

## Harmonisation of exposure and risk assessment models for the BeNeKempen project

Griet Van Gestel  
OVAM

## Co-authors:

Van Gestel Griet<sup>1</sup>, Cornelis Christa<sup>2</sup>, Kuppens  
Carla<sup>3</sup>, Swartjes Frank<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> OVAM Public Waste Agency of Flanders - Department of Soil  
Management – Belgium

Stationsstraat 110, B-2800 Mechelen, , tel.: ++32/15.284.493

<sup>2</sup> VITO Flemish Institute for Technological Research – Belgium

<sup>3</sup> ABdK – Active Soil Management Campine area– The  
Netherlands


<sup>4</sup> RIVM National Institute of Public Health and the Environment –  
The Netherlands

## Content :

1. The BeNeKempen project
2. Approach to harmonization
3. Examples
4. Conclusions

## 1. The BeNeKempen project

# BeNeKempen



## 1. The BeNeKempen project (1/5)

- The NO part of Belgium and the SE part of the Netherlands (Campine area)
- End 19<sup>th</sup> century - 1970's: non-ferrous industries:
  - emissions, discharges of waste water, use of ashes for pavement of roads
    - diffuse soil contamination
    - contamination of sediments, groundwater and surface water

## 1. The BeNeKempen project (2/5)

Similar problems at both sides of the border:

- human health and ecological risks;
- hindrance of different activities: e.g. roadworks on roads paved with ashes, dredging of rivers, ...

→ BeNeKempen project

Partners: OVAM

ABdK

with financial support EU INTERREG III

## 1. The BeNeKempen project (3/5)

Objective of the BeNeKempen project:

to develop and implement cross-border strategies to solve problems related to the heavy metal contamination and to reduce risks



## 1. The BeNeKempen project (4/5)

One aspect:

to assess and manage human health risks

But:

different guidelines and methodologies for risk assessment in the two countries

→ different conclusions for the same contamination with regard to risks

Difficult to explain!

## 1. The BeNeKempen project (5/5)

One of the aims of the project:

to develop a common methodology for risk assessment for soil contamination in the Campine area

by harmonizing regional (Flanders) and national (The Netherlands) methodologies

## Content :

1. The BeNeKempen project
2. Approach to harmonization
3. Examples
4. Conclusions

## 2. Approach to harmonization (1/4)




Fig. 1 Transfer and exposure model.

## 2. Approach to harmonization (2/4)

### Standard-computing models:

to calculate transfer of contaminants and exposure dose, and assess risks

→ in Flanders: Vlier-humaan

→ in the Netherlands: CSOIL

similar basis, but many input parameters differ

## 2. Approach to harmonization (3/4)

### Selection of relevant aspects:

- contaminants: Cd, Pb, As
- land use scenarios:
  - vegetable garden
  - residences with garden
  - residences without garden
  - recreation
- exposure routes:
  - ingestion of soil and dust
  - inhalation of soil and dust
  - consumption of vegetables
  - consumption of drinking water

## 2. Approach to harmonization (4/4)

### Inventory of differences:

description of algorithms and parameters in  
Vlier-humaan and CSOIL  
analysis

### Discussion leading to consensus:

- straightforward
- more research
- policy decisions

## Content :

1. The BeNeKempen project
2. Approach to harmonization
3. Examples
4. Conclusions



## 3. Examples (1/7)

- Uptake by plants
- Soil ingestion rates
- Background exposure (air and food)

## 3. Examples (2/7)

### Uptake by plants:

Vlier-humaan and CSOIL:

$$C_{\text{plant}} = \text{BCF} * C_{\text{soil}}$$

Analysis:

BCF's ~ soil characteristics  
~ plant species

e.g. Cd, carrots (Flanders):

$$\log \text{BCF} = 0.54 - 0.12 * \text{pH-KCl} - 0.75 * \log C_{\text{soil}}$$



## 3. Examples (3/7)

Uptake by plants:

Harmonization:

grouping of data from the Netherlands and Flanders

e.g. Cd, carrots:

$$\log \text{BCF} = 0.43 - 0.12 * \text{pH-KCl} - 0.51 * \log C_{\text{soil}}$$

## 3. Examples (4/7)

### Soil ingestion rates:

CSOIL: no distinction inside/outside

Vlier-humaan: distinction inside/outside

<b>mg/dag</b>	<b>children</b>	<b>adults</b>
<b>CSOIL</b>		
residential	<b>150</b>	<b>50</b>
recreation	<b>30</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Vlier-humaan</b>		
residential	<b>50</b>	<b>20</b>
recreation	<b>100</b>	<b>50</b>

## 3. Examples (5/7)

### Soil ingestion rates:

Analysis: uncertain, few experimental data  
literature research

Harmonization:

common values for amount/day

mg/dag	children	adults
<b>Harmonization</b>		
residential	100	50
recreation	130	50

## 3. Examples (5/7)

### Soil ingestion rates:

Harmonization:

preliminary results

more research data needed:

- intake inside / outside
- concentration of metals in soil taken in
- land use type: urban / rural
- validation e.g. biomonitoring

## 3. Examples (6/7)

### Background exposure (air and food):

CSOIL: no

Vlier-humaan: yes

Analysis:

different viewpoints:

with background: protection of people, whole environment is considered

without background: only soil pollution is considered

## 3. Examples (7/7)

### Background exposure (air and food):

Harmonization: stepwise approach → clarify importance  
with background exposure  
without background exposure

e.g. critical values for residences with garden

mg/kg ds	with BG	without BG
As	63	154
Cd	42	63
Pb	560	612



## Content :

1. The BeNeKempen project
2. Approach to harmonization
3. Examples
4. Conclusions

## 4. Conclusions (1/2)

- harmonization of methodologies is possible by introducing most recent developments
- research needs are indicated, research is ongoing, methodology will be adapted
- policy decisions → different options were calculated in order to clarify

## 4. Conclusions (2/2)

- need for harmonisation of methodologies for risk assessment on a larger scale

Thank you for your attention