



CORNELL WASTE MANAGEMENT INSTITUTE

CWMI, Center for the Environment
email: cwmi@cornell.edu

100 Rice Hall

Cornell University

Ithaca, NY 14853-5601

(607) 255-1187

internet: www.cfe.cornell.edu/wmi/

THE CASE FOR CAUTION

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR
LAND APPLICATION OF SEWAGE SLUDGES

AND

AN APPRAISAL OF THE US EPA'S PART 503 SLUDGE RULES

by Ellen Z. Harrison
Murray B. McBride and David R. Bouldin

Working Paper

August 1997; revised February 1999

THE CASE FOR CAUTION

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR
LAND APPLICATION OF SEWAGE SLUDGES

AND

AN APPRAISAL OF THE US EPA'S PART 503 SLUDGE RULES

by Ellen Z. Harrison¹
Murray B. McBride² and David R. Bouldin²

¹Cornell Waste Management Institute
Center for the Environment
Cornell University, Ithaca, NY 14853

²Dept. of Soil, Crop and Atmospheric Sciences
Cornell University, Ithaca, NY 14853

Cornell Waste Management Institute Working Paper
August 1997; revised February 1999

THE CASE FOR CAUTION

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR LAND APPLICATION OF SEWAGE SLUDGES
AND AN APPRAISAL OF THE US EPA'S PART 503 SLUDGE RULES

by Ellen Z. Harrison
Murray B. McBride and David R. Bouldin

Copyright 1997, 1999 by The Cornell Waste Management Institute.
Permission to reprint in whole or part is granted provided that the Cornell Waste
Management Institute is given full credit for the material reprinted.



Additional copies may be obtained from:

Cornell Waste Management Institute
Center for the Environment
100 Rice Hall, Cornell University
Ithaca, NY 14853-5601
607/255-1187 ~ cwmi@cornell.edu

This document is available in its entirety on the Internet at:
<http://www.cfe.cornell.edu/wmi/PDFS/LandApp.pdf>

Acknowledgements

The authors appreciate the comments made by many people on the drafts of this paper. Among these are Michael Bender, Josh Clelland, John Duxbury, Gerson Lesser, Kevin Mathers, Brian Richards, Sally Rowland, and Tammo Steenhuis.

Acknowledgement of their review in no way implies
their agreement with the contents of this publication.

Revised: February 1999

Printed on Recycled Paper

Contents

Summary	1
Non-Protective Aspects of US EPA Part 503 Risk Assessment	1
Introduction	2
Is Land Application “Safe?”	3
The Regulatory Framework and Federal Standards	4
Description of the US EPA Risk Assessment Process	6
Issues	6
Risk Assessment	6
Comparison Among Different Countries and Comparison with Cleanup Standards	8
Alternative Policy Approaches	12
Sludge Quality	13
Alternative Land Application Uses	13
Non-Protective Aspects of US EPA Part 503 Risk Assessment	14
1. Allows pollution to reach maximum “acceptable” level	14
2. No safety or uncertainty factors	14
3. Evaluates each exposure pathway separately not accounting for multiple pathways of exposure or synergy	15
4. Calculates cancer risk of 1-in-10,000 vs. 1-in-1,000,000	15
5. Soil ingestion rate	15
6. Underestimates pollutant intake through food	16
Assesses diet very low in vegetables	16
Very low plant uptake coefficients	17
Averages are not applicable to particular site or crop	18
Cadmium levels under different assumptions	19
7. RfD for Arsenic of 0.0008 mg/kg/day vs. 0.0003 or less	19
8. Many pollutants not regulated or monitored	20
Pollutants present in less than 10% of sludges not considered	20
Pollutants with insufficient data	20
Synthetic organic chemicals	21
Radioactivity	23
9. Ground and surface water calculations assume large dilution/attenuation	23
Leachate diluted/attenuated before reaching well	23
Only 0.24% of the model watershed receives sludge	23
10. Not protective of agricultural productivity	25
Phytotoxicity and crop yield reduction	25
Soil microorganisms	26
Animal health	26
11. Inadequate assessment of pathogen risks	28
12. Ecological impacts inadequately assessed	29
13. Inadequate enforcement and oversight	29
14. No labeling of sludges or sludge products	30
Conclusions	30
Recommendations Regarding Application of Sewage Sludges on Agricultural Lands or Gardens	31
Recommendations to those who elect to use sewage sludges or sludge products	31
References	36

Tables

Table 1.	Different Concerns Regarding Land Application of Sludges	4
Table 2.	Pollutant Limits in EPA Part 503 Regulations	5
Table 3.	Exposure Pathways Used in the 503 Risk Assessment	7
Table 4.	The Limiting Pathways Determined in Part 503 Risk Assessment	8
Table 5.	International Sludge Standards	9
Table 6.	International Soil Standards	11
Table 7.	Metal Levels in Sludges	13
Table 8.	Cadmium Standard Calculated Using Different Assumptions Regarding Diet and Uptake Coefficient (UC)	19
Table 9.	Relative Sensitivity of Crops to Sludge-Applied Copper, Nickel and Zinc	26
Table 10.	Phytotoxicity Thresholds for Crops Grown in Sludge-amended Soils	27
Table 11.	Recommended Maximum Concentrations of Contamination in Soils	32

Figures

Figure 1:	European and US Allowable Zn and Cd Soil Concentrations Resulting from Sludge Application	10
Figure 2.	USDA Recommended Daily Vegetable Intake Compared with Diet Used in the Part 503 Risk Assessment	17
Figure 3.	Map of New York Showing Example of Size of Drainage Basin and Proportion Receiving Sludges Under Part 503 Risk Assessment Assumptions	24

Summary

Current US federal regulations governing the land application of sewage sludges do not appear adequately protective of human health, agricultural productivity or ecological health. The risk assessment conducted by United States Environmental Protection Agency (US EPA) contains many gaps and non-conservative assumptions in establishing contaminant levels which are far less protective than those of many other nations. Current New York State (NYS) regulations are more protective than those of US EPA, but not as stringent as the recommendations of the authors. The potential for widespread use of sludge on agricultural and residential land, the persistence of many of the pollutants which may remain in soils for a very long time, and the difficulty of remediation call for a more cautious approach. In addition, reassessment of standards based on ecotoxicological impacts will need to be undertaken shortly when the US EPA-sponsored study being performed by Oak Ridge National Laboratory is completed.

Soil, water and crop characteristics in NYS and other areas of the northeastern US raise particular concerns. Shallow acid soils, abundant precipitation and crops sensitive to phytotoxic metal inputs increase the need for caution. Federal regulations are the same for all soils, areas and uses, which is an unrealistic simplification.

Based on their analyses, the authors do not suggest a prohibition of land application; but rather significantly more restrictive use. Recommendations are made for farmers and home gardeners electing to use sewage sludges and suggestions are made for policies and regulations which incorporate the more conservative assumptions expected to be more protective of human health and agricultural productivity. Limiting cumulative additions of pollutants to prevent soils from exceeding recommended maximum contaminant levels can be achieved by application of clean sludges or by application of lesser quantities of less high quality sludges. Additional testing of sludges is recommended. Caution is advised in application to pasture and forage as well as on home grounds where vegetables are grown or children have access. Further investigation is needed to assess risks to ground and surface water and to establish standards for additional contaminants.

NYS Conditions Requiring Special Consideration

- shallow soils
- acid soils
- shallow groundwater used for domestic wells
- abundant streams
- dairy as main agricultural use (sufficient N and P)
- sensitive crops grown
- large amounts of sludge relative to amount of suitable land

Non-Protective Aspects of US EPA Part 503 Risk Assessment

The list below highlights many of the assumptions and decisions which are part of the US EPA risk assessment for Part 503 which we believe to be questionable and which are not conservative or protective. They are further discussed in the text of this paper which also contains the references on which the critique is based.

1. Pollution allowed to reach maximum “acceptable” level
2. No safety or uncertainty factors
3. Each exposure pathway evaluated separately – not accounting for multiple pathways of exposure
4. Cancer risk of 1-in-10,000 vs. 1-in-1,000,000
5. Soil ingestion rate may be too low

6. Pollutant intake through foods underestimated
 - Assessed diet very low in vegetables
 - Very low plant uptake coefficients used
 - Averages are not applicable to particular site or crop
7. RfD for Arsenic of 0.0008 mg/kg/day vs. 0.0003 or less
8. Many pollutants not regulated or monitored
 - Pollutants present in less than 10% of sludges not considered
 - Eliminated from consideration pollutants with insufficient data for full risk assessment
 - No synthetic organic chemicals regulated
 - Radioactivity not addressed
9. Ground and surface water calculations assume large dilution/attenuation
 - Leachate diluted or attenuated before reaching well
 - Only 0.24% of the model watershed receives sludge
10. Not protective of agricultural productivity
 - Phytotoxicity underestimated with potential for excessive crop yield reduction
 - Potential health impacts to grazing animals
11. Inadequate assessment of pathogen risks
12. Ecological impacts inadequately assessed
13. Inadequate enforcement and oversight
14. No labeling of sludge products

Introduction

Sewage sludges are created for a good reason—they are the by-product of processes that clean our sewage before the cleaned water is discharged into streams and estuaries. New treatment processes hold promise for significantly reducing or eliminating sludge production (Krogmann, 1998), but until widely adopted, managing sludges is a necessity. There are currently limited options—ocean dumping has been banned—leaving landfilling, incineration, or application to the land.

The ban on ocean dumping and the environmental and economic costs of incineration and landfilling are part of what has led to increased focus on land application. Also, the philosophy of “recycle what we can” is now widely held, and it is appropriate to contemplate recycling of sludges through land application.

Sewage contains not only human fecal wastes from homes and businesses but also products and contaminants from homes, industries, businesses, storm water, landfill leachate (in some locales) and contaminants leached from pipes. The goal of sewage treatment is to clean up the water, so many

Sewage sludges contain nutrients and organic matter, but also pathogens and contaminants from home and industry.

While recycling sludges is a desirable goal, caution is warranted since many pollutants are persistent and agricultural soils are irreplaceable.

contaminants are preferentially removed from the water and are concentrated in the sludges. Thus, for example, it is estimated that about 90% of the dioxins in the incoming water (influent) will end up in the sludges. Similarly, parasite eggs settle and are concentrated in sludges. This is beneficial in providing a cleaner effluent water discharge from the treatment plant, but makes beneficial use of the sludge more difficult.

There is general agreement that the long-term goal should be to recycle the nutrients and organic matter in sludges through land application and there is agreement about the need to protect and enhance human, livestock and ecological health and the productivity of agricultural soils. While the recycling of the organic matter and nutrients contained in wastewater through land application is a worthwhile objective, the mix of chemicals and pathogens in sludges includes contaminants that are detrimental to human health, agricultural productivity and ecological health. Wastewater treatment plants have been designed to dispose of waste and not to create an agricultural soil additive. Separating the human excreta which contain the desired nutrients and organic matter from the domestic and industrial contaminants in order to create a product that is appropriate for land application is the challenge and reuse should be conditioned on meeting strict standards (Gardner, 1997). We believe that it is wise to be cautious, since many of the added contaminants are persistent and, once applied, will remain in soils and the ecosystem for many years.

In 1997, 181 sewage treatment plants which generate a little over half (51%) of the 1,000 tons per day (dry weight) of sludge produced in NYS either directly land applied or treated their sludges for use as a soil amendment. This is a significant increase from levels reported in 1994 when 36% of sludges were directed towards land application and a tremendous increase from 1989 when only 5% went to land application amendment (NYS DEC, 1998). The elimination of ocean dumping of sludges from NYC and Long Island in 1991 account for some of this trend.

Is Land Application “Safe?”

There is debate over whether recycling of sludges through land application as allowed under current regulations is protective enough and whether it provides for a long term sustainable practice. People often ask if land application is “safe,” but there is no such thing as “safe.” Is it safe to drive your car? Nearly all that we do entails some risk, so the question really is “is the risk acceptable?” People’s acceptance of risk is subjective and depends in part on their basic values and beliefs as well as their training and experience. For example, some people place faith in technological solutions and our ability to calculate impacts and risks. Others are more skeptical, believing that history shows that there have been numerous failures of technology resulting in unanticipated environmental and health damage. These are fairly fundamental differences in world view, leading some to favor precaution while others are willing to proceed until harm is shown to occur.

There is no such thing as “safe.”
Rather, the question is:
“What is an acceptable risk,
and to whom?”

People’s acceptance of land application also depends on their primary concerns. There is also an interesting difference in the time scales over which people think. In the calculations performed for the risk assessment regarding land application of sludges, the US EPA used a 100 year site life. This may seem a long time to Americans whose view of history is relatively short and who have been used to having huge land resources, making it easy to consider “moving on” to greener pastures if the need arises. However, our current agricultural lands in the US are substantially the same ones we will be relying on for as long as humans continue to occupy the earth.

In contrast, in Europe the view of time and land is different since one can see lands that have been farmed for thousands of years. Vineyards that grew grapes for Roman wines are still growing grapes today and lead used by Romans persists in the soil two millennia later. That makes the concept of sustainable practices that can be carried out in perpetuity much more salient in Europe.

This is not to say that people have only one interest. The neighbor and environmentalist are also taxpayers concerned about economical sludge management. The generators and vendors depend on productive agriculture for a safe and economical food supply. But differences in the primary interest of different groups help to explain why intelligent, knowledgeable, concerned people can have very different views regarding land application (Citizens' Environmental Coalition and Scenic Hudson, 1996; Cornell Waste Management Institute, 1996; Cornell Waste Management Institute, 1997; Water Environment Federation, 1996).

Home gardener	Cost-effective product, risk to children
Grower	Reliable, cost-effective product, liability
Generators	Economical disposal/management
Neighbor	Nuisances, health, water contamination
Environmentalist	Ecological impacts, human health
Agronomist	Long-term soil productivity, plant growth

Table 1. Different Concerns Regarding Land Application of Sludges

Thus there is disagreement about whether current regulations are stringent enough and today's sludges are clean enough to give confidence that land application is a sustainable practice or at least an acceptable risk (McBride, 1995). While US EPA asserts that application of sludges is a low risk and thus a low priority for their attention, this seems to ignore the fact that sludges may end up spread over large areas where we grow our food, obtain our water and where we live and play. The authors have particular concern for the application of the federal rules to NYS and others parts of the northeastern US where some soils have low pH which tends to increase metal availability, where a number of crops sensitive to phytotoxic metals are important and where soils are shallow, increasing concerns for groundwater contamination. In the northeast dairy is the major agricultural use, raising concerns about molybdenum toxicity to ruminants as well as concerns that the application of additional nutrients from sludges to those already provided by manure application may result in excessive nitrogen and phosphorus.

The Regulatory Framework and Federal Standards

The US Environmental Protection Agency adopted regulations in 1993 (40 CFR Part 503, known as Part 503; US EPA, 1993; US EPA, 1994) that establish minimum standards which must be met if sludges are to be land applied. The regulations include concentration limits for 9 metals and for pathogens, and requirements for vector (flies and rodents) attraction reduction. The regulations establish Class A sludges which have been treated to essentially eliminate pathogens (disease causing organisms) and Class B in which pathogens have been reduced, but are still present. Under the federal 503 rules certain site restrictions apply to Class B use, but no individual site permits are required for its use.

The federal regulations also establish standards for 9 contaminants (Table 2). The standards include so-called "exceptional quality" (EQ) sludges which meet certain concentration limits (no more than X parts per million of any of the 9 regulated contaminants) as well as pathogen limits and vector reduction requirements. In regard to metal concentrations, sludges and sludge products which fail to meet one or more of those "EQ" pollutant concentrations but which fall below a higher ceiling concentration may be applied, but the applicator is directed to keep track of the total amount of each metal applied and cease application when a regulatory cumulative pollutant loading limit is reached. Sludge products which fail to meet one or more of the "EQ" pollutant concentrations but which fall

below the ceiling concentration may still be distributed to homes or in bags so long as information on the acceptable annual pollutant loading rate (APLR) is provided to the user. In response to a lawsuit, EPA is likely to remove this APLR provision (Rubin, 1998).

State regulations must be at least as strict as the federal standards, but states have the option of adopting regulations that are more stringent than the federal standards. New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (NYS DEC) regulations (Part 360; NYS DEC, 1993) have been more stringent in a number of ways, but NYS and many other states are considering revising or have revised their regulations, bringing them closer to the federal Part 503 rules. Land application must follow the more stringent state rules where they exist.

Pollutant	Max. Pollutant Concentration in EQ Sludges (mg/kg = ppm)	Max. Ceiling Conc. in Sludges Applied to Land (mg/kg)	Cumulative Pollutant Loading Rate Limits (kg/ha)	Annual Pollutant Loading Rate (kg/ha/yr)
Arsenic	41	75	41	2
Cadmium	39	85	39	1.9
Copper	1500	4300	1500	75
Lead	300	840	300	15
Mercury	17	57	17	0.85
Molybdenum	—	75	—	—
Nickel	420	420	420	21
Selenium	100	100	100	5
Zinc	2800	7500	2800	140
Applies to:	Bulk Sludges and Bagged Sludges	All Sludges That Are Land Applied	Bulk Non-EQ Sludges	Bagged Sludges Not Meeting "EQ" Limits

Table 2. Pollutant Limits in US EPA Part 503 Regulations

Under the 503 rules, Class A “EQ” sludges and sludge products can be applied without restriction in amount or duration, for use in home gardens, parks, crop production, etc. No records of where and how much is used are required to be kept, nor is notification of neighbors, local officials or others required. Under the federal rules there is also no permit requirement for a site where Class B sludges or sludges not meeting “EQ” but falling below the ceiling limits are applied. Sludge products meeting Class A pathogen and vector reduction requirements but not meeting “EQ” quality standards can be distributed to the public under the APLR requirements for labeling regarding maximum annual application so long as they fall below the ceiling limits.

Currently, NYS regulations require a permit from the NYS DEC for the production and distribution of a Class A “EQ” product (such as compost or N-Viro), but no permit or records are required for the actual use. Sludge products sold in NYS but coming from out of state are not regulated by the NYS DEC. For Class B sludges applied in NYS, NYS rules require a site specific permit, record-keeping and the use of various agricultural best management practices.

A risk assessment was performed to establish the US EPA limits and to determine what contaminants to address. Since the regulations were adopted in 1993, the list of regulated contaminants has, in fact, been decreased with the elimination of chromium. While a list of 31 additional contaminants were being considered for regulation in “Round 2,” US EPA is only planning to add regulation of co-planar PCBs and dioxins and furans to the list of 9 regulated contaminants in the next several years.

Description of the US EPA Risk Assessment Process

The approach taken by US EPA to develop contaminant standards was to identify the various potential routes for exposure to sludge that is land applied and then to assess the risks posed by each of these exposure pathways. The table below lists the 14 pathways which were assessed. The risk associated with each pathway was calculated for each of the contaminants for which the assessment was performed using available data. The contaminant standard for that particular contaminant was the number generated by the pathway resulting in the lowest concentration that represented an acceptable risk according to the US EPA analysis. That pathway was called “the most limiting pathway” and for the regulated contaminants, those pathways are listed in a table below. Surprisingly to many, for 5 of the 9 regulated contaminants the pathway of a child directly ingesting sludge was deemed to be the most limiting path, generating the lowest acceptable level. Each pathway was assessed independently and no attempt was made to look at the risk from exposure through several pathways simultaneously (US EPA, 1995; US EPA, 1996c) or the effects of more than one contaminant at a time.

Issues

The remainder of this paper discusses the issues which lead the authors to recommend a more cautious approach to land application than that of the US EPA.

Risk Assessment

A risk assessment is a model which, like all models, is a simplified simulation of real world conditions that relies on many assumptions and subjective judgments. Moreover, a model is only as good as the data from which it draws conclusions. The more complex the system being modeled, the more vulnerable the model and conclusions drawn from it are to errors resulting from the gaps between the model and reality. This is one reason why risk assessments generally fail to effectively evaluate impacts on ecosystems as a whole and do not address synergistic impacts. Developing regulations for a country as diverse as the US is a tremendous challenge. The Part 503 risk assessment holds out the expectation that models approximating the reality of a ranch in west Texas are also appropriate for a vegetable farm in NYS.

Because of the limitations inherent in a model, results should include an expression of their uncertainty, whether as a range of values or through the application of a safety factor. Thus risk assessments must take both variability and uncertainty into account. Uncertainty forces decision makers to judge how probable it is that risks will be overestimated or underestimated for every member of the exposed population, whereas variability forces them to cope with the certainty that different individuals will be subjected to risks both above and below any reference point one chooses.

Calculations in the US EPA risk assessment use single values (deterministic point estimates) for input variables such as crop uptake of contaminants or food consumption. However, no single value can reflect the real variability in uptake among different crops, or at different stages in crop development or under different growing conditions (*e.g.*, soil pH, climate, management variables). Nor can any single input value represent the variability in diet among a population, *i.e.*, people eat different quantities of different foods. While the input value used in a point estimate may be the mean (or median or geometric mean or 99th percentile) of multiple data points, as a single value it does not convey the range or likely distribution of data for the population. Nor does it reflect uncertainties due to possible measurement or random errors, nor uncertainties due to systematic biases or problems with the risk model.

Rather than using point estimates to set a risk standard (as was done by the EPA in assessing risks of land application), a more robust approach considers a range of possible input values to determine a

The results of a risk assessment depend on the data, assumptions used, and levels of risk which are selected.

Different choices will result in very different standards.

range of possible outcomes (a probabilistic approach). The use of point based calculations rather than a probabilistic approach can be highly misleading (Finkel, 1995). While a number of different mathematical techniques can be used, a computerized Monte Carlo simulation is a powerful means of generating a distribution of probable outcomes. The term “Monte Carlo” refers to the famous gambling resort and signifies the random selection of a winning number on the roulette wheel. The Monte Carlo method uses a random number generator to chose a set of input variables based upon the parameters. Each run or recalculation of the model generates a new scenario, and the simulation is repeated hundreds or thousands of times to generate a distribution of probable results.

Pathway	Description of Highly Exposed Individual
1. Sludge ⇒ Soil ⇒ Plant ⇒ Human	Human (except home gardener) lifetime ingestion of plants grown in sludge-amended soil
2. Sludge ⇒ Soil ⇒ Plant ⇒ Human	Human (home gardener) lifetime ingestion of plants grown in sludge-amended soil
3. Sludge ⇒ Human	Human (child) ingesting sludge
4. Sludge ⇒ Soil ⇒ Plant ⇒ Animal ⇒ Human	Human lifetime ingestion of animal products (animals raised on forage grown on sludge-amended soil)
5. Sludge ⇒ Soil ⇒ Animal ⇒ Human	Human lifetime ingestion of animal products (animals ingest sludge directly)
6. Sludge ⇒ Soil ⇒ Plant ⇒ Animal	Animal lifetime ingestion of plants grown on sludge-amended soil
7. Sludge ⇒ Soil ⇒ Animal	Animal lifetime ingestion of sludge
8. Sludge ⇒ Soil ⇒ Plant	Plant toxicity due to taking up sludge pollutants when grown in sludge-amended soils
9. Sludge ⇒ Soil ⇒ Organism	Soil organism ingesting sludge / soil mixture
10. Sludge ⇒ Soil ⇒ Predator	Predator of soil organisms that have been exposed to sludge-amended soils
11. Sludge ⇒ Soil ⇒ Airborne Dust ⇒ Human	Adult human lifetime inhalation of particles (dust) (e.g., tractor driver tilling a field)
12. Sludge ⇒ Soil ⇒ Surface Water ⇒ Human	Human lifetime drinking surface water and ingesting fish containing pollutants in sludge
13. Sludge ⇒ Soil ⇒ Air ⇒ Human	Human lifetime inhalation of pollutants in sludge that volatilize to air
14. Sludge ⇒ Soil ⇒ Groundwater ⇒ Human	Human lifetime drinking well water containing pollutants from sludge that leach from soil to groundwater

Table 3. Exposure Pathways Used in the Part 503 Risk Assessment

Consider as an example the use of a risk assessment to develop a standard for cadmium in sludge based on the risks posed by ingesting crops grown on sludge-amended soils. Plant uptake of cadmium as measured in various experiments varies widely (this is discussed more fully in a later section of this report). Dietary intakes also vary widely among the population. A deterministic analysis such as used by EPA uses a single value for uptake (EPA used the geometric mean of uptake coefficient data) and one value for diet (the average consumption circa 1980). In contrast, a Monte Carlo simulation makes use of the full range of data on uptake and on diet. The output of a Monte Carlo simulation enables analysts to identify the relationship between the concentration of cadmium in the sludge and the percentage of the population who will likely be protected at that level of application.

Element	Limiting Pathway
Arsenic	Child Ingesting Sludge
Cadmium	Child Ingesting Sludge
Copper	Plant Phytotoxicity
Lead	Child Ingesting Sludge
Mercury	Child Ingesting Sludge
Molybdenum	Animal Eating Feed
Nickel	Plant Phytotoxicity
Selenium	Child Ingesting Sludge
Zinc	Plant Phytotoxicity

Table 4. The Limiting Pathways According to the Part 503 Risk Assessment

While the US EPA and others made a major effort in performing the risk assessment supporting the Part 503 regulations, the authors of this paper demonstrate that there are fundamental errors in the assessment structure, a number of untenable assumptions made, and serious omissions (whether due to oversights or data gaps) which result in regulations that are not sufficiently protective. A precautionary approach such as that adopted by a number of other nations is more appropriate given the uncertainties inherent in such a complex risk assessment, potential long-term impact on agricultural productivity and the difficulty of remediation of any impacts resulting from soil contamination. Many of the pollutants of concern are not degradable and may remain in the soil for an extremely long time, although the bioavailability of contaminants may limit their impacts.

Comparison Among Different Countries and Comparison with Cleanup Standards

Standards for sludges in a number of different countries are presented in Table 5. Comparisons require an understanding of how these maximum contaminant standards are applied. The standards in the top portion of Table 5 apply to products considered acceptable for use without significant restriction and are thus comparable. In general, home use of such products is permitted, though there may be some restrictions. Currently in NYS, for example, use in home vegetable gardens is not allowed.

US regulations for land application are less restrictive than those of many other countries. Allowable contaminant levels are higher than soil clean-up guidelines in the US and other countries.

For all contaminants except lead, the US EPA “EQ” standards are significantly higher than standards for sludge products allowed elsewhere for unrestricted use. In fact, US EPA rules allow the application of sludges with metal concentrations up to the ceiling limits (Tables 2 and 5) to be used in home gardens. Under the APLR approach, US EPA regulations allow bagged products to be distributed so long as a label states the maximum annual application rate. This policy has been criticized even by those otherwise relatively positive

towards land application (National Research Council, 1996; Chaney, 1995). Since children ingesting sludge is the limiting pathway for many of the “EQ” contaminants (Table 4), application of sludges potentially containing up to the far higher ceiling concentrations of pollutants around homes seems inadvisable.

Sludges with contaminant concentrations listed in the bottom portion of Table 5 can be applied with some restrictions. To compare these standards and arrive at an understanding of what soil quality

	As	Cd	Co	Cr	Cu	Hg	Mo	Ni	Pb	Se	Zn	PCB	NNP
Products - relatively unrestricted													
EPA EQ sludge ¹	41	39			1500	17		420	300	100	2800		
Texas compost, home use ²	10 ³	16		180	1020	11	75	160	300	36	2190	1	
Ontario clean compost ⁴	10	3		50	60	0.15		20	150		500		
NYS Class I Compost ⁵		10		100	1000	10		200	250		1000	1	
Sludges applied with restrictions													
EPA Ceiling limit sludge ⁶	75	85			4300	57	75	420	840	100	7500		
NYS sludge ⁷		25		1000	1000	10		200	1000		2500		
Denmark sludge ⁸	25 ⁹	0.8		100	1000	0.8		30	120(60) ¹⁰		4000		
Eur. Union sludge ¹¹		20-40			1000-1750	16-25		300-400	750-1200		2500-4000		
Germany sludge ^{12,13}		5/10 ¹⁴		900	800	8		200	900		2000/2500 ¹⁴	0.2	
Ontario dewater ¹⁵	170	34	340	2800	1700	11	94	420	1100	34	4200		
Ontario dewater, target ¹⁶	35	4	77	530	380	1.4	1.2	80	220	6	840		
Sweden sludge, 1994		4		100	1200	5		50	200		800		
Sweden sludge, 1998 ¹⁷		2		100	600	2.5		50	100		800	0.4	50
Netherlands sludge ¹⁸	0.15	1.25		75	75	0.75		30	100		300		
Norway sludge ag ¹⁹		2.5		100	1000	3		50	80		800		

Values are ppm=mg/kg dry weight.

Table 5. International Sludge Standards

¹ Unrestricted use if sludges contain less than these concentrations (US EPA, 1993).
² Standards for grade 1 compost suitable for home use. Different standards apply to agricultural use (TNRCC, 1997).
³ Based on background soil. 1 ppm would be risk-based allowable concentration (TNRCC, 1996).
⁴ (Ontario Ministry, 1996).
⁵ (NYS DEC, 1993).
⁶ Can apply until cumulative load is reached or for bagged product which may be used anywhere can apply at annual rate.
⁷ NYS DEC Part 360.
⁸ There are higher alternative limits for metals based on the ratio of metals to phosphorus (Danish Ministry, 1996).
⁹ As 25 for home garden use.
¹⁰ Pb 60 for home garden use.
¹¹ Upper value is max member country may allow, lower is recommended max (Leschber, 1997).
¹² Max 5 metric tons/ha/3 yrs. (except compost 10 metric tons/ha/3 yrs if concentration <50% max). No use on fruit, vegetables, fodder crops, grazing land, forest.
¹³ Germany has liability fund to which all producers must contribute to reimburse farmers.
¹⁴ Value depends on pH.
¹⁵ Max 4 applications. Max 8 metric tons/ha/5 yrs. or 135 kg/ha N/5 yrs. 40 metric tons/ha max lifetime of site.
¹⁶ Unspecified date, target values.
¹⁷ If concentrations are met may harvest crops one year after application. No application to pasture. If exceed concentration, use only for energy or industrial crops. Organics are voluntary targets. Max loading rates are also specified.
¹⁸ 2 metric tons/ha/yr max application rate on arable land, 1 metric ton/ha/yr. on pasture (Matthews, 1996). Sludge may be applied only if soils have less than specified concentration of metals (formula based on soil characteristics).
¹⁹ Max sludge concentration for agricultural use (Miljøverndepartementet, 1997). 2 metric tons/10 yrs. max application rate (Matthews, 1996).

would result from application of a sludge, it is critical to know whether applications are limited in quantity and frequency. So, for example, Ontario allows application of sludges which exceed the US EPA ceiling limit for a number of contaminants, but total application is limited to 40 metric tons/hectare or 4 applications. US EPA rules allow application of sludges with concentrations up to the ceiling limit, but for those not meeting EQ limits the total amount of any contaminant applied cannot exceed the cumulative limit (Table 2).

To facilitate a comparison, Figure 1 shows the allowable maximum concentration of cadmium and zinc in soils resulting from sludge application for a number of countries (Krogmann and Harrison, 1998). The levels allowed in the U.S. are far higher. Table 6 includes soil standards for the all of the contaminants regulated under Part 503. It includes calculated soil concentrations that would result from long-term application of sludge containing the cumulative limits of metals allowed under Part 503 and mixing that into a 15cm plow layer. A similar calculation is included for sludges regulated under NYS DEC rules. The actual metal levels would be higher since background soil metal concentrations are not included in the calculations. Typical agricultural soil levels are included in Table 6 for comparison.




Figure 1: European and US Allowable Zn and Cd Soil Concentrations Resulting from Sludge Application

Notes: German (D) values depend on soil pH. EU values are recommended and a maximum allowable concentration

The cumulative pollutant loading allowed under Part 503 would result in contaminant levels approximately an order of magnitude higher than those allowed under rules in European countries (Table 6) (McGrath, et al., 1994). Soil screening and clean up numbers used by US EPA, NYS DEC and the Netherlands (intervention value) are also included. These US EPA and NYS values used in considering the need for remediation of contaminated sites are significantly lower than the values which sludge application would allow. NYS numbers are based on a goal of cleaning up sites to background concentrations (NYS DEC, 1994), while the US EPA numbers are based on an assessment of risks posed by soil ingestion and groundwater (US EPA, 1996). A site or soil background concentration is used when the risk-based number is lower than the background. The values for soil in other countries include both goals for soil quality and maximum levels allowed for contaminant accumulation as noted in Table 6. All of these various soil levels are all far lower than those allowed under Part 503. The Dutch intervention values were derived using a risk analysis similar to that used for Part 503, yet the values they suggest for soil clean-up of serious contamination are generally low or lower than those suggested by US EPA to pose no significant threat (McGrath, et al., 1994).

	As	Ba	Cd	Co	Cr	Cu	Hg	Mo	Ni	Pb	Se	Zn	PCB
Part 503 calculated sludged soil ¹	20		20			750	8.5		210	150	50	1400	
EPA soil screening ²	0.4	82	0.4	30/SB	2 ³				7	400	0.3	620	1 ⁴
NYS calculated soil ⁵ —Ag soils classes 1-3			1.4		138	35			14	138		69	
NYS calculated soil —Ag soils classes 4-10			1.8		205	52			21	205		103	
NYS calculated soil —Non-agricultural soils			4.6			115			69	460		230	
NYS soil clean up goals ⁶	7.5/SB	300/SB	1/SB		10/SB		0.1/SB		13/SB	SB	2/SB	20/SB	
Ontario soil ⁷	14		1.6	20	120	100	0.5	4	32	60	1.6	220	
Germany soil ⁸			1/1.5 ⁹		100	60	1		50	100		150/ 200 ⁹	
Netherlands soil target ¹⁰	29 ¹¹	200	0.8	20	100	36	0.3	10	25	85		140	0.02
Netherlands intervention ¹²	55	625	12	240	380	190	10	200	210	530		720	1
Norway soil ¹³			1		100	50	1		30	50		150	
Average N. Amer. Agricultural Soils	6 ¹⁴	-	0.1-0.3 ¹⁵	-	15 ¹⁴	10-30 ¹⁵	0.05-0.1 ¹⁴	1-2 ¹⁶	10-30 ¹⁵	10-20 ¹⁵	0.3-0.4 ¹⁶	40-70 ¹⁵	
95 percentile N. Amer. Agricultural Soils	10-20 ¹⁷		0.78 ¹⁸			95 ¹⁸	0.3-0.4 ¹⁷	3.0 ¹⁷	57 ¹⁸	23 ¹⁸	1-1.5 ¹⁷	126 ¹⁸	

Values are ppm=mg/kg dry weight.

Table 6. International Soil Standards for Metals

¹Residual soil conc. calculated when the cumulative load limit from Part 503 is mixed into the plow layer. Actual levels would be higher due to background level in soil.
²Generic soil screening levels based on human health risk assessment of soil ingestion and groundwater pathways. SB=Soil Background (USEPA, 1996).
³2 ppm listed for total chromium but concern is Cr (VI).
⁴Based on superfund guidance (USEPA, 1990).
⁵Residual soil conc. calculated when cumulative load limit in Part 360 (NYS DEC, 1993) is mixed into plow layer. Actual levels would be higher due to background level in soil. Different cumulative limits are applied to different soil classifications.
⁶SB=Soil Background (NYS DEC, 1994).
⁷Max soil conc allowed includes background soil levels.
⁸No sludge additions to soils which exceed these levels.
⁹Depends on pH.
¹⁰Desired soil quality. Values vary with cally and humus content.
¹¹Netherlands TDIs are different than US. For As, NL is 0.0021 vs. 0.0003 IRIS (USEPA database), vs. 0.0008 in 503. Netherlands risk assessment does not include groundwater path because there are essentially no private wells in Holland.
¹²Level at which clean up needs to be considered.
¹³Maximum soil concentration.
¹⁴Value for southern Ontario soils (Frank, et al., 1976).
¹⁵NYS average values taken from Holmgren, et al., 1993.
¹⁶Typical U.S. Soils (Logan & Traina, 1993).
¹⁷Approximately 95% of Eastern U.S. soils would fall at or below this value (Shacklette and Boerngen, 1984).
¹⁸Approximately 95% of U.S. agricultural soils would fall at or below this value (Holmgren, et al., 1993).

Alternative Policy Approaches

The US rules allow sludges to be applied up to a maximum acceptable contaminant limit. In other words, through a risk assessment some contaminant level is selected as a maximum level to which people, crops or other receptors can be exposed without creating unacceptable harm (as defined by the assumptions in the risk assessment). Pollutants present in sludge may then be added up to that limit. Thus, if it is concluded that exposure to 50 micrograms per day of contaminant X through food is acceptable, the Part 503 rules calculate the maximum amount of contaminant X which could be in sludge and not result in more than 50 micrograms per day in the diet. Obviously, many assumptions go into all phases of this calculation and under the Part 503 risk assessment, no safety factors were applied.

In contrast, several European countries (Sweden, Denmark, the Netherlands) use a philosophy of “do no harm” to protect soil quality. Their approach to achieving sustainability is to work towards limiting inputs to the soil so they do not exceed outputs, thus preventing accumulation of pollutants in the soil (McGrath, et al., 1994; Munters, 1997; Witter, 1996). The “do no harm” philosophy of environmental management strives to limit the addition of contaminants to the levels that are present in uncontaminated soils while recognizing the inherent uncertainty involved in risk modeling. This “no net degradation” approach is precautionary—it permits land application of inorganic contaminants only to the extent to which there will be no accumulation above levels in uncontaminated agricultural soils. In setting clean up objectives for remediation of contaminated sites in NYS, this philosophy was embodied in the use of soil background numbers for the inorganic contaminants (See Table 6) (NYS DEC, 1994).

US regulations are based on calculations of acceptable risk. The data gaps, uncertainties, irreplaceable value of agricultural land, and persistence of contamination have led several European countries to adopt a different approach in which they strive to prevent the accumulation of metals above levels present in uncontaminated soils.

Since there is a range of metal levels in uncontaminated soils resulting from differences in site geology and other factors, a limit may be set at the level found in no more than 10% (or 1%) of such soils. Thus 90% (or 99%) of uncontaminated soils would have less than the regulated limit. Such a “no net degradation” policy would result in levels for the 9 regulated metals that are much lower than those established under Part 503.

The values for some elements determined through a risk assessment may be lower than those found in some uncontaminated soils. In examining arsenic, for example, a limit of 1 ppm was determined through the risk assessment performed in Texas, while background levels in soils exceeded that number (TNRCC, 1996). This led Texas to adopt an arsenic standard of 10 ppm based on the values in soils.

Some would suggest that calculations which show acceptable risk levels to be lower than background soil levels indicate that the risk assessments are overly conservative and for some risk assessments the application of safety factors may provide a conservative margin. However, the inorganic elements present in soils may be significantly less bioavailable than those same elements added in sludge or other anthropogenic additions. The chemical form in which an element is present plays a critical role in its biological impact.

Since the concentration of contaminants allowed under the Part 503 regulations in the US in sludges applied to land is markedly greater than the concentration in agricultural soils (Table 6), over time the levels of any persistent contaminants like heavy metals will increase in soils to the level in the sludge being applied. Recent evidence, however, suggests that losses of certain metals through leaching is not always negligible, so there may be removal of some fraction of the metals through groundwater (Camobreco, et al., 1996; Richards, et al., 1997).

Sludge Quality

Sewage sludges vary widely in the concentration of contaminants. Efforts to remove industrial contaminants through pretreatment programs have resulted in greatly improved quality over the last decade in the US. As shown in Table 7, the mean concentrations of the regulated contaminants in both the US and NYS sludges are far lower than the US EPA “EQ” standards. In fact, 95% of NYS sludges fall far below those standards for most contaminants, indicating that stricter standards would be achievable today for most sludges.

Sludge quality has improved and there are opportunities for continuing to reduce pollutant levels.

Most US sludges could meet stricter standards than Part 503.

Pollution prevention efforts in a number of European countries have greatly reduced contaminant concentrations and have resulted in sludges which are able to meet much more stringent limitations for cadmium (<2 ppm) (Madsen, 1997; Tidestrom, 1997b; Witter, 1996). While control of industrial sources can help to reduce many contaminants, others, such as copper and lead, result in part not from industrial sources but from leaching of pipes including those in our homes. Efforts to decrease the corrosivity of water supplies can help to reduce their concentrations. There is some evidence that low levels of dioxins come from residential sources (washing of textiles) which may make them difficult to control in sludges (Horstmann and McLachlan, 1995; McLachlan, Horstmann and Hinkel, 1996).

	As	Cd	Cr	Cu	Pb	Hg	Mo	Ni	Se	Tl	Zn
Part 503 “EQ” Standard	41	39	-	1500	300	17	-	420	10 0	-	2800
U.S. Sludge (mean) ¹	10	7	119	741	134	5	9	43	5	5	1202
N.Y.S. Sludge (mean) ²	6	7	86	763	152	2.7	18	44	5	-	887
N.Y.S. Sludge (95 percentile)	13	18	242	1600	403	7	57	110	9	-	1750

Values are ppm (mg/kg)

¹ Data from 1988 National Sewage Sludge Survey (US EPA, 1990).

² Data from early 1990’s (NYS DEC Division of Solid and Hazardous Materials).

Table 7. Metal Levels in Sludges

In addition to sludge quality improvement, wastewater treatment technologies which minimize sludge production are being developed, thus decreasing the need for disposal. Other technologies to recover energy or fuel gas from sludges also hold some promise for development of beneficial use options beyond land application.

Alternative Land Application Uses

The significance of risks posed by land application of sludges varies according to different use scenarios. For example, since the potential for a child to ingest sludge is much greater for sludge used by residential gardeners than for sludge applied to field corn, stringent limitations based on this pathway should apply to home use but may not be necessary for agricultural use. Conversely, groundwater contamination may be a concern where sludges are applied to large acreage but will not likely be a concern for smaller scale residential use. While this paper focuses on the potential use of sludges on lands used for growing

Some uses of sludges present less risk than use on agricultural lands and home grounds.

agricultural crops, there are numerous other land application scenarios which present less risk. Among these are application to turf such as golf courses, roadsides or parks, reclamation of severely disturbed lands, or application to biomass plantations. Development of different standards for different end uses would recognize the variation in risks and benefits and permit the use of sludges where most appropriate.

Non-Protective Aspects of US EPA Part 503 Risk Assessment

Discussed below are a number of the assumptions and decisions which are part of the US EPA risk assessment for Part 503 that the authors believe to be questionable and which are not conservative or protective.

1. Allows pollution to reach maximum “acceptable” level

Through a risk assessment some contaminant level is selected as a maximum level to which people, crops or other receptors can be exposed without creating unacceptable harm (as defined by the assumptions in the risk assessment). Pollutants present in sludge may then be added up to that limit.

In establishing Part 503 regulations, the policy choice made is that pollutants can be added up to the level which represents some determination of the acceptable risk. No safety factor is applied, leaving no margin for error nor for future changes in determination of what levels represent an acceptable risk.

For example, sludge application would be allowed to raise groundwater contaminant levels up to the drinking water standard or increase contaminants in crops up to the level considered to represent an acceptable risk. The philosophy behind this approach depends on an accurate knowledge of pollutant pathways, processes and impacts. The impact of other sources of pollutants (e.g. atmospheric deposition) and change over time in both pollutant inputs and knowledge of impacts (e.g. the hormone disrupting effects of some synthetic organic chemicals, which is likely to result in a decrease in the allowable maximum contamination levels for those chemicals) makes this an uncertain and potentially non-protective approach. Without a very good understanding of pathways and processes, allowing pollutants to reach calculated maximum acceptable values is unwise. It leaves no room for the possibility that as our understanding of impacts increases,

maximum acceptable values will be lowered (e.g., standards for lead have decreased over the years; our knowledge of hormone disruption impacts at low chemical concentration is increasing). Once contaminated, soils are difficult to remediate. Alternative approaches are discussed in the section on alternative policy approaches above.

2. No safety or uncertainty factors

The uncertainties inherent in a risk assessment, originating from both missing data and a lack of understanding of how available data should be applied to complex systems with inherent biologic variation, argue for the application of safety factors. Many risk assessment-based standards divide calculated numbers by 2, 10, 100 or even 1000 depending on the level of uncertainty or the applicability of available data. The Dutch risk assessment, for example, assigns uncertainty values of 1, 2 or 3 based on the number and quality of data available for the particular variable being assessed (van den Berg, 1994).

3. Evaluates each exposure pathway separately not accounting for multiple pathways of exposure or synergy

It is likely that in a number of sludge use scenarios, a person or animal will be exposed simultaneously through a number of pathways. Thus the child of a home gardener using sludge will likely eat vegetables from the garden (pathway 2, Table 2) and may ingest soil that has received sludge (pathway 3). They may also drink from a well or eat animals or animal products that have been impacted by sludge use. The US EPA risk assessment calculated “acceptable” risk according to each of 14 pathways and selected as a standard the lowest of those numbers. They did not add exposures from several paths to arrive at a level from the multiple exposures which would result in an “acceptable” risk. An additive approach is generally used in performing risk assessments (van den Berg, 1994; Duff, 1996; Lund, 1997).

Where sludges are used, exposure to contaminants will come from a number of routes (e.g., eating sludged crops, ingesting sludged soil, drinking water which has received some sludge contaminants). Most risk assessments take this into account by adding exposures from different pathways but the Part 503 risk assessment does not.

Similarly, the risk assessment did not attempt to address the ways in which the effects of exposure to multiple chemicals simultaneously can affect the toxicity impacts. While estimating exposure and risk to a single pollutant from a number of pathways simultaneously could be done by summing results from different pathways, our lack of knowledge about how different contaminants interact makes it infeasible to evaluate impacts resulting from exposure to multiple pollutants. There can be synergistic or antagonistic impacts in which exposure to multiple chemicals has a greater or lesser impact than exposure to each. Our very limited knowledge of how different contaminants may interact is one reason for skepticism regarding risk assessment and for the use of a more conservative approach.

4. Calculates cancer risk of 1-in-10,000 vs. 1-in-1,000,000

US EPA made a policy decision that a cancer risk of 1-in-10,000 was an acceptable risk resulting from sludge application. For a number of contaminants, cancer risk was determined to be the most significant risk. A cancer risk estimated to lie between 1-in-10,000 and 1-in-1,000,000 is typically used in setting regulations and in many regulatory contexts (e.g. drinking water regulation), a risk of one excess cancer in one million people exposed is used to establish the standards. Under the 503 risk assessment, policy makers elected to use the less restrictive value.

Standards for carcinogens based on a risk assessment depend on what rate of increased cancer is considered acceptable. Values between one excess cancer in 10,000 to 1,000,000 people are typically used. A 1-in-10,000 risk was used in the Part 503 risk assessment.

5. Soil ingestion rate

Children inadvertently ingesting sludge via the soil is calculated by US EPA to be the most restrictive pathway for 5 of the 9 regulated metals (pathway 3, Table 3). The Part 503 risk assessment calculated risk for a child eating 200 mg/day for 5 years. (For perspective, 200 mg equates to about the volume of an aspirin tablet.) Two aspects of this analysis may not be protective. First, the data regarding ingestion are limited and 200 mg/day of soil may be low. Second, through normal activities, inadvertent ingestion continues throughout life, though at lesser rates (although rates may actually peak in teenage years). Other risk assessments include child ingestion rates for several years and a lower adult ingestion rate (the Dutch and Texas risk assessments use 50 and 100 mg/day for adult ingestion [TNRCC, 1996; van den Berg, 1994]) for the remaining lifetime.

All young children ingest some soil as part of their normal behavior. The regulation seeks to protect the “average high-end child” (not defined). There are children who ingest far more than average (so-called pica children), and the regulation clearly states that it does not seek to protect these children.

A key piece of data is just how much soil children actually ingest. Collecting data on this is difficult and there are only a few studies to draw from. The primary study monitored 24 children for 8 days in Massachusetts. The range for each child and the day-to-day variation were large. The average rate derived was 200 mg/day. However, there is no clear agreement on the appropriate statistical approach to extrapolating from these few children and few days to an annual rate for an “average high-end child” (Stanek and Calabrese, 1995). Thus there is concern that the regulatory limits based on 200 mg/day soil ingestion may not be conservative enough to protect children who may be exposed, particularly in a home garden scenario.

6. Underestimates pollutant intake through food

Assesses diet very low in vegetables

Dietary intake is a critical parameter for calculating risk from pathways 1 and 2. An average late 1970s diet was used in the risk assessment. Americans, responding in part to the USDA recommended diet, are eating significantly greater amounts of fruits and vegetables. Recalculations based on the USDA recommended diet of the risk associated with eating from a home garden receiving sludge show that the US EPA standard for cadmium would exceed the “acceptable” daily intake.

The risks posed through eating foods grown on sludge-treated lands depend on assumptions about how much of those crops are eaten and how much of a contaminant is taken up by the crops.

US EPA assessed two scenarios, one for the general population and a second for the home gardener. The risk assessment assumes 2.5% of the vegetables eaten by the general population were grown on sludge amended soils. While this may be a reasonable guess for the nation as a whole, states with high populations, such as NYS, may ultimately have a much higher proportion of sludged agricultural land, though how this relates to the percentage of a person’s diet depends greatly on how locally their food is

obtained. The recent trend for consumers to buy “shares” in produce from a given farm could expose some individuals to much more than the average, though less than the home gardener. For the home gardener, the US EPA assessment assumes 59% of most vegetables eaten are grown in the home garden which received sludge.

Dietary assumptions used in the risk assessment make use of what the average American ate in the late 1970s for both the general population evaluation and for the home gardener evaluation (US EPA, 1992). This diet is very low in fruits and vegetables, and the population is now eating more of these components of the diet that contribute the majority of cadmium intake (Chou, 1991; Heirmendinger and van Duyn, 1995; Krebs-Smith et al., 1995). In particular, home gardeners can be expected to eat significantly more vegetables than the average American. A comparison was made of the diet evaluated in the risk assessment by US EPA and of the diet recommended by USDA in the food pyramid (USDA, 1996). Seen in Figure 2, the amount (in dry weight) of vegetables, fruits and grains recommended by USDA is about two and a half times that used by US EPA. For leafy vegetables, which are a major source of dietary cadmium, the US EPA diet is one sixth the USDA recommended amount. The recommended diet contains more than 16 times the amount of fruit as the US EPA diet used in the Part 503 risk assessment.

Americans are eating more vegetables than the amount used in calculating the Part 503 standards.

USDA recommendations are far more than that amount.



Figure 2. Diet Used in the Part 503 Risk Assessment Compared to USDA Recommended Daily Vegetable Intake

Left: Daily vegetable, fruit and grain in diet used in the 503 risk assessment

Foods shown: cereal, tomato, carrots, rice, peas, cookie, potato, bread, lettuce

Right: *Additional* vegetable, fruit and grain in the USDA recommended diet

Foods shown: apple, bagel, greens, bread, strawberries, carrots, peas, orange, rice, lettuce, 1/2 potato

Since the sludge–soil–plant–human pathway risk analysis depends on the amount of fruits, vegetables and grains consumed, revising dietary assumptions leads to very different standards. For example, using US EPA’s assumptions and calculating allowable application of cadmium, changing only the dietary assumptions to those of the food pyramid, leads to a standard for cadmium of 15 ppm as compared to the current federal standard of 39 ppm. Even this may not be protective, as discussed below.

Very low plant uptake coefficients

A knowledge of how much of the metals added to soils end up in crops is key to calculating standards for pathways 1 and 2 (general population and home gardeners eating crops from soil to which sludge has been applied). Data establishing the relationship between the amount of a contaminant added and its rate of uptake by different crops vary widely. In the part 503 risk assessment, US EPA used the highly non-conservative geometric mean of the data and included data from all soils, including those with high pH. Recalculating “acceptable” levels using the arithmetic mean or the 90th percentile for uptake coefficients results in a lower standard.

Uptake coefficients, which express the amount of a metal taken up by a plant compared to the amount applied to the soil, are critical to a number of the pathways in the risk assessment. The higher the uptake coefficient, the greater is the fraction of the metal which accumulates in the plant. Uptake coefficients are critical for assessing the pathways that examine people eating sludged crops (pathways 1 and 2) and also the phytotoxicity pathway (pathway 8, Table 2, which assesses negative impact on plant growth resulting from accumulation of some metals, discussed below).

The authors and others (Stern, 1993; Chaney and Ryan, 1994) are concerned that the uptake coefficients used in the US EPA risk assessment are too low, particularly in regard to the northeastern US, where acid soils are common. Also, the uptake coefficients calculated by US EPA include data from lime-stabilized sludges which have an immediate effect of raising the soil pH, which in turn reduces availability of cadmium and zinc, an effect that cannot be expected to persist in the long term.

Many studies in the field and greenhouse have tried to measure the rate at which a crop takes up a particular metal from the soil. Unfortunately there is a great deal of variation (the data used by US EPA vary by 4 orders of magnitude for cadmium uptake coefficients, a factor of 10,000), depending on many factors including specific variety of crop (not just lettuce versus beans, but the particular variety of lettuce), soil characteristics such as cation exchange capacity, pH, moisture conditions, and many other factors.

The amount of a contaminant taken up by a plant (uptake coefficient) varies greatly depending on a number of factors.

The Part 503 rules are based on very low uptake coefficients which are lower than those of many sites and soils.

In selecting uptake coefficients for the risk assessment, US EPA used the geometric mean of available field data, which results in a much lower number than that obtained if other statistical approaches are used. The uptake coefficient is different for each metal and varies among crops. Since cadmium uptake into crops and subsequent ingestion is a potentially limiting pathway, cadmium is used as an example in the following analysis. While the geometric mean for the uptake coefficient for cadmium in leafy vegetables (a crop type that has a high uptake rate) used by US EPA in the risk

assessment is 0.182, the arithmetic mean of the same data is 0.630. A probabilistic Monte Carlo analysis of the distribution of uptake coefficient values from the data used by US EPA (for soils with pH <6.5) determined that 10% of the distribution showed an uptake coefficient of 2.87 or higher and far more than half the data had levels greater than the level used in the risk assessment (Stern, 1993). For more than 50% of all soil conditions represented in the risk assessment, the uptake coefficient—and thus the risk posed by cadmium uptake into crops—is underestimated (McBride, 1998a). Because geometric means are biased towards low values, their suitability for use in risk assessment is questionable (Parkhurst, 1998).

For some metals (including lead and mercury), measurements of uptake coefficients appear to be compromised by either analytic limitations or by physical contamination of “control” crops (McBride, 1998a). A number of field plot experiments used in the EPA risk assessment showed low or even negative uptake of these metals. However, the reported concentrations of these contaminants in the control (non-sludged) plants are far higher compared to levels in farm-grown crops in areas remote from sludged sites. Since uptake coefficients are based on the comparison of concentration in the sludged to the control plots, high levels in the controls underestimate uptake. The controls should instead represent levels in uncontaminated crops and the elevated levels in the sludge experiment control samples indicate that either the controls were contaminated physically by soil particles carried over from the sludged plots or that there were analytical problems (McBride, 1998a).

Averages are not applicable to particular site or crop

Use of averages or means is not a valid approach for some exposure pathways since a particular crop (which may be highly sensitive or accumulate metals more readily) will be grown on a particular site which may have soils that result in high uptake of contaminants by the crop. Similarly a farmer may be growing a crop that is very sensitive to phytotoxic metals on soils that promote high uptake, leading to low crop yields. The US EPA risk assessment, then, in using the geometric mean for uptake coefficients does not apply conservative estimates and is thus not highly protective. A more protective approach would use data from sensitive crops and soils with high uptake coefficients.

Cadmium levels under different assumptions

Different assumptions regarding the appropriate uptake coefficient to use for cadmium in the calculations for pathway 2 (home gardener applying sludge and eating crops) result in very different allowable cadmium levels in sludge (Table 8). For pathway 2, the US EPA risk assessment number is 120 kilograms/hectare (kg/ha) cumulative cadmium loading. Applying assumptions about depth of tilling into soil, this is equivalent to 120 ppm cadmium in “EQ” sludges. (Note that the Part 503 standard of 39 kg/ha is derived from Pathway 3.) Correcting for the diet recommended by USDA versus the low vegetable diet used in the risk assessment, but using the same geometric mean for uptake coefficient and the same assumptions regarding the acceptable increase in dietary exposure to cadmium, the cadmium limit calculated is 15 kg/ha or 15 ppm. If instead the arithmetic mean of the data is used for the uptake coefficient, 5 kg/ha or ppm is calculated. For this pathway, application of the values derived from a Monte Carlo analysis show that a maximum Cd contaminant level of 1.5 kg/ha or ppm is calculated to be protective of persons gardening in 90% of the slightly to strongly acidic soils included in the data base and eating the USDA recommended diet. As seen in Table 5, other countries have adopted cadmium standards approaching this low limit. While currently many NYS sludges could not meet this limit, with aggressive pollution prevention this number could be achieved as seen by the fact that many European sludges are able to meet their more stringent limits.

Application of different data and assumptions regarding diet and uptake coefficient results in acceptable cumulative loadings for cadmium that differ by a factor of 80.

Acceptable Cd Cumulative Limit	Basis
120	EPA calculation based on geometric mean UC and average late 1970s diet
15	Concentration based on geometric mean UC and USDA recommended diet
5.4	Concentration based on arithmetic mean UC and USDA recommended diet
1.5	Concentration based on Monte Carlo 90th percentile UC and USDA recommended diet
39	EPA cumulative limit based on child ingestion pathway

Values are in kg/ha.

Table 8. Cadmium Standard Calculated Using Different Assumptions Regarding Diet and Uptake Coefficient (UC)

7. RfD for Arsenic of 0.0008 mg/kg/day vs. 0.0003 or less

The reference dose (RfD) of a toxic chemical is the daily exposure over a lifetime likely to be without “appreciable” risk. It is expressed as the amount which can enter the body per kilogram of body weight per day. For arsenic, there is some uncertainty regarding the recommended maximum level. US EPA believes it to fall within the range of 0.0001-0.0008 mg/kg/day. US EPA selected the least conservative number (0.0008 mg/kg/day) in the Part 503 risk assessment despite the fact the RfD used by US EPA in other programs is 0.0003 mg/kg/day (US EPA, 1992, p. 5-107). A recalculation using the same assumptions as US EPA in the Part 503 risk assessment except for the use of an RfD of 0.0003 mg/kg/day for arsenic, produces an acceptable limit of 1 ppm arsenic in sludge products based on pathway 3, child ingestion of soil (TNRCC, 1996).

8. Many pollutants not regulated or monitored

Pollutants present in less than 10% of sludges not considered

A key issue is the very limited number of contaminants that are regulated under Part 503. In developing the rules, US EPA used a national perspective, not considering contaminants “infrequently” found in sludges. In the first round of regulation development which led to the Part 503 rules, there was no formal definition of the frequency of detection necessary for consideration nor was there a consistent data base of sludge quality from treatment plants in the US. That was one reason why US EPA sponsored the National Sewage Sludge Survey in 1988 (US EPA, 1990). For Round 2 of regulation development which is underway, contaminants found in 10% or fewer of sludges (determined by the 1988 survey) were not considered significant enough to regulate. However, in up to one out of ten sludges, these contaminants may be present and possibly at levels of concern.

A wide variety of contaminants have been found in sludges. Part 503 regulates only 9. While most sludges do not have high levels of non-regulated contaminants, without testing a user has no way of knowing what unregulated sludge contaminants are present.

While on a national scale the risks posed by such contaminants may be low, the particular sludge which a grower or home gardener may use might in fact have significant levels of some unregulated contaminants. Since no monitoring is required for these contaminants, users would have no way of knowing. Consider, for example, a hypothetical small city where an industry infrequently discharges a highly toxic contaminant not included in the Part 503 rules. A survey of sludges from 24 central NYS communities and another of 30 sludges from around the US documented just such a concern, finding elevated levels of various exotic contaminants in sludges from communities in which a particular industry was located (Mumma, et al., 1983; Mumma, et al., 1984).

Pollutants with insufficient data

Another rationale for not setting standards or requiring monitoring is the inability to adequately assess risks due to a lack of data to complete the risk assessment. Lack of adequate data is a serious limitation to the usefulness of risk assessment, but ignorance is not a solution to uncertainty. Currently, US EPA rules only require monitoring for regulated contaminants. Testing sludges for a wider range of priority pollutants and for dioxins and furans would not include all of the thousands of chemicals that might be present, but would be a step towards knowing what is being spread on land. One issue with wider testing is that the significance of detecting contaminants for which there are no regulatory limits is unclear. The data on many chemicals is not adequate to assess their impacts. Finding chemicals

through wider testing, however, can at least alert us and research can be undertaken to assess their effects. The current position of US EPA that further research is not needed on land application of sludges is inconsistent with the arguments of insufficient data used to eliminate many contaminants from consideration for regulation.

EPA determined that data for some pollutants were insufficient to perform a risk assessment and thus develop standards. The risks posed by some of these suggest a need for further study and regulation. Currently, EPA has eliminated them from consideration in Round 2 of regulation development and proposes no further research.

In their Round 2 evaluation of additional pollutants in sewage sludges, US EPA identified an additional twelve inorganic and organic chemicals beyond those regulated in Part 503 that are potentially harmful by one or more exposure pathways. The arguments ultimately used to exclude all but two of these (coplanar PCBs and dioxins/dibenzofurans) from further consideration can be called into question; most are based on a lack of data.

If the leachability of beryllium and barium is assumed to be as high as has been measured in acid sandy soils, both of these elements would have been subject to regulation to limit groundwater contamination (US EPA, 1996b). For barium, US EPA in the risk assessment used the lowest rather than the highest or median measured leachability for acid sandy soils, based on a single experiment. For beryllium, the median value of leachability was used.

US EPA excluded boron and fluoride from regulation despite both elements having critical pathways (pathway 6 for boron, pathways 6 and 10 for fluoride [Table 3]), arguing that the experiments from which this initial assessment of potential impact was derived did not measure transfer into biota from boron and fluoride in soils amended specifically with sludges. Since no information was available on uptake of either element from sludge into crops, US EPA concluded that the pathways could not be evaluated with existing information, and that boron and fluoride should not be regulated. However, both of these elements occur as anions and may not be strongly adsorbed in the sludge matrix. The initial solubility of boron in some sludges and composts is especially high, such that boron phytotoxicity in crops grown on soils recently amended with sludges has been observed (Chaney and Ryan, 1993). It is questionable whether it is reasonable to assume little transfer to animals and soil biota given the absence of data.

Synthetic organic chemicals

No organic contaminants are currently regulated under 503. The US EPA eliminated from consideration any organic contaminant that met any of the following three criteria. The criteria used were: 1) the pollutant has been banned for use in the US or it is not being manufactured for US use; or 2) it has been detected in 5% or fewer of the sludges tested in the National Sewage Sludge Survey; or 3) the 1-in-10,000 cancer risk limit was less than the concentration found in 99% of the sludges tested. Thus, even persistent synthetic organic chemicals found to be present in more than 5% of sludges were eliminated from regulation if they were no longer being manufactured (US EPA, 1992, 1995).

PCBs are an example of a class of organic contaminants generally found at low levels, but at high levels in some sludges. The risk assessment performed by US EPA shows that 4.6 ppm would be the limit for acceptable risk using a 1 in 10,000 cancer risk. In contrast, the rules in Texas set a 1 ppm standard for residential use and the Dutch clean-up intervention value is 1 ppm in soil (Tables 5 and 6) (Texas, 1996; van den Berg, 1994). A reassessment of pathway 5 by Chaney et al., arrived at a limit of 2.23 ppm for PCBs based on the pathway of a farm family consuming meat (Chaney, et al., 1997), but for a number of reasons the US EPA rules were stated to be adequately protective (Chaney, et al., 1996). Recent monitoring demonstrates that wastewater treatment plants are active sources of PCBs, and a majority of the PCBs contained in influents to wastewater plants are preferentially removed from the water into the sludge (Delaware River Basin Commission, 1998; Durell and Lizotte, 1998). Non-detection of PCBs from wastewater plant discharges in earlier studies may be partially due to analytical problems resulting from the fact that severely weathered samples no longer retain the congener “signature” of the original PCB mixtures and are thus not recognized by traditional laboratory methods (Delaware River Basin Commission, 1998).

PCBs are not regulated under Part 503 because they are no longer being manufactured in the US. PCBs, dioxins, and many other chlorinated synthetic organic chemicals are persistent, slow to degrade,

Current US rules contain no standards or testing requirements for organic chemicals. Standards for coplanar PCBs, dioxins, and furans are proposed for future development by the EPA.

A number of synthetic organic detergent additives are found in high levels in sludges and are regulated in some European countries.

and they bioaccumulate. More than 50% of dioxins and furans were still present in soils 20 years after sludge application (McLachlan, et al., 1996; McLachlan, Horstmann and Hinkel, 1996). Most sludges contain low levels, but some individual sludges contain significant amounts. Monitoring of persistent synthetic organic chemicals such as PCBs is not required under US EPA rules but has been recommended, even by researchers who believe the toxicity risk from these chemicals resulting from land application of sludges is very low (Chaney, et al., 1996). Again, this is a case of the 503 regulations dealing with “average” rather than specific conditions. While it is stated that “PCB concentrations will limit use of biosolids from only a few of the 14,000 POTWs [publicly owned treatment works] in the US” (Chaney, et al., 1996), without testing a sludge user would have no way of knowing if the sludge or sludge product they are applying is one of those few. The particular pathway of concern is ingesting sludge. In addition, since PCBs (and other persistent, fat soluble toxic organics) bioaccumulate in animal fats, ingestion of sludges containing such organics by cattle could be a concern regarding milk and meat quality.

Dioxins and furans are a series of related compounds, some level of which are found in all sludges (McLachlan, Horstmann and Hinkel, 1996; US EPA, 1990; US EPA, 1996a, c). Since the toxicity of the different particular types (known as congeners) varies widely, US EPA and others have defined toxic equivalency factor (TEQ) which is a calculated number varying from 1 for 2,3,7,8 TCDD, the most toxic, to 0.001 for other less toxic types. To calculate the total risk posed by dioxins and furans in a sludge, the concentration of a particular type of dioxin or furan is multiplied by the toxicity factor for that particular type and then summed for all the dioxins and furans that are present to arrive at a total TEQ. Levels in US sludges vary widely, with a mean value of 10 to 20 nanograms/kg TEQ, but some sludges have a TEQ over 100 ng/kg. While no regulations are in place regarding the land application of materials containing dioxins, an agreement between the paper companies and US EPA regarding land application of paper mill sludges established 10 ng/kg TEQ as the limit for unregulated spreading and paper sludges containing over 50 ng/kg are not to be land applied. For levels between 10 and 50 ng/kg TEQ, site specific evaluation would govern use. There are thus a number of sewage sludges which would not be spread under these criteria. It has been suggested that dioxins may be a limiting factor in the application of sludges in Ontario where there is a risk-based soil clean up level for dioxins of 10 ng/kg TEQ (Campbell and Webber, 1997; Webber and Nichols, 1995). Dioxins and furans and co-planar PCBs are the only additional pollutants which US EPA is proposing to address in Round 2, which is expected to take several years. In the meantime, federal rules do not require testing for these contaminants.

Toxicity data are sparse for many synthetic organic chemicals. Previous standard-setting has focused primarily on cancer risks, but other risks such as hormone disruption or IQ depression may be more limiting.

A number of organic contaminants which are components of detergents are found in relatively high levels in sludges including linear alkylbenzene sulphonates (LAS), nonylphenol (NP), nonylphenol ethoxylates (NPE) and di-(2-ethylhexyl) phthalate (DEHP) (Giger, 1997). These vary in toxicity and degradability in the soil environment, but some are suspect regarding hormonal mimicking actions. To date, these contaminants have not been assessed by US EPA in regard to land application of sludges. Further research on their effects on humans and animals is needed (Krogmann, et al., 1997). Switzerland has banned the use of nonylphenol and a number of other countries have set standards for these constituents, as well as for total polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs), dioxins and for some measurement of total chlorinated organics. In Sweden, recommended limits for a number of organic contaminants were established in negotiations with the agricultural community. Maximum concentrations of 50 mg/kg for nonylphenol, 5 for toluene, 3 for PAHs and 0.42 for PCBs have been established (Matthews, 1996).

Radioactivity

Radioactivity is not addressed in Part 503. Little is known about the extent to which sewage sludges are contaminated with radioactivity and monitoring is not required. While the average sludge may contain little radioactivity, individual sludges receiving waste water from various types of facilities may reconcentrate radioactivity in sludges (GAO, 1994). Further investigation is needed, particularly where potential sources discharge to sewage treatment plants including nuclear facilities, hospitals and other medical facilities and leachate from superfund sites containing radioactivity.

9. Ground and surface water calculations assume large dilution/attenuation

Leachate diluted/attenuated before reaching well

While the US EPA risk assessment for the groundwater pathway (pathway 14, Table 3) states that the objective is to protect a shallow well immediately downgradient of a sludged field, the calculation assumes a large reduction of peak metal concentrations (through dilution and/or attenuation) by the time that leachate reaches a well (e.g., the reduction factor for arsenic is 244.) Depending on numerous characteristics of the site and contaminant, a well in the vicinity of sludged fields may not receive the benefit of that great a reduction.


The generally-held belief that metals in sludges cannot readily leach has been called into question by recent data. Working with undisturbed soil columns rather than the repacked soil columns used in previous experiments, the potential for leaching of metals has been demonstrated. In undisturbed soils, channels created by worms and roots and other processes (“macropores”) provide for rapid downward water movement that can limit the adsorption or chemical interactions between the percolate and the soil (Camobreco, et al., 1996). Transport appears to be governed by this fast and far-reaching preferential flow and by the relatively non-reactive forms of some of the metals, i.e., as soluble and/or colloidal complexes which is enhanced by the organic matter in sludges (Richards, et al., 1998). Most sludge research to date has overlooked this phenomenon. High pH (such as in alkaline-stabilized sludge products) can actually increase leaching since the solubility of some organically-complexed metals is high under such conditions. Examination of field research data collected over the years by many researchers shows that typically up to half of some metals applied in sludges appear to be “missing” from the soil and may have leached (Baveye, et al., 1999). Transport of a range of metals in percolating water has been directly observed at a field site where sludge was applied more than a decade earlier (Richards, et al., 1998).

Concentrations of Cd, Ni, and Zn exceeded drinking water standards in leachate collected from lysimeters immediately below soils receiving sludge 20 years after a large quantity of sludge had been applied to agricultural soils (Richards, et al, 1998). Calculations of impacts on groundwater indicate the potential for violation of drinking water standards in the vicinity of sludge application sites (Richards, 1997). Thus, the US EPA risk assessment assumptions may not be sufficiently protective of wells near sludge application sites. Further investigation is needed to ascertain if there is a significant concern for both metals and pathogens in groundwater, as viral pathogens could migrate by preferential flow as well.

Only 0.24% of the model watershed receives sludge

There is concern for the quality of surface water in the vicinity of sludge application sites. There is potential for contaminants including metals and pathogens to be present in surface runoff and in

Material balances on several sites which have received sludges show unexplained metal losses. Recent research indicates the potential for metals to leach from sludges and sludge products and the possibility of violating drinking water standards.



shallow percolating water that reaches tile drains which are common beneath fields in the northeast. The US EPA risk assessment used unrealistic assumptions regarding dilution of contaminants (Figure 3).

A key parameter in the surface water exposure pathway is the amount of the watershed which has received sludge. The Part 503 risk assessment assumes that only 1074 ha out of a 440,300 ha watershed receives sludge. This may be applicable to a very large watercourse, but in a local area a far greater proportion of a smaller stream's watershed may have received sludge. Figure 3 shows the size of such a drainage basin (in the upper Hudson River in NYS) and depicts the tiny fraction assumed to receive sludge applications. US EPA's choice is thus not protective of the smaller streams in agricultural areas where sludge is applied. For example, a change in the percentage of watershed area receiving sludge to assume a 100 acre farm receiving sludge in a 1000 acre watershed would lower calculated limits for PCBs by more than 95% as compared to the US EPA assumptions (Cleland, 1995).

Recent laboratory and greenhouse research has shown that some metals present in sludges (Cu, Mo, Ni) are relatively soluble in the very alkaline product created by the mixing of sludge with cement kiln dust or fly ash, and lime. Much smaller fractions of a number of other metals (Ag, Cd, Hg, Pb

Impacts of sludge application on surface water streams and lakes depend on the percentage of the watershed land that receives sludge.

In assuming that only a tiny fraction of the watershed is sludged, the Part 503 risk assessment fails to assess impacts on smaller bodies of water.

and Zn) were immediately water soluble (McBride, 1998b; Richards, et al., 1997). This solubility, likely a result of complexation with dissolved organic substances, suggests the potential for the movement of the soluble metals from land-applied alkaline sludge products into surface waters and shallow groundwater under some conditions. Further work is necessary to investigate field conditions. The sensitivity of aquatic organisms to dissolved copper suggests that a large dilution factor would be required to prevent toxicity in surface waters receiving runoff from areas where such sludge products have been surface applied (McBride, 1998b).

10. Not protective of agricultural productivity

Phytotoxicity and crop yield reduction

Appropriate use of sludges on agricultural lands has positive effects on plant growth through the addition of nutrients and organic matter. Excessive accumulation of certain metals such as copper, zinc and nickel reduces crop yields. We need to assess not only short-term benefits, but long-term risks of yield reduction due to accumulation of contaminants over time. This pathway (Pathway 8, Table 3) was evaluated by US EPA in the risk assessment and has also been considered by agronomists at the land-grant universities in the northeast (Pennsylvania State University, 1985). The cumulative limits for copper, nickel and zinc in the Part 503 regulations are approximately ten times those recommended by the northeast soil scientists.

Acceptable cumulative levels of Zn and Ni depend on calculations of the uptake coefficients and of the yield reductions that are associated with the concentration of metals in the crop tissue resulting from uptake. As discussed above, the US EPA risk assessment used values for uptake coefficients that are not conservative. In addition, not all elements exhibiting phytotoxic impacts can be assessed with this plant uptake model. For Cu, for example, roots are affected by toxicity before tissue levels in the crop are elevated significantly. Assessing the risk of yield reduction based on uptake coefficients and tissue levels is not appropriate for such elements.

The yield reductions calculated in the EPA risk assessment are higher than most growers would find acceptable. For some growers, any reduction would be unacceptable. In one method, US EPA calculated the cumulative load of Zn allowed under Part 503 based on the probability that it could

The Part 503 rules allow an accumulation of phytotoxic metals in soils that is about an order of magnitude higher than recommended by a panel of northeast soil scientists, or than the level which rules in Ontario and several European countries would allow.

result in a 50% yield reduction. Although the US EPA calculations demonstrate a low probability of such a reduction, a standard based on such a calculation is not useful since such a high yield reduction is clearly unacceptable. Recalculation indicates that with a loading of approximately one tenth of the Zn standard in Part 503, yield reductions of 10% are likely in 10% of the soil-crop combinations in the US EPA database (Bouldin, 1997).

Protecting agricultural productivity, especially in the northeast where soils are acid and sensitive crops such as beans or alfalfa are raised (Table 9), makes it prudent to restrict cumulative additions of phytotoxic metals (Table 11). Based in part on values derived by a group of northeastern soil scientists who recommend a sliding scale for phytotoxic metal loading limits according to soil texture, the

Sludges are applied to agricultural lands with a goal of increasing productivity through the addition of nutrients and organic matter. Excessive application of some contaminants, however, can reduce crop yields; risks vary among different soils and crops.

Since these pollutants do not degrade, it is critical to limit their addition to protect the long-term productivity of the land.

Very Sensitive	Sensitive	Tolerant	Very Tolerant
Chard	Mustard	Cauliflower	Corn
Lettuce	Kale	Cucumber	Sudangrass
Beet	Spinach	Zucchini squash	Smooth bromegrass
Carrot	Broccoli	Oat	
Turnip	Radish	Orchardgrass	
Peanut	Tomato	Switchgrass	
Clovers	Birdsfoot trefoil	Kentucky Bluegrass	
Crownvetch	Soybean	Fescues	
Alfalfa ¹	Snapbean		
Sunflower ²	Timothy		
	Bentgrasses		
	Ryegrass		

Table 9. Relative Sensitivity of Crops to Sludge-Applied Copper, Nickel and Zinc³

¹ Hydroponic study (Ibekwe et al., 1996).

² Metal salts added to soil (Gorlach and Gambus, 1992).

³ Adapted from Chaney and Hundemann in US EPA, 1992.

recommendations of this paper in Table 11 for copper, zinc and nickel are close to one-tenth of the Part 503 cumulative load standards (Pennsylvania State University, 1985). The recommendations in this paper also take into account soil metal levels known to cause toxicity to crops in specific field experiments (Table 10) as well as a reassessment of the US EPA data base on phytotoxicity applying more conservative assumptions.

Soil microorganisms

Experiments at a number of long-term sludge-treated field sites in the UK, Germany, and Sweden, where metals had accumulated and persisted for decades, have shown that microbial functions in soils are adversely affected at metal concentrations that are not necessarily toxic to crops. Rhizobium populations in the soil can be reduced when the Zn, Cu, Ni, and Cd concentrations reach 130-200, 27-48, 11-15, and 0.8-1.0 mg/kg (ppm), respectively, in the soil (McGrath et al., 1995). Other microorganisms, such as free-living N-fixing heterotrophic bacteria and phototrophic cyanobacteria, are sensitive to heavy metals at these or even lower levels. The soil microbial mass is reduced at Zn, Cu, Ni, and Cd concentrations ranging from 180-857, 70-384, 22-35, and 0.7-6.0 mg/kg, respectively. Generally, higher soil pH and increased content of clay and organic matter in the soil mitigate toxicity, shifting the limiting concentrations toward the higher end of these ranges. Based on the negative effects observed in soil microbes, the advised limit in Great Britain for Zn in soils was adjusted downward from 300 to 200 mg/kg (UK Dept. of the Environment, 1995). The risk assessment for Part 503 does not set limits based on soil microorganisms (McGrath et al., 1994; US EPA, 1992).

Animal health

Animals that graze on land to which sludge has been applied to the surface will ingest sludge along with the plants and some soil. Grazing cattle ingest from 1-18% of their dry matter intake as soil and sheep may ingest as much as 30% depending upon management and the seasonal supply of grass (Fries, 1996; Thornton and Abrahams, 1983). The US EPA risk assessment assumes a soil ingestion of 1.5% of diet. This is a non-conservative estimate based on use of best management practices. Incorporation of sludge into the soil can help prevent impacts to animal health, but it is very inconvenient so in practice sludge is generally applied to the surface in pasture land applications. US EPA regulations do not restrict grazing on lands to which Class A sludges have been applied and they allow grazing 30 days after application of Class B sludges. The adequacy of this one-month period for

	Sludge-treated Mineral Soils		Organic soils, pure Composts and Sludges	
COPPER	100 ¹ 125 ²	protect most sensitive field crops	1000-1500 ³	sludge pot study (oat, corn, spinach, etc.)
	350 ⁴	toxic to rape field crop	1100-1900 ⁵	compost pot study (cabbage, bean, chard. etc.)
	500 ⁶	chlorosis in most crops	2000 ⁷	peat pot studies (soybean, carrots, onion)
	750	EPA 503		
ZINC	200-250 ^{2,8}	protect most sensitive field crops	1000 ⁹	field vegetables on muck
	320 ¹	ryegrass limit in pot study		
	360 ¹⁰	field bean yield loss	2200 ⁵	compost pot study (cabbage, bean, chard. etc.)
	390 ¹¹	field oat, wheat yield loss		
	600-700 ^{12,6}	field crop toxicity	2000-3000 ³	sludge pot study (oat, corn, spinach, etc.)
	1400	EPA 503		
1500 ¹	field grasses, cereals			
NICKEL	50 ¹	red beet toxicity	250-750 ³	sludge pot study (oat, corn, spinach, etc.)
	200-220 ^{1,11}	protect most field crops	1500 ¹³	field vegetables on muck
	210	EPA 503	1800 ⁷	peat pot study (soybean)

Values are soil concentrations in ppm (mg/kg)

Table 10: Phytotoxicity Thresholds For Crops Grown In Sludge-Amended Soils

¹ Sauerbeck & Styperek, 1986; Davis & Carlton-Smith, 1984

² Webber, 1972

³ Smilde, 1982

⁴ Reith et al., 1979

⁵ Handreck, 1994

⁶ Rohde, 1962

⁷ Roth et al., 1971; Levesque & Mathur, 1984

⁸ Sanders et al., 1987

⁹ Staker & Cummings, 1941

¹⁰ Giordano et al., 1975

¹¹ Lubben et al., 1991

¹² Williams et al., 1985

¹³ Frank et al., 1992; Temple & Bisessar, 1981

protection against pathogen transmission has been questioned, with an 18-month waiting period suggested (National Research Council, 1996). Denmark and Sweden do not allow application of sludges of any kind to lands used for grazing (Matthews, 1996).

Current limits for molybdenum (Mo) and selenium (Se) in Part 503 are also a concern. Both can be readily taken up by crops (high uptake coefficients) and can accumulate to concentration levels toxic to foraging animals. There is a narrow range between necessary nutrient levels and toxicity for these elements, and naturally occurring levels of these metals are highly variable within US soils.

Molybdenum toxicity in ruminant animals (Mo-induced Cu deficiency) is associated with forages containing 10-20 mg/kg of Mo (or more) with relatively normal concentrations (4-10 mg/kg) of Cu in the forage (Kubota and Allaway, 1972). Molybdenum availability in soils is enhanced by moderate to high pH soil conditions, high phosphate fertilization, and high organic matter content (Fleming, 1980). Under such conditions, 2-3 mg/kg of total Mo in soil has produced forages with toxic concentrations for ruminants. Selenium toxicity in ruminants occurs if forages contain 5-10 mg Se/kg (Jacobs, 1989). Calcareous or alkaline soils with as little as 0.5-2.0 mg/kg of total Se can produce forages with Se at

toxic levels (Purves, 1985). Studies of uptake into red clover (McBride et al., in prep.) and forage grass (Nguyen and O'Connor, 1997) suggest that uptake is sufficiently high to call for limiting Mo additions to soils where forage is grown.

Application of sludges could pose some risk because sludge molybdenum and selenium are relatively soluble in sludges and are present at higher concentrations than in most soils. The high pH of alkaline-stabilized sludge products are conducive both to water solubility and to plant absorption of these elements. Most of the metal contaminant concerns regarding land application are related to long-term soil loading and thus are unlikely to result in impacts in the short term. In contrast, the potential for molybdenum toxicity can be an immediate concern. As with other calculations in the risk assessment upon which the Part 503 rules are based, the geometric mean of uptake coefficients from the very few studies of Mo uptake were used. This resulted in a cumulative limit of 18 kg Mo/ha which was subsequently deleted from the rules so that there is presently only a ceiling concentration limit of 75 ppm for Mo. The assumption that increased copper uptake resulting from sludge application would be adequate to offset the Mo taken up by the crops is not supported by research data (McBride et al, in prep; Webber et al., 1983). Uptake of Mo into legumes is relatively high, particularly from alkaline sludge products commonly used in NYS. Since a dairy herd may predominantly be fed on forage such as alfalfa (a legume) from a particular farm, protection of the health of ruminant livestock whose diet is forages grown on sludge-amended soils suggests that limiting soil concentrations of Mo to approximately 2mg/kg and limiting loading rates to 1-2 kg Mo/ha may be necessary (McBride, personal communication, 1998). In the U.K. a maximum soil concentration of 4 mg/kg is advised. However, elevated Mo levels in legumes may be associated with soils whose parent material contains 3mg/kg Mo or more (Kubota, 1980).

Iron, which can be high in sludges, can also cause toxicity in grazing animals by direct ingestion of sludge retained on forage. It is not one of the elements for which sludges must be tested or for which there are standards. Ingestion of soil is also an important and possibly even dominant pathway for lead and arsenic transfer into grazing animals (Thornton and Abrahams, 1983).

Animal health is sensitive to the ratios of different metals in their diets, so analysis of the various metals in both the sludge as well as other components of the animal diet needs to be conducted for the particular type of animal being raised. In addition, the potential impact of sludge application on wildlife grazing on sludge amended land is not well known (University of New Hampshire, 1998). There is some evidence that moose may be susceptible to molybdenosis (Frank, 1998).

Class B sludges contain significant pathogen levels.

Little is known about the leaching of pathogens to groundwater from sludge application sites.

11. Inadequate assessment of pathogen risks

Sludges contain a high concentration of pathogenic viruses, bacteria and parasites. In fact, most microbes which are present in raw sewage are concentrated in sludge. The levels and types are dependent in part on the health of the population contributing to the sewage plant and will vary over time as the health of the population varies. The type of sludge treatment also affects the viability of pathogens. High treatment temperatures (>56 degrees C) are relatively effective in killing pathogens.

Prior to land application, sludges must be treated to reduce pathogen levels. Class B sludges still contain significant levels of pathogens (Straub, et al., 1993). Class A sludges and sludge products have received higher levels of treatment (generally hotter for longer). If not killed, the small size of viruses and other pathogens may potentially permit them to leach to groundwater (Powelson, et al., 1991). This may be the most likely route of significant human exposure to pathogens from land applied Class B sludges (Straub, 1993). There is a need for field data regarding the movement of pathogens, particularly where groundwater is found at shallow depths and soils are conducive to preferential flow.

Few viruses have been studied in regard to sludges and unfortunately unlike viruses behave differently (Dubovi, 1997). No monitoring is currently required for viruses in sludges or sludge products.

Bacteria, unlike either viruses or parasites, can actually increase in numbers during treatment under certain conditions. Regrowth in composts that were not fully stabilized has been documented (Soares, et al., 1995). Thus a compost could have met processing requirements and standards for *E. coli* or *Salmonella* (US EPA requires testing for one or the other for Class A), but could subsequently have significant bacterial levels if regrowth occurs after testing.

Parasites such as Helminth ova are relatively resistant to inactivation when present as cysts. In Class B sludges they could be present in significant numbers and they have been documented to survive for many years in soils (Bowman, 1997). Little is known about the presence and viability of *Cryptosporidium* and *Giardia* in sludges. High levels of cysts of *Giardia* have been detected in sludges, but they may be inactivated (non-infective). More research is needed to assess the risks posed by these protozoa (Straub, et al., 1993).

Generally cooler, wetter conditions such as those found in the northeast favor survival of pathogens in the soil.

12. Ecological impacts inadequately assessed

The US EPA risk assessment addressed only the impact of copper on earthworms, and of cadmium, lead and PCBs on shrews using only field data from agricultural sites. Recognizing the limitations of this analysis, an US EPA-funded study has been carried out at Oak Ridge National Laboratory to assess the current state of knowledge on ecological impacts of sludge application. This study which examines impacts to plants and animals has not yet been released. Preliminary results indicate that for some contaminants, ecological risk may become the most limiting pathway. The standards for soil quality derived from the Dutch risk assessment found ecotoxicologic impacts to be the most sensitive measures requiring the lowest standards (van den Berg, et al., 1993; Crommentuijn, et al., 1994; Swartjes, 1997). The paucity of data on ecological effects used in developing Part 503 rules is likely an important reason why these rules are far less restrictive (McGrath, et al., 1994). The Part 503 rules will need to be reassessed when the results of the Oak Ridge study are available to determine what changes in contaminants levels may be needed to protect ecological systems.

Efforts to curb emissions of mercury are underway in NYS and elsewhere due to its toxicity and propensity to bioaccumulate. Recent research has demonstrated that some of the mercury in land applied sludge volatilizes and that the concentration of mercury in air over sludge sites contains 10-100 times the background concentration (Carpi and Lindberg, 1997). The EPA risk assessment assumes that no mercury is volatilized from land application. A review of the risk assessment in light of the new findings suggests that for most pathways there is not a substantial concern, but that the potential to impact local waterbodies through re-deposition of methyl mercury may be significant and warrants further analysis (Carpi, 1997). Worldwide sludge land application is estimated to emit to the air about one eighth of the amount of mercury discharged by power plants or by municipal waste incinerators (Carpi and Lindberg, 1997).

13. Inadequate enforcement and oversight

Enforcement (or the lack thereof) of rules and practices such as use of agricultural best management practices is a significant issue. This concern is magnified as both federal and state budget cuts force a reduction in environmental staff. US EPA has said that they view the 503 regulations as largely “self-implementing.” Under the Part 503 regulations, sludge producers are required to follow processing procedures and perform monitoring. Periodic reporting is required, but no permits are issued for land

application (note that NYS currently requires site specific permits for Class B applications) and no record-keeping of application is required for Class A “EQ” sludges. Such a system gives neighbors of land application sites and others little confidence that rules will be followed. Without permits or records, there is no way for concerned parties to know even whether or not sludge products have been applied. It may also prove difficult for anyone to keep track of the cumulative load of metals applied from non-“EQ” sludges. Interestingly, even in Ontario where records were required, researchers found that they could not locate sludge application records because sludge haulers did not turn over records when contracts were transferred (OMAFRA, 1995).

Adherence to best management practices, some of which are specified in federal and state rules, is of critical importance in preventing negative impacts from sludge application. Further management practices may be recommended by agricultural advisors (e.g., Cornell Cooperative Extension, 1997). Without oversight there is concern that even required practices such as application at no higher than agronomic rates necessary to meet crop nutrient requirements or maintenance of setback distances from watercourses may not be followed, leading to water pollution.

14. No labeling of sludges or sludge products

No labels nor information for users are required for sludge and sludge products which meet the EQ standards set in part 503. Thus information on the quality of the product is not readily available to potential users. Labeling is needed which includes analytic information about the concentration of contaminants and nutrients of the material. Growers and their advisors need the information to make appropriate decisions about nutrient management.

Additionally, if those electing to use a sludge or sludge product want to select the cleanest possible material or to follow more stringent recommendations for application (such as those in Table 11), they require information on contaminant concentrations.

In order to compare among sludges and sludge products, users need information on the product quality. Federal rules do not require suppliers to provide such information for sludges meeting “EQ” standards.

Conclusions

US national standards for the land application of sewage sludges are markedly less stringent than those of many other countries. The standards were developed through an extensive risk assessment, but data gaps and non-protective policy choices result in regulations which are not adequately protective of human health and the environment.

The exposure pathways and significance of impacts for home use, agricultural use and other applications such as to golf course turf and roadside vegetation are significantly different. For home use, more stringent standards are appropriate, reflecting the greater likelihood of child ingestion of sludge and the potential for less careful management. For use on agricultural lands, reduction of soil productivity and animal health concerns are of greater significance. For many other uses, these pathways are of less importance, which might result in less stringent standards.

The application of sewage sludges to agricultural lands and home grounds should be based on acceptable resultant contaminant concentrations in the receiving soil. Where a single set of standards are applied regardless of end use, the limits should reflect the most limiting pathway. Table 11 suggests maximum soil concentrations appropriate for soils in the northeastern US. The numbers are for recommended maximum soil concentrations and reaching these levels will depend on initial soil concentrations, the concentration of the contaminant in the sludge, the total loading of sludge applied and any losses (e.g. through leaching). Limiting application to these maximum levels will also help prevent excessive contamination with currently unregulated contaminants by limiting the amount of sludge that could be applied over time. Sludges with contaminant concentrations not exceeding the

levels in ppm listed for maximum soil concentrations in Table 11 could be applied in unlimited cumulative quantity without exceeding the recommended soil concentrations for contaminants. (Application at appropriate annual rates to ensure that nutrient levels are not exceeded is still required.) For sludges exceeding the Table 11 recommended maximum concentrations, calculations should be made to determine the cumulative amount of sludge which could be applied without exceeding the recommended soil concentration.

In addition to testing of receiving soils, monitoring for a number of currently unregulated contaminants should be required and test results provided to potential users to enable them to compare among different sludges. Tests should include synthetic organic chemicals (including dioxins and furans), antimony, beryllium, boron, chromium, and silver. If animals will be grazing or if forage is grown, copper, fluoride, iron, molybdenum and selenium should be monitored and dietary metal ratios considered.

Further research is needed on nitrogen release rates, the movement of metals and pathogens to ground and surface water, the presence and impact of synthetic organic contaminants and of contaminants eliminated from US EPA Round 2 consideration due to inadequate data, and ecological impacts (including soil organisms). Additional standards should be developed to address the research findings.

Policies should be designed to support pollution prevention and promote continued improvement in sludge quality. This includes establishing outreach and technical assistance programs, as well as regulations which minimize the use of undesirable contaminants, especially those which are persistent in the environment. "Clean sludge" standards should be set at levels low enough to motivate minimization of pollutant concentrations.

Recommendations Regarding Application of Sewage Sludges on Agricultural Lands or Gardens

Recommendations to those who elect to use sewage sludges or sludge products

Sludge and soil quality

1. Limit application of sludges so that the soil concentrations in Table 11 (last column) are not exceeded. The numbers are for recommended maximum soil concentrations. Reaching these levels will depend on initial soil concentrations, the concentration of the contaminant in the sludge, the total loading of sludge applied and any losses (e.g. through leaching). Limiting application to these maximum levels will also help prevent excessive contamination with currently unregulated contaminants by limiting the amount of sludge that could be applied over time. Table 11 For sludges exceeding the Table 11 recommended maximum concentrations, calculations should be made to determine the cumulative amount of sludge which could be applied without exceeding the recommended soil concentration.¹ Sludges with contaminant concentrations at or below the levels listed for maximum soil concentrations in Table 11 could be applied in unlimited cumulative quantity without exceeding the recommended soil concentrations for contaminants. (Application at appropriate annual rates to ensure that nutrient levels are not exceeded is still required.)

¹ To determine the total number of tons/acre which could be applied for a sludge with measured contaminant levels apply the following equation: Total cumulative application in tons/acre=1000 x (max. soil concentration in ppm minus background soils concentration in ppm) divided by sludge contaminant concentration in ppm. For example: If a sludge contains Cd at 10 ppm, background soil is 0.2 ppm, and the recommended maximum soil concentration of 2 ppm is used, a total of 180 tons/acre could be applied [1000x(2 ppm - 0.2 ppm)/10 ppm] without exceeding the recommended maximum soil concentration, assuming all of the cadmium applied remained in the soil. (Texas Natural Resources Commission, 1996). Background soil often exceeds 1 ppm so a range suggested as potentially acceptable.

Contaminant	Typical NYS Sludge Conc. ¹	Typical NYS Agr. Soil	Recommended Soil Maximum Concentration
Arsenic	3-10	<9	1-10 ²
Cadmium	2-15	0.2	2 ³
Chromium	50-500	52	— ⁴
Copper	300-1500	20	40-100 ⁵
Lead	100-300	15	— ⁶
Mercury	1-10	0.1	1 ⁷
Molybdenum	5-50	1.0	4 ⁸
Nickel	10-150	16	25-50 ⁹
Selenium	2-6	0.4	5 ¹⁰
Zinc	500-2500	60	75-200 ¹¹
PCBs	<5		1 ¹²

Values are in ppm dry weight. 1 ppm ≈ 2 lbs./acre cumulative load.

Table 11. Maximum Concentrations of Contaminants in Soils

¹ Based on a survey of NYS sludges (NYS DEC, 1994).

² Risk assessment based on child ingestion and 0.0003 RfD suggests 1 ppm concentration limit for sludges used at home (Texas Natural Resources Commission, 1996). Background soil often exceeds 1 ppm so a range suggested as potentially acceptable.

³ A limit of 2 ppm is recommended due to crop uptake concerns.

⁴ The chemical form of chromium is of critical importance. Cr III is of little concern because it forms relatively insoluble compounds, while Cr VI is highly toxic and soluble. Little information is available on the ionic status of Cr in sludged soils and the potential for chromium oxidation in sludged soils.

⁵ Concentration limit to prevent phytotoxicity based on the northeast guidelines (Pennsylvania State, 1985). 40 ppm for sandy soils, 60 ppm for fine sandy loam to silt loam, 100 ppm for silt to clay soils.

⁶ The lowest attainable levels are desirable since negative human impacts continue to be discovered at increasingly low levels. Child ingestion is the primary concern.

⁷ The lowest attainable levels are desirable. Ecotoxicologic and groundwater impacts are likely to be the determining factor.

⁸ Excessive molybdenum can result in molybdenum toxicity (induced copper deficiency) in ruminants. A minimum dietary Cu:Mo ratio of 2:1 is advised. Test forages for molybdenum and copper periodically and preventing ruminants from grazing on land to which sludge has been applied and not incorporated into the soil is recommended.

⁹ Concentration limit to prevent phytotoxicity based on the northeast guidelines (Pennsylvania State, 1985). 25 ppm for sandy soils, 35 ppm for fine sandy loam to silt loam, 50 ppm for silt to clay soils.

¹⁰ This may be high. Test forages periodically for selenium to assure that concentration does not exceed that considered toxic to animals.

¹¹ Concentration limit to prevent phytotoxicity based on the northeast guidelines (Pennsylvania State, 1985). 75 ppm for sandy soils, 130 ppm for fine sandy loam to silt loam, 200 ppm for silt to clay soils. Higher concentrations can be tolerated in calcareous soils.

¹² Based on EPA recommended soil levels (US EPA, 1990).

2. As a general precaution, do not land-apply at high rates or for many applications any sludge with contaminant concentrations greater than those listed as recommended maximum soil concentrations in Table 11.
3. Excessive application of nutrients resulting in leaching of nitrogen and excess enrichment of phosphorus in soils may result from sludge application, particularly on livestock farms where there may already be excess nutrients. Therefore apply only according to a nutrient management plan.
4. Obtain information from supplier (and applicator if sludge is spread by another party) which states that the sludge meets all required standards and that required application practices have been followed. Indemnification can also include a commitment to provide legal defense on behalf of the farmer should a lawsuit be brought.

Testing

5. Require the supplier to provide information on content of contaminants. Consumers including farmers should be able to compare among various products to select the one with the lowest contaminant levels and optimal nutrient content. In addition to the regulated contaminants, request information about synthetic organic chemicals (including dioxins and furans), antimony, beryllium, boron, chromium, and silver. If animals will be grazing or if growing forage, also request analyses for fluoride, iron, molybdenum and selenium and consider dietary metal ratios. Ideally the tests would pertain to the specific load of sludge or product being used (not a report from several years ago). When this is not possible, reports from several different sampling times should be compared to ensure that levels are relatively constant. Select only products with consistently low levels of contaminants.
6. Test soils before application to determine pH, nutrient requirements and metals concentrations. Avoid over-application of metals by testing for background levels before application and at least every five years in a sustained application program.
7. Test shallow water supply wells that are near and downgradient of field where sludges have been applied for metals and pathogens.

Note: In NYS, soil analyses for some constituents may be obtained through Cornell Cooperative Extension. Contact the Dept. of Health or DEC for information on other laboratories certified to perform analyses.

Uses and Management Practices

8. Caution is advised regarding application of sewage on land used for forage production or grazing. Toxicities can result from imbalances in trace elements, particularly molybdenum, selenium and copper. For Class B sludges, pathogens are a concern. If sludge or sludge products are used, do not apply to standing forage. If used, incorporation into soils is particularly important and analysis of the ratio of various metals in the animal diet is recommended.
9. Apply as you would manure, using a calibrated spreader to ensure accurate, uniform distribution. Prevent over application and avoid hotspots. If someone else is applying, make sure they spread properly. Visit fields where they have previously applied.
10. Maintain soil pH at 6.5-7.0 to minimize plant uptake and leaching unless contaminant levels are low, similar to background soil concentrations or recommended soil values in Table 11.
11. Incorporation is recommended to prevent odor problems, enrichment of surface water runoff and deposition of dust or spray on crops. Spread sludges within one or two days of delivery and incorporate within 48 hours after application. Assume odors will always be a concern for neighbors when using sludges.
12. Maintain setbacks from streams, ponds, wells and property lines.
13. Avoid application on steep slopes, on saturated soils where runoff is excessive, or on shallow or extremely well-drained (coarse) soils where percolation to groundwater may be rapid.
14. Avoid contact with and inhalation of Class B sludges to reduce pathogen hazards.
15. Take delivery only after analytical reports have been examined, application plans have been understood and agreed to, and best management practices established.
16. Check with NYS DEC, farm credit organization and person buying crops to determine any restrictions.
17. Avoid access to sludge products by children. (Home garden use presents the greatest potential for child exposure.)
18. Avoid use on home vegetable gardens (currently NYS regulations specify such a restriction and require distributors to include such a restriction on the label or distribution information). Concerns about cadmium and synthetic organics are the primary reason for the recommendation. If a resident decides to use a sludge product, use one with low contaminant levels (preferably meeting the recommended soil concentrations in the last column of Table 11).

Suggestions for policies and regulations

The following suggestions are based on a review of the US EPA Part 503 regulations in light of current research. NYS DEC regulations presently address some of these issues. The authors and other Cornell faculty and staff would be pleased to discuss these recommendations and assist in developing them into policies which can be implemented.

General

1. Reevaluate policy and regulation for application of sludges to land in light of the inadequacies in the Part 503 risk assessment.
2. Reevaluate and revise regulations to reflect the results of the US EPA supported study being conducted at Oak Ridge National Laboratories regarding ecological impacts of sludge application when these are available.
3. Consider adoption of maximum soil concentrations for contaminants (see Table 11 for recommended limits).
4. Consider the adoption of standards for “clean sludge” that are at least as restrictive as the values in the last column of Table 11. Any sludge product for which tracking of cumulative additions is not required should meet these values. For tracked products, include a ceiling limit (for NYS, the 95th percentile values for NYS sludges would seem a reasonable ceiling) and require a calculation of and limit application to the number of tons which could be applied before reaching the recommended maximum soil concentrations in Table 11.
5. Consider regulating home use, agricultural use and other applications such as to golf course turf and roadside vegetation differently since exposure pathways and significance of impacts are very different. For home use, more stringent standards are appropriate, reflecting the greater likelihood of child ingestion of sludge and the potential for less careful management. For use on agricultural lands, phytotoxicity concerns are of greater significance. For many other uses, these pathways are of less import which might result in less stringent standards.
6. Work to develop standards for PCBs, dioxins and other organics such as detergent constituents.
7. Work to develop standards for other elements reviewed in Round 2 by US EPA.
8. Consider measures to apply equal controls to sludge products imported from out of state.

Monitoring and Labeling

9. Consider implementation of labeling requirements for sludges and sludge products that include information on the source of the materials, the content of contaminants and on required and recommended management practices.
10. Require testing for synthetic organics, including surfactants, and additional metals. Testing for organics might be required when a permit for beneficial use of sludge is requested and periodically thereafter, with frequency depending on the size of the plant and whether or not it accepts industrial waste waters. In addition to the regulated metals, particular attention should be paid to antimony, beryllium, chromium, silver; and, if animals will be grazing or forage grown, also fluoride, iron, molybdenum and selenium.
11. Consider expanding pathogen testing to include both fecal coliform and salmonella and require non-detection of salmonella for Class A sludge.
12. Consider development of groundwater monitoring requirements, taking spatial, temporal and analytic issues into account.
13. Consider requiring posting of sites where sludges have been applied and require information for farmworkers on the potential hazards of exposure and how they can be minimized.
14. Review existing data on use and disposal of radionuclides and assess potential exposures and require monitoring of sludges for radioactivity.

Home Use

15. Eliminate the Alternative Pollutant Loading Rate approach. Research shows that it is unreasonable to expect all home users to abide by restrictions printed on a label. It also potentially exposes children to materials which, if ingested, might represent an unacceptable risk.
16. Consider requiring any product available for home use to meet maximum concentrations listed in the last column of Table 11 (in addition to pathogen control and labeling requirements).

Compliance and Permitting

17. Consider stringent criteria for allowing surface application of Class B sludges based on strict necessity and an assessment of ecological and animal health impacts.
18. Support a strong compliance program including monitoring of sites, evaluation of compliance with management requirements and investigation of complaints.

Research and Pollution Prevention

19. Support research on nitrogen release rates, the movement of metals and pathogens to ground and surface water, the presence and impact of synthetic organic contaminants and of contaminants eliminated from Round 2 consideration due to inadequate data, and ecological impacts (including soil organisms). Some of this research needs to be northeast-based where soil conditions are more conducive to contaminant migration to groundwater and soil and crop types render crops more susceptible to phytotoxicity. Other topics can be investigated more generally.
20. Support pollution prevention through research, education, outreach, and technical assistance to promote continued improvement in sludge quality. NYS should establish pollution prevention vs. end-of-pipe pretreatment programs for businesses, local municipalities and trade organizations which might be linked to existing pretreatment.
21. Consider a fee on sludge generation as a partial funding source for necessary research, compliance programs and pollution prevention assistance.

Recommendations for home gardeners who have already applied sludge products

1. If possible, obtain test results from the supplier for the sludge product used and compare these with the recommendations in Table 11. If such data cannot be obtained, consider paying for an analysis. Your local cooperative extension may be able to advise you about obtaining a sample and getting an analysis for some of the contaminants. For other contaminants, the local or state health department may be able to provide a list of laboratories.
2. If a lot of sludge has been applied (for example if sludge products comprise 25% or more of the top six inches of the garden soil), spread out to dilute or remove. Mix what remains thoroughly and deeply into soil. Dilute it with topsoil or relatively clean organic matter such as leaf compost.
3. If sludge products have been used in vegetable gardens, consider converting these to ornamental gardens, lawn or ground cover. Establish a new vegetable garden on non-sludge amended soils. (Note that in NYS current regulations prohibit use of sludge or sludge products on crops for direct human consumption such as home vegetable gardens. Enforcement of this provision is through required labeling of products available to home users.)
4. Test soil for cadmium and lead. If higher than 2 ppm cadmium, either further dilute with clean soil or avoid growing leafy vegetables. If you wish to be very cautious, prevent access by small children who might ingest soil where lead exceeds 150 ppm.
5. In general, it is recommended to prevent access to sludged areas by small children who might ingest sludged soils to avoid potential exposure to pathogens (possibly an issue with composted sludges) and other contaminants.
6. In ornamental gardens, incorporate sludge products into the soil or if not possible, cover the soil where sludge has been applied with a thick layer of appropriate mulch to reduce the chances of a child ingesting the sludge and replace the mulch as needed.
7. If used where vegetables are grown, keep pH adjusted to approximately 6.5-7 to reduce uptake of lead and cadmium by plants.

References

- (* indicates titles available from CWMI, Rice Hall, Cornell, Ithaca NY 14853; email: cwmi@cornell.edu, phone: 607 255-1187)
- Baveye, P., et al. 1999. Mass balance and distribution of sludge-borne trace elements in a silt loam soil following long-term applications of sewage sludge. *Science of the Total Environ.* In press.
- Bouldin, D. R. 1997. Why guidelines for beneficial use of sludges in agriculture are different and estimates of alternatives. *Soil Sciences Society of North Carolina Proceedings.* *
- Bowman, D. 1997. Parasites in sewage sludges. Presentation to Cornell Sludge Working Group, May 8, 1997.
- Camobreco, V. J., et al. 1996. Movement of heavy metals through undisturbed and homogenized soil columns. *Soil Science* 161:740-750. *
- Campbell, H. W., and M. D. Webber. 1997. Biosolids management in Canada: current practice and future trends. Paper presented at the Specialty Conference on Management and Fate of Toxic Organics in Sludge Applied to Land, Copenhagen, Denmark, April 30- May 2, 1997.
- Carpi, A. and S. Lindberg. 1997. Sunlight-mediated emission of elemental mercury from soil amended with municipal sewage sludge. *Environ. Sci. and Tech.* 31(7):2085-2091.
- Carpi, A. 1997. The surface/atmosphere exchange of elemental and methyl mercury over background and municipal sewage sludge amended soil. A dissertation presented to the faculty of the Graduate School of Cornell University. January, 1997.
- Chaney, R. L. 1995. Summary of 1) differences between USDA's views and those of US EPA under 40 CFR 503; 2) differences in the views of M. B. McBride and R. L. Chaney regarding the fate of potential effects of heavy metals in biosolids beneficially used on cropland; and 3) needed research to support long-term biosolids utilization on cropland. Letter from Chaney to A. R. Rubin, J. M. Walker, M. B. McBride and others.
- Chaney, R. L. and J. A. Ryan. 1994. Risk based standards for arsenic, lead and cadmium in urban soils. Frankfurt, Germany: DECHEMA.
- Chaney, R. L., J. A. Ryan, and G. A. O'Connor. 1996. Organic contaminants in municipal biosolids: risk assessment, quantitative pathways analysis, and current research priorities. *The Science of the Total Environment* 185:187-216.
- Chaney, R. L., J. A. Ryan, and G. A. O'Connor. 1997. Pathway analysis of terrestrial risks from pcbs in land-applied biosolids based on field measured transfer coefficients. Paper presented at the Specialty Conference on Management and Fate of Toxic Organics in Sludge Applied to Land, Copenhagen, Denmark, April 30-May 2, 1997.
- Chou, M. 1992. Changes in the American diet over the past 20 years. *Cereal Foods World.* 36.2:249-50.
- Citizens' Environmental Coalition and Scenic Hudson. 1996. Sewage sludge in agriculture: cause for concern. 4 pp. *
- Cleland, J. 1995. Sensitivity analysis for the Part 503 surface water pathway. Presentation and handout to the NYS Biosolids Roundtable. Scenic Hudson, Poughkeepsie, NY.
- Cornell Cooperative Extension. 1997. 1998 Cornell recommends for field crops - land application of sewage sludges. Ithaca, NY. *
- Cornell Waste Management Institute. 1996. Land application of sewage biosolids. Two-hour video. \$40 from Cornell Resource Center, 7 Business & Technology Park, Ithaca, NY 14850. (phone: 607 255-2080, fax: 255-9946, email: dist_center@cce.cornell.edu).
- Cornell Waste Management Institute. 1997. Sludge land application: questions and answers. (On the World Wide Web) [http:// www.cfe.cornell.edu/ wmi/ sludgeques.html](http://www.cfe.cornell.edu/wmi/sludgeques.html).
- Crommentuijn, G. H., et al. 1994. Guidance on the derivation of ecotoxicological criteria for serious soil contamination in view of the intervention value for soil clean-up. Report No. 955001 003. the Netherlands: National Institute of Public Health & the Environment.
- Danish Ministry of Environment and Energy. 1996. Statutory application of waste products for agricultural purposes. No. 823, Annex 2.
- Davis, R. D. and Carlton-Smith. 1984. An investigation into the phytotoxicity of zinc, copper and nickel using sewage sludge of controlled metal content. *Environ. Pollut. Ser. B8*, pp. 163-185.

- Delaware River Basin Commission. 1998. Study of the loadings of polychlorinated biphenyls from tributaries and point sources discharging to the tidal Delaware River. West Trenton, NJ.
- Dubovi, E. 1997. Cornell University Veterinary Diagnostic Lab. Personal communication.
- Duff, R. M. 1996. A public health perspective on the land application of sewage sludge: review of the USEPA technical support document for the land application of sewage sludge. New Hampshire Bureau of Health Risk Assessment.
- Durell, G. S. and R. D. Lizotte, Jr. 1998. PCB levels at 26 New York City and New Jersey WPCPs that discharge to the New York / New Jersey harbor estuary. *Environ. Sci and Tech.* 32(8):1022-31
- Finkel, A. M. 1995. Toward less misleading comparisons of uncertain risk: the example of aflatoxin and alar. *Environmental Health Perspectives.* 103-4:376
- Fleming, G. A. 1980. Essential micronutrients I. boron and molybdenum. In: *Applied Soil Trace Elements*. B. E. Davies, editor. New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- Frank, A. 1998. Mysterious moose disease in Sweden. *The Sci. of the Total Envir.* 209:17-26.
- Frank, R. K. I. Stonefield and P. Suda. 1982. Impact of nickel contamination on the production of vegetables on an organic soil, Ontario, Canada, 1980-81. *Science of the Total Environment.* 26:41-65.
- Frank, R., et al. 1976. Metals in agricultural soils of Ontario. *Canadian Journal of Soil Science.* 56:181-196.
- Fries, G. F. 1996. Ingestion of sludge applied organic chemicals by animals. *Science of the Total Environment.* 185:93-108.
- Gardner, G. Recycling organic waste: from urban pollutant to farm resource. *Worldwatch paper* 135. 1997
- Giger, Walter. 1997. Occurrence and behavior of detergent-derived contaminants in sewage sludge. Paper presented at the Specialty Conference on Management and Fate of Toxic Organics in Sludge Applied to Land, Copenhagen, Denmark, April 30- May 2, 1997.
- Giordano, P. M., J. J. Mortvedt and D. A. Mays. 1975. Effect of municipal wastes on crop yields and uptake of heavy metals. *J. Environ. Quality.* 4:394-399.
- Gorlach, E. and F. Gambús. 1992. A comparison of sensitivity to the toxic action of heavy metals in various plant species. *Polish Journal of Soil Science.* 25/2:207-213.
- Handreck, K. A. 1994. Total and extractable copper and zinc as assessors of phytotoxicity in soil-less potting media. *Commun. Soil. Sci. Plan.* 24:2313-2340.
- Heimendinger, J. and M. S. Van Duyn. 1995. Dietary behavior change: the challenge of recasting the role of fruit and vegetables in the American diet. *American Journal of Clinical Nutrition.* 61(suppl):1397s-401s.
- Holmgren, G. G. S., et al. 1993. Cadmium, lead, zinc, copper and nickel in agricultural soils of the United States of America. *Journal of Environmental Quality* 22:335-348.
- Horstman, M. and M. S. McLachlan. 1995. Concentrations of polychlorinated dibenzo-p-dioxins (PCDD) and dibenzofurans (PCDF) in urban runoff and household wastewaters. *Chemosphere* 31:2897-2900.
- Ibekwe, A. M., et al. 1996. Zinc and Cadmium toxicity to alfalfa and its microsymbiont. *J. Environ. Qual.* 25:1032-1040.
- Jacobs L. W., editor. 1989. Selenium in agriculture and the environment. Madison, WI: Soil Science Society of America Special Publication No. 23.
- Jansen, P. J. C. M. and G. J. A. Speijers. 1997. Guidance on the derivation of maximum permissible risk levels for human intake of soil contaminants. Report No. 711701 006. The Netherlands: National Institute of Public Health & the Environment.
- Kerbs-Smith, S. M., et al. 1995. US adults' fruit and vegetable intake, 1989 to 1991: a revised baseline for Healthy People 2000 objective. *American Journal of Public Health.* 85.12:1623-29.
- Krogmann, U., et al. 1997. Biosolids and sludge management. *Water Environment Research.* 69, 534-550.
- Krogmann, U., et al. 1998. Biosolids and sludge management. *Water Environment Research.* 70(4):557-580.
- Krogmann, Uta and Ellen Z. Harrison. 1998. Understanding the difference: Why European and U.S. sludge standards differ. Paper presented at AAAS Conference, February, 1998, Philadelphia. (Abstract and figures can be viewed on web site: <http://www.cfe.cornell.edu/wmi/Sludge/AAAS/Overview.html>)
- Kubota, J. 1980. Regional distribution of trace element problems in north America. In: *Applied Soil Trace*

- Elements. B. E. Davies, editor. New York: J. Wiley and Sons.
- Kubota, J. and W. H. Allaway. 1972. Geographic distribution of trace element problems. In: *Micronutrients in Agriculture*. J. J. Mortvedt, et al., editors. Madison, WI: Soil Science Society of America, pp. 525-554.
- Leschber, R. 1997. Regulations in Germany for agricultural use of sewage sludge with special regard to toxic organics. Paper presented at the Specialty Conference on Management and Fate of Toxic Organics in Sludge Applied to Land, Copenhagen, Denmark, April 30- May 2, 1997.
- Levesque, M. P., S. P. Mathur. 1984. The effect of using copper for mitigating histosol subsidence on (3.) The yield and nutrition of mini-carrots, carrots and onions grown in histosols, mineral sublayers and their mixtures. *Soil Science*. 138:127-137.
- Logan, T. J. and S. J. Traina. 1993. Trace metals in agricultural soils. In: *Metals In Groundwater*. H.E. Allen, et al., editors. Chelsea, MI: Lewis Publishers, pp. 309-347.
- Lübben, S., E. Rietz and D. Sauerbeck. 1991. Metal uptake and crop growth on sewage sludge field trials with heavy metal contents near the recommended limit values. In: *Treatment and use of sewage sludge and liquid agricultural wastes*, pp. 535-543. P. L'Hermite, editor. New York: Elsevier.
- Lund, L. Texas Natural Resources Conservation Commission, Office of Air Quality. Personal communication.
- Madsen, T. 1997. Danish Water Quality Institute. Personal communication.
- Matthews, P. (editor). 1996. *A global atlas of wastewater sludge and biosolids use and disposal*. London, England: International Association on Water Quality.
- McBride, M. B. 1995. Toxic metal accumulation from agricultural use of sludge: Are US EPA regulations protective? *Journal of Environmental Quality* 24:5-18. *
- McBride, M. B. 1998a. Growing food crops on sludge-amended soils: problems with the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency method of estimating toxic metal transfer. *Environ. Tox. and Chem.* 17(11):2274-2281. *
- McBride, M. B. 1998b. Soluble trace metals in alkaline stabilized sludge products. *Journal of Environ. Qual.* 27:578-584. *
- McBride, M. B., et al. 1997. Mobility and solubility of toxic metals and nutrients in soil fifteen years after sludge application. *Soil Science*. 162:487-500.*
- McGrath, S. P., A. C. Chang, A. L. Page, and E. Witter. Land application of sewage sludge: scientific perspectives of heavy metal loading limits in Europe and the United States. *Environ. Rev.* 2, 108-118.
- McGrath, S. P., A. M. Chaudri, and K. E. Giller. 1995. Long-term effects of metals in sewage sludge on soils, microorganisms and plants. *Journal of Industrial Microbiology*. 14:94-104.
- McLachlan, M. S., A. P. Sewart, J. R. Bacon, and K. C. Jones. 1996. Persistence of PCDD/Fs in a sludge-amended soil. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* 30:2567-2571.
- McLachlan, M. S., M. Horstmann and M. Hinkel. 1996. Polychlorinated dibenzo-*p*-dioxins and dibenzofurans in sewage sludge: sources and fate following sludge application to land. *Science of the Total Environment*. 185:109-123.
- Miljøverndepartementet. 1997. Forskrift om avløpsslam. (Norwegian Standards.)
- Mumma, R. O., et al. 1984. National survey of elements and other constituents in municipal sewage sludges. *Arch. Environ. Contam. Toxic.* 13, 75-83.
- Mumma, R. O., et al. 1983. *Arch. Environ. Contam. Toxic.* 12, 581-587.
- Munters, W. H. 1997. Netherlands Ministry of Housing, Spatial Planning and Environment, Dept. of Soil Protection. Personal communication.
- National Research Council. 1996. *Use of reclaimed water and sludge in food crop production*. National Academy Press.
- Netherlands Ministry of Housing, Spatial Planning and Environment, Dept. of Soil Protection. 1994. *Intervention values and target values: soil quality standards*. The Hague, the Netherlands.
- NYS DEC. 1993. *Solid waste management facilities: revisions/enhancements to New York state's waste management facilities*. 6 NYCRR Part 360.
- NYS DEC. 1994. *Determination of soil cleanup objectives and cleanup levels*. Division Technical and Administrative Guidance Memorandum No. 4046.

- NYS DEC. 1998. Biosolids management in New York State. October, 1998 Report.
- Ontario Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs. 1995. Analytical results, findings and recommendations of the 1995 OMAFRA sewage biosolids field survey.
- Ontario Ministry of Environment & Energy. 1996. Guidelines for the utilization of biosolids and other wastes on agricultural land.
- Parkhurst, D. F. 1998. Arithmetic versus geometric means for environmental concentration data. *Environmental Sci. and Tech.* 32:92A-98A.
- Pennsylvania State University. 1985. NEC-28. Criteria and recommendations for land application of sludges in the Northeast. Bulletin 851.
- Powelson, D. K., J. R. Simpson and C. P. Gerba. 1991. Effects of organic matter on virus transport in unsaturated flow. *Appl. Environ. Microbiol.* 57:2192-2196.
- Purves, D. 1985. Trace-element contamination of the environment. Elsevier, New York.
- Reith, J. W. S., M. L. Berrow and J. C. Berridge. 1979. Effects of copper in distillery wastes on soils and plants. In: International conference on management and control of heavy in the environment, pp. 536-540. Edinburgh: CEP Consultants.
- Richards, B. K. 1997. Review of the US EPA Part 503 Risk Assessment groundwater pathway. Presentation to Cornell Sludge Metals Working Group. April 17, 1997.
- Richards, B. K., et al. 1997. Effect of processing mode on trace elements in dewatered sludge products. *Journal of Environmental Quality.* 26:782-788. *
- Richards, B. K., T. S. Steenhuis, J. H. Peverly, and M. B. McBride. 1998. Metal mobility at an old, heavily loaded sludge application site. *Environmental Pollution* 99:365-377. *
- Rohde, G. 1962. The effects of trace elements on the exhaustion of sewage-irrigated land. *Journal of the Institute of Sewage Purification.* Part 6, pp. 581-585.
- Roth, J. A., E. F. Wallihan and R. G. Sharpless. 1971. Uptake by oats and soybeans of copper and nickel added to a peat soil. *Soil Science.* 112:338-342.
- Rubin, A. 1998. US EPA. Personal communication.
- Sanders, J. R., S. P. McGrath and T. M. Adams. 1987. Zinc, copper and nickel concentrations in soil extracts and crops grown on four soils treated with metal-loaded sewage sludges. *Environ. Pollut.* 44:193-210.
- Sauerbeck, D. R. and Styperek, P. 1986. Long-term effects of contaminations. In: Processing and use of organic sludge and liquid agricultural wastes. P. L'Hermite, editor. Dordrecht: D. Reidel.
- Schmidt, J. P. 1997. Understanding phytotoxicity thresholds for trace elements in land-applied sewage sludge. *Journal of Environmental Quality* 26:4-10.
- Shacklette, H. T. and J. G. Boergen. 1984. Element concentrations in soils and other surficial materials of the coterminous United States. US Geological Survey Professional Paper 1270. United States Govt. Printing Office. Washington, D. C.
- Smilde, K. W. 1981. Heavy-metal accumulation in crops grown on sewage sludge amended with metal salts. *Plant and Soil.* 62:3-14.
- Soares, H. M., et. al. 1995. Evaluating pathogen regrowth in biosolids compost. *Biocycle* 36(6): 70-76.
- Staker, E. V. and R.W. Cummings. 1941. The influence of zinc on the productivity of certain New York peat soils. *Soil Sci. Soc. Am. Proc.* 6:207-214.
- Stanck, E. and E. Calabrese. 1995. Daily estimates of soil ingestion in children. *Environmental Health Perspectives* 103(3).
- Stern, A. H. 1993. Monte Carlo analysis of the US EPA model of human exposure to cadmium in sewage sludge through consumption of garden crops. *Journal of Exposure Analysis and Environmental Epidemiology* 3:449-469.
- Straub, T. M., et. al. 1993 Hazards from pathogenic microorganisms in land-disposed sewage sludge. *Reviews of Environmental Contamination and Toxicology* 132:55-91.
- Temple, P. J. and S. Bisessar. 1981. Uptake and toxicity of nickel and other metals in crops grown on soil contaminated by a nickel refinery. *Journal of Plant Nutrition.* 3:473-482.

- Texas Natural Resource Conservation Commission. 1996. End-product standards for compost. Office Of Air Quality. RG-217.
- Texas Natural Resource Conservation Commission. 1997. Title 30 Chapter 332.
- Thornton, I., and P. Abrahams. 1981. Soil ingestion as a pathway of metal intake into grazing livestock. In: Proc. Int. Conf. Heavy Metals in the Environment. Edinburgh, Scotland: CEP Consultants.
- Tidestrom, H. 1997. Swedish Environmental Protection Agency. Personal communication.
- Tideström, H. Swedish Environmental Protection Agency. 1997. Swedish regulation on the use of sewage sludge in agriculture: why is it important to use sludge as a fertilizer in agriculture? Specialty Conference on Management and Fate of Toxic Organics in Sludge Applied to Land. Copenhagen, Denmark, April 30- May 2, 1997.
- UK Dept. of the Environment, 1995. Code of practice for agricultural use of sewage sludge. Her Majesty's Stationery Office, London.
- United States General Accounting Office (US GAO). 1994. Nuclear regulation: action needed to control radioactive contamination at sewage treatment plants. GAO/RCED-94-133.
- University of New Hampshire. 1998. Landspreading of sludge in New Hampshire. UNH Sludge Task Force report
- US EPA. 1990. National sewage sludge survey; availability of information and data, and anticipated impacts of proposed regulations; proposed rule. Title 40 of the Code of Federal Regulations, Part 503.
- US EPA. 1992. Technical support document for land application of sewage sludge. Document No. EPA-822/R-93-001a.
- US EPA. 1993. The standards for the use or disposal of sewage sludge. Title 40 of the Code of Federal Regulations, Part 503.
- US EPA. 1994. A plain English guide to the EPA part 503 biosolids rule. Office of wastewater management. EPA/832/R-93/003.
- US EPA. 1995. A guide to the biosolids risk assessments for the EPA part 503 rule. Office of Wastewater Management. US EPA/ 8332//B-93-005.
- US EPA. 1996a. Evaluation of candidate pollutants for the round two sewage sludge regulation. Office of wastewater management.
- US EPA. 1996b. Soil screening guidance. EPA Tech. Background Document No. 9355.4-23.
- US EPA. 1996c. Technical support document for the round two sewage sludge pollutants. Office of Water. US EPA-822/R-96-003.
- USDA. 1995. Dietary guidelines for Americans. Home & Garden Bulletin No. 232.
- van den Berg, R. 1994. Human exposure to soil contamination: a qualitative and quantitative analysis towards proposals for human toxicological intervention values. Report No. 725201011. the Netherlands: National Institute of Public Health & the Environment.
- van den Berg, R., et al. 1993. Risk assessment of contaminated soil: proposals for adjusted, toxicologically based Dutch soil clean-up criteria. Contaminated Soil. 93:349-364. the Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Water Environment Federation. 1996. Biosolids recycling: grounded in sound science. *
- Webber, J. 1972. Effects of toxic metals in sewage on crops. Water Pollution Control, pp. 404-410.
- Webber, M. D. and J. A. Nichols. 1995. Organic and metal contaminants in Canadian municipal sludges and a sludge compost. Wastewater Technology Centre.
- Williams, J. H., K. A. Smith and J. R. Jones. 1986. Varietal tolerance in cereals to metal contamination in a sewage treated soil. In: Processing and use of organic sludge and liquid agricultural wastes. P. L'Hermite, editor. Dordrecht: D. Reidel.
- Witter, E. 1996. Towards zero accumulation of heavy metals in soils. Fertilizer Research. 43:225-233.



CORNELL WASTE MANAGEMENT INSTITUTE

100 Rice Hall

Cornell University

Ithaca, NY 14853

Who Are We?

The Cornell Waste Management Institute (CWMI) was established in 1987. CWMI addresses the environmental and social issues associated with waste management by focusing University resources and capabilities on this pressing economic, environmental, and political issue. Through research, outreach, and teaching activities, CWMI staff and affiliated researchers and educators work to develop technical solutions to waste management problems and to address broader issues of waste generation and composition, waste reduction, risk management, environmental equity, and public decision-making. The focus for such work is on multi-disciplinary projects that integrate research and outreach. Working in collaboration with Cornell faculty and students from many departments and with cooperators in both the public and private sectors, issues ranging from management of sewage sludges to enviroshopping are the focus of on-going programs.