Revised Federal Standard Proposed for Copper in Marine Waters

Presented by
Chris Miller, City of Newport Beach, and
Shelly Anghera, Ph.D., and Wendy Hovel, Ph.D.
September 12, 2016
Overview

- EPA issued for public comment draft aquatic life criteria for copper in estuarine/marine waters (July 2016)
  - Updated water quality criteria uses the Biotic Ligand Model (BLM), which allows the criteria to vary with changes in water quality parameters (i.e., temperature, salinity, dissolved organic carbon [DOC], and pH)
  - The 2016 draft copper criteria will be more conservative than the current 2003 for Southern California marinas where DOC is low
  - EPA “normalized” the toxicity data using the BLM to a “standard” water quality criteria
    - Standard = pH of 8.0, temperature of 22°C, DOC of 1.0 mg/L, and salinity of 32 ppt
  - Please note, the draft criteria may not be adopted by the State of California
Key Changes in 2016 Revised Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chronic criterion = 1.9 μg/L</td>
<td>Chronic criterion = 1.3 μg/L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acute criterion = 3.1 μg/L</td>
<td>Acute criterion = 2.0 μg/L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For a given 24-hour average concentration</td>
<td>For a given 1-hour average concentration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44 genera used</td>
<td>78 genera used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Mytilus</em> mussel most sensitive species</td>
<td><em>Haliotis rufescens</em> abalone most sensitive species</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual EC₅₀ data used</td>
<td>BLM used to normalize all EC₅₀ data to standard BLM assumptions for temperature, pH, salinity, and DOC, where DOC is 1 mg/L</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please note, the draft criteria may not be adopted by the State of California. The State currently uses the California Toxics Rule (CTR) for enclosed bays and estuaries. However, there is concern that the State may be vulnerable to third-party lawsuits requesting federal standards be applied to specific programs.
Copper BLM Output Example for Varying DOC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample Label</th>
<th>Temp (°C)</th>
<th>pH</th>
<th>Cu (µg/L)</th>
<th>DOC (mg/L)</th>
<th>Salinity (ppt)</th>
<th>Model Mode</th>
<th>CMC (µg/L)</th>
<th>CCC (µg/L)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EPA Baseline</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>EPA WQC</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>1.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Example Marina</td>
<td>17-22</td>
<td>7-8</td>
<td>1-10</td>
<td><strong>0.5</strong></td>
<td>32-34</td>
<td>EPA WQC</td>
<td><strong>0.99</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.66</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>4.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Copper BLM Output Example for Varying DOC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample Label</th>
<th>Temp (°C)</th>
<th>pH</th>
<th>Cu (µg/L)</th>
<th>DOC (mg/L)</th>
<th>Salinity (ppt)</th>
<th>Model Mode</th>
<th>CMC (µg/L)</th>
<th>CCC (µg/L)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EPA Baseline</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>EPA WQC</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>1.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Example Marina</td>
<td>17-22</td>
<td>7-8</td>
<td>1-10</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>32-34</td>
<td>EPA WQC</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newport Marina</td>
<td>(20)</td>
<td>(8)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(33)</td>
<td>EPA WQC</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>1.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EPA WQC</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>1.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EPA WQC</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>2.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EPA WQC</td>
<td>4.95</td>
<td>3.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EPA WQC</td>
<td>5.94</td>
<td>3.93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary of Ranked Copper Toxic Effects

- Measured (2003 criteria)
- BLM Predicted (Proposed 2016 criteria)

Shift in toxicity curve because of BLM adjustment

50 most sensitive data points used to develop criteria (natural seawater)
Comparison of recorded effects concentration to BLM adjusted effects concentration
Biotic Ligand Model

• BLM had already been accepted for freshwater
• State Water Resources Control Board asked EPA to consider approval of the BLM for marine waters
  – BLM allows for adjustment of site-specific water chemistry that can bind copper, leaving it less bioavailable
  – For waters with high dissolved organic carbon, the copper limits are much higher
Key Issues that Affect the Relevance of the Criteria to California Harbors

- New criteria are lower than the California Ocean Plan’s background copper concentration of 2 µg/L
- The BLM does not provide the flexibility it was intended to provide
- The BLM should include flexibility for considering different habitat types and regions (e.g., the Gulf, enclosed bays, harbors, saltmarshes, etc.).
- Greater pressure to conduct EPA-approved site-specific criteria evaluations (Water Effect Ratio testing)
Key Uncertainties that Drive the Criteria Lower

• Uncertainty resulting from a single abalone test used to derive the draft criteria
  – Draft criteria are ultimately driven by results from a single red abalone toxicity test published in 1989
  – Species only present in waters in or near kelp forest habitats; not relevant to enclosed-shallow water bays and harbors or waters in the Gulf and East Coast
  – In contrast, 2003 draft criteria were ultimately derived based on results of hundreds of mussel (Mytilus spp.) tests
Key Uncertainties that Drive the Criteria Lower

- Uncertainty associated with normalizing the laboratory-derived toxicity test results to an assumed and non-validated DOC value
  - EPA has assumed DOC is at 2 mg/L for all tests when laboratory DOC and test location are not known
  - This included the single abalone test driving the draft criteria
  - This affected 60% of the 50 most sensitive tests

Recorded effect level ÷ DOC = adjusted effect level
Shift in toxicity curve because of BLM adjustment

50 most sensitive data points used to develop criteria (natural seawater)

Comparison of recorded effects concentration to BLM adjusted effects concentration
**Shift in toxicity curve because of BLM adjustment**

- 50 most sensitive data points used to develop criteria (natural seawater)
- Comparison of recorded effects concentration to BLM adjusted effects concentration
Key Uncertainties that Drive the Criteria Lower

- Uncertainty in calculation of the acute chronic ratio (ACR) value used to establish the chronic criterion
  - Highly sensitive freshwater species are used to estimate marine species ACR
Technical-based Recommendations

• Criteria should be based on a robust data set; additional abalone data should be collected

• Revise criteria based on actual/new data
  – The toxicity test data set that is modified by the BLM should only include:
    • Species and test conditions known to occur in U.S. waters
    • Paired toxicity tests with actual water quality measurements (specifically DOC)

• Chronic criteria should be derived by marine organism acute:chronic measurements
  – Additional paired chronic/acute tests are needed to justify a new marine-based ACR
Questions/Discussion