



Minutes of TPH Workshop

Naming (TPH vs TRH)

It was agreed that the term used should clearly reflect what is being analysed without ambiguity. Total recoverable hydrocarbon (TRH) includes compounds other than total petroleum hydrocarbons (TPH). Therefore, the term 'TPH' should be used only when silica gel cleanup is performed, and 'TRH' without silica gel cleanup. The laboratories should make it explicit on the report and other documents what these terms mean, so that end users make an informed decision including what to request for analysis. Laboratories should offer both TPH and TRH, but must clearly label reports to show what was analysed. It was suggested the NEPM needs to be clear as to what is meant by TPH.

Banding

The laboratories understood that based on CRC CARE work on Health Screening Levels of petroleum hydrocarbons, it is highly likely that the new TPH banding will be introduced into the NEPM. The proposed TPH bandings are as follows:

- C6 – C10
- > C10 – C16
- > C16 – C34
- > C34

There was general agreement that the selected bands in themselves would not present an issue for analysis and reporting. The proposed banding are considered good because '>' covers everything between the last cut-off and the next carbon number, and also avoids confusion in calculation. It was also felt that first three bands are okay to analyse, however, >C34 band has some difficulty in analysis as it is not clear where this band ends. A decision needs to be made to determine the end point of this band. A convention is needed as to how to handle the cut offs (e.g. mid peak or post peak). This was mainly to effect consistency as little difference was envisaged in the overall levels reported.

Technical Working Group

It was agreed to set up a small technical working group to clarify many technical points. This should mainly consist of analytical chemists with additional representatives of EPAs and consulting companies. This group will be coordinated by CRC CARE.