LINGERING OIL DECISON PROCESS Listing Methodology

Table of Contents

ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

AAC	Alaska Administrative Code
CAS	Chemical Abstracts Service Number
DEC	Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation
BaP	benzo(a)pyrene
cm	centimeter(s)
dw	dry weight
HMW	high molecular weight
in	inch(es)
LMW	low molecular weight
mg/kg	milligram(s) per kilogram
PAH	polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbon
PEF	potency equivalent factor
QAPP	Quality Assurance Project Plan
ww	wet weight

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background

The purpose of this document is to provide guidance to Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation (DEC) staff for waterbody assessment of lingering oil for the Alaska Integrated Water Quality Monitoring and Assessment Report. This document includes the following:

- A definition of lingering oil

- The purpose or need for a methodology

- Applicable regulations as adopted in the Alaska water quality standards in 18 Alaska Administrative Code (AAC) 70 (DEC, 2003)

- Information on the quantity and characteristics of data identified as sufficient and credible for assessment

- Assessment guidelines

This guidance outlines methodology for determining water body status for lingering oil based on available data. It provides guidelines for evaluating whether sufficient data are available to determine if a waterbody is attaining applicable water quality standards, and for assessment of that data.

1.2 Lingering Oil Definition

The following definition was developed to support this listing methodology. It has undergone review by DEC, DEC internal counsel, and the *Exxon Valdez* Oil Spill Trustee Council:

> "Lingering oil is an oil residue deposited in shoreline sediment from an anthropogenic release that is generally not bioavailable unless disturbed."

The definition provides a basis for interacting with Alaska Water Quality Standards. It also clearly separates lingering oil from freshly oiled locations due to anthropogenic releases.

1.3 Designated Uses and Water Quality Criteria

Alaska's water quality standards are established in 18 AAC 70. Both fresh water and marine water quality standards are applicable to assess potential impacts of lingering oil on designated uses for shorelines and adjacent waterbodies. Table 1-1 summarizes the applicable narrative criteria; Appendix A provides the detailed applicable criteria. The uses and narrative water quality standards summarized in Table 1-1 apply to all data tiers in this listing methodology as described in Section 2.

Table 1-1: Summary of Designated Uses and Narrative Water Quality Standards

Designated Use	Reference	Summarized Narrative Criteria

(A) Water supply
  - drinking water, culinary, food processing
  - agriculture
  - aquaculture
  - seafood processing
  - industrial
(B) Water recreation
  - contact recreation
  - secondary recreation
(C) Growth and propagation of fish, shellfish, other aquatic life, and wildlife
(D) Harvesting for consumption of raw mollusks or other raw aquatic life
	Petroleum Hydrocarbons, Oils and Grease
	18 AAC 70.020(5) & (20)
	
	Toxic and Other Deleterious Organic and Inorganic Substances
	18 AAC 70.020(11) & (23)
	
	Residues
	18 AAC 70.020(8) & (20)
	
	Color
	18 AAC 70.020(1) & (13)
	
	Sediment
	18 AAC 70.020(9) & (21)
		Surface waters, adjoining shorelines, and waterbody floor must be virtually free from floating oil, film, sheen, or discoloration.
		
		There can be no concentrations of petroleum hydrocarbons, animal fats, or vegetable oils in shoreline or bottom sediments that cause deleterious effects to aquatic life.[1]
		
		May not exceed concentrations that individually or in combination impart undesirable odor or taste to organisms as determined by bioassay or organoleptic tests.

Complete narrative criteria are provided in Appendix A and in 18 AAC 70.

1.4   Data Qualification

Data characteristics such as age, quality, and quantity are key elements of waterbody assessment. Data less than 10 years old are required for the initial steps of assessment, older data may be considered in the overwhelming evidence approach (Tier 5), provided natural or anthropogenic conditions in the waterbody have not changed since original data collection.

DEC considers data collected under a Quality Assurance Project Plan (QAPP), or other approved data collection plan, to be credible and of sufficient quality for assessment. Data collected without a QAPP can be considered but must be corroborated by supplemental lines of evidence. Generally, a minimum of 10 data points is required to conduct an assessment. Data requirements are the same for impairment or attainment determinations.

Waterbody assessment for lingering oil may rely on various forms of data and will follow a tiered approach (Table 1-2). For example, Tier 1 will first be explored and if test pit data does not exist or does not meet the minimum data requirements (Table 1-3), Tier 2 would be

---

[1] Although 18 AAC 70 contains numeric water quality standards for hydrocarbons, fats, or oils, when assessing lingering oil impairment, chemical concentrations alone might not provide sufficient data for the impairment decisions due to lingering oil's sequestered state within the shoreline sediments.

explored. This approach prioritizes direct measurements (Tiers 1 and 2) while still allowing consideration of important indirect measurements (Tiers 3 and 4). If multiple types of data fall short of one or more of the data requirements in Table 1-3, they can be assessed together using the Tier 5 overwhelming evidence approach.

Table 1-2: Tiered Data Types

Tier	Data Type
1	Test Pit Data
2	Sediment Chemistry Data
3	Biological Data
4	Modeled Data
5	Overwhelming Evidence

Table 1-3: Minimum Data Requirements

Parameter	Conditions
Data Age	Tier 1-3: Less than or equal to 10 years old. Tier 4: Model updated in the last 10 years Tier 5: Data more than 10 years old may be considered
Spatial Area	Assessment unit (see section 1.5 for more information)
Density	Tier 1 and 2: At least 10 samples (observations) per assessment unit. Tier 3: Variable. Reference site or value required. Tier 4: At least 50% of the shoreline length per assessment unit must have modeled data coverage. Tier 5: Variable.
Quality	Peer-reviewed data and/or data collected under an approved QAPP or similar are preferred. Data that does not meet the minimum data requirements can be used to support Tier 5 assessment.
Frequency	Tier 1: Data from at least two years within the last 10-years. Tier 2: Data from at least two years within the last 10-years, with sample depths between 1 and 12 inches below the surface. Tier 3: Data from at least two years within the last 10-years. A minimum of two biological lines of evidence (tissue, sediment toxicity, community metrics or food web contaminant uptake analysis). Tier 4: Model updated within the last 10 years. Tier 5: Two or more lines of evidence.

1.5   Assessment Units

Waterbodies are segmented into smaller units, called assessment units (AU), based on hydrological boundaries. Assessment units for lingering oil decisions will depend on the data type available. Physical characteristics that affect oil distribution may be used for finer AU delineation. Beach AU's cannot be standardized across Alaska due to the varying scales of data, GIS imagery available, and physical features of Alaska's shoreline.

For example, when the shoreline cleanup and assessment technique (SCAT) is employed following an initial spill event, beaches/shorelines are typically segmented into sections 0.2 to 2 kilometers (km) long. Assessment units with a finer scale of data, such as EVOS beaches, might be drawn by segmenting the shoreline using HUC-14 scale watersheds as boundaries. Where oiling was present based on past evidence (current impaired waters, predictive model data, test pit data, initial oil trajectory), assessment units can be further delineated using a headland-to-headland approach and taking into consideration shore types[2] and aspect. DEC will document the methodology used to delineate assessment units in the Integrated Report.

---

[2] Shore types were downloaded from the NOAA Response and Restoration website at https://response.restoration.noaa.gov/esi_download#Alaska, and classifications were rated as 1-5 based on their oil capturing capabilities (sand and gravel = high oil capture, rocky outcrops = low oil capture).

2. IMPLEMENTATION

The tiered approach incorporates several forms of shoreline assessment data developed through oil spill response actions, specifically those potential impacts or impairments to designated uses that may remain long after (e.g., years, decades) surface oils have either been removed or naturally degraded. Data used for assessment may include test pits, sediment chemistry data, biological data, modeling data, or some combination of these data types.

The tiered approach for data assessment begins with Tier 1. If sufficient data are available to complete an assessment, then no further assessment of that AU occurs. If sufficient data are not available, then proceed to Tier 2. This process repeats through Tier 5. This approach prioritizes empirical data less than 10 years old while allowing for other lines of evidence to still be considered in Tier 5. For example, if test pit data from 1989 to 1991 for an oiled beach were available as well as sediment chemistry data from 2021, the sediment chemistry data would take precedence because it is more recent (within the last 10 years) and thus more likely to reflect the current conditions of that area.

2.1 Tier 1: Test Pit Data

Test pits are generally defined as a hole dug into sediment to determine if oil has penetrated the subsurface. Lingering oil exists entrenched in sediment. Subsurface oiling in an assessment unit and is typically categorized as heavy, moderate, light, or very light (Table 2-1).

Table 2-2: Test Pit Data Categorization and Depth of Penetration or Thickness of Oil

Oil Categorization	More than 30 cm Depth	21–30 cm Depth	11–20 cm Depth	0–10 cm Depth
Oil-Filled Pores	Heavy	Heavy	Moderate	Moderate
Partially Filled Pores	Heavy	Moderate	Moderate	Light
Oil Residue	Moderate	Moderate	Light	Light
Trace	Light	Very Light	Very Light	Very Light

Modified from Environment and Climate Change Canada 2018

The thresholds in Table 2-2 apply to test pits on lingering oil in an assessment unit, which will be considered impaired if it is not virtually free of oil. To establish that the oil is lingering and not bioavailable/degrading, there should be existing test pit data for the initial spill from the shoreline cleanup and assessment technique (Environment and Climate Change Canada 2018) or from other evidence. If the minimum data requirements for test pit data are met (Table 1-3), conduct assessment using the methodology described below (Table 2-2). If the minimum requirements for test pit data are not met, move to Tier 2, or evaluate if multiple lines of evidence are available for Tier 5.

Table 2-3: Test Pit Data Assessment Approach

Attainment Status	Test Pit Data Assessment Thresholds
Attaining	Less than or equal to 10% of test pits with light to moderate oil; more than 90% of test pits are clean or very light AND No pit with heavy oil
Impaired	More than 10% of test pits have presence of light to heavy oil OR One pit or more with heavy oil

2.2   Tier 2: Sediment Chemistry Data

If Tier 1 data are unavailable or do not meet the minimum data requirements in Table 1-3, sediment chemistry data are considered the next best available data.

Sediment chemistry data include measurements of chemical concentrations within the sediment measured by a laboratory. Oil is a complex mixture of many chemical compounds. While a wide variety of chemicals can be used to characterize oil in sediments, polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs) are selected because of their ability to indicate risks to health for humans and aquatic life from oil. For human health, the concentration of benzo(a)pyrene (BaP) equivalents in sediment are evaluated to protect humans against cancer risks of PAHs.

Samples should be, at minimum, analyzed for the compounds in Table 2-3. If more than two compounds were not measured, the data is inadequate for using sediment chemistry for assessment. The results should be summed for high molecular weight (HMW) PAHs and low molecular weight (LMW) PAHs. In addition, PAH results should be used to calculate the BaP toxicity equivalent (BaP equivalents). For this calculation, multiply the concentration of the PAHs in a sediment sample by the BaP potency equivalent factors provided in Table 2-3, and sum the results.

Table 2-4: B[a]P Potency Equivalent Factors[3]

Polycyclic Aromatic Hydrocarbon	CAS Number	Designation	B[a]P PEF
acenaphthylene	208-96-8	LMW	--
acenaphthene	83-32-9	LMW	--
anthracene	120-12-7	LMW	--
benzo(a)anthracene	56-55-3	HMW	0.01
benzo(a)pyrene	50-32-8	HMW	1
benzo(e)pyrene	192-97-2	HMW	--
benzo(b)fluoranthene	205-99-2	HMW	0.1
benzo(g,h,i)perylene	191-24-2	HMW	0.01
benzo(k)fluoranthene	207-08-9	HMW	0.1
biphenyl	92-52-4	LMW	--
chrysene	218-01-9	HMW	0.01
dibenzo(a,h)anthracene	53-70-3	HMW	2.4
fluoranthene	206-44-0	HMW	--
fluorene	86-73-7	LMW	--
indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene	193-39-5	HMW	--
1-methylnaphthalene	90-12-0	LMW	--
2-methylnaphthalene	91-57-6	LMW	--
1-methylphenanthrene	832-69-9	LMW	--
naphthalene	91-20-3	LMW	--
phenanthrene	85-01-8	LMW	--
pyrene	129-00-0	HMW	--
perylene	198-55-0	HMW	--

--: no available B[a]P PEF
CAS: chemical abstract service number
HMW: high molecular weight
LMW: low molecular weight
BaP PEF: benzo(a)pyrene potency equivalent factors (e.g. chrysene is 1% as toxic as B[a]P (0.01 PEF)

If the minimum data requirements (Table 1-3) are met, conduct assessment using the methodology described below (Table 2-4). Attainment status will be determined if all samples meet the condition statements in Table 2-4, or if, for any one set of samples where more than 10% exceed the thresholds for HMW, LMW, or BaP, then the waterbody will be impaired. If the

---

[3] See Section 3.2 of Technical Approach document for references.

minimum data requirements for sediment chemistry data are not met, move to Tier 3, or evaluate if multiple lines of evidence are available for Tier 5.

Table 2-5: Sediment Chemistry Data Assessment Approaches

Attainment Status	Sediment Chemistry Assessment Thresholds
Attaining	Less than or equal to 10% of samples exceed HMW PAHs threshold (13 mg/kg dw)[4] AND Less than or equal to 10% of samples exceed LMW PAHs threshold (3.1 mg/kg dw)[4] AND Less than or equal to 10% of samples exceed BaP equivalents threshold (5.3 mg/kg dw)[5]
Impaired	More than 10% of samples exceed HMW PAHs threshold (13 mg/kg dw)[4] OR More than 10% of samples exceed LMW PAHs threshold (3.1 mg/kg dw)[4] OR More than 10% of samples exceed BaP equivalents threshold (5.3 mg/kg dw)[5]

mg/kg dw: milligrams per kilogram on a dry weight basis

2.3 Tier 3: Biological Data

If Tier 1 and Tier 2 data are unavailable or do not meet the minimum data requirements, biological data are considered the next best available data. Biological data include measurements of exposure and effects of oil on biota or measurements of individual, population, or community health. Data should be collected over a relatively short period of time (i.e., less than 10 years but preferably over 3 years). Additionally, organism-related data tend to be highly variable; therefore, multiple lines of evidence are assessed within this tier.

Four lines of evidence were selected for Tier 3 as shown in Table 2-5:

These lines of evidence were selected for assessing lingering-oil-related impacts because they can be collected within a single sampling event and allow for a quantitative or semiquantitative evaluation of impacts relative to a reference site (or a reference toxicity value). For assessments using Tier 3 biological data, two or more of the lines of evidence provided in Table 2-5 are required.

---

[4] This value is the geometrical mean of marine and generic (neither marine nor freshwater) values that indicate an adverse effect is likely at concentrations higher than this value for HMW PAHs. See section 3.3 and Appendix B of the Lingering Oil Listing Methodology Technical Support Document for more information on the development of sediment thresholds.

[5] This value is equivalent to a 10^{-5} excess lifetime cancer risk from PAHs. See section 3.2 of the Lingering Oil Listing Methodology Technical Support Document.

Table 2-6: Relevant Biological Lines of Evidence

Data Type	Description
Tissue chemistry	Immobile invertebrates such as clams, mussels, or other intertidal species
Sediment toxicity	Amphipods
Population abundance and intertidal community diversity	Benthic infauna (e.g., shrimp, worms) Benthic epifauna (e.g., mussels)
Food web contaminant uptake analysis	Sensitive invertivorous birds or mammals (e.g., shorebirds, sea otters, etc.)

If the minimum data requirements (Table 1-3) are met for at least two lines of evidence, determine if the waterbody is attaining or impaired using the methodology described below (Table 2-6). Attainment will be assessed against two or more of the lines of evidence thresholds. If the minimum data requirements are not met, move to Tier 4, or evaluate if multiple lines of evidence are available for Tier 5.

Table 2-7: Biological Data Assessment Approach

Attainment Status	Biological Lines of Evidence Endpoint Assessment Thresholds
Attaining	Two of four endpoints: • For tissue chemistry: no statistically significant difference at α= 0.05 and effect size[6] less than 20% and below the PAH tissue threshold of 97 mg/kg ww total PAHs[7] • For sediment toxicity: no statistically significant difference at α= 0.05 and effect size less than 20% • For community diversity and population: no statistically significant difference at α= 0.05 and effect size less than 20% • For food web contaminant uptake analysis: lack of dietary uptake risk relative to toxicity reference values
Impaired	Two of four endpoints: • For tissue chemistry: statistically significant difference at α= 0.05 and effect size greater than 20% and above the PAH tissue threshold of 97 mg/kg ww total PAHs. • For sediment toxicity: statistically significant difference at α= 0.05 and effect size greater than 20% • For community diversity and population: statistically significant difference at α= 0.05 and effect size greater than 20% • For food web contaminant uptake analysis: dietary uptake risk relative to toxicity reference values

mg/kg ww: milligrams per kilogram on a wet weight basis

2.4 Tier 4: Modeling Data

If Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3 data are unavailable or do not meet the minimum data requirements, modeled data are considered the next best available data. Modeled data for lingering oil can include data from the shoreline cleanup and assessment technique (Environment and Climate Change Canada 2018) or data for the level of oiling, toxicity, bioavailability, or other parameters. In general, the model would produce a spatially continuous distribution of one or more of these parameters and could include a temporal component. The processes and conditions considered in the model would likely include distance from oil source, currents, shape of shoreline, slope of shoreline, sediment type, etc.

Different model outputs will vary. If model outputs do not include probabilities for the categories of heavy, moderate, or light oil, then best professional judgement will be used to

---

[6] % effect size = [(mean at reference site – mean at oiled beach)/(mean at reference site)] X 100
[7] The tissue threshold of 97 mg/kg comes from the geometrical mean value for lowest observed effects levels for PAHs for invertebrates using the United States Army Corps of Engineers Environmental Residue-Effects Database (2024).

determine if model outputs are comparable to either of the modelled data assessment thresholds in Table 2-7. As other models are developed and more advanced techniques are used, Tier 4 processes and thresholds might need to be updated to accommodate the types and probability values of the modeled data.

A model used for the assessment of lingering oil should be high quality and suitable for this purpose. As such, the following criteria should be met (ASTM International 2018):

- Thorough documentation of boundary conditions, assumptions, and methods

- Displayed calibration: test of a model with known input and output information that is used to adjust or estimate coefficient or parameter values

- Displayed validation: test of a model to accurately produce modeled values that have been verified by field observations, analytical samples, or other means of evidence

- Repeatable results: a basic principle of scientific documentation that a report should provide enough details for others to reproduce the findings (Nature Publishing Group 2013)

- Undergone third-party expert review: either through DEC or in the publication process

If a model used for predicting the presence of lingering oil has not been updated within the last 10 years, then its output should be assessed as a line of evidence alongside other data types (Tier 1, Tier 2, etc.), if available, as Tier 5. If the minimum data requirements (Table 1-3) for the model are met and the model is of high quality and suitable for this purpose, determine if the waterbody is attaining or impaired using the methodology described below (Table 2-7). If the minimum data requirements for the model are not met, evaluate if multiple lines of evidence are available for Tier 5.

Table 2-8: Modeled Data Assessment Approach

Attainment Status	Modeled Data Assessment Thresholds
Attaining	Less than or equal to 10% of modeled subsegments have greater than or equal to 15% probability of subsurface oil.
Impaired	More than 10% of modeled subsegments have greater than or equal to 15% probability of subsurface oil.

2.5 Tier 5: Overwhelming Evidence

If insufficient Tier 1 to 4 level data are available, overwhelming evidence can be considered. Overwhelming evidence uses multiple lines of evidence to determine whether the narrative threshold is exceeded. This approach would be used in cases where previous tier results are inconclusive or don't meet the minimum data requirements. Rationale for Tier 5 determinations will be documented in the Integrated Report.

Lines of evidence used can include the following:

- Data that does not meet minimum data requirements

- Division of Spill and Response cleanup status

- Visual observations (e.g., if lingering oil becomes unburied and exposed following a severe weather event)

- Additional observational data could include reported changes in human recreational and/or subsistence use of an area (e.g., clammers no longer collect clams from a beach because they smell like oil, or swimmers stop swimming in an area due to observed oil sheens.

- New science or new data types

- Public health advisories

- Other biologic indicators or habitat data

Data from Tiers 1 through 4 that exceed established numeric thresholds, but do not meet minimum data requirements to make a determination, should be prioritized for consideration in the overwhelming evidence approach (Tier 5).

3. REFERENCES

DEC. 2003. 18 AAC 70 Water Quality Standards. Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation. As amended through June 26.

DEC. 2021. *Alaska Consolidated Assessment and Listing Methodology.* Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation. As amended through March 2021.

DEC. 2025. *Lingering Oil Listing Methodology Technical Support Document.* Prepared and provided by Geosyntec Consultants.

ASTM International. 2018. *ASTM E978-18, Standard Practice for Evaluating Mathematical Models for the Environmental Fate of Chemicals*. ASTM International. https://doi.org/10.1520/E0978-18.

Environment and Climate Change Canada. 2018. *Shoreline Cleanup Assessment Technique (SCAT) Manual*. 3rd edition, prepared and provided by Triox Environmental Emergencies, Owens Coastal Consultants, Environmental Mapping Ltd.

Nature Publishing Group. 2013. "Guide to Publication Policies of the Nature Journals." Retrieved from www.nature.com/authors/gta.pdf.