan River significantly toxic	*
276.9	Norwalk nontoxicshrimp	No effect
300	1986 Puget Sound AETbenthic	*
300	Lake Union 95% mortalityamphipod	* .
312.3 ± 23	Palos Verdes major benthic degradation	*
320.9 ± 195	Hudson-Raritan highly toxicnematode	*
450	1988 Puget Sound AETbenthic	*
512 ± 231✔	Baltimore Harbor most toxicfish	*
530	1986 Puget Sound AETMicrotox™	*
570.1 ± 1489	Commencement Bay highly toxicoyster	*
660	1986 Puget Sound AETamphipod	*
660	1986 Puget Sound AET-oyster	*
750.2 ± 1763	Puget Sound highly toxicamphipod	*
1613.2 ± 2628	Commencement Bay highly toxicamphipod	*
3360	EP acute marine @ 4% TOČ	*

Table B-6. (continued)

* 47 concentrations used to determine ER-L and ER-M values

• ,

• • •

B-10

.

.

Concentration (ppm) Biological Test	Remarks
<0.1 ± 0 ✓	Mississippi River low toxicityinsects✓	No effect
0.026	Newport not toxicshrimp	No effect
0.032	EP chronic marine @4% TOC	*
0.035	Mississippi River low toxicity	No effect
).05	Duwamish River not toxic—shrimp	No effect
).06	Massachusetts Bay high benthos species richness	No effect
).08	Waukegan Harbor highly toxicHyalella	*
).08 ± 0.1	Kishwaukee River high number of taxa	No effect
0.09 ± 0.1	Kishwaukee River low number of taxa	No gradient
<0.1	Sheboygan River significant toxicityprawn	Below detection
0.1 ± 0.1	Feral Fraser River Macoma present	No effect
).1 ± 0.1✔	Keweenaw Waterway least toxicDaphnia	No effect
0.11 ± 0.02	Massachusetts Bay low benthos species richness	No gradient
0.13 ± 0.1	Keweenaw Waterway not toxicDaphnia	No effect
).147	Los Angeles toxic (>50% mortality)shrimp	*
0.15	ER-L	10 percentile
0.162	Stamford not toxicshrimp	No effect
0.173	Lake Union 95% mortalityamphipod	*
0.18 ± 0.1	Massachusetts. Bay moderate benthos species richn	ess No gradient
0.18	Macoma burrowing time bioassay	*
).2 ± 0.8✔	Keweenaw Waterway most toxicDaphnia	No gradient
).2 ± 0.1	Commencement Bay least toxicamphipod	No effect
).2 ± 0.1	Commencement Bay moderately toxicoyster	No gradient
0.2 ± 0.1	Commencement Bay least toxicoyster	No effect
0.2 ± 0.1	Keweenaw Waterway significantly toxicDaphnia	No gradient
0.21	PSDDA screening level	No effect
0.28 ± 0.2	DuPage River high number of taxa	No effect
0 .29	Torch Lake significant mortalityDaphnia	*
0.3 ± 0.2	Commencement Bay moderately toxicamphipod	No gradient
0.3 ± 0.2	San Francisco Bay least toxicbivalve	No effect
0.3 ± 0.1	Trinity River significantly toxicDaphnia	No concordance
0.3	Norwalk not toxicshrimp	No effect
0.33 ± 0.1	Southern California significantly toxicamphipod	No gradient
0.34 ± 0.02	Southern California not toxicamphipod	No effect
0.38 ± 0.1	Baltimore Harbor least toxicfish	No effect
0.41	1986 Puget Sound AETMicrotox™	+
0.42 ± 0.2	Feral Fraser River Macoma absent	*
0.47 ± 0.5	Puget Sound nontoxicamphipod	No effect
0.48	Macoma avoidance bioassay	*
0.5 ± 0.4	San Francisco Bay least toxicamphipod	No effect
0.5 ± 0.3	San Francisco Bay not toxicbivalve	No effect
0.59	1986 Puget Sound AEToyster	*
0.6 ± 0.4	San Francisco Bay not toxicamphipod	No effect
0.6 ± 0.4	San Francisco Bay highly toxic-bivalve	No concordance
0.6 ± 0.7	Trinity River low toxicityDaphnia	No effect
0.6	EP acute marine @4% TOC	*
0.61	Georgetown benthic community	No effect
0.65-1.15	Pontoporeia activity not significantly decreased	No effect
0.7 ± 0.8	San Francisco Bay moderately toxicamphipod	No gradient
0.7 ± 0.8	San Francisco Bay significantly toxicamphipod	No gradient}
0.7 ± 0.9	San Francisco Bay significantly toxicbivalve	No gradient
0.88	1986 Puget Sound AETbenthic	The Brachen

Table B-7. Sediment effects data available for MERCURY arranged in ascending order with remarks regarding use of the concentrations to determine ER-L and ER-M values.

Concentration	(ppm) Biological Test	Remarks
0.9 ± 1	San Francisco Bay moderately toxicbivalve	*
0.9	Cubatao River EC50 toxicityDaphnia	+
0.96 ± 1	San Francisco Bay highly toxicamphipod	*
1.02 ± 1.3	Phillips Chain not toxicDaphnia	No effect
1.3	ER-M	50 percentile
1.3	San Francisco Bay AET-amphipod	*
1.38 ± 4.6	Puget Sound intermediate toxicityamphipod	*
1.5	San Francisco Bay AET-bivalve	*
1.5 ± 0.9	L. Grizzly Creek significantly toxic-Daphnia	*
1.6 ± 1.1	Baltimore Harbor most toxic-fish	*
1.6 ± 2	DuPage River low number of taxa	*
2.1	1986 Puget Sound AETamphipod	*
2.1	1988 Puget Sound AETbenthic	*
2.15-3.35	Pontoporeia activity sign decreased	*
2.7	San Diego Bay not toxic-various	No effect
3.5 ± 12.5	Commencement Bay highly toxic-oyster	*
5 ± 6.7	Hudson-Raritan not toxicnematode	No effect
5.04 ± 14.8	Puget Sound highly toxic	*
8.9 ± 7.5	Hudson-Raritan highly toxicnematode	*
9.4	Phillips Chain significantly toxic	*
11.2 ± 22.8	Commencement Bay highly toxic-amphipod	*
13.1	LC50 amphipod bioassay	*
34.9	New York nontoxic, 100-d, various species	No effect
58.2	San Diego Bay not toxicmysid	No effect
66.5	San Diego Bay not toxicclam	No effect
254.4	San Diego Bay not toxic-fish	No effect

* 30 concentrations used to determine ER-L and ER-M values

oncentration	(ppm) Biological Test	Remarks
3 ′	Cubatao River toxicityDaphnia	No concordance
6	Georgetown benthic community	No effect
10±3	Massachusetts Bay high species richness	No effect
10	Newport not toxic-shrimp	No effect
12±3	Commencement Bay least toxicoyster	No effect
16±7	Commencement Bay least toxicamphipod	No effect
17±8	Commencement Bay moderately toxicoyster	Small gradient
17.5	Duwamish River nontoxic-shrimp	No effect
20±13	Commencement Bay moderately toxicamphipod	Small gradient
20±15	Southern California not toxicamphipod	No effect
21±11	Massachusetts Bay moderate species richness	*
24+22	Southern California significantly toxicamphipod	Small gradient
28	1986 Puget Sound AET-Microtox™	*
28	PSDDA screening level	No effect
29 ± 3.6		No effect
29±26	Keweenaw least toxicDaphnia	
	Trinity River significantly toxicDaphnia	No concordance
30	ER-L Common company Bay highly taxis, avetar	10 percentile *
30 <u>+22</u>	Commencement Bay highly toxic-oyster	*
31	Los Angeles Harbor (>50% mortality)shrimp	halong datastian
<31.8	Waukegan Harbor significantly toxicamphipod	below detection
33±12	Massachusetts Bay low species richness	
34±14	Feral Fraser River Macoma present	No effect
35±14	Keweenaw Waterway not toxicDaphnia	No effect
36±29	Trinity River not toxicDaphnia	No effect
38	Stamford not toxic	No effect
39	1986 Puget Sound AEToyster	*
40±16	Little Grizzly Creek significantly toxicDaphnia	т ч
41±32	Commencement Bay highly toxicamphipod	*
43	Norwalk not toxic-shrimp	No effect
44±3	Feral Fraser River Macoma absent	Small gradient
49	1986 Puget Sound AETbenthic	*
50	ER-M	50 percentil e
52	Black Rock Harbor 100% mortalityNereis	*
70±14	Baltimore Harbor least toxicfish	No effect
78±42	San Francisco Bay least toxicbivalve	No effect
88	Lake Union highly toxic-amphipod	*
93±3	San Francisco Bay highly toxic–bivalve	Small gradient
94±5	Palos Verdes major benthic degradation	* -
97±53	Baltimore Harbor most toxicfish	*
99±35	San Francisco Bay moderately toxicamphipod	No gradient
100±35	San Francisco Bay significantly toxic-bivalve	No gradient
100 ± 26 🗸	Keweenaw Waterway highly toxicDaphnia	*
102±44	San Francisco Bay not toxicbivalve	No effect
105±36	San Francisco Bay significantly toxic-amphipod	No gradient
106±74	Phillips Chain least toxic Daphnia	No effect
108±25	San Francisco Bay least toxicamphipod	No effect
108±27	San Francisco Bay not toxicamphipod	No effect
109±19	Keweenaw Waterway significantly toxicDaphnia	*
110±0		*
112±31	Sheboygan River significant mortalityprawn	Poor concordance
	San Francisco Bay moderately toxicbivalve	
113±43	San Francisco Bay highly toxicamphipod	Small gradient
>120	1986 Puget Sound AETamphipod	No definitive value
>140	1988 Puget Sound AETamphipod	No definitive value
>140	1988 Puget Sound AETbenthic	No definitive value
150	Torch Lake significant toxicityDaphnia	Not de Culture
>170	San Francisco Bay AETbivalve	Not definitive
>170	San Francisco Bay AETamphipod	Not definitive
350	Phillips Chain significant toxicityDaphnia	-

Table B-8. Sediment effects data available for NICKEL arranged in ascending order with remarks regarding use of the concentrations to determine ER-L and ER-M values.

* 18 concentrations used to determine ER-L and ER-M values

Concentration	(ppm) Biological Test	Remarks
0.2 ± 0.1	Commencement Bay highly toxic-amphipod	No gradient
0.3 ± 0.1	Commencement Bay moderately toxic-amphipod	No gradient
0.3 ± 0.1	Commencement Bay least toxic-amphipod	No gradient
0.3 ± 0.1	Commencement Bay highly toxic-oyster	No gradient
0.3 ± 0.1	Commencement Bay moderately toxicoyster	No gradient
0.3 ± 0.1	Commencement Bay least toxic-oyster	No gradient
0.3 ± 0.1	Puget Sound least toxicamphipod	No effect
0.5 ± 0.4	San Francisco Bay least toxic-bivalve	No effect
>0.6	1986 Puget Sound AET-oyster	No definitive value
>0.6	1986 Puget Sound AETMicrotox™	No definitive value
0.6 ± 1	Puget Sound highly toxicamphipod	*
0.6 ± 0.5	San Francisco Bay not toxicbivalve	No effect
0.6 ± 0.8	Southern California high echinoderm abundance	No effect
0.6 ± 0.7	Southern California moderate echinoderm abundance	No gradient
0.7 ± 1	Southern California moderate arthropod abundance	No concordance
0.7 ± 0.8	Southern California moderate species richness	No concordance
0.8 ± 0.6	Feral Fraser River Macoma present	No effect
0.8	San Diego Bay high survivalvarious	No effect
0.8	San Diego Bay high survivalvarious	No effect
0.9 ± 0.9	San Francisco Bay moderately toxicamphipod	No concordance
0.9 ± 1.6	Southern California high arthropod abundance	No effect
0.9 ± 2.1	Southern California high species richness	No effect
1	Macoma avoidance bioassay	*
1	ER-L	10 percentile
1 ± 0.6	San Francisco Bay moderately toxicbivalve	¥
1 ± 2	Southern California moderate abundance	No concordance
1.1	San Francisco Bay AET—bivalve	*
1.1 ± 1.9	Southern California not toxicamphipod	No effect
1.2	PSDDA screening level	No effect
1.2 ± 1.7	San Francisco Bay significantly toxic-amphipod	No concordance
1.3 ± 1.8	San Francisco Bay least toxic-amphipod	No effect
1.3 ± 1.4	Southern California significantly toxicamphipod	No gradient
1.3 ± 1.8	Southern California low abundance	No concordance
1.4 ± 1.9	San Francisco Bay not toxic-amphipod	No effect
1.7 ± 2.6	San Francisco Bay highly toxicamphipod	No concordance
1.7 ± 2.2	San Francisco Bay significantly toxic bivalve	*
2.1 ± 1.3	Feral Fraser River Macoma absent	*
2.2 ± 3.9	Southern California low arthropod abundance	*
2.2	ER-M	50 percentile
2.5 ± 4.1	Southern California low species richness	*
2.6	Macoma burrowing bioassay	+
3.1 ± 4.5	Southern California low echinoderm abundance	*
3.2 ± 5.6	Southern California high abundance	No effect
>3.7	1986 Puget Sound AET-amphipod	No definitive value
5.2	1986 Puget Sound AET-benthic	•
>6.1	1988 Puget Sound AETbenthic	No definitive value
6	1988 Puget Sound AETamphipod	•
6.9 ± 2.5	San Francisco Bay highly toxicbivalve	₩ · ·
>8.6	San Francisco Bay AETamphipod	Not definitive

Table B-9. Sediment effects data available for SILVER arranged in ascending order with remarks regarding use of the concentrations to determine ER-L and ER-M values.

* 13 concentrations used to determine ER-L and ER-M values

_

Concentration	(ppm) Biological Test	Remarks
11	Georgetown benthic community	No effect
20	Cubatao River highly toxic-Daphnia	No concordance
32 ± 7	Massachusetts Bay high species richness	No effect
50 ± 13	Southern California high echinoderm abunda	
50 ± 22	Southern California moderate species richnes	
51 ± 24	Southern California high arthropod abundan	
51	Amphipod avoidance bioassay	*
52 ± 28	Southern California moderate arthropod abu	ndance No gradient
53 ± 28	Southern California moderate abundance	No concordance
55 ± 34	Southern California moderate echinoderm abi	
55	Newport low toxicityshrimp	No effect
58 ± 41	Trinity River low mortality-Daphnia	No effect
59 to 124	Pontoporeia bioassay	*
62 ± 20✔	Keweenaw Waterway low toxicityDaphnia	No effect
65 ± 19	Feral Fraser River Macoma present	No effect
69 ± 24	Keweenaw Waterway not toxicDaphnia	No effect
71 ± 106	Southern California high species richness	No effect
73 ± 81	Southern California low abundance	No concordance
72	Duwamish River low toxicityshrimp	No effect
76	LC08 amphipod bioassay	No effect
79	LC05 amphipod bioassay	No effect
30	Norwegian benthic species diversity	Poor concordance
89 ± 41	San Francisco least toxicbivalve	No effect
96 ± 52	Kishwaukee River highest benthic species rid	
98 ± 64	Massachusetts Bay moderate species richness	
107 ± 122	Commencement Bay least toxicoyster	No effect
107 ± 31	Kishwaukee River least benthic species richn	
108 ± 79	Commencement Bay least toxicamphipod	No effect
109	Macoma burrowing time bioassay	No concordance
114 ± 52	Puget Sound nontoxicamphipod	No effect
17 ± 42	Massachusetts Bay lowest species richness	*
120	ER-L	10 percentile
21 ± 100	Trinity River significant mortalityDaphnia	*
27	Waukegan Harbor high toxicamphipod	*
130	San Francisco Bay AETbivalve	* *
l36 ± 78	San Francisco Bay not toxicbivalve	No effect
146 ± 73	San Francisco Bay moderately toxicamphipe	
154 ± 91	San Francisco Bay significantly toxicbivalve	
54 ± 54 ✓	Keweenaw highly toxicDaphnia	*
58 ± 87	San Francisco Bay significantly toxicamphip	od No concordance
60	PSDDA screening level	No effect
68 ± 52	Keweenaw Waterway significantly toxicDay	
69 ± 53	Feral Fraser River Macoma absent	*
71 ± 91	San Francisco Bay least toxicamphipod	No offect
.72	Macoma avoidance bioassay	No effect
.72 ± 92		*
$.77 \pm 96$	San Francisco Bay moderately toxicbivalve	
$.82 \pm 384$	San Francisco Bay not toxicamphipod	No effect
$.82 \pm 56$	Southern California low arthropod abundance	
	DuPage River highest benthic species richness	s No effect
.85 ± 335 .87 ± 115	Commencement Bay moderately toxic-oyster	NT_ 11
07 T 110	San Francisco Bay highly toxicamphipod	No gradient

Table B-10. Sediment effects data available for ZINC arranged in ascending order with remarks regarding use of the concentrations to determine ER-L and ER-M values.

Concentration	(ppb) Biological Test	Remarks
188	Amphipod avoidance bioassay	*
195 ± 166	Puget Sound moderately toxic-amphipod	*
197 ± 415	Southern California low species richness	+
205 ± 90	San Francisco Bay highly toxic-bivalve	*
211 ± 342	Commencement Bay moderately toxicamphipod	*
212 ± 243	Southern California not toxicamphipod	No effect
216 ± 213	Phillips Chain low mortalityDaphnia	No effect
223	Los Angeles Harbor >50% mortalityshrimp	+
230	San Francisco Bay AET-amphipod	+
230 ± 444	Southern California low echinoderm abundance	*
245 ± 201	Hudson-Raritan positive growth-nematode	No effect
260	1986 Puget Sound AET-benthic	+
267 ± 298	Little Grizzly Creek significant mortalityDaphnia	+
270	ER-M	50 percentile
276	LC50 for amphipod bioassay	*
29 0 ± 10	Sheboygan River significant mortalityprawn	*
310	Torch Lake significant mortalityDaphnia	+
320	Lake Union high mortalityamphipod	*
327 ± 162	DuPage River least benthic species richness	*
334	Black Rock Harbor 100% mortality-Nereis	*
340	Stamford low mortality-shrimp	No effect
347 ± 592	Southern California high abundance	No concordance
348 ± 234	Southern California significantly toxicamphipod	*
387 ± 783	Commencement Bay highly toxic-oyster	*
410	1988 Puget Sound AET-benthic	*
449 ± 252	Hudson-Raritan negative growth-nematode	*
570	Phillips Chain significant mortality	*
613	54.7% mortality <i>Rhepoxynius</i> bioassay	+
636	Norwalk 0% mortalityshrimp	No effect
707 ± 955	Puget Sound highly toxic-amphipod	+
738 ± 394	Baltimore Harbor least toxic-fish	No effect
739 ± 139	Palos Verdes major benthic degradation	*
760	EP marine chronic @4% TOC	*
870	1986 Puget Sound AET–amphipod	+
941 ± 1373	Commencement Bay highly toxic-amphipod	*
960	1988 Puget Sound AET-amphipod	+
1600	1986 Puget Sound AET-oyster	*
1600	1986 Puget Sound AETMicrotox™	*
1804 ± 2098	Baltimore Harbor most toxic-fish	*
2240	EP marine acute @4% TOC	*

* 46 concentrations used to determine ER-L and ER-M values

•

٠

.

Concentration	(ppb) Biological Test	Remarks
0.005 ± 0	Trinity River significant mortalityDaphnia	No gradient
0.005 ± 0	Trinity River low mortalityDaphnia	No effect
0.7 ± 0.3	Mississippi River 55% survivalmidges	No concordance
<1.13	MIssissippi River 25% survivalmayfly	No concordance
2±1	Massachusetts Bay high species richness	No effect
2.9	SLC freshwater	*
5±5	Massachusetts Bay moderate species richness	No gradient
5 ± 5	Massachusetts Bay low species richness	No gradient
7 ± 6	Kishwaukee River highest species richness	No effect
12 ± 20 15 ± 22	Mississippi River high survivalmayfly	No effect
15 ± 22 20 ± 20	Mississippi River 90% survivalmidges	No effect
20 ± 20 25	Southern California high echinoderm abundance	No effect No effect
25	San Diego Bay high survivalvarious	No effect
26 ± 16	San Diego Bay high survivalvarious San Francisco least toxicbivalve	No effect
28 ± 27		No effect
30 ± 50	Commencement Bay least toxicoyster Southern California moderate echinoderm abundance	Small gradient
31 ± 19	DuPage River highest species richness	No effect
36.6	SLC marine	*
38 ± 32	Commencement Bay highly toxicamphipod	No concordance
42.6	SLC marine	*
50	Georgetown benthic community	No effect
50	ER-L	10 percentile
54	San Francisco Bay AETbivalve	*
60 ± 70	Southern California moderate arthropod abundance	No concordance
60	Mississippi River high survival	No effect
61 ± 88	Commencement Bay least toxicamphipod	No effect
80 ± 100	Southern California high arthropod abundance	No effect
80 ± 140	Southern California moderate abundance	No concordance
94 ± 147	San Francisco Bay least toxicamphipod	No effect
99 ± 120	Puget Sound nontoxicamphipod	No effect
≤100	San Francisco Bay triad minimum bioeffects	*
101 ± 153	San Francisco Bay not toxicamphipod	No effect
127 ± 171	San Francisco Bay significantly toxic-bivalve	No concordance
128 ± 264	Kishwaukee River least species richness	*
130	1986 Puget Sound AETMicrotox™	*
130	PSDDA screening level	No effect
140 ± 262	Commencement Bay moderately toxicoyster	47
146 ± 218	San Francisco Bay significantly toxicamphipod	*
151 ± 260	San Francisco Bay moderately toxicamphipod	*
≥160 160 ± 420	San Francisco Bay triad significant bioeffects.	
160 ± 430 164 + 100	Southern California low abundance	No concordance
164 ± 100 165 + 232	San Francisco Bay highly toxicbivalve	No gradient *
165 ± 232 169 ± 171	San Francisco Bay moderately toxicbivalve	No gradient
189 ± 171 180 ± 160	San Francisco Bay highly toxicamphipod	No gradient No effect
190 ± 214	Baltimore Harbor least toxicfish DuPage River least species richness	*
216 ± 376	DuPage River least species richness San Francisco not toxicbivalve	No effect
220 ± 540		No effect
	Southern California high species richness	IND CHECK

Table B-11. Sediment effects data available for PCBs arranged in ascending order with remarks regarding use of the concentrations to determine ER-L and ER-M values.

Table B-11. (continued)

Concentration (ppb	b) Biological Test	Remarks
251 ± 556	Commencement Bay moderately toxicamphipod	No concordance
259 ± 407	Puget Sound moderately toxicamphipod	, + .
260	San Francisco Bay AETamphipod	*
272 ± 217	Southern California significantly toxicamphipod	No concordance
276 ± 365	Puget Sound highly toxicamphipod	Small gradient
280	EP chronic marine (hexa-PCB)	* .
290 ± 502	Hudson-Raritan positive growthnematode	No effect
368 ± 695	Commencement Bay highly toxicoyster	*
400	ER-M	50 percentile
400 ± 600	Southern California moderate species richness	*
480 ± 724	Southern California not toxicamphipod	No effect
638 ± 512	Hudson-Raritan negative growthnematode	*
1000	1988 Puget Sound AETbenthic	*
1000 ± 2400	Southern California low arthropod abundance	*
1000 ± 300	Significant toxicityRhepoxynius in mixtures	*
1100	1986 Puget Sound AEToyster	*
1100	1986 Puget Sound AETbenthic	*
1100 ± 800	Baltimore Harbor most toxicfish	*
1110 ± 2600	Southern California low species richness	*
1300 ± 2610	Southern California low echinoderm abundance	*
1700	Black Rock Harbor significantly toxicamphipod	*
2260 ± 3530	Southern California high abundance	No effect
2500	1986 Puget Sound AETamphipod	*
3100	1988 Puget Sound AETamphipod	*
4300	Lake Union significantly toxicamphipod	+
7280	New York Harbor low mortalityvarious	No effect
10800	LC50 Rhepoxynius 10-d bioassay	*
ND-174,000	Waukegan Harbor least toxicMicrotox TM	No effect
1141300 ± 2229700	Waukegan Harbor moderately toxicMicrotox [™]	*
3550050 ± 6598300 ✓	Waukegan Harbor highly toxicMicrotox TM	*

* 34 concentrations used to determine ER-L and ER-M values

B-18

Concentr	ation (ppb) Biological Test	Remarks
0.4	EP 99 percentile chronic marine	*
0.6	San Francisco Bay highly toxicbivalve	No concordance
0.7	EP 95 percentile chronic marine	*
1	ER-L	10 percentile
1.22	San Francisco Bay not toxic-amphipod	No effect
1.3	San Francisco Bay least toxicamphipod	No effect
1.6	EP chronic safe level @1% TOC	*
2.1	San Francisco Bay least toxic—bivalve	No effect
2.4	San Francisco Bay moderately toxic-amphipod	No gradient
3.2	San Francisco Bay not toxic-bivalve	No effect
3.9	1986 Puget Sound AETamphipod	1 #
5.1	San Francisco Bay significantly toxic-bivalve	Small gradient
>6	1986 Puget Sound AET-oyster	No definitive value
6	EP chronic marine @4% TOC	*
6.4	EP chronic marine @4% TOC	*
6.6	San Francisco Bay moderately toxicbivalve	*
7.	ER-M	50 percentile
7.5	San Francisco Bay significantly toxic-amphipod	*
9.6	San Francisco Bay AETbivalve	Poor concordance
9.6	San Francisco Bay AETamphipod	*
11	1986 Puget Sound AET-benthic	*
12.2	San Francisco Bay highly toxic-amphipod	*
34	1988 Puget Sound AET-benthic	*
49.5	Overall LC50 R. abronius spiked bioassay @ 1% TOC	*
<50	Georgetown benthic communities	No effect
74	Palos Verdes not toxic-amphipod (n=1)	No effect
83	Palos Verdes significantly toxicamphipod (n=2)	Small sample size
210	EP acute safe level @1% TOC	* -
>270	1988 Puget Sound AETamphipod	No definitive value
840	EP acute marine @4% TOC	*

ł

Table B-12. Sediment effects data available for p,p'-DDT arranged in ascending order with remarks regarding use of the concentrations to determine ER-L and ER-M values.

* 15 concentrations used to determine ER-L and ER-M values

Concentration	(ppb) Biologi	cal Test	Remarks
0.1±0	Mississippi River 55% surviva	Imidge	No gradient
<0.2	Mississippi River 80 to100% su	rvival-midge	No effect
<0.2	Mississipi River 90% survival-		No effect
<0.2	Mississippi River 25% surviva		Small sample size
0.28	Mississippi River 80 to100% su		No effect
0.6±0.7	San Francisco Bay least toxic-		No effect
0. 7±0. 7	San Francisco Bay not toxican		No effect
0.7±1	San Francisco Bay least toxic		No effect
1±0.5	San Francisco Bay highly toxi	cbivalve	No gradient
1.2±1	San Francisco Bay not toxicbi	valve	No effect
1.2±1	San Francisco Bay moderately		No gradient
1.7±3.4	San Francisco Bay significantly		No gradient
2	ER-L	· · · · ·	10 percentile
2.1±4	San Francisco Bay moderately	toxicbivalve	*
2.2	San Francisco Bay AETbivaly		* .
<u>2.2+4</u>	San Francisco Bay significantly		*
2.2	San Francisco Bay AETamphi	pod	*
3.4±5.2	San Francisco Bay highly toxic	amphipod	*
)	1986 Puget Sound AETbenthic		*
15	ER-M		50 percentile
15	1986 Puget Sound AETamphip	od	•
27	EP 99 percentile chronic marine		*
<50	Georgetown benthic communitie		No effect
50	EP 95 percentile chronic marine		*
3374±3153	Palos Verdes not toxicamphip		No effect
5157±1065	Palos Verdes significantly toxi	camphipod	*
5157±1065	Palos Verdes major benthic des	gradation	*
7000	EP safe acute @1% TOC		*
28000	EP acute marine @4% TOC	· · ·	*

Table B-13. Sediment effects data available for p,p'-DDE arranged in ascending order with remarks regarding use of the concentrations to determine ER-L and ER-M values.

* 13 concentrations used to determine ER-L and ER-M values.

.

.:

.

.

.

ļ

 \mathbb{C}

Concentration (ppb)	Biological Test	Remarks	
0.6 ± 0.7	isco Bay moderately toxicamphipod	No gradient	
0.9 ± 1.6 San France 2 ER-L	sco Bay significantly toxicamphipod	No gradient 10 percentile	
	isco Bay highly toxicbivalve	No concordance	
1.3 ± 1.2 San Franc	isco Bay least toxicamphipod	No effect	
1.3 ± 2.1 San Franc	isco Bay highly toxicamphipod Sound AETbenthic	No gradient	
2.3 ± 0.1 San Franci		No effect	
6 EP 99 perc	entile chronic marine	*	
	isco Bay least toxicbivalve	No effect	
	sco Bay not toxic-bivalve	No effect	
	isco Bay significantly toxicbivalve	Small gradient	
	isco Bay AETbivalve	No gradient	
	sco Bay AETamphipod	No gradient	
16 1988 Pugel	Sound AET-benthic	*	
16.1 ± 23.2 San Franc	isco Bay moderately toxic-bivalve	Small gradient	
20 ER-M	• • •	50 percentile	
	entile chronic marine	* -	
	Sound AET-amphipod	•	
	n benthic communities	No effect	
	les not significantly toxicamphipod	No effect	
	les signficantly toxic-amphipod	Small sample size	
	afe level @1% TOC	*	
13000 EP acute r	narine @4% TOC	*	

Table B-14. Sediment effects data available for p,p'-DDD arranged in ascending order with remarks regarding use of the concentrations to determine ER-L and ER-M values.

* 7 concentrations used to determine ER-L and ER-M values

.

B-21

Concentration	(ppb) Biological Test	Remarks
1.58	EP saltwater chronic, assuming 1% TOC	¥.
1.9	Freshwater SLC, assuming 1% TOC	* `.
3	ER-L	10 percentile
3.29	EP saltwater chronic, assuming 1% TOC	*
6.9	PSDDA screening level	No effect
6.9 ± 9.8	Trinity River low mortalityDaphnia	No effect
8.28	Interim EP saltwater criteria, assuming 1% TOC	*
19.6 ± 18.4	DuPage River highest taxa richness	No effect
20	Lethal threshold-Crangon bioassay	*
28.6 ± 36.1	Southern California not toxicamphipod	No effect
	(excludes Palos Verdes sample)	
31	97-h LC50 Crangon spiked bioassay	*
31.4 ± 20.4	Trinity River significant mortalityDaphnia	*
45.9	Calculated EP threshold for freshwater	*
50 ± 60	Southern California high echinoderm abundance	No effect
58 ± 71.7	Southern California significantly toxicamphipod	No concordance
79 ± 126✔	Southern California moderate echinoderm abundance	*
100 ± 150	Southern California high arthropod abundance	No effect
210 ± 490	Southern California moderate total abundance	No concordance
221.7 ± 281.6	DuPage River least taxa richness	*
250 ± 620	Southern California moderate species richness	No concordance
350	ER-M	50 percentile
350 ± 710	Southern California moderate arthropod abundance	* -
128	Saltwater SLC, assuming 1% TOC	* `
505	Saltwater SLC, assuming 1% TOC	* .
1018.2 ± 2424	Southern California not toxic-amphipod	No effect
	(includes Palos Verdes sample)	-
1874 ± 6660✔	Southern California high species richness	No effect
1410 ± 5440	Southern California low total abundance	No concordance
1950	Overall LC50 for Rhepoxynius bioassay	*
11000	LC50 H. azteca bioassay @ 3% TOC	*
13420 ± 37670	Southern California low arthropod abundance	*
14190 ± 40200	Southern California low species richness	*
16500	No deaths N. virens spiked bioassay	No effect
18260 ± 43080	Southern California low echinoderm abundance	*
19600	LC50 H. azteca bioassay @ 7.2% TOC	*
35300 ± 59540	Southern California high total abundance	No effect
49700	LC50 H. azteca bioassay @ 10.5% TOC	*
57232	LD50 cricket nymph bioassay	*

Table B-15. Sediment effects data available for total DDT arranged in ascending order with remarks regarding use of the concentrations to determine ER-L and ER-M values.

* 21 concentrations used to determine ER-L and ER-M values

5

Table B-16. Sediment effects data available for CHLORDANE arranged in ascending order with remarks regarding use of the concentrations to determine ER-L and ER-M values.

Concentrations	(ppb) Biological Test	Remarks
ND	San Francisco Bay moderately toxic-amphipod	No concordance
ND	San Francisco Bay least toxicamphipod	No effect
ND	San Francisco Bay highly toxicbivalve	No concordance
0.3	EP 99 percentile chronic marine	*
0.5 ± 1	San Francisco Bay least toxicbivalve	No effect
0.5	ER-L	10 percentile
0.6	EP 95 percentile chronic marine	*
1 ± 1.4	San Francisco Bay not toxicamphipod	No effect
1 ± 1.4	San Francisco Bay not toxic-bivalve	No effect
1.7 ± 2.3	Trinity River not toxic-Daphnia	No effect
2	San Francisco Bay AETbivalve	Poor concordance
2	San Francisco Bay AETamphipod	- *
3.5 ± 6.3	San Francisco Bay significantly toxicamphipod	*
3.5 ± 6.3	San Francisco Bay significantly toxicbivalve	*
4.1 ± 6.6	San Francisco Bay moderately toxicbivalve	
6	ER-M	50 percentile
6.4 ± 7.5	San Francisco Bay highly toxicamphipod	*
8.3 ± 4.3	DuPage River most benthic taxa	No effect
17.4	EP lethal threshold freshwater	*
25 ± 22.3	DuPage River least benthic taxa	*
31.3 ± 29.4	Trinity River significantly toxicDaphnia	*
<50	Georgetown benthic communities	No effect
120	LC50 Crangon bioassay	*
≤5800	LC50 N. virens bioassay	*

* 12 concentrations used to determine ER-L and ER-M values

. ,

-

.

.

e a construction de la construct

Concentrations (ppb) Biological Test	Remarks
ND	San Francisco Bay highly toxic-bivalve	No gradient
0.01	EP 99 percentile chronic marine	*
0.02	ER-L	10 percenitle
0.02	EP 95 percentile chronic marine	*
0.21	Freshwater SLC @1% TOC	*
4.1	LC50 Crangon spiked bioassay	*
4.3 ± 2.1	Kishwaukee River most benthic taxa	No effect
4.4 ± 2.3	San Francisco Bay moderately toxicamphipod	No concordance
5.2 ± 1.2	San Francisco Bay least toxicamphipod	No effect
5.2 ± 1.2	San Francisco Bay least toxic-bivalve	No effect
5.6 ± 2.2	DuPage River most benthic taxa	No effect
6.2 ± 0.6	San Francisco Bay not toxicamphipod	No effect
6.2 ± 0.6	San Francisco Bay not toxicbivalve	No effect
6.6	San Francisco Bay AETbivalve	*
6.6	San Francisco Bay AET-amphipod	*
7.4 ± 4.8	Kishwaukee River least benthic taxa	*
7.6 ± 7.5	San Francisco Bay significantly toxic-amphipod	Small gradient
7.6 ± 7.5	San Francisco Bay significantly toxic-bivalve	Small gradient
8	ER-M	50 percentile
8.2 ± 8.1	San Francisco Bay moderately toxicbivalve	+ *
10.3 ± 9.6	San Francisco Bay highly toxicamphipod	+
11.9	EP lethal freshwater threshold	*
16 ± 12.1	DuPage River least benthic taxa	*
25.5 ± 33.2	Trinity River significantly toxicDaphnia	No gradient
25.5 ± 61.1	Trinity River not toxicDaphnia	No effect
<50	Georgetown disposal site benthic communities	No effect
57.7	EP interim marine criteria	+
199	EP interim freshwater criteria	*
13000	LC50 Nereis spiked bioassay	*

Table B-17. Sediment effects data available for DIELDRIN arranged in ascending order with remarks regarding use of the concentrations to determine ER-L and ER-M values.

* 14 concentrations used to determine ER-L and ER-M values

;

·. ·

Concentrations (ppb)	Biological Test	Remarks
	EP 99 percentile chronic marine	*
0.02	ER-L	10 percentile
0.02	EP 95 percentile chronic marine	*
2.15	EP interim marine criteria @1% TOC	+
3.8 ± 3.1	Trinity River low mortality-Daphnia	No effect
10.4	EP interim freshwater criteria @1% TOC	*
15.4	EP freshwater lethal threshold	+
18.3 ± 2	Trinity River significant mortality-Daphnia	*
45	ER-M	50 percentile
17	LC50 Crangon spiked bioassay	*
<50	Georgetown benthic communities	No effect
174	EP chronic sediment/water marine @1% TOC	*
321	EP chronic sediment/biota marine @1% TOC	*
4400	LC50 H. azteca @3% TOC	*
4800	LC50 H. azteca @6.1% TOC	*
6000	LC50 H. azteca @11.2 % TOC	*
28000	LC50 N. virens spiked bioassay	*

Table B-18. Sediment effects data available for ENDRIN arranged in ascending order with remarks regarding use of the concentrations to determine ER-L and ER-M values.

* 13 concentrations used to determine ER-L and ER-M values

Table B-19. Sediment effects data available for ACENAPHTHENE arranged in ascending order with remarks regarding use of the concentrations to determine ER-L and ER-M values.

Concentrations	(ppb) Biological Test	Remarks
1.8 ± 4	San Francisco Bay least toxicbivalve	No effect
3 ± 5.2	San Francisco Bay not toxicbivalve	No effect
3.3 ± 5.9	San Francisco Bay moderately toxicbivalve	Small gradient
3.9 ± 1.6✔	Southern California highly toxicamphipod	No concordance
5.4 ± 12.1	San Francisco Bay moderately toxicamphipod	No concordance
5.9 ± 16.8	San Francisco Bay significantly toxic-amphipod	No concordance
7 ± 11.8✓	Southern California not toxicamphipod	No effect
7.6 ± 21.6	San Francisco Bay highly toxicamphipod	No concordance
9	San Francisco Bay AETbivalve	Small gradient
9.4 ± 17.9	San Francisco Bay significantly toxicbivalve	Small gradient
9.8 ± 15.9	San Francisco Bay least toxicamphipod	No effect
11.8 ± 16.8	San Francisco Bay not toxicamphipod	No effect
30	Black Rock Harbor highly toxicamphipod	Small gradient
48 ± 18.4	San Francisco Bay highly toxicbivalve	Small gradient
56	San Francisco Bay AETamphipod	No concordance
56.7 ± 70	Commencement Bay least toxicoyster	No effect
86 ± 97	Commencement Bay least toxicamphipod	No effect
118.5 ± 105	Commencement Bay moderately toxicoyster	*
127 ± 117	Commencement Bay moderately toxicamphipod	Small gradient
150	ER-L	10 percentile
150	Predicted LC50 amphipod bioassay-Eagle Harbor	*
306 ± 604	Commencement Bay highly toxicoyster	*
500	1986 Puget Sound AEToyster	*
500	1986 Puget Sound AETbenthic	*
500	1986 Puget Sound AETMicrotox™	*
630	1986 Puget Sound AETamphipod	*
650	ER-M	50 percentile
654 ± 1049	Commencement Bay highly toxicamphipod	*
730	1988 Puget Sound AETbenthic	*
2000	1988 Puget Sound AETamphipod	*
5599 ± 24392	Eagle Harbor least toxicamphipod	No effect
6522 ± 8915	Eagle Harbor moderately toxicamphipod	Small gradient
7330	EP freshwater interim criteria @1% TOC	*
16500	EP chronic marine level @1% TOC	*
23000	EP acute marine level @1% TOC	*
39557 ± 48678	Eagle Harbor highly toxicamphipod	*
66000	EP chronic marine @4% TOC	*

*15 concentrations used to determine ER-L and ER-M values.

Concentrations	(ppb) Biological Test	Remarks
15.4 ± 7.5	San Francisco Bay least toxicbivalve	No effect
24	San Francisco Bay AETbivalve	*
34.3 ± 41.2	San Francisco Bay not toxic-bivalve	No effect
36±52 √	Southern California not toxicamphipod	No effect
63 ± 72	San Francisco Bay moderately toxic-amphipod	No concordance
70	Predicted LC50 Eagle Harbor-amphipod	*
85	ER-L	10 percentile
85.3 ± 119.3	San Francisco Bay moderately toxicbivalve	*
110 ± 257	San Francisco Bay least toxicamphipod	No effect
119.8 ± 276.7	San Francisco Bay significantly toxicamphipod	No gradient
120.2 ± 269.2	San Francisco Bay not toxicamphipod	No effect
130	PSDDA screening level	No effect
147.8 ± 148	Commencement Bay least toxicoyster	No effect
163	Saltwater SLC @1% TOC	*
183.9 ± 347.2	San Francisco Bay significantly toxicbivalve	*
190	99 percentile chronic marine @1% TOC	*
225 ± 131	Southern California significantly toxicamphipod	*
227.3 ± 197.6	Commencement Bay least toxicamphipod	No effect
237 ± 455	San Francisco Bay highly toxicamphipod	*
264.6 ± 227.8	Commencement Bay moderately toxicamphipod	Small gradient
282.3 ± 206.9	Commencement Bay moderately toxicoyster	*
363 ± 353.4	Commencement Bay highly toxicoyster	*
380	95 percentile chronic marine @1% TOC	*
476.2 ± 549.2	Commencement Bay highly toxicamphipod	*
922.7 ± 558.1	San Francisco Bay highly toxicbivalve	*
960	1986 Puget Sound AET-oyster	*
960	ER-M	50 percentile
960	1986 Puget Sound AETMicrotox™	*
1100	San Francisco Bay AETamphipod	*
1177 ± 1582	Eagle Harbor moderately toxicamphipod	No concordance
1300	1986 Puget Sound AETbenthic	*
1490 ± 5389	Eagle Harbor least toxicamphipod	No effect
1900	1986 Puget Sound AETamphipod	*
4400	1988 Puget Sound AETbenthic	*
6600	28-d LC50 2.5% Elizabeth Riverspot	*
7597 ± 7264	Eagle Harbor highly toxicamphipod	*
13000	1988 Puget Sound AETamphipod	*
44000	EP chronic marine @4% TOC	*
120000	Lake Union highly toxicamphipod	*
147840	24-h LC50 58% Elizabeth Riverspot	*
264000	LC100 100% Elizabeth Riverspot	*

Table B-20 Sediment effects data available for ANTHRACENE arranged in ascending order with remarks regarding use of the concentrations to determine ER-L and ER-M values.

*26 concentrations used to determine ER-L and ER-M values.

Table B-21 Sediment effects data available for BENZO(A)ANTHRACENE arranged in ascending order with remarks regarding use of the concentrations to determine ER-L and ER-M values.

Concentrations	(ppb) Biological Test	Remarks
40.7 ± 20	San Francisco Bay not toxicbivalve	No effect
56.4 ± 25.7	San Francisco Bay least toxic-bivalve	No effect
59.6 ± 129	Southern California not toxicamphipod	No effect
60	San Francisco Bay AET-bivalve	*
80	Predicted LC50 Eagle Harboramphipod	*
122.1 ± 125.9	San Francisco Bay moderately toxicbivalve	*
l67.7 ± 324.2	San Francisco Bay least toxicamphipod	No effect
187 ± 156.2	San Francisco Bay moderately toxicamphipod	Small gradient
187.2 ± 359.2	San Francisco Bay not toxic-amphipod	No effect
230	ER-L	10 percentile
232 ± 336.8	San Francisco Bay significantly toxic-bivalve	*
234.7 ± 246.8	Commencement Bay least toxic-oyster	No effect
236.3 ± 313.2	San Francisco Bay significantly toxic-amphipod	Small gradient
261	Saltwater SLC @1 % TOC	*
300 ± 398.3	San Francisco Bay highly toxic-amphipod	*
310 ± 179.8	Southern California significantly toxic-amphipod	*
150	PSDDA screening level	No effect
75.6 ± 437.1	Commencement Bay least toxic-amphipod	No effect
520 ± 523.1	Commencement Bay moderately toxic-amphipod	Small gradient
548.5 ± 384	Commencement Bay moderately toxic-oyster	*
301 ± 866.2	Commencement Bay highly toxic-oyster	•
919.3 ± 432.7	San Francisco Bay highly toxic-bivalve	*
31 ± 1322.8	Commencement Bay highly toxic-amphipod	*
100	San Francisco Bay AETamphipod	*
1300	1986 Puget Sound AETMicrotox™	+
1600	1986 Puget Sound AET-amphipod	*
1600	ER-M	50 percentile
1600		*
	1986 Puget Sound AET-oyster	*
1600	EP 99 percentile chronic marine @ 1% TOC	No effect
2200	Columbia River maximum-amphipod	No effect
2496 ± 4157	Eagle Harbor least toxicamphipod	*
4500 5100	1986 Puget Sound AETbenthic	* · · ·
	1988 Puget Sound AETamphipod	*
5100 7370 ± 9984	1988 Puget Sound AETbenthic	*
	Eagle Harbor moderately toxicamphipod	*
3750	28-d LC50 2.5% Elizabeth River-spot	*
10000	Spiked bioassay with mixtureamphipod	*
1088 ± 8941	Eagle Harbor highly toxic-amphipod	*
13200	EP freshwater interim criteria @ 1% TOC	*
21000	EP 95 percentile chronic marine @ 1% TOC	ч ж
55000	EP acute safe level @ 1% TOC	т ъ
170000	Lake Union highly toxicamphipod	न 4
196000	24-h LC50 56% Elizabeth River-spot	<i>π</i>
220000	EP acute marine @ 4% TOC	π
350000	LC100 100% Elizabeth Riverspot	¥ .

* 30 concentrations used to determine ER-L and ER-M values.

Table B-22 Sediment effects data available for BENZO(A)PYRENE arranged in ascending order with remarks regarding use of the concentrations to determine ER-L and ER-M values.

Concentrations	(ppb) Biological Test	Remarks
10	Eagle Harbor predicted LC50amphipod	
63 ± 96	Southern California not toxicamphipod	Small gradient No effect
129 ± 61	San Francisco Bay least toxicbivalve	No Effect
210 ± 237	San Francisco Bay not toxicbivalve	No effect
329 ± 385	Commencement Bay least toxic-oyster	No effect
396	Marine SLC @1% TOC	*
397	Marine SLC @1% TOC	*
400 ± 447	San Francisco Bay least toxicamphipod	No effect
400	ER-L	10 percentile
404 ± 428	San Francisco Bay moderately toxicbivalve	*
123 ± 465	San Francisco Bay not toxicamphipod	No effect
429 ± 382	San Francisco Bay significantly toxicamphipod	No gradient
432 ± 344	San Francisco Bay moderately toxicamphipod	Small gradient
465 ± 471	San Francisco Bay significantly toxicbivalve	*
486 ± 484	San Francisco Bay highly toxicamphipod	Small gradient
509 ± 354	Southern California significantly toxicamphipod	*
596 ± 593	Commencement Bay least toxicamphipod	No effect
580	PSDDA screening level	No effect
584 ± 464	Commencement Bay moderately toxicoyster	*
390 ± 1322	Commencement Bay moderately toxicamphipod	*
1091 ± 338	San Francisco Bay highly toxicbivalve	*
192 ± 1643	Commencement Bay highly toxicamphipod	*
1261 ± 1620	Commencement Bay highly toxicoyster	*
>1300	San Francisco Bay AETamphipod	Not definitive
1600	1986 Puget Sound AEToyster	*
1600	1986 Puget Sound AETMicrotox™	*
>1800 ·	San Francisco Bay AETbivalve	Not definitive
1959 ± 1993	Eagle Harbor least toxic-amphipod	No effect
2400	1986 Puget Sound AETamphipod	*
2462	LC50 2.5% Elizabeth Riverspot	*
2500	ER-M	50 percentile
3000	1988 Puget Sound AETamphipod	*
3485 ± 2475	Eagle Harbor highly toxicamphipod	No concordance
3600	1988 Puget Sound AETbenthic	*
100 ± 600	Significantly toxic mixturesamphipod	*
5335 ± 6488	Eagle Harbor moderately toxicamphipod	*
5355 <u>1</u> 0488		*
10630	1986 Puget Sound AETbenthic EP interim freshwater criteria @ 1% TOC	*
		*
18000	99 percentile chronic marine @1% TOC	*
15000 55140	95 percentile chronic marine @1% TOC	*
55160	LC50 56% Elizabeth River-spot	*
98500	LC100 100% Elizabeth Riverspot	*
220000	Lake Union highly toxic-amphipod	7 34
150000	EP acute safe level	-
1800000	EP chronic marine @ 4% TOC	ч

*27 concentrations used to determine ER-L and ER-M values.

.

Concentrations	(ppb) Biological Test	Remarks	
80	Eagle Harbor predicted LC50amphipod	*	
82 ± 37	San Francisco Bay least toxic-bivalve	No effect	
127 ± 226	Southern California not toxicamphipod	No effect	
198 ± 276	San Francisco Bay not toxicbivalve	No effect	
358 ± 365	Commencement Bay least toxic-oyster	No effect	
368 ± 466	San Francisco Bay moderately toxicbivalve	*	
378 ± 549	San Francisco Bay least toxicamphipod	No effect	
384	Marine SLC @1% TOC	*	
400	ER-L	10 percentile	
405 ± 571	San Francisco Bay not toxicamphipod	No effect	
413 ± 385	San Francisco Bay moderately toxicamphipod	Small gradient	
423 ± 512	San Francisco Bay significantly toxicamphipod	Small gradient	
500 ± 671	San Francisco Bay significantly toxicbivalve	*	
517 ± 729	San Francisco Bay highly toxicamphipod	Small gradient	
524 ± 284	Southern California significantly toxicamphipod	*	
670	PSDDA screening level	No effect	
748 ± 773	Commencement Bay least toxic-amphipod	No effect	
821 ± 732	Commencement Bay moderately toxicamphipod	Small gradient	
902 ± 691	Commencement Bay moderately toxicoyster	*	
1200	99 percentile chronic marine @1% TOC	* :	
1218 ± 1286	Commencement Bay highly toxic-oyster	*	
1363 ± 1970	Commencement Bay highly toxic-amphipod	* -	
1400	1986 Puget Sound AETMicrotox™	*	
1679 ± 847	San Francisco Bay highly toxicbivalve	*	
1700	San Francisco Bay AETbivalve	*	
2100	San Francisco Bay AET-amphipod	*	
2800	1986 Puget Sound AETamphipod	+	
2800	1986 Puget Sound AEToyster	*	
2800	ER-M	50 percentile	
3165 ± 4535	Eagle Harbor least toxic-amphipod	No effect	
4100	Columbia River bioassayamphipod	No effect	
4400	95 percentile chronic marine @1% TOC	*	
6700	1986 Puget Sound AETbenthic	*	
7925✔	LC50 2.5% Elizabeth River-spot	+	
9200	1988 Puget Sound AETamphipod	*	
9200	1988 Puget Sound AETbenthic	*	
9203 ± 10972	Eagle Harbor moderately toxicamphipod	*	
10574 ± 7337	Eagle Harbor highly toxic-amphipod	*	
115000	EP acute safe level	· +	
170000		*	
177520	Lake Union significantly toxicamphipod	*	
317000	LC50 56% Elizabeth Riverspot	*	
	LC100 100% Elizabeth Riverspot		
460000	EP chronic marine @4% TOC	*	

Table B-23. Sediment effects data available for CHRYSENE arranged in ascending order with remarks regarding use of the concentrations to determine ER-L and ER-M values.

* 27 concentrations used to determine ER-L and ER-M values.

Concentrations	(ppb) Biological Test	Remarks
15 ± 15	San Francisco Bay least toxicbivalve	No effect
21 ± 22	San Francisco Bay not toxic-bivalve	No effect
24 ± 36	Southern California not toxicamphipod	No effect
42 ± 46	San Francisco Bay moderately toxic-bivalve	*
44 ± 32	San Francisco Bay moderately toxicamphipod	No concordance
55 ± 41	Commencement Bay least toxic-bivalve	No effect
55 ± 58	San Francisco Bay significantly toxicamphipod	No concordance
57 ± 77	San Francisco Bay least toxicamphipod	No effect
60	ER-L	10 percentile
26 ± 80	San Francisco Bay not toxic-amphipod	No effect
63 ± 80	San Francisco Bay significantly toxicbivalve	+ .
66 ± 46	Southern California significantly toxicamphipod	*
72 ± 139	Commencement Bay highly toxicamphipod	No gradient
73 ± 71	Commencement Bay least toxicamphipod	No effect
80 ± 88	San Francisco Bay highly toxicamphipod	Small gradient
101 ± 58	Commencement Bay moderately toxic-oyster	*
120	PSDDA screening level	No effect
120 183 ± 344	Commencement Bay moderately toxicamphipod	*
217 ± 88	San Francisco Bay highly toxicbivalve	*
230	1986 Puget Sound AET-oyster	*
230	1986 Puget Sount AETMicrotox TM	*
260		•
260	1986 Puget Sound AET-amphipod ER-M	50 marcontila
260		50 percentile *
260 ± 413	San Francisco Bay AETbivalve	*
265 ± 415 300	Commencement Bay highly toxic-bivalve	Poor concordance
360 ± 298	San Francisco Bay AETamphipod	No effect
	Eagle Harbor least toxicamphipod	
399 ± 252	Eagle Harbor highly toxicamphipod	Small gradient
540	1988 Puget Sound AET-amphipod	*
797 ± 723	Eagle Harbor moderately toxicamphipod	
97 0	1988 Puget Sound AET-benthic	*
1200	1986 Puget Sound AET-benthic	
12000	99 percentile EP chronic marine @ 1% TOC	न •
35000	95 percentile EP chronic marine @ 1% TOC	4
240000	EP acute safe level	

Table B-24. Sediment effects data available for DIBENZ(A,H)ANTHRACENE arranged in ascending order with remarks regarding use of the concentrations to determine ER-L and ER-M values.

* 18 concentrations used to determine ER-L and ER-M values.

.

oncentrations	(ppb) Biological Test	Remarks
98	Palos Verdes not toxicamphipod	No effect
136 ± 107	San Francisco Bay least toxicbivalve	No effect
153 ± 307	Southern California not toxicamphipod	No effect
193	Palos Verdes significantly toxicamphipod	Small sample siz
382 ± 617	San Francisco Bay not toxic-bivalve	No effect
382 ± 241	Southern California significantly toxicamphipod	*
432	Marine SLC @ 1% TOČ	*
451 ± 562	San Francisco Bay moderately toxicbivalve	*
489 ± 492	Commencement Bay least toxic-oyster	No effect
509 ± 481	San Francisco Bay moderately toxicamphipod	No gradient
539 ± 842	San Francisco Bay least toxicamphipod	No effect
572 ± 880	San Francisco Bay not toxicamphipod	No effect
584 ± 789	San Francisco Bay significantly toxicamphipod	Small gradient
600	ER-L	10 percentile
600	Predicted LC50 Eagle Harboramphipod	*
630	PSDDA screening level	No effect
644	Marine SLC @ 1% TOC	*
682 ± 1043	San Francisco Bay significantly toxicbivalve	*
794 ± 1210	San Francisco Bay highly toxicamphipod	Small gradient
923 ± 865	Commencement Bay least toxicamphipod	No effect
925 ± 864	Commencement Bay moderately toxicamphipod	No gradient
1046 ± 655	Commencement Bay moderately toxic-oyster	*
1600	99 percentile EP chronic marine @ 1% TOC	*
1655 ± 2029	Commencement Bay highly toxic-oyster	
1700	1986 Puget Sound AETMicrotox™	*
2000	San Francisco Bay AETbivalve	*
2100	Columbia River bioassayamphipod	No effect
2360 ± 3330	Commencement Bay highly toxicamphipod	*
2500	1986 Puget Sound AET-oyster	*
2737 ± 1617	San Francisco Bay highly toxicbivalve	*
3100	95 percentile EP chronic marine @ 1% TOC	*
3300	LC50 spiked bioassays @ 0.2% TOCamphipod	*
3600	ER-M	50 percentile
3600	EP chronic safe level	*
>3700	San Francisco Bay AETamphipod	Not definitive
3900	1986 Puget Sound AETamphipod	*
4200	LC50 spiked bioassaysamphipod	*
6200	LC50 spiked bioassays @ 0.3% TOCamphipod	*
6300	1986 Puget Sound AET-benthic	*
8895 ± 10337	Eagle Harbor moderately toxicamphipod	No concordance
9000	EP acute safe level	*
10500	LC50 spiked bioassays @ 0.5% TOCamphipod	*
12080 ± 51889		No effect
15000	Eagle Harbor least toxicamphipod	NO effect
18800	Mixtures spiked bioassaysamphipod	*
	EP interim freshwater criteria @ 1% TOC	*
24000	1988 Puget Sound AET-benthic	*
30000	1988 Puget Sound AETamphipod	*
36000	EP acute marine @ 4% TOC	*
59250	LC50 2.5% Elizabeth Riverspot	*
71988 ± 95713	Eagle Harbor highly toxicamphipod	*
570000	Lake Union significantly toxicamphipod	
1327200	LC50 56% Elizabeth River-spot	
2370000	LC500 100% Elizabeth Riverspot	•

Table B-25. Sediment effects data available for FLUORANTHENE arranged in ascending order with remarks regarding use of the concentrations to determine ER-L and ER-M values.

* 33 concentrations used to determine ER-L and ER-M values.

Concentrations ((ppb) Biological Test	Remarks
6±5	San Francisco Bay least toxicbivalve	No effect
8 ± 16✔	Southern California not toxicamphipod	No effect
11	San Francisco Bay AETbivalve	*
11.3 ± 8.2✔	Southern California significantly toxicamphipod	Small gradient
16 ± 23	San Francisco Bay not toxicbivalve	No effect
19 ± 30	San Francisco Bay moderately toxicbivalve	*
29 ± 48	San Francisco Bay significantly toxicamphipod	No concordance
30 ± 21	San Francisco Bay moderately toxicamphipod	No concordance
33 ± 77	San Francisco Bay highly toxicamphipod	No gradient
35	ER-L	10 percentile
35 ± 64	San Francisco Bay significantly toxicbivalve	*
39 ± 49	San Francisco Bay least toxicamphipod	No effect
43± 51✔	San Francisco Bay not toxicamphipod	No effect
59	99 percentile EP chronic marine @ 1% TOC	*
64	PSDDA screening level	No effect
75 ± 76	Commencement Bay least toxicoyster	No effect
93	Black Rock Harbor significant toxicamphipod	*
101	Marine SLC @1% TOC	*
117 ± 113	Commencement Bay least toxicamphipod	No effect
143 ± 119	Commencement Bay moderately toxicoyster	*
147 ± 131	Commencement Bay moderately toxicamphipod	Small gradient
160	95 percentile EP chronic marine @ 1% TOC	*
162 ± 105	San Francisco Bay highly toxicbivalve	*
187 ± 234	Eagle Harbor moderatley toxicamphipod	No concordance
210	Eagle Harbor predicted LC50amphipod	*
210	San Francisco Bay AETamphipod	No concordance
353 ± 746	Commencement Bay highly toxicoyster	+ -
540	1986 Puget Sound AETamphipod	4
540	1986 Puget Sound AEToyster	*
540	1986 Puget Sound AETMicrotox™	* F0
640	ER-M	50 percentile
640 707 + 1241	1986 Puget Sound AETbenthic	*
707 ± 1341	Commencement Bay highly toxicamphipod	*
1000 1017 ± 4670	1988 Puget Sound AETbenthic	No offect
1017 ± 4679 3600	Eagle Harbor least toxicamphipod	No effect *
7000	1988 Puget Sound AETamphipod EP acute safe level	*
22811 ± 65559	•	*
28000	EP chronic marine @ 4% TOC	*
31250	LC50 2.5% Elizabeth Riverspot	*
40000	Lake Union significantly toxicamphipod	*
176510	Winter flounder liver-MFO	*
220550	Winter flounder liver-somatic condition	*
285290	Winter flounder kidneyMFO	*
	LC50 56% Elizabeth Riverspot	*
700000	LL 10 16% CU20DEED KIVER-STOT	

Table B-26. Sediment effects data available for FLUORENE arranged in ascending order with remarks regarding use of the concentrations to determine ER-L and ER-M values.

* 28 concentrations used to determine ER-L and ER-M values.

Table B-27. Sediment effects data available for 2-METHYLNAPHTHALENE arranged in ascending order with remarks regarding use of the concentrations to determine ER-L and ER-M values.

*15 concentrations used to determine ER-L and ER-M values.

B-34

. .

.

ncentrations	(ppb) Biological Test	Remarks
65±30	San Francisco Bay least toxicbivalve	No effect
88	San Francisco Bay AETbivalve	*
110	99 percentile chronic marine @1% TOC	*
119 ± 242	Southern California not toxicamphipod	No effect
159 ± 216	San Francisco Bay not toxicbivalve	No effect
188 ± 197	San Francisco Bay least toxicamphipod	No effect
199 ± 205	San Francisco Bay not toxicamphipod	No effect
220 ± 163	San Francisco Bay significantly toxicamphipod	Small gradient
222 ± 136	Southern California significantly toxicamphipod	*
224 ± 203	San Francisco Bay moderately toxic-bivalve	*
225	ER-L	10 percentile
228 ± 146	San Francisco Bay moderately toxicamphipod	Small gradient
233 ± 208	San Francisco Bay significantly toxicbivalve	Small gradient
240	95 percentile chronic marine @ 1% TOC	*
242 ± 203	San Francisco Bay highly toxicamphipod	Small gradient
259	Marine SLC @1% TOC	*
270	Winter flounder liverMFO induction	*
297 ± 263	Commencement Bay least toxicoyster	No effect
320	PSDDA screening level	No effect
340	Winter flounder liversomatic condition	*
368	Marine SLC @1% TOC	*
429	Winter flounder kidneyMFO induction	*
475 ± 160	San Francisco Bay highly toxicbivalve	*
478 ± 367	Commencement Bay least toxicamphipod	No effect
500	Mixtures bioassaysamphipod	*
510	San Francisco Bay AETamphipod	*
580	Columbia River bioassaysamphipod	No effect
593 ± 365	Commencement Bay moderately toxicoyster	*
597 ± 513	Commencement Bay moderately toxicamphipod	*
950	Eagle Harbor predicted LC50amphipod	*
1020	EP marine interim criteria @1% TOC	*
1379 ± 2546	Commencement Bay highly toxicoyster	*
1380	ER-M	50 percentile
1390	EP freshwater interim criteria @1% TOC	* 1
1500	1986 Puget Sound AET–oyster	*
1500	1986 Puget Sound AETMicrotox™	*
2142 ± 2404	Eagle Harbor moderately toxicamphipod	No concordanc
2600 ± 10009	Eagle Harbor least toxicamphipod	No effect
2838 ± 4603	Commencement Bay highly toxicamphipod	*
3200	1986 Puget Sound ÁET-benthic	*
3680	LC50 spiked bioassayamphipod	*
5400	1986 Puget Sound AÉTamphipod	*
5400	1988 Puget Sound AET-oyster	*
6900	1988 Puget Sound AETamphipod	*
14000	EP acute safe level @1% TOC	*
33603 ± 84430	Eagle Harbor highly toxicamphipod	*
56000	EP chronic marine @4% TOC	*
105500	LC50 2.5% Elizabeth Riverspot	*
220000	LC100 100% Elizabeth Riverspot	*
410000	Lake Union significantly toxicamphipod	*
2363200	LC50 56% Elizabeth River-spot	-

Table B-29. Sediment effects data available for PHENANTHRENE arranged in ascending order with remarks regarding use of the concentrations to determine ER-L and ER-M values.

*34 concentrations used to determine ER-L and ER-M values.

Table B-28. Sediment effects data available for NAPHTHALENE arranged in ascending order with remarks regarding use of the concentrations to determine ER-L and ER-M values.

oncentrations	(ppb) Biological Test	Remarks
4.2	Black Rock Harbor projected highly toxicamphipod	Small gradient
8.2 ± 16.1	Southern California not toxicamphipod	No effect
30	Predicted Eagle Harboramphipod bioassay LC50	Small gradient
36 ± 50	Puget Sound least toxicMicrotox™ EC50	No effect
43.1 ± 26.2	San Francisco Bay moderately toxic-bivalve	No concordance
48 ± 24.7	San Francisco Bay moderately toxic-amphipod	No concordance
53.4 ± 40	San Francisco Bay significantly toxicamphipod	No concordanc
53.4 ± 37.6	San Francisco Bay significantly toxic-bivalve	No concordance
58±50.6	San Francisco Bay least toxicamphipod	No effect
63.2 ± 57.2	San Francisco Bay least toxic-bivalve	No effect
64 ± 45.8	San Francisco Bay highly toxicamphipod	Small gradient
65.2 ± 53.5	San Francisco Bay not toxicamphipod	No effect
77.3 ± 180.6	Southern California significantly toxicamphipod	*
88.7	San Francisco Bay not toxic-bivalve	No effect
127.3 ± 32.4	San Francisco Bay highly toxic-bivalve	*
>160	San Francisco Bay AETbivalve	Not definitive
>160	San Francisco Bay AETamphipod	Not definitive
210	PSDDA screening level	No effect
288 ± 201	Eagle Harbor moderately toxicamphipod	No concordance
340	ER-L	10 percentile
343 ± 388	Puget Sound moderately toxicMicrotox™EC50	*
358 ± 326	Commencement Bay least toxicoyster	No effect
367🖌	Saltwater SLC	. +
414	Saltwater SLC	*
456 ± 682	Eagle Harbor least toxicamphipod	No effect
500	99 percentile EP chronic marine @1% TOC	*
510 ± 499	Commencement Bay least toxicamphipod	No effect
593 ± 505	Commencement Bay moderately toxicoyster	*
594 ± 424	Commencement Bay moderately toxicamphipod	*
720	95 percentile EP chronic marine @1% TOC	*
973 ± 1041	Commencement Bay highly toxicoyster	*
1501 ± 2064	Eagle Harbor highly toxicamphipod	*
1564 ± 1735	Commencement Bay highly toxic-amphipod	*
2100	1986 Puget Sound AET-amphipod	*
2100	1986 Puget Sound AET-oyster	*
2100	1986 Puget Sound AETbenthic	* 1
2100	1986 Puget Sound AETMicrotox™	*
2100	ER-M	50 percentile
2375	28-d LC50 for spot-2.5% Elizabeth River sediments	+
2400	1988 Puget Sound AETamphipod	*
2700	1988 Puget Sound AET-benthic	*
3934 ± 8864	Puget Sound highly toxicMicrotox™ EC50	*
5250 ± 1500	Trinity River high species richness	No effect
6200	Winter flounder spiked bioassayshepatic MFO	*
7370	Winter flounder spiked bioassays-HSI	*
10710	Winter flounder spiked bioassayskidney MFO	*
11500 ± 5600	Trinity River low species richness	*
40000	Lake Union highly toxic-Hyallella	*
42000	EP acute marine threshold @4% TOC	*
53200	24-h LC50 for spot-56% Elizabeth River	*
95000	LC100 for spot-100% Elizabeth River	*

*28 concentrations used to determine ER-L and ER-M values.

Table B-31. Sediment effects data available for total PAH arranged in ascending order with remarks regarding use of the concentrations to determine ER-L and ER-M values and the number of the PAHs that were quantified to determine the totals.

oncentrations (ppb)	Biological Test	Remarks P	AH Reported
(PPO)			
		1	
763 ±727	Puget Sound least toxic-Microtox TM	No effect	unspecified
870	San Francisco Bay AET-bivalve	•	**
941 ± 429	San Francisco Bay least toxicbivalve	No effect	**
2242	Southern California not toxic-amphipod	No effect	18
2557 ± 3816	San Francisco Bay not toxic-bivalve	No effect	¥#
2590	Predicted LC50 Eagle Harbor-amphipod	*	13
3322 ± 4337	San Francisco Bay least toxicamphipod	No effect	₩₩ - 2
3343 ± 4039	San Francisco Bay moderately toxicbivalve	🛎 s	4 # .
3527 ± 4520	San Francisco Bay not toxic-amphipod	No effect	**
3705	Commencement Bay least toxicoyster	No effect	16
3800	San Francisco Bay triad minimum bioeffects	*	9
3832 ± 3927	San Francisco Bay significantly toxic-amphipod	Small gradient	***
3966 ± 3524	San Francisco Bay moderately toxicamphipod	Small gradient	**
4000	ER-L	10 percentile	•
4022 ± 4908	San Francisco Bay significantly toxic-bivalve	*	**
4201 ± 4612	Puget Sound nontoxic-amphipod	No effect	unspecifie
4227 ± 5025	San Francisco Bay highly toxicamphipod	Small gradient	16
6467	Commencement Bay least toxic-amphipod	No effect	16
7627 ± 7065	Puget Sound moderately toxicamphipod	*	unspecifie
7841	Commencement Bay moderately toxicoyster	*	16
8209	Commencement Bay moderately toxic-amphipod	Small gradient	16
8363	Southern California significantly toxic-amphipod	*	18
8550 ± 22990	Mississippi Sound not toxicmysid	No effect	
8550 ± 23000	Mississippi Sount least toxic-mysid	No effect	unspecifie
			unspecifie
8700 ± 12600	Massachusetts Bay high species richness	No effect	unspecifie
9500	San Francisco Bay triad significant bioeffects	NT CC C	18
9730 ± 22390	Mississippi Sound least toxic-amphipod	No effect	unspecifie
10000	Petroleum product spiked bioassayoyster larvae	No effect	unspecifie
10200 ± 9950	Forth Estuary high meiofauna density	No effect	unspecifie
11273	Black Rock Harbor significantly toxic-amphipod	*	20
11400 ± 14100	Mississippi Sound highly toxic-mysid	No concordance	e unspecifie
11735 ± 5499	San Francisco Bay highly toxicbivalve	*	**
11752 ± 14548	Puget Sound highly toxic-amphipod	*	unspecifie
11800 ± 9700	Forth Estuary moderate meiofauna density	Small gradient	unspecifie
12325 ± 10425	Hampton Roads moderately toxicshrimp	No concordance	e 16 -
12877	Commencement Bay highly toxic-oyster	*	16
13933 ± 17427	Puget Sound moderately toxic-Microtox TM	+	unspecifie
>15000	San Francisco Bay AET—amphipod	Not definitive	18 **
16771	Commencement Bay highly toxic-amphipod	*	16
16921 ± 20976	Hampton Roads least toxicshrimp	No effect	16
18600 ± 47000	Mississippi Sound not toxicamphipod	No effect	unspecifie
19000	Lower Columbia River bioassays-amphipod	No effect	17
21467 ± 31160	Hudson-Raritan least toxic-nematode	No effect	unspecifie
21600 ± 31000	Mississippi Sound significantly toxic-amphipod	No gradient	unspecifie
23100 ± 15400	Massachusetts Bay moderate species richness	*	unspecifie
35000±2540	Massachusetts Bay low species richness	+	unspecifie
35000	ER-M	50 percentile	
357000 ± 42181	Hampton Roads highly toxic-shrimp	*	16
41790 ± 66160	Mississippi Sound significantly toxic-mysid	*	
41790 ± 86180 42769 ± 46084	Hudson-Raritan highly toxic-nematode	*	unspecifie
42769 ± 40004 47760 ± 74890		*	unspecifie
	Mississippi Sound highly toxic-amphipod	+	unspecifie
55630 ± 112530	Puget Sound highly toxic-Microtox TM		unspecifie
66100 ± 83300 83800 ± 57900	Mississippi Sound moderately toxic–mysid Forth Estuary low meiofauna density	*	unspecifie unspecifie

Concentrations	(ppb) Biological Test	Remarks
182	Kidney MFO induction-winter flounder	*
184 ± 318	Southern California not toxicamphipod	No effect
216 ± 102	San Francisco Bay least toxic-bivalve	No effect
300	Liver MFO induction-winter flounder	*
350	Eagle Harbor predicted LC50amphipod	*
350	ER-L	10 percentile
360	Liver somatic condition-winter flounder	*
430	PSDDA screening level	No effect
434 ± 442	Commencement Bay least toxicoyster	No effect
434	Marine SLC @1% TOC	*
532 ± 372	Southern California significantly toxicamphipod	*
665	Marine SLC @1% TOC	*
701 ± 866	San Francisco Bay least toxicamphipod	No effect
719 ± 1123	San Francisco Bay not toxicbivalve	No effect
724 ± 939	San Francisco Bay moderately toxicbivalve	*
743 ± 902	San Francisco Bay not toxic-amphipod	No effect
777 ± 908	San Francisco Bay highly toxic-amphipod	Small gradient
806 ± 975	San Francisco Bay significantly toxicbivalve	Small gradient
850	EP 99 percentile chronic marine @ 1% TOC	*
865 ± 719	Commencement Bay moderately toxic-amphipod	No concordance
896 ± 870	San Francisco Bay significantly toxic-amphipod	Small gradient
978 ± 996	Commencement Bay least toxic-amphipod	No effect
1078 ± 806	Commencement Bay moderately toxic-oyster	*
10.0 ± 000 1110 ± 904	San Francisco Bay moderately toxicamphipod	*
1538 ± 1501	Commencement Bay highly toxic-oyster	*
1820 ± 2252		*
1900	Commencement Bay highly toxic-amphipod EP 95 percentile chronic marine @ 1% TOC	*
2188 ± 776		*
2200	San Francisco Bay highly toxic-bivalve ER-M	50 norcontilo
		50 percentile
2500	Columbia River bioassaysamphipod	No effect
2600	1986 Puget Sound AET-Microtox™	*
2600	San Francisco Bay AETamphipod	*
3300	1986 Puget Sound AET-oyster	Not definitions
>3400	San Francisco Bay AETbivalve	Not definitive
4300	1986 Puget Sound AETamphipod	*
>7300	1986 Puget Sound AET-benthic	No definitive value
13100	EP interim freshwater criteria @ 1% TOC	*
16000	1988 Puget Sound AETamphipod	•
16000	1988 Puget Sound AET-benthic	
33750	LC50 2.5% Elizabeth River-spot	*
49500	EP acute safe level	*
198000	EP chronic marine @ 4% TOC	₩
750000	Lake Union significantly toxicamphipod	*
756000	LC50 56% Elizabeth Riverspot	*
1350000	LC100 100% Elizabeth River-spot	*

Table B-30. Sediment effects data available for PYRENE arranged in ascending order with remarks regarding use of the concentrations to determine ER-L and ER-M values.

*28 concentrations used to determine ER-L and ER-M values.

Table B-31 (Continued)

Concentrations (ppb)	Biological Test	Remarks	PAH Reported	
99400	Mississippi Sound AET-mysid bioassay	*	unspecified	
183060	Spiked bioassays-winter flounder liver MFO	•	4	
>205000	Mississippi Sound AETamphipod bioassay	Not definitive	unspecified	
228722	Spiked bioassayswinter flounder liver condition	•	4	
295860	Spiked bioassays-winter flounder kidney MFO	*	4	
530000	LC50 2.5% Elizabeth River-spot	. •	21	
2240000	LC50 Bunker C oil spiked bioassay-amphipod	*	gravimetric	
3900000	56% mortality Elizabeth River-spot	*	20	
3900000	100% fin erosion Elizabeth River-spot	*	20	
11872000	LC50 56% Elizabeth River-spot	- · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	21	
21200000	LC100 100% Elizabeth River-spot	*	21	

* 34 concentrations used to determine ER-L and ER-M values.

** Long and Buchman, 1989, 18 PAH ; Chapman et al., 1986, 18 PAH; Word et al, 1988, 16 PAH; U. S. Navy, 1987, 6 or 7 PAH

B-39

GLOSSARY

NATIONAL STATUS AND TRENDS PROGRAM SITES

NS&T Program Mussel Watch Sites

AIACAbsecon InletAtlantic CityNew JerseyABWJAnaheim BayWest JettyCaliforniaAPCPApalachicola BayCat Point BarFloridaAPDBApalachicola BayDry BarFloridaABHIAranasa BayHarbor IslandTexasABURAranasa BayLong ReefTexasABURAtchafalay BayOyster BayonLouisianaBBSDBarataria BayBayou Saint DenisLouisianaBBTBBarataria BayTurtle BayLouisianaBBMBBarataria BayMiddle BankLouisianaBBMBBarataria BayPrinceton CanalFloridaBBLBarnegat InletBarnegat LightNew JerseyBBMBBolck IslandBlock IslandRhode IslandBBDEDolga BayPrinceton CanalFloridaBBHIBoston HarborDorchester BayMassachusettsBHDBBoston HarborBrevort SurfsideTexasBHHBBoston HarborBrevort SurfsideTexasBSGBreton SoundBay GarderneLouisianaBSSIBreton SoundSable IslandMassachusettsBSGIBreton SoundSable IslandMassachusettsBGNBuzzards BayGooscbury NeckMassachusettsCLCCallou LakeCallou LakeCallou LakeLouisianaCLCCallou LakeCallou LakeCallou LakeLouisianaCLCCallou LakeCallou LakeCallou LakeCorlina </th <th>Code</th> <th>General Location</th> <th>Specific Location</th> <th>State</th>	Code	General Location	Specific Location	State
ABWJAnalekim BayWest JettyCaliforniaAPCPApalachicola BayCat Point BarFloridaAPDBApalachicola BayDry BarFloridaABHIAransas BayLong ReefTexasABURAransas BayLong ReefTexasABURAransas BayLong ReefTexasABBDBarataria BayDoyster BayouLouisianaBBTBBarataria BayMiddle BankLouisianaBBMBBarataria BayMiddle BankLouisianaBBMBBarataria BayMiddle BankLouisianaBBMBBarataria BayMiddle BankLouisianaBBMBBarataria BayMiddle BankLouisianaBBMBBarataria BaySqualicum MarinaWashingtonBBPCBicky IslandBlock IslandRhode IslandBBBEBodega BayBodega Bay EntranceCaliforniaBHDIBoston HarborDeer IslandMassachusettsBHHBBoston HarborDeer IslandMassachusettsBHBBBotson HarborBrerport SurfsideTexasBHBHBuzzards BayRound HillMassachusettsBRFSBruzzards BayAngelica RockMassachusettsBBRHBuzzards BayAngelica RockMassachusettsBBRHBuzzards BayAngelica RockMassachusettsBBRECalesieu LakeCalifou LakeLouisianaCLCCalasieu LakeSable IslandNorth CarolinaCLCCalasieu LakeSa	AIAC	Absecon Inlet	Atlantic City	New Jersev
APCPApalachicola BayCat Point BarFloridaAPDBApalachicola BayDry BarFloridaABHIAransas BayLong ReefTexasABCBAtchafalay BayOyster BayouLouisianaBBSDBarataria BayBayou Saint DenisLouisianaBBTBBarataria BayMiddle BankLouisianaBBTBBarataria BayMiddle BankLouisianaBBTBBarbers PointBarbers PointHawaiiBBTBarbers PointBarbers PointHawaiiBBTBarbers PointBarbers PointHawaiiBBTBodega BayPrinceton CanalFloridaBHIBlock IslandBlock IslandRhode IslandBHDIBoston HarborDorchester BayMassachusettsBHDIBoston HarborDorchester BayMassachusettsBHBIBoston HarborBrewster IslandMassachusettsBHBIBoston HarborBrewster IslandMassachusettsBHBIBoston HarborBay GarderneLouisianaBSSGBreton SoundBay GarderneLouisianaBSSIBreton SoundSable IslandMassachusettsBBRABuzzards BayCosebury NeckMassachusettsBCLCalcasieu LakeCallou LakeLouisianaCLCCallou LakeCallou LakeLouisianaCLCCallou LakeSuint Johns IslandLouisianaCLCCalcasieu LakeSuite SointFloridaCHFCharleston Harbo	ABWJ	Anaheim Bay		
APDBApalachicola BayDry BarFloridaABHIAransas BayLong ReefTexasABLRAransas BayLong ReefTexasABCBAtchafalaya BayOyster BayouLouisianaBBDDBarataria BayTurtle BayLouisianaBBTBBarataria BayMiddle BankLouisianaBBTBBarataria BayMiddle BankLouisianaBBMBBarataria BayMiddle BankLouisianaBBRBBarataria BaySqualicum MarinaWashingtonBBCBiscayne BayPrinceton CanalFloridaBBEBodega BayBodega Bay EntranceCaliforniaBHDIBoston HarborDorchester BayMassachusettsBHDBBoston HarborDorchester BayMassachusettsBHTBBoston HarborBrewster IslandMassachusettsBHTBBoston HarborBrewster IslandMassachusettsBHTBBoston HarborBay GarderneLouisianaBSSIBreton SoundSable IslandLouisianaBSRGNuzzards BayAngelica RockMassachusettsBGNBuzzards BayAngelica RockMassachusettsBCLCalicus LakeCalilou LakeLouisianaCLCCalicus LakeCalilou LakeLouisianaCKLCCalcusieu LakeSable IslandLouisianaCKLCCalcus LakeSable IslandLouisianaCLCCalilou LakeCalilou LakeLouisianaCLCCalcus Lake <t< td=""><td>APCP</td><td></td><td></td><td>Florida</td></t<>	APCP			Florida
ABHIAransas BayHarbor IslandTexasABLRAransas BayLong ReefTexasABOBAtchafalaya BayOyster BayouLouisianaBBDDBarataria BayBayou Saint DenisLouisianaBBTBBarataria BayMiddle BankLouisianaBBTBBarataria BayMiddle BankLouisianaBBRBBarataria BayMiddle BankLouisianaBBRBBarnesp FointHarwaiiHawaiiBBLBarnespa InletBarnespa LightNew JerseyBBSMBellingham BaySqualicum MarinaWashingtonBBRCBiscayne BayPrinceton CanalFloridaBBBBodega BayBodega Bay EntranceCaliforniaBHDIBoston HarborDeer IslandMassachusettsBHBBoston HarborDingham BayMassachusettsBHBBoston HarborBrewster IslandMassachusettsBHBBoston HarborBay GarderneLouisianaBSRGBreton SoundSable IslandLouisianaBSRHBuzzards BayRound HillMassachusettsBBRHBuzzards BayGoosebury NeckMassachusettsBBRHBuzzards BayGoosebury NeckMassachusettsCLCLCalilou LakeCalilou LakeLouisianaCLCLCalilou LakeCalilou LakeLouisianaCLCLCalilou LakeSaint Johns IslandLouisianaCLCLCalilou LakeSaint Johns IslandLouisianaCLSPCa	APDB		Dry Bar	Florida
ABOBAtchafalayaOyačer BayouLouisianaBBSDBarataria BayBayou Saint DenisLouisianaBBTBBarataria BayTurtle BayLouisianaBBMBBarataria BayMiddle BankLouisianaBBRBBartesr PointBaratariaBayou Saint DenisLouisianaBBRBarnegat InletBarnegat LightNew JerseyBBSMBellingham BaySqualicum MarinaWashingtonBBPCBiscayne BayPrinceton CanalFloridaBBIBlock IslandBlock IslandRhode IslandBBBEBodega BayBodega Bay EntranceCaliforniaBHDIBoston HarborDeer IslandMassachusettsBHHBBoston HarborBrewster IslandMassachusettsBHBIBoston HarborBay CarderneLouisianaBSSGBreton SoundBay CarderneLouisianaBSSIBreton SoundSable IslandLouisianaBSRBuzzards BayAngelica RockMassachusettsBCABuzzards BayAngelica RockMassachusettsBCABuzzards BayCoosebury NeckMassachusettsBCABuzzards BayCoosebury NeckMassachusettsBCABuzzards BayCoosebury NeckMassachusettsCLCCalcasieu LakeLake CharlesLouisianaCLCCalcasieu LakeSaint Johns IslandLouisianaCLCCalcasieu LakeShites Folly IslandNorth CarolinaCHFCharleston HarborF	ABHI			Texas
BBSDBarataria BayBáyou Saínt DenisLouisianaBBTBBarataria BayTurtle BayLouisianaBBMBBarataria BayMiddle BankLouisianaBPPBarbers PointBarbers PointHawaiiBBLBarnegat LightNew JerseyBSMBellingham BaySqualicum MarinaWashingtonBBPCBiscayne BayPrinceton CanalFloridaBBBEBodega BayBodega Bay EntranceCaliforniaBHDIBoston HarborDorchester BayMassachusettsBHTBBoston HarborDorchester BayMassachusettsBHTBBoston HarborHingham BayMassachusettsBHBIBoston HarborBerewster IslandMassachusettsBHTBBoston HarborBerewster IslandLouisianaBSSGBreton SoundSable IslandLouisianaBSHBuzzards BayRocued HandMassachusettsBBAHBuzzards BayGoosebury NeckMassachusettsBBARBuzzards BayGoosebury NeckMassachusettsCLCCalcasieu LakeLake CharlesLouisianaCLGCacasieu LakeLake CharlesLouisianaCLGCape FearBattery IslandNorth CarolinaCHFFCharleston HarborFort JohnsonSouth CarolinaCLGCacasieu LakeLake CharlesLouisianaCLGCacasieu LakeLake CharlesLouisianaCLGCacasieu LakeSaint JohnsonSouth Carolina <td< td=""><td>ABLR</td><td>Aransas Bay</td><td>Long Reef</td><td>Texas</td></td<>	ABLR	Aransas Bay	Long Reef	Texas
BBTBBarataria BayTurtle BayLouisianaBBMBBarataria BayMiddle BankLouisianaBPBPBarbers PointHarvatiBIBLBarnegai InletBarbers PointHavatiBBSMBellingham BaySqualicum MarinaWashingtonBBPCBiscayne BayPrinceton CanalFloridaBIBIBlock IslandBlock IslandRhode IslandBBBEBodga BayBodega Bay EntranceCaliforniaBHDBBoston HarborDeer IslandMassachusettsBHTBBoston HarborDorchester BayMassachusettsBHTBBoston HarborBreyster IslandMassachusettsBHTBBoston HarborBreyster IslandMassachusettsBRFSBreton SoundBay GarderneLouisianaBSRGBreton SoundBay GarderneLouisianaBSRIBuzzards BayAngelica RockMassachusettsBBARBuzzards BayAngelica RockMassachusettsBGNBuzzards BayGoosebury NeckMassachusettsCLLCCallou LakeCaillou LakeLouisianaCLGCape AnnGap HeadMossachusettsCFBICape AnnGap HeadMassachusettsCKBPCedar KeyBlack PointHoridaCHFJCharleston HarborFort JohnsonSouth CarolinaCBBICharlotte HarborFort MeyersFloridaCBHCesapeake BayMountain Point BarMarylandCBFCharlotte Harbor	ABOB	Atchafalaya Bay	Oyster Bayou	Louisiana
BBMB BYBP Barbers PointMiddle Bánk Barbers PointLouisiana HawaiiBPBP BBPB BBPDBarbers PointHawaiiBBL BBSMBellingham Bay BBPCSqualicum Marina Block IslandWashingtonBBPC BBPC Biscayne BayPrinceton Canal Princeton CanalFloridaBBBE BHDI Bodega BayBodega Bay Entrance Docchester BayCalifornia MassachusettsBHDI BHDB Boston HarborDorchester Bay Dorchester Bay MassachusettsMassachusettsBHBE BHBI Boston HarborDorchester Bay Hingham Bay MassachusettsMassachusettsBHBI BHBI Boston HarborBerwster Island Bay GarderneMassachusettsBRFS BBAR Buzzards BayRound Angelica Rock MassachusettsLouisianaBSRH BUzzards Bay Club LakeCoosebury Neck Caliou LakeMassachusettsCLC Caliou LakeCaliou Lake Caliou LakeLouisianaCLC Caliou LakeCaliou Lake Caliou LakeLouisianaCLG CAGH Cape AnnGap Head Gap HeadNorth CarolinaCKBP Cedar KeyBlatery IslandNorth CarolinaCHFJ Charleston HarborFort JohnsonSouth CarolinaCHFF Charleston HarborFort blandSouth CarolinaCHFF Charleston HarborFort JohnsonSouth CarolinaCHFF Charleston HarborFort JohnsonSouth CarolinaCHFF Charleston HarborFort JohnsonSouth CarolinaCBH Chesapeake Bay Choctawatchee BayMountain Point Bar M				Louisiana
BPBP BBIDF Barnegat InletBarnegat LightHawaiiBIBL BBSM Bellingham Bay BBSM BBPCBellingham Bay Squalicum MarinaWashingtonBBPC BBSM BBIDC BBSMBellingham Bay Block IslandBlock IslandRhode IslandBBB Bble Bbotega Bay BHDI Boston HarborBodega Bay Entrance Dorchester Bay MassachusettsCaliforniaBHDB BHDB Boston HarborDeer IslandMassachusettsBHTB BHTB Boston HarborHingham Bay Dorchester Bay MassachusettsMassachusettsBHTB BHTB Boston HarborFerrport Surfside Brewster IslandTexasBSG Breton SoundBay Garderne Bay GarderneLouisianaBSTG BBRH Buzzards Bay Caliout LakeCalifornia CalisianaMassachusettsBBRH BBRH Buzzards Bay CLCL Calilou LakeCalilou Lake Calilou LakeLouisianaCLC Calcasieu LakeCalilou Lake CalisianaLouisianaCLGC Calcasieu LakeGoosebury Neck MassachusettsMassachusettsCHFJ Charleston HarborFort Johns Island HarborLouisianaCKBP Cedar Key Calarsen HarborBittery IslandNorth CarolinaCHFJ Charleston HarborFort Meyers Fort Johnson South CarolinaSouth CarolinaCBH Charlotte HarborFort Meyers Fort MeyersFloridaCBH Charlotte HarborFort Meyers Fort MeyersFloridaCBHP Chesapeake Bay Choctawatchee BayHackett Point Bar MarylandMarylandCBHP Chesapeake B		Barataria Bay		
BIBLBarnegat InletBarnegat LightNew JerseyBBSMBellingham BaySqualicum MarinaWashingtonBBPCBiscayne BayPrinceton CanalFloridaBIBIBlock IslandBlock IslandRhode IslandBBBEBodega BayBodega Bay EntranceCaliforniaBHDIBoston HarborDeer IslandMassachusettsBH1BIBoston HarborDorchester BayMassachusettsBHBIBoston HarborBrewster IslandMassachusettsBHBIBoston HarborBay GarderneLouisianaBSSGBreton SoundSable IslandLouisianaBSSIBreton SoundSable IslandLouisianaBBAHBuzzards BayAngelica RockMassachusettsBBARBuzzards BayGoosebury NeckMassachusettsCLCLCalilou LakeCalilou LakeLouisianaCLCLCalilou LakeCalilou LakeLouisianaCLSFCalcasieu LakeSaint Johns IslandNorth CarolinaCAGHCape FearBattery IslandNorth CarolinaCHFJCharleston HarborBind IslandSouth CarolinaCHFJCharleston HarborBitd IslandSouth CarolinaCHFCharleston HarborBattery IslandNorth CarolinaCHFCharleston HarborFort JohnsonSouth CarolinaCAGHCaleasieu LakeSaint JohnsonSouth CarolinaCAGHCaleasieu JakeBattery IslandNorth CarolinaCHFJCharl				
BBSMBellingham BaySqualicum MarinaWashingtonBBPCBiscayne BayPrinceton CanalFloridaBIBIBlock IslandBlock IslandRhode IslandBBBEBodega BayBodega Bay EntranceCaliforniaBHDIBoston HarborDorchester BayMassachusettsBHDBBoston HarborDorchester BayMassachusettsBHBIBoston HarborBrewster IslandMassachusettsBHBIBoston HarborBrewster IslandMassachusettsBRFSBrazos RiverFerrport SurfsideTexasBSGBreton SoundBay GarderneLouisianaBSRHBuzzards BayRound HillMassachusettsBBGNBuzzards BayAngelica RockMassachusettsBGNBuzzards BayCoosebury NeckMassachusettsBGNBuzzards BayCoosebury NeckMassachusettsCLCCalcasieu LakeCalilou LakeLouisianaCLCCalcasieu LakeSaint Johns IslandNorth CarolinaCKBPCedar KeyBlack PointFloridaCHFJCharleston HarborFort JohnsonSouth CarolinaCHSFCharleston HarborFort MeyersFloridaCBBICharleston HarborFort JohnsonSouth CarolinaCKBPCedar KeyBlack PointFloridaCHFJCharleston HarborFort JohnsonSouth CarolinaCBHCharleston HarborFort JohnsonSouth CarolinaCBHCharleston Harbor				
BBPCBiscayne BayPrinceton CanalFloridaBIBIBlock IslandBlock IslandRhode IslandBBBEBodega BayBodega Bay EntranceCaliforniaBHDIBoston HarborDeer IslandMassachusettsBHDBBoston HarborDorchester BayMassachusettsBHHBBoston HarborHingham BayMassachusettsBHHBBoston HarborBrewster IslandMassachusettsBSBGBreton SoundBay GarderneLouisianaBSBIBreton SoundSable IslandLouisianaBBRNBuzzards BayRound HillMassachusettsBBARBuzzards BayAngelica RockMassachusettsBBARBuzzards BayCoosebury NeckMassachusettsCLCCalcasieu LakeLake CharlesLouisianaCLCCalcasieu LakeSaint Johns IslandLouisianaCLGCalcasieu LakeSaint Johns IslandNorth CarolinaCKBPCedar KeyBlack PointFloridaCHFCharleston HarborFort MeyersFloridaCHFCharleston HarborFort MeyersFloridaCBMCharleston HarborFort MeyersFloridaCBMCharleston HarborFort MeyersFloridaCBFCabe RearBlack PointFloridaCBFCharleston HarborFort MeyersFloridaCBFCharleston HarborFort MeyersFloridaCBFCharleston HarborFort MeyersFloridaCB				
BIBIBlock IslandBlock IslandRhode IslandBBBEBodega BayBodega Bay EntranceCaliforniaBHDIBoston HarborDeer IslandMassachusettsBHDBBoston HarborDorchester BayMassachusettsBHHBBoston HarborDorchester BayMassachusettsBHBIBoston HarborBrewster IslandMassachusettsBHBIBoston HarborBrewster IslandMassachusettsBRFSBrazos RiverFerrport SurfsideTexasBSSIBreton SoundSable IslandLouisianaBSRHBuzzards BayRound HillMassachusettsBBARBuzzards BayGosebury NeckMassachusettsBBCNBuzzards BayGosebury NeckMassachusettsCLCCalcasieu LakeLakeCalilou LakeLouisianaCLCCalcasieu LakeSaint Johns IslandLouisianaCLCCalcasieu LakeSaint Johns IslandLouisianaCAGHCape AnnGap HeadMassachusettsCFBICape FearBlatery IslandNorth CarolinaCHFFCharleston HarborFort JohnsonSouth CarolinaCHFFCharleston HarborFort JohnsonSouth CarolinaCBBCCharlotte HarborBird IslandFloridaCBFMCharleston HarborFort JohnsonSouth CarolinaCBFMCharleston HarborFort MeyersFloridaCBFMCharleston HarborBird IslandFloridaCBFMCharlotte Ha				
BBBEBodega BayBodega Bay EntranceCaliforniaBHDIBoston HarborDeer IslandMassachusettsBHDBBoston HarborDorchester BayMassachusettsBHHBBoston HarborHingham BayMassachusettsBHBIBoston HarborBrewster IslandMassachusettsBRFSBrazos RiverFerrport SurfsideTexasBSBGBreton SoundBay GarderneLouisianaBSRIBreton SoundSable IslandLouisianaBBRKBuzzards BayRound HillMassachusettsBBARBuzzards BayGoosebury NeckMassachusettsBBGNBuzzards BayGoosebury NeckMassachusettsCLCCalicasieu LakeLakeCalilou LakeLouisianaCLSCalcasieu LakeLakeCalilou LakeLouisianaCAGHCape AnnGap HeadMassachusettsCFBICape FearBattery IslandNorth CarolinaCKBPCedar KeyBlack PointFloridaCHFJCharleston HarborFort JohnsonSouth CarolinaCHFJCharleston HarborFort MeyersFloridaCBBICharlotte HarborFort MeyersFloridaCBMPChesapeake BayMountain Point BarMarylandCBHPChesapeake BayHackett Point BarMarylandCBHPChesapeake BayCape CharlesVirginiaCBCCChesapeake BayCape CharlesVirginiaCBCCChesapeake BayGoos Hackett				
BHDIBoston HarborDeer IslandMassachusettsBHDBBoston HarborDorchester BayMassachusettsBHHBBoston HarborHingham BayMassachusettsBHBIBoston HarborBrewster IslandMassachusettsBRFSBrazos RiverFerrport SurfsideTexasBSBGBreton SoundBay GarderneLouisianaBSSIBreton SoundSable IslandLouisianaBBARBuzzards BayRound HillMassachusettsBBARBuzzards BayCoosebury NeckMassachusettsBGNBuzzards BayGoosebury NeckMassachusettsCLCCalcasieu LakeLakeLakeLouisianaCLSJCalcasieu LakeSaint Johns IslandLouisianaCKBPCedar KeyBlack PointFloridaCHFJCharleston HarborFort JohnsonSouth CarolinaCKBPCedar KeyBlack PointFloridaCHFJCharleston HarborFort MeyersFloridaCHFJCharlotte HarborFort MeyersFloridaCBMCharlotte HarborFort MeyersFloridaCBMCharlotte HarborFort MeyersFloridaCBMCharlotte HarborFort MeyersVirginiaCBMCharlotte HarborFort MeyersVirginiaCBMCharlotte HarborBorth MarylandCaber VirginiaCBMCharlotte HarborFort MeyersVirginiaCBMCharlotte HarborFort MeyersFlorida<			· ·	
BHDBBoston HarborDorchester BayMassachusettsBHHBBoston HarborHingham BayMassachusettsBRFSBrazos RiverFerrport SurfsideTexasBSBGBreton SoundBay GarderneLouisianaBSSIBreton SoundBay GarderneLouisianaBSRHBuzzards BayRound HillMassachusettsBBRHBuzzards BayAngelica RockMassachusettsBBGNBuzzards BayGosebury NeckMassachusettsCLCCallou LakeCallou LakeLouisianaCLSCalcasieu LakeSaint Johns IslandLouisianaCLSJCalcasieu LakeSaint Johns IslandLouisianaCAGHCape FearBattery IslandNorth CarolinaCHFCharleston HarborFort JohnsonSouth CarolinaCHSFCharleston HarborFort JohnsonSouth CarolinaCHSFCharleston HarborFort JohnsonSouth CarolinaCHSFCharlotte HarborFort MeyersFloridaCBMPChesapeake BayMountain Point BarMarylandCBHPChesapeake BayHackett Point BarMarylandCBHPChesapeake BayDandy PointVirginiaCBCCChesapeake BayHackett Point BarMarylandCBFPChoctawatchee BayShirk PointFloridaCBSPChoctawatchee BayShirk PointFloridaCBSPChoctawatchee BayShirk PointFloridaCBSPChoctawatchee BayShirk Poin				
BHHBBoston HarborHingham BayMassachusettsBHBIBoston HarborBrewster IslandMassachusettsBRFSBrazos RiverFerrport SurfsideTexasBSBGBreton SoundBay GarderneLouisianaBBRHBuzzards BayRound HillMassachusettsBBCNBuzzards BayAngelica RockMassachusettsBBCNBuzzards BayGoosebury NeckMassachusettsCLCCaillou LakeCaillou LakeLouisianaCLSCalcasieu LakeSaint Johns IslandLouisianaCLSJCalcasieu LakeSaint Johns IslandLouisianaCKPICape FearBattery IslandNorth CarolinaCKBPCedar KeyBlack PointFloridaCHFJCharleston HarborFort JohnsonSouth CarolinaCBFMCharlotte HarborBird IslandFloridaCBFICharleston HarborFort MeyersFloridaCBFICharleston HarborFort MeyersFloridaCBFICharleston HarborFort MeyersFloridaCBFICharleston HarborFort MeyersFloridaCBFMCharlotte HarborFort MeyersFloridaCBFMCharlotte HarborFort MeyersFloridaCBHPChesapeake BayHog PointMarylandCBHGChesapeake BayIngram BayVirginiaCBCCChesapeake BayDandy PointVirginiaCBCCChesapeake BayDandy PointVirginiaCBCI </td <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>				
BHBIBoston HarborBrewster IslandMassachusettsBRFSBrazos RiverFerrport SurfsideTexasBSBGBreton SoundBay GarderneLouisianaBSRHBuzzards BayRound HillMassachusettsBBARBuzzards BayAngelica RockMassachusettsBBGNBuzzards BayGoosebury NeckMassachusettsCLCCaillou LakeCallou LakeLouisianaCLSCalcasieu LakeLake CharlesLouisianaCAGHCape AnnGap HeadMassachusettsCKBPCedacsieu LakeSaint Johns IslandLouisianaCAGHCape FearBattery IslandNorth CarolinaCHSFCharleston HarborFort JohnsonSouth CarolinaCHSFCharleston HarborFort JohnsonSouth CarolinaCHSFCharlotte HarborBird IslandFloridaCBHPCheaspeake BayMountain Point BarMarylandCBHPChesapeake BayHackett Point BarMarylandCBHPChesapeake BayHackett Point BarMarylandCBHPChesapeake BayIngram BayVirginiaCBCCChesapeake BayDandy PointVirginiaCBCIChincot. BayCape CharlesVirginiaCBCIChincot. BayChincot. InletVirginiaCBCIChincot. BayChincot. InletVirginiaCBCRCopano BayCopano ReefTexasCBCRCopano BayCopano ReefTexasCCNB <td></td> <td>_</td> <td></td> <td></td>		_		
BRFSBrazos RiverFerrport SurfsideTexasBSBGBreton SoundBay GarderneLouisianaBSSIBreton SoundSable IslandLouisianaBBRHBuzzards BayRound HillMassachusettsBBARBuzzards BayAngelica RockMassachusettsBBGNBuzzards BayGoosebury NeckMassachusettsBGCNBuzzards BayGoosebury NeckMassachusettsCLCLCaillou LakeCaillou LakeLouisianaCLLCCalcasieu LakeLakeLouisianaCLSJCalcasieu LakeSaint Johns IslandLouisianaCAGHCape AnnGap HeadMassachusettsCFBICape FearBlack PointFloridaCHFJCharleston HarborFort JohnsonSouth CarolinaCBICharleston HarborFort MeyersFloridaCBHCharlotte HarborFort MeyersFloridaCBHChesapeake BayMountain Point BarMarylandCBHCChesapeake BayHog PointMarylandCBHCChesapeake BayIngram BayVirginiaCBDPChesapeake BayDandy PointVirginiaCBDPChesapeake BayDandy PointVirginiaCBCCChesapeake BayDandy PointVirginiaCBCCChesapeake BayDandy PointVirginiaCBDPChesapeake BayCape CharlesVirginiaCBCCChesapeake BayDandy PointVirginiaCBCCChesapeake Bay <td< td=""><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></td<>				
BSBGBreton SoundBay GarderneLouisianaBSSIBreton SoundSable IslandLouisianaBBRHBuzzards BayRound HillMassachusettsBBARBuzzards BayAngelica RockMassachusettsBBGNBuzzards BayGoosebury NeckMassachusettsCLCCaillou LakeCaillou LakeLouisianaCLLCCalcasieu LakeLake CharlesLouisianaCLSCalcasieu LakeSaint Johns IslandLouisianaCAGHCape AnnGap HeadMassachusettsCFBICape FearBattery IslandNorth CarolinaCKBPCedar KeyBlack PointFloridaCHFFCharleston HarborFort JohnsonSouth CarolinaCHSFCharleston HarborBird IslandSouth CarolinaCBBICharlotte HarborFort MeyersFloridaCBMPChesapeake BayMountain Point BarMarylandCBHPChesapeake BayHog PointMarylandCBHGChesapeake BayIngram BayVirginiaCBCCChesapeake BayDandy PointVirginiaCBCCChesapeake BayOff Santa RosaFloridaCBTPChoctawatchee BayOff Santa RosaFloridaCBSRChoctawatchee BayOff Santa RosaFloridaCBSRChoctawatchee BayOff Santa RosaFloridaCBSRChoctawatchee BayOff Santa RosaFloridaCBSRChoctawatchee BayOff Santa RosaFlorida				
BSS1Breton SoundSable IslandLouisianaBBRHBuzzards BayRound HillMassachusettsBBARBuzzards BayAngelica RockMassachusettsBBGNBuzzards BayGoosebury NeckMassachusettsCLCLCaillou LakeCaillou LakeLouisianaCLSJCalcasieu LakeLake CharlesLouisianaCAGHCape AnnGap HeadMassachusettsCFBICape FearBattery IslandNorth CarolinaCHSFCharleston HarborFort JohnsonSouth CarolinaCHSFCharleston HarborShutes Folly IslandSouth CarolinaCBBICharlotte HarborFort MeyersFloridaCBHChesapeake BayMountain Point BarMarylandCBHPChesapeake BayHog FointMarylandCBHPChesapeake BayHog FointMarylandCBHGChesapeake BayIngram BayVirginiaCBCCChesapeake BayDandy PointVirginiaCBCCChesapeake BayDandy PointVirginiaCBCCChesapeake BayOff Santa RosaFloridaCBSPChoctawatchee BayOff Santa RosaFloridaCBSPChoctawatchee BayOff Santa RosaFloridaCBSPColourbia RiverSouth JettyOregonCBCLChincot. BayCoos HeadOregonCBSRChoctawatchee BayCoos HeadOregonCBCRCopano BayCoos HeadOregonCBCRCopano Ba				
BBRHBuzzards BayRound HillMassachusettsBBARBuzzards BayAngelica RockMassachusettsBBGNBuzzards BayGoosebury NeckMassachusettsCLCLCaillou LakeCaillou LakeLouisianaCLLCCalcasieu LakeLakeLouisianaCLSJCalcasieu LakeLakeLouisianaCAGHCape AnnGap HeadMassachusettsCKBPCedar KeyBlack PointFloridaCHFJCharleston HarborFort JohnsonSouth CarolinaCKBPCedar KeyBlack PointFloridaCHFJCharleston HarborFort JohnsonSouth CarolinaCBFMCharlotte HarborFort MeyersFloridaCBHPChesapeake BayMountain Point BarMarylandCBHPChesapeake BayHog PointMarylandCBHGChesapeake BayIngram BayVirginiaCBCCChesapeake BayDandy PointVirginiaCBCCChesapeake BayDandy PointVirginiaCBCCChesapeake BayDandy PointFloridaCBCIChincot. BayChincot. InletVirginiaCBSRChoctawatchee BayShirk PointFloridaCBSPChoctawatchee BayCoos HeadOregonCBRPCoos BayCoos HeadOregonCBRPCoos BayCoos HeadOregonCBRPCoos BayCoos HarborTexasCBRPCoos BayCopano ReefTexasCCBH <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>				
BBARBuzzards BayAngelica RockMassachusettsBBGNBuzzards BayGoosebury NeckMassachusettsCLCLCaillou LakeCaillou LakeLouisianaCLLCCalcasieu LakeLake CharlesLouisianaCLSJCalcasieu LakeSaint Johns IslandLouisianaCAGHCape AnnGap HeadMassachusettsCFBICape FearBattery IslandNorth CarolinaCKBPCedar KeyBlack PointFloridaCHFJCharleston HarborFort JohnsonSouth CarolinaCHSFCharleston HarborShutes Folly IslandSouth CarolinaCBICharleston HarborFort MeyersFloridaCBFMCharlette HarborBird IslandFloridaCBHCharlette HarborFort MeyersFloridaCBHPChesapeake BayMountain Point BarMarylandCBHGChesapeake BayHackett Point BarMarylandCBHGChesapeake BayIngram BayVirginiaCBCCChesapeake BayDandy PointVirginiaCBCIChincot. BayChincot. InletVirginiaCBSPChoctawatchee BaySouth JettyOregonCBSRChoctawatchee BayGoos HeadOregonCBSRCoctawatchee BayCopano ReefTexasCOBSRCoos BayCoos HeadOregonCBCRCopano BayCoos HeadOregonCBCRCopano BayCopano ReefTexasCCBCCorpus Christi <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>_</td>				_
BBGNBuzzards BayGoosebury NeckMassachusettsCLCLCaillou LakeCaillou LakeLouisianaCLLCCalcasieu LakeLake CharlesLouisianaCLSJCalcasieu LakeSaint Johns IslandLouisianaCAGHCape AnnGap HeadMassachusettsCFBICape FearBattery IslandNorth CarolinaCKBPCedar KeyBlack PointFloridaCHFJCharleston HarborFort JohnsonSouth CarolinaCBBICharleston HarborFort JohnsonSouth CarolinaCBFMCharlotte HarborBird IslandFloridaCBFMCharlotte HarborFort MeyersFloridaCBHPChesapeake BayMountain Point BarMarylandCBHGChesapeake BayHog PointMarylandCBHGChesapeake BayIngram BayVirginiaCBCCChesapeake BayDandy PointVirginiaCBCCChesapeake BayDandy PointVirginiaCBCCChincot. BayChincot. InletVirginiaCBSPChoctawatchee BayShirk PointFloridaCBSRChoctawatchee BayOff Santa RosaFloridaCBSPCoctawatchee BayCoos HeadOregonCBSRChoctawatchee BayCoos HeadOregonCBSRCoos BayCoos HeadOregonCBCRCopano BayCoos HeadOregonCBCRCopano BayCopano ReefTexasCCICCorpus ChristiBoat Harbo				
CLCLCaillou LakéCaillou LakeLouisianaCLJCCalcasieu LakeLake CharlesLouisianaCLSJCalcasieu LakeSaint Johns IslandLouisianaCAGHCape AnnGap HeadMassachusettsCFBICape FearBattery IslandNorth CarolinaCKBPCedar KeyBlack PointFloridaCHFJCharleston HarborFort JohnsonSouth CarolinaCBBICharleston HarborBird IslandSouth CarolinaCBFCharleston HarborBird IslandSouth CarolinaCBFCharleston HarborBird IslandFloridaCBFMCharlotte HarborFort MeyersFloridaCBMPChesapeake BayMountain Point BarMarylandCBHGChesapeake BayHog PointMarylandCBHGChesapeake BayIngram BayVirginiaCBCCChesapeake BayDandy PointVirginiaCBCIChincot. BayCape CharlesVirginiaCBCIChincot. BayChincot. InletVirginiaCBSPChoctawatchee BayShirk PointFloridaCBSRChoctawatchee BayTahlequah PointWashingtonCBCHCoos BayCoos HeadOregonCBCRCopano BayCopano ReefTexasCCBHCorpus ChristiBoat HarborTexasCCNBCorpus ChristiNoth SeaseTexasCCNBCorpus ChristiNatesel PointTexas				
CLLCCalcasieu LakeLake CharlesLouisianaCLSJCalcasieu LakeSaint Johns IslandLouisianaCAGHCape AnnGap HeadMassachusettsCFBICape FearBattery IslandNorth CarolinaCKBPCedar KeyBlack PointFloridaCHFJCharleston HarborFort JohnsonSouth CarolinaCHSFCharleston HarborShutes Folly IslandSouth CarolinaCBBICharlotte HarborFort MeyersFloridaCBMPChesapeake BayMountain Point BarMarylandCBHPChesapeake BayHog PointMarylandCBHGChesapeake BayIngram BayVirginiaCBCCChesapeake BayDandy PointVirginiaCBCCChesapeake BayDandy PointVirginiaCBCIChincot. BayChincot. InletVirginiaCBCIChincot. BayColumbia RiverSouth JettyCBSRChoctawatchee BayShirk PointFloridaCBSRChoctawatchee BayTahlequah PointWashingtonCBCHCoos BayCoos HeadOregonCBCRCopano BayCopano ReefTexasCCBRCopus ChristiBoat HarborTexasCCNBCorpus ChristiNoth SeasTexas				
CLSJCalcasieu LakeSaint Johns IslandLouisianaCAGHCape AnnGap HeadMassachusettsCFBICape FearBattery IslandNorth CarolinaCKBPCedar KeyBlack PointFloridaCHFJCharleston HarborFort JohnsonSouth CarolinaCBFCharleston HarborFort JohnsonSouth CarolinaCBFCharleston HarborShutes Folly IslandSouth CarolinaCBFCharleston HarborFort JohnsonSouth CarolinaCBBICharlotte HarborFort MeyersFloridaCBMPChesapeake BayMountain Point BarMarylandCBHPChesapeake BayHog PointMarylandCBIBChesapeake BayIngram BayVirginiaCBCCChesapeake BayDandy PointVirginiaCBCCChesapeake BayDandy PointVirginiaCBCIChincot. BayChincot. InletVirginiaCBSPChoctawatchee BayShirk PointFloridaCBSPColumbia RiverSouth JettyOregonCBCHCoos BayCoos HeadOregonCBCRCopano BayCopano ReefTexasCCICCorpus ChristiBoat HarborTexasCCICCorpus ChristiNeuces BayTexas				
CAGHCape AnnGap HeadMassachusettsCFBICape FearBattery IslandNorth CarolinaCKBPCedar KeyBlack PointFloridaCHFJCharleston HarborFort JohnsonSouth CarolinaCHSFCharleston HarborShutes Folly IslandSouth CarolinaCBBICharleston HarborBird IslandFloridaCBFMCharlotte HarborFort MeyersFloridaCBMPChesapeake BayMountain Point BarMarylandCBHGChesapeake BayHog PointMarylandCBHGChesapeake BayIngram BayVirginiaCBCCChesapeake BayDandy PointVirginiaCBCCChesapeake BayDandy PointVirginiaCBCCChesapeake BayDandy PointVirginiaCBCIChincot. BayChircot. InletVirginiaCBSRChoctawatchee BayShirk PointFloridaCBSRChoctawatchee BayOff Santa RosaFloridaCBTPCommencement BayCoos HeadOregonCBCHCoos BayRussell PointOregonCBCRCopano BayCopano ReefTexasCCICCorpus ChristiIngleside CoveTexasCCICCorpus ChristiIngleside CoveTexas				
CFBICape FearBattery IslandNorth CarolinaCKBPCedar KeyBlack PointFloridaCHFJCharleston HarborFort JohnsonSouth CarolinaCHSFCharleston HarborShutes Folly IslandSouth CarolinaCBBICharlotte HarborBird IslandFloridaCBFMCharlotte HarborFort MeyersFloridaCBHPChesapeake BayMountain Point BarMarylandCBHGChesapeake BayHog PointMarylandCBHGChesapeake BayHog PointMarylandCBHGChesapeake BayIngram BayVirginiaCBCCChesapeake BayDandy PointVirginiaCBCCChesapeake BayCape CharlesVirginiaCBCCChesapeake BayDandy PointVirginiaCBCIChincot. BayChincot. InletVirginiaCBSPChoctawatchee BayOff Santa RosaFloridaCRSJColumbia RiverSouth JettyOregonCBCHCoos BayCoos HeadOregonCBCRCopano BayCopano ReefTexasCCICCorpus ChristiIngleside CoveTexasCCICCorpus ChristiIngleside CoveTexasCCNBCorpus ChristiNeuces BayTexas		-		
CKBPCedar KeyBlack PointFloridaCHFJCharleston HarborFort JohnsonSouth CarolinaCHSFCharleston HarborShutes Folly IslandSouth CarolinaCBBICharlotte HarborBird IslandFloridaCBFMCharlotte HarborFort MeyersFloridaCBFMCharlotte HarborFort MeyersFloridaCBFMCharlotte HarborFort MeyersFloridaCBMPChesapeake BayMountain Point BarMarylandCBHGChesapeake BayHackett Point BarMarylandCBHGChesapeake BayHog PointMarylandCBIBChesapeake BayIngram BayVirginiaCBCCChesapeake BayDandy PointVirginiaCBCIChincot. BayChincot. InletVirginiaCBSPChoctawatchee BayShirk PointFloridaCBSRChoctawatchee BayOff Santa RosaFloridaCRSJColumbia RiverSouth JettyOregonCBCHCoos BayCoos HeadOregonCBRPCoos BayCopano ReefTexasCCBHCorpus ChristiBoat HarborTexasCCICCorpus ChristiIngleside CoveTexasCCNBCorpus ChristiNeuces BayTexas				
CHFJCharleston HarborFort JohnsonSouth CarolinaCHSFCharleston HarborShutes Folly IslandSouth CarolinaCBBICharlotte HarborBird IslandFloridaCBFMCharlotte HarborFort MeyersFloridaCBFMCharlotte HarborFort MeyersFloridaCBMPChesapeake BayMountain Point BarMarylandCBHPChesapeake BayHackett Point BarMarylandCBHGChesapeake BayHog PointMarylandCBIBChesapeake BayIngram BayVirginiaCBCChesapeake BayDandy PointVirginiaCBCChesapeake BayDandy PointVirginiaCBCChesapeake BayDandy PointVirginiaCBCChesapeake BayDandy PointVirginiaCBCChoctawatchee BayShirk PointFloridaCBSPChoctawatchee BayOff Santa RosaFloridaCBSRChoumbia RiverSouth JettyOregonCBTPCommencement BayTahlequah PointWashingtonCBCHCoos BayCoos HeadOregonCBRPCoos BayCopano ReefTexasCCBHCorpus ChristiBoat HarborTexasCCICCorpus ChristiIngleside CoveTexasCCNBCorpus ChristiNeuces BayTexas				
CHSFCharleston HarborShutes Folly IslandSouth CarolinaCBBICharlotte HarborBird IslandFloridaCBFMCharlotte HarborFort MeyersFloridaCBMPChesapeake BayMountain Point BarMarylandCBHPChesapeake BayHackett Point BarMarylandCBHGChesapeake BayHog PointMarylandCBHGChesapeake BayIngram BayVirginiaCBCCChesapeake BayCape CharlesVirginiaCBCCChesapeake BayDandy PointVirginiaCBCIChincot. BayChincot. InletVirginiaCBSPChoctawatchee BayShirk PointFloridaCBSRChoctawatchee BayOff Santa RosaFloridaCBTPCommencement BayTahlequah PointWashingtonCBCHCoos BayCoos HeadOregonCBCRCopano BayCopano ReefTexasCCBHCorpus ChristiIngleside CoveTexasCCNBCorpus ChristiNeuces BayTexas				
CBBICharlotte HarborBird IslandFloridaCBFMCharlotte HarborFort MeyersFloridaCBMPChesapeake BayMountain Point BarMarylandCBHPChesapeake BayHackett Point BarMarylandCBHGChesapeake BayHog PointMarylandCBIBChesapeake BayIngram BayVirginiaCBCCChesapeake BayCape CharlesVirginiaCBDPChesapeake BayDandy PointVirginiaCBCIChincot. BayChincot. InletVirginiaCBSRChoctawatchee BayShirk PointFloridaCBSRChoctawatchee BayOff Santa RosaFloridaCRSJColumbia RiverSouth JettyOregonCBTPCommencement BayTahlequah PointWashingtonCBCHCoos BayCopano ReefTexasCBRPCoos BayCopano ReefTexasCCBHCorpus ChristiIngleside CoveTexasCCICCorpus ChristiIngleside CoveTexasCCNBCorpus ChristiNeuces BayTexas				
CBFMCharlotte HarborFort MeyersFloridaCBMPChesapeake BayMountain Point BarMarylandCBHPChesapeake BayHackett Point BarMarylandCBHGChesapeake BayHog PointMarylandCBIBChesapeake BayIngram BayVirginiaCBCCChesapeake BayCape CharlesVirginiaCBDPChesapeake BayDandy PointVirginiaCBCIChincot. BayChincot. InletVirginiaCBSPChoctawatchee BayShirk PointFloridaCBSRChoctawatchee BayOff Santa RosaFloridaCRSJColumbia RiverSouth JettyOregonCBCHCoos BayCoos HeadOregonCBCRCopano BayCopano ReefTexasCCBHCorpus ChristiBoat HarborTexasCCICCorpus ChristiIngleside CoveTexasCCNBCorpus ChristiNeuces BayTexas				
CBMPChesapeake BayMountain Point BarMarylandCBHPChesapeake BayHackett Point BarMarylandCBHGChesapeake BayHog PointMarylandCBIBChesapeake BayIngram BayVirginiaCBCCChesapeake BayCape CharlesVirginiaCBDPChesapeake BayDandy PointVirginiaCBCIChincot. BayChincot. InletVirginiaCBSPChoctawatchee BayShirk PointFloridaCBSRChoctawatchee BayOff Santa RosaFloridaCRSJColumbia RiverSouth JettyOregonCBCHCoos BayCoos HeadOregonCBRPCoos BayCopano ReefTexasCCBRCopano BayCopano ReefTexasCCICCorpus ChristiIngleside CoveTexasCCICCorpus ChristiIngleside CoveTexasCCNBCorpus ChristiNeuces BayTexas				
CBHPChesapeake BayHackett Point BarMarylandCBHGChesapeake BayHog PointMarylandCBIBChesapeake BayIngram BayVirginiaCBCCChesapeake BayCape CharlesVirginiaCBDPChesapeake BayDandy PointVirginiaCBCIChincot. BayChincot. InletVirginiaCBSPChoctawatchee BayShirk PointFloridaCBSRChoctawatchee BayOff Santa RosaFloridaCRSJColumbia RiverSouth JettyOregonCBCHCoos BayCoos HeadOregonCBCRCopano BayCopano ReefTexasCCBHCorpus ChristiBoat HarborTexasCCICCorpus ChristiIngleside CoveTexasCCNBCorpus ChristiNeuces BayTexas				Maryland
CBHGChesapeake BayHog PointMarylandCBIBChesapeake BayIngram BayVirginiaCBCCChesapeake BayCape CharlesVirginiaCBDPChesapeake BayDandy PointVirginiaCBCIChincot. BayChincot. InletVirginiaCBSPChoctawatchee BayShirk PointFloridaCBSRChoctawatchee BayOff Santa RosaFloridaCRSJColumbia RiverSouth JettyOregonCBTPCommencement BayTahlequah PointWashingtonCBCHCoos BayCoos HeadOregonCBRPCoos BayCopano ReefTexasCCBHCorpus ChristiBoat HarborTexasCCICCorpus ChristiIngleside CoveTexasCCNBCorpus ChristiNeuces BayTexas				
CBIBChesapeake BayIngram BayVirginiaCBCCChesapeake BayCape CharlesVirginiaCBDPChesapeake BayDandy PointVirginiaCBCIChincot. BayChincot. InletVirginiaCBSPChoctawatchee BayShirk PointFloridaCBSRChoctawatchee BayOff Santa RosaFloridaCRSJColumbia RiverSouth JettyOregonCBTPCommencement BayTahlequah PointWashingtonCBCHCoos BayCoos HeadOregonCBRPCoos BayCopano ReefTexasCCBHCorpus ChristiBoat HarborTexasCCICCorpus ChristiIngleside CoveTexasCCNBCorpus ChristiNeuces BayTexas	CBHG	Chesapeake Bay	Hog Point	Maryland
CBCCChesapeake BayCape CharlesVirginiaCBDPChesapeake BayDandy PointVirginiaCBCIChincot. BayChincot. InletVirginiaCBSPChoctawatchee BayShirk PointFloridaCBSRChoctawatchee BayOff Santa RosaFloridaCBSRChoctawatchee BayOff Santa RosaFloridaCBSRCourbia RiverSouth JettyOregonCBTPCommencement BayTahlequah PointWashingtonCBCHCoos BayCoos HeadOregonCBRPCoos BayCopano ReefTexasCCBHCorpus ChristiBoat HarborTexasCCICCorpus ChristiIngleside CoveTexasCCNBCorpus ChristiNeuces BayTexas			Ingram Bay	
CBDPChesapeake BayDandy PointVirginiaCBCIChincot. BayChincot. InletVirginiaCBSPChoctawatchee BayShirk PointFloridaCBSRChoctawatchee BayOff Santa RosaFloridaCBSRColumbia RiverSouth JettyOregonCBTPCommencement BayTahlequah PointWashingtonCBCHCoos BayCoos HeadOregonCBRPCoos BayCopano ReefTexasCCBHCorpus ChristiBoat HarborTexasCCICCorpus ChristiIngleside CoveTexasCCNBCorpus ChristiNeuces BayTexas				
CBCIChincot. BayChincot. InletVirginiaCBSPChoctawatchee BayShirk PointFloridaCBSRChoctawatchee BayOff Santa RosaFloridaCBSRChoctawatchee BayOff Santa RosaFloridaCRSJColumbia RiverSouth JettyOregonCBTPCommencement BayTahlequah PointWashingtonCBCHCoos BayCoos HeadOregonCBRPCoos BayRussell PointOregonCBCRCopano BayCopano ReefTexasCCBHCorpus ChristiBoat HarborTexasCCICCorpus ChristiIngleside CoveTexasCCNBCorpus ChristiNeuces BayTexas				
CBSPChoctawatchee BayShirk PointFloridaCBSRChoctawatchee BayOff Santa RosaFloridaCRSJColumbia RiverSouth JettyOregonCBTPCommencement BayTahlequah PointWashingtonCBCHCoos BayCoos HeadOregonCBRPCoos BayRussell PointOregonCBCRCopano BayCopano ReefTexasCCBHCorpus ChristiBoat HarborTexasCCICCorpus ChristiIngleside CoveTexasCCNBCorpus ChristiNeuces BayTexas				
CBSRChoctawatchee BayOff Santa RosaFloridaCRSJColumbia RiverSouth JettyOregonCBTPCommencement BayTahlequah PointWashingtonCBCHCoos BayCoos HeadOregonCBRPCoos BayRussell PointOregonCBCRCopano BayCopano ReefTexasCCBHCorpus ChristiBoat HarborTexasCCICCorpus ChristiIngleside CoveTexasCCNBCorpus ChristiNeuces BayTexas	CBSP		Shirk Point	
CBTPCommencement BayTahlequah PointWashingtonCBCHCoos BayCoos HeadOregonCBRPCoos BayRussell PointOregonCBCRCopano BayCopano ReefTexasCCBHCorpus ChristiBoat HarborTexasCCICCorpus ChristiIngleside CoveTexasCCNBCorpus ChristiNeuces BayTexas	CBSR		Off Santa Rosa	
CBTPCommencement BayTahlequah PointWashingtonCBCHCoos BayCoos HeadOregonCBRPCoos BayRussell PointOregonCBCRCopano BayCopano ReefTexasCCBHCorpus ChristiBoat HarborTexasCCICCorpus ChristiIngleside CoveTexasCCNBCorpus ChristiNeuces BayTexas	CRSJ	Columbia River	South Jetty	Oregon
CBRPCoos BayRussell PointOregonCBCRCopano BayCopano ReefTexasCCBHCorpus ChristiBoat HarborTexasCCICCorpus ChristiIngleside CoveTexasCCNBCorpus ChristiNeuces BayTexas	CBTP	Commencement Bay	Tahlequah Point	Washington
CBCRCopano BayCopano ReefTexasCCBHCorpus ChristiBoat HarborTexasCCICCorpus ChristiIngleside CoveTexasCCNBCorpus ChristiNeuces BayTexas		Coos Bay		Oregon
CCBHCorpus ChristiBoat HarborTexasCCICCorpus ChristiIngleside CoveTexasCCNBCorpus ChristiNeuces BayTexas				Oregon
CCICCorpus ChristiIngleside CoveTexasCCNBCorpus ChristiNeuces BayTexas				
CCNB Corpus Christi Neuces Bay Texas				
DBFE Delaware Bay False Egg Island Point Delaware				
	DBFE	Delaware Bay	False Egg Island Point	Delaware

Code	General Location	Specific Location	State
DBBD	Delaware Bay	Ben Davis Point Shoal	Delaware
DBKI	Delaware Bay	Kelly Island	Delaware
EBFR	Elliott Bay	Four-Mile Rock	Washington
ESSP	Espiritu Santo	South Pass Reef	Texas
ESBD	Espiritu Santo	Bill Days Reef	Texas
EVFU	Everglades	Faka Union Bay	Florida
FIEL	Farallon Island	East Landing	California
GBHR	Galveston Bay	Hanna Reef	Texas
GBSC	Galveston Bay	Ship Channel	Texas
GBYC	Galveston Bay	Yacht Club	Texas
GBTD	Galveston Bay	Todd's Dump	Texas
GBCR	Galveston Bay	Confed.Reef	Texas
GBOB	Galveston Bay	Offats Bayou	Texas
GHWJ	Gray's Harbor	Westport Jetty	Washington
HHKL	Honolulu Harbor	Keehi Lagoon	Hawaii
HRJB	Hudson/Raritan Estuary	Jamaica Bay	New York
HRUB	Hudson/Raritan Estuary	Upper Bay	New York
HRLB	Hudson/Raritan Estuary	Lower Bay	New York
HMBJ	Humboldt Bay	Jetty	California
IBNJ	Imperial Beach	North Jetty	California
IRSR	Indian River	Sebastian River	Florida
JHJH	Joseph Harbor Bayou	Joseph Harbor Bay	Louisiana
KAUI	Kauai	Nawiliwili Harbor	Hawaii
LJLJ	La Jolla	Point La Jolla	California
LMSB	Laguna Madre	South Bay	Texas
LMPI	Laguna Madre	Port Isabell	Texas
LBNO	Lake Borgne	New Orleans	Louisiana
LBMP	Lake Borgne	Malheureux Point	Louisiana
LICR	Long Island Sound	Connecticut River	Connecticut
LINH	Long Island Sound	New Haven	Connecticut
LIHR	Long Island Sound	Housatonic River	Connecticut
LISI LIHU	Long Island Sound	Sheffield Island Huntington Harbor	Connecticut New York
LIPJ	Long Island Sound	Huntington Harbor Port Jefferson	New York
LIMR	Long Island Sound Long Island Sound	Mamaroneck	New York
LIHH	Long Island Sound	Hempstead Harbor	New York
LITN	Long Island Sound	Throgs Neck	New York
MDSJ	Marina Del Rey	South Jetty	California
MBEM	Matagorda Bay	East Matagorda	Texas
MBDI	Matagorda Bay	Dog Island	Texas
MBCB	Matagorda Bay	Carancahua Bay	Texas
MBTP	Matagorda Bay	Tres Palacios Bay	Texas
MBGP	Matagorda Bay	Gallinipper Point	Texas
MBLR	Matagorda Bay	Lavaca River Mouth	Texas
MRCB	Matanzas River	Cresent Beach	Florida
MSSP	Merriconeag Sound	Stover Point	Maine
MBAR	Mesquite Bay	Ayres Point	Texas
MRTP	Mississippi River	Tiger Pass	Louisiana
MRPL	Mississippi River	Pass a Loutre	Louisiana
MSPB	Mississippi Sound	Pascagoula Bay	Mississippi
MSBB	Mississippi Sound	Biloxi Bay	Mississippi
MSPC	Mississippi Sound	Pass Christian	Mississippi
MBVB	Mission Bay	Ventura Bridge	California
MBHI	Mobile Bay	Hollingers Island Channel	Alabama
MBCP	Mobile Bay	Cedar Point Reef	Alabama
MBSC	Monterey Bay	Point Santa Cruz	California

. .

G-2

Code	General Location	Specific Location	State
MBTH	Moriches Bay	Tuthill Point	New York
NYLB	New York Bight	Long Branch	New Jersey
NYSH	Raritan Bay	Sandy Hook Bay	New Jersey
NYSR	New York Bight	Shark River	New Jersey
NBNB	Naples Bay	Naples Bay	Florida
NBDU	Narragansett Bay	Dutch Island	Rhode Island
NBDI	Narragansett Bay	Dyer Island	Rhode Island
NBWJ	Newport Beach	Wedge Jetty	California
NMML	North Miami	Maule Lake	Florida
OEIH	Oakland Estuary	Inner Harbor	California
OSBJ	Oceanside	Beach Jetty	California
PGLP	Pacific Grove	Lovers Point	California
PVRP	Palos Verdes	Royal Palms State Park	California
PSWB	Pamlico Sound	Wysoching Bay	North Carolina
PCMP	Panama City	Municipal Pier	Florida
PBSI	Penobscot Bay	Sears Island	Maine
PBPI	Penobscot Bay	Pickering Island	Maine
PBPH	Pensacola Bay	Public Harbor	Florida
PBIB	Pensacola Bay	Indian Bayou	Florida
PVMC	Port Valdez	Mineral Čreek Flats	Alaska
PALH	Point Arena	Lighthouse	California
PCPC	Point Conception	Point Conception	California
PDSC	Point Delgada	Shelter Cove	California
PDPD	Point Dume	Point Dume	California
PLLH	Point Loma	Lighthouse	California
PRPR	Point Roberts	Point Roberts	Washington
SBSB	Point Santa Barbara	PointSanta Barbara	California
SGSG	Point Saint George	Point Saint George	California
QIUB	Quinby Inlet	Upshur Bay	Virginia
RSJC	Roanoke Sound	John Creek	North Carolina
RBHC	Rookery Bay	Henderson Creek	Florida
SCBR	South Catalina Island	Bird Rock	California
JFCF	South Juan de Fuca	Cape Flattery	Washington
SSBI	South Puget Sound	Budd Inlet	Washington
SLBB	Sabine Lake	Blue Buck Point	Texas
SHFP	Salem Harbor	Folger Point	Massachusetts
SAMP	San Antonio Bay	Mosquito Point	Texas
SAPP	San Antonio Bay	Panther Point Reef	Texas
SDHI	San Diego Bay	Harbor Island	California
SFDB	San Francisco Bay	Dumbarton Br.	California
SFSM	San Francisco Bay	San Mateo Bridge	California
SFEM	San Francisco Bay	Emeryville	California
SLSL	San Luis Obispo Bay	Point San Luis	California
SANM	San Miguel Island	Tyler Bight	California
SPFP	San Pedro Harbor	Fishing Pier	California
SPSP	San Francisco Bay	San Pablo Bay	California
SSSS	San Simeon Point	San Simeon Point	California
SCFP	Santa Cruz Island	Fraser Point	California
SSSI	Sapelo Sound	Sapelo Island	Georgia
SRTI	Savannah River Estuary	Tybee Island	Georgia
SIWP	Sinclair Inlet	Waterman Point	Washington
SAWB	Saint Andrew Bay	Watson Bayou	Florida
SJCB	Saint Johns River	Chicopit Bay	Florida
SRWP	Suwannee River	West Pass	Florida
TBMK	Tampa Bay Tampa Bay	Mullet Key Bayou	Florida
TBCB	Tampa Bay	Cockroach Bay	Florida

G-3

Code	General Location	Specific Location	Sta
TBHB	Tampa Bay	Hillsborough Bay	Flo
TBPB	Tampa Bay	Papys Bayou	Flo
TBOT	Tampa Bay	Old Tampa Bay	Flo
TBLB	Terrebonne Bay	Lake Barre	Lou
TBHP	Tillamook Bay	Hobsonville Point	Ore
TBSR	Tomales Bay	Spanger's Res.	Cal
UISB	Unakwit Inlet	Siwash Bay	Ala
VBSP	Vermillion Bay	Southwest Pass	Lou
WIPP	Whidbey Island	Possession Point	Wa
YBOP	Yaquina Bay	Oneata Point	Ore
YHSS	Yaquina Bay	Sally's Slough	Ore
YHYH	Yaquina Head	Yaquina Head	Ore
,			

NS&T Program Benthic Surveillance Sites

Code	Location	State
APA	Apalachicola Bay	Florida
BAR	Barataria Bay	Louisiana
BOD	Bodega Bay	California
BOS	Boston Harbor	Massachusetts
BUZ	Buzzards Bay	Massachusetts
CAS	Casco Bay	Maine
CCB	Corpus Christi Bay	Texas
CHS	Charleston Harbor	South Carolina
COL	Columbia River	Oregon
COM	Commencement Bay	Washington
COO	Coos Bay	Oregon
DAN	Dana Point	California
DEL	Delaware Bay	Delaware
ELIE	Long Island Sound	Connecticut
ELL	Elliott Bay	Washington
END	Prudhoe Bay	Alaska
FRB	Frenchman Bay	Maine
GAL	Galveston Bay	Texas
GRB	Great Bay	New Jersey
HER	Heron Bay	Mississippi
HMB	Humboldt Bay	California
HUN	Hunters Point	California
LCB	Lower Chesapeake Bay	Virginia
LLM	Lower Laguna Madre	Texas
LNB	Long Beach	California
LOT	Charlotte Harbor	Florida
LUT	Lutak Inlet	Alaska
MAC	Machias Bay	Maine
MCB	Middle Chesapeake Bay	Virginia
MER	Merrimack River	Massachusetts
MOB	Mobile Bay	Alabama
MON	Monterey Bay	California
MRD	Mississippi Delta	Louisiana
NAH	Nahku Bay	Alaska
NAR	Narragansett Bay	Rhode Island
NIS	Nisqually Reach	Washington
OAK	Oakland Estuary	California
	-	

State

Florida Florida Louisiana Oregon California Alaska Louisiana Washington Oregon Oregon

OLI Oliktok Point Alaška PAM Pankio Sound North Carolina PEN Pensacola Bay Florida RNB Penobsot Bay Maine RAR Raritan Bay New Jersey ROU Round Island New Jersey SAB San Antonio Bay Texas SAI Salem Harbor California SDF Saged Island Georgia SDA San Diego Harbor California SHS Southhampton Shoal California SHS Southhampton Shoal California SPB San Pedro Bay California SPB Santa Monica Bay California SPB San Pedro Bay California SPB San Pedro Bay California SPC San Pedro Bay California SPC San Pedro Bay California CB Upper Chesapeake Bay Maryland WLI West Long Island Sound New York	Code	Location	1	State
	PAB PAM PEN PNB RAR ROU SAB SAL SAP SDA SDF SDA SDF SEA SHS SJR SMB SPB SPC TAM UCB	San Pablo Bay Pamlico Sound Pensacola Bay Penobscot Bay Raritan Bay Round Island San Antonio Bay Salem Harbor Sapelo Island San Diego Harbor San Diego Bay Seal Beach Southhampton Shoal Saint Johns River Santa Monica Bay San Pedro Bay San Pedro Canyon Tampa Bay Upper Chesapeake Bay		California North Carolina Florida Maine New Jersey Mississippi Texas Massachusetts Georgia California California California Florida California California Florida California California Florida California Florida Maryland
				<i>′</i> .
				i i
		:		
	• •	5		18 - <i>2</i>
	· , ,	· · · ·		
		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
	-			
	, •	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
		`*		
				· •
				• •
				91 - A
		(a) A set of the se		
	a sea a			
	•			. *
				1 . A
		· · · ·		

.

.

G-5

★U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE: 1991 - 594 - 721/43076