4.3.4 Calculation of Upper Tolerance Limits and Summary Statistics

Upper Tolerance Limits - Calculations

Summary statistics were calculated for background analyte concentrations at Fort Polk for surface and subsurface soils for each granularity and across granularities as described above. The following statistics were also calculated: sample size, minimum, maximum, mean, one-sided 95% upper confidence limit (UCL) for the mean, median, and the 95%/95% upper tolerance limit (UTL). A UTL is an estimate of an upper bound on individual measurements from a population. It is described with two numbers. The first number is the confidence, the second is the coverage. The coverage of a UTL specifies the minimum percentage of the population that should lie below the UTL value. The confidence of a UTL indicates the certainty that the calculated UTL value provides at least the specified coverage. This certainty is a function of both the sample size and the variability among the data values used to calculate the UTL. For a 95%/95% UTL, investigators are 95% certain that 95% of the population values lie below the calculated UTL.

The results of the Shapiro-Wilk W-tests were used to determine whether parametric or non-parametric statistical methods were most appropriate for calculating the 95% UTLs. Parametric methods were used when the data distribution was normal or lognormal. Non-parametric methods (sometimes referred to as "distribution-free" methods) were used for those analytes whose data were neither normally nor lognormally distributed. Both the parametric UTLs (U.S. EPA, 1992) and the non-parametric UTLs (Conover, 1980) were calculated at the 95% confidence level.

Normal and Lognormal UTL Calculation

The normal UTL was calculated using the following equation:

$$UTL = \bar{x} + Ks$$

The Lognormal UTL was calculated as

$$UTL = e^{\frac{1}{2} + K\tau}$$

where:

x =the mean of the observations

$$=\sum_{i=1}^n x_i/n$$

s = the standard deviation of the observations

$$s = \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^{n} (x_i - \overline{x})/n - 1}$$

and

K = the one-sided normal tolerance factor selected to provide 95% coverage at the 95% confidence level for the given sample size. (Appendix B, Table 5, U.S. EPA, 1989)

The non-parametric UTL is the maximum reported value (if the samples size is less than 60) and is the second, third, forth, etc. largest result for larger sample sizes. Coverage for non-parametric UTLs is a function of the sample size and may be less than the coverage of 95% used for the normal UTLs.

Upper Tolerance Limits - Discussion

The background 95% upper tolerance limit (UTL) may be used to determine the presence or absence, and nature and extent of environmental contamination for metals, organic herbicides, and organochlorine pesticides. The UTL is the 95% upper confidence limit for the 95th percentile of the true background concentration of a constituent of interest. Results for individual samples from the site may be compared directly to the UTLs for the corresponding constituents in the same background sample medium. If a site sample concentration exceeds the UTL, it may be interpreted as indicating the presence of potential contamination.

The UTLs for 95% coverage level (i.e., the 95% upper confidence limit of the 95th percentile) are conservative, in that only measurements that are very different from background will be discerned. Thus, when only the 95% UTLs are used for comparisons, there is a chance of concluding that an individual measurement is not different from background, when in fact it is from a population with results larger than background. Other factors, such as contaminant toxicity, the potential existence of

"hot spots", etc., would need to be considered in the use of the UTLs to make decisions regarding site risk and clean-up levels.

All calculated statistics are presented in this report to allow the flexibility to choose statistics that are most appropriate for comparisons planned for future applications. The UTLs are presented for those instances in which decisions must be made on the basis of a comparison of individual site sample results to background (e.g., determining the presence or absence of contamination). Means, medians, and the upper confidence limits for the mean are presented for those instances in which means comparisons will be used to determine whether a site is contaminated on the average. Background UTLs and summary statistics for each depth and granularity are presented in Appendix C, Table 3. Background UTLs and summary statistics across granularities are presented (by depth) in Appendix C, Table 4.

Other Summary Statistics

In addition to comparisons of individual site sample results to background UTLs, means comparisons are also appropriate for other environmental applications (e.g., estimating the volume of contaminated media requiring corrective action, demonstrating attainment of required clean-up levels, performing statistical comparisons for risk assessments, etc.). Means comparisons, or central tendency tests, are used to indicate whether or not differences exist between two sample populations (e.g., "background" and "site").

A one-sided 95% upper confidence limit (UCL) for the mean is calculated as $\bar{x} + t_{\alpha,n-1} s / \sqrt{n}$ where \bar{x} and s are the mean and standard deviation of the data, n is the sample size and t is value from the Students t distribution with α level of significance and n-1 degrees of freedom. For all cases, normal theory UCLs were considered appropriate by the Central Limit Theorem.

The one-sided 95% upper confidence limit (UCL) for the mean can be used when comparing average site concentrations to background. A one-sided 95% lower confidence limit (LCL) for the site average can be calculated and compared to the UCL for the background average. If the LCL for the site average is less than the UCL for the background average, then one may conclude that there is no difference between the background and site concentrations, on the average. For a conservative check, one may also calculate the site average and compare the site average to the background UCL. If the site average is less than the background UCL, then one may conclude that there is no difference between the background and site concentrations, on the average. For a more thorough analysis between site and background averages, a statistician should be consulted.

4.4 Conclusions

Plots illustrating the data for each of the individual analytes are presented in Appendix D. For each analyte, box plots are shown to compare the coarse and fine granularity data along with their combined blank UTLs. Raw data used for the statistical evaluations are given in Appendix B. All tests of normality, UTLs and summary statistics are presented in Appendix C.

Surface and subsurface soils were segregated for the background study and should be segregated for future investigations. Coarse and fine-grained soils were segregated for this background study and it is recommended that they be segregated for future investigations. Summary statistics for coarse and fine granularities for each depth are presented in Appendix C, Table 3. Because information will not always be available about the granularity of future samples, UTLs and other summary statistics are also provided for the combined granularities. Combining data across granularities reduces the ability of the study to determine true differences between potential releases and background, but may be necessary in some cases. The process of deriving the combined UTLs and summary statistics was the same as that for the segregated data. Summary statistics for combined coarse and fine granularities are presented in Appendix C, Table 4. Measurement imprecision indicated by the analysis of the field duplicate data may contribute to the overall uncertainty of our analyses.

Metals concentrations in fine-grained soils tended to be higher than metals concentrations in coarse-grained soils. These differences in concentrations were statistically significant, except for antimony, calcium, cobalt, manganese, mercury, molybdenum, and silver in subsurface soils and antimony, barium, beryllium, cobalt, manganese, mercury, molybdenum, selenium, silver, sodium, and thallium in surface soils. No significant differences in granularity were observed for herbicides or pesticides, however there were in general few detected results for these analytes.

For comparison purposes of individual sample results to background concentrations, the background 95% UTL may be used to determine the presence or absence of environmental contamination for metals, organic herbicides, and organochlorine pesticides. For those samples in which the soil type is known, refer to Table 4.4-1. If the soil type is unknown, refer to Table 4.4-2.

Background UTLs by Depth and Granularity

Coarse	Aluminum	Substarface	Day Ser	10363.31
Coarse	Aluminum	Surface	mo/ca	20500.00
Coarse	Antimony	Substirface		0.53
Coarse	Antimony	Surface	a gran	
Coarse	Arsenic	Subsurface	9/00	10 10
Coarse	Arsenio	Surface	ma/ka	8.69
Coarse	Barium	Subsurface	D D	28.80
Coarse	Bartum	Surface	mo/kg	60.43
Coarse	Berylkum	Substarface	ma/on	0.69
Coarse	Beryllium	Surface	malka	7.0
Coarse	Cadmium	Subsurface	ma/ka	570
Coarse	Cedmium	Surface	movice	280
Coarse	Calcium	Subsurface	ma/ka	1320.00
Coarse	Celcium	Surface	ma/kg	488.91
Coarse	Chromium	Subsurface	mg/kg	12.03
Coarse	Chromium	Surface	mo/kg	28.10
Coarse	Cobatt	Subsurface	mg/kg	6.46
Coarse	Cobalt	Surface	mo/kg	32
Coarse	Copper	Subsurface	mg/kp	7.84
Coarse	Copper	Surfece	mo/kg	04.6
Coarse	<u>ror</u>	Subsurface	mo _f /d	12872.58
Coarse	Ē	Surface	mg/kg	24500.00
Coarse	Lead	Subsurface	D/OLL	8.8
Coarse		Surface	mo/da	11.10
Coarse	Magnesium	Subsurface	mg/kg	902.00
Source	Magnesium	Surface	mg/kg	688.00
CORTISE	Manganese	Subsurface	mo/da	215.00
Soarse	Manganese	Surface	mg/kg	270.00
Sourse	Molybdenum	Subsurface	D/QE	0.72
Source	Molybdenum	Surface	mo/ta	28.0
	Acka.	Subsurface	DA/AD	6.90
corse	Nickel	Surface	mo/to	7.41
CORTRO	Potnesium	Subsurface	mo/kg	655.00
Carso	Potseskim	Surface	mo/la	80000
Carse	Selentum	Subsurface	mg/kg	0.45
Course	Selenich	Surface	mo/la	0.40
Coerse	Silver	Subsurface	mo/ga	0.12
carse	Silver	Surface	a/om	023
Course	Sodium	Subsurface	mp/kg	97.50
Coarse	Sodium	Surface	mo/kg	43.28
Coarse	Their	Subsurface	mo/ta	0.57
Coarse	Thefilm	Surface	al/an	22.0

Background Study Report Fort Polk, Louisiana

Section 4.0 - Background Study Evaluation

4.4-1

Table 4.4-1 Background UTLs by Depth and Granularity

CHAIRMETTY	Athensy Co.			
Coarse	Vanadium	Surface	mo/kg	58.20
Coarse	Zinc	Substantage	mo/ou	15.30
Coerse	Zho	Surface	mo/lea	20.80
Coarse	Mercury	Subsurface	moffee	
Coarse	Mercury	Surface	mo/lea	980
Coarse	4,4-000	Surface	Dayon.	3.12
Coarse	4,4-DDE	Surface	e Se	0.37
Coarse	4,¢-DDT	Surface	DO/YC	0.86
Coarse	Aldrin	Surface	ng/kg	2.80
Coarse	Chlordane	Surface		33.80
Coarse	Dietdrin	Surface	D/JCD	334
Coarse	Endosulfan I	Surface	g/gn	1.65
Coarse	Endosulfan II	Surface	na/co	200
Coarse	Endosulfan Sulfats	Surface	ng/kg	6.48
carse	Endrin	Surface		19.20
Coarse	Endrin Aldehyde	Surface	DQ/QI	0.48
Coarse	Endrin Katone	Surface	Dy/Cn	7.16
Coarse	Heptschior	Surface	og/go	0.85
Coarse	Heptachlor epodde	Surface	na/ka	808
Coarse	leodrin	Surface	0/0n	67-1
osuse	Methoxychior	Surface	ug/kg	1290
Coarse	Mirex	Surface	DV/Dh	86,1
Coarse	Tocaphene	Surface	no/kg	288.00
Ostrae	alpha-8HC	Surface	Dy/on	5.7
Carse	. alpha-Chlordana	Surface	200	320
Carse	beta-BHC	Surface	Dyon	3.48
Carse	deta-BHC	Surface	D/On	2.88
OBLEO	gamma-BHC	Surface	a/on	8,1
Carrie	gamma-Chlordane	Surface		030
OBITS	2,4,5-T	Surface	D/dn	19.4
Carres	2,4,5-TP (Silvax)	Surface	D)/đn	5,58
carse	24D	Surface	oy/on	38.86
Coarse	2,4-08	Surface	D/on	17,30
Carse	Dalapon	Surface	9/91	746.00
oarse	Dicemba	Surface	D/On	12.86
Carres	Dichloroprop	Surface	מאַסו	24.80
98789	Diroseb	Surface	D/01	47.80
	MCPA	Surface	Dydn	7180.00
Course	MCPP	Surface	B/On	4800,00
۽	Alminum	Subsurface	moyo	24486.59
۽	Aluminum	Surface	mo/da	20401.37
2	Antimony	Subsurface	E PACE	22.0

Background Study Report Fort Polk, Louisiana

Section 4.0 – Background Study Evaluation

Table 4.4-1 Background UTLs by Depth and Granularity

	Aldin Mark			
Fine	Arsenic	Substanface	menter	CC 47
.	Arsenic	Surface		5. C
<u>.</u>	Rariem	S. Paris		10.00
Hine			D E	278.25
2 14			9 9	118.05
			mg/kg	1.90
Ē,	Beryllium	Surface	mg/kg	1.68
	Cadmium	Subsurface	mo/or	2.47
E.	Cadmium	Surface	ma/ka	187
	Calcium	Subsurface	ma/ka	8140 C
Fine	Calcium	Surface	ma/ka	2882 74
Fine	Chronium	Subsurface	LL LL	
Fig	Chromium	Surface		78 77
Fine	Cobalt	Subsurface		£ 4.
Fine	Cobat	Surface		28.7
Fine	Copper	Subsurface		, , ,
Fire	Copper	Surface	morka	i t
Fig.	<u>5</u>	Subsurface	ma/kg	ARA45 70
	ē	Surface	- D/CH	44434 40
Fine	Pead	Subsurface	ma/ka	78.71
Fire	Peed	Surface	ma/ka	52.50
ED#	Megnesium	Subsurface	mo/ka	3228 00
	Magnesium	Surface	mg/kg	2159.34
F.26	Manganese	Subsurface	mg/kg	209:00
2 .	Manganese	Surface	mg/kg	225.00
\$.	Molybdenum	Subsurface	By∕ou	1.28
8	Molybdenum	Surface	mo/kg	1. 8.
2	Nickel	Substantace	Dy/du	18.50
	Nicke!	Surface	mg/kg	9.77
	Percent moisture	Subsurface	*	28.73
ر 2	Percent moisture	Surface	*	23.57
	Potassium	Substarface	mg/kg	1174.52
9	Potassium	Surface	mg/kg	1119.94
	Selenium	Subsurface	mg/kg	0.47
	Selentum	Surface	a/em	90
2	Silver	Subsurface	mofka	0.13
	Silver	Surface	mo/co	900
	Sodium	Subsurface	ma/ka	228.00
Fje	Sodium	Surface	movice	68 42
FI26	Theffern	Substurface	e Volume	¥ •
캶	The Firm	Surface	and the	2 5
Fis	Variation	Suthernface		5. 5 5. 1
2	Varietim	Surface		2.5
				72,00

Background Study Report Fort Polk, Louisiana

Section 4.0 - Background Study Evaluation

4-21