



Ecotoxicological impact assessment of upgrading technologies

Jörg Oehlmann¹, Axel Magdeburg¹, Daniel Stalter¹, Mirco Weil² and Thomas Knacker²

¹ Goethe University Frankfurt am Main, Department Aquatic Ecotoxicology ² ECT Oekotoxikologie GmbH, Flörsheim am Main









- Introducing the problem: Impacts
- Effects of selected emerging contaminants
 - Endocrine disrupters (EDs)
 - Pharmaceuticals
- Ecotoxicological impact assessment
 - Case study 1: Ozonation (WWTP Regensdorf, CH)
 - Case study 2: Ozonation and activated carbon treatment (WWTP Neuss, D)
- Conclusions

Ecotoxicology: Protection of ecosystems

Surface waters receive 10.5 billion m³ wastewater per year in Germany

Neptone Wastewater and emerging contaminants

- Several 10,000 chemicals enter the sewer system
- Polar to medium polar contaminants are often not removed in WWTP
- Emerging contaminants with particular relevance:
 - high biological activity,
 - thus effects in the μ g/L range and below,
 - present as complex mixtures
- Examples: Endocrine disrupters (EDs) and pharmaceuticals

Neptune Impact on aquatic ecosystems

Loss of sensitive wildlife groups: ٠



E = Ephemoptera, mayflies



P = Plecoptera,stoneflies



T = Trichoptera,caddis flies



- wastewater content

Magdeburg & Stalter: unpublished

... correlated with the exposure to emerging contaminants such as EDs in the river Elbe:



Oehlmann et al. (2007): Ecotoxicology 16, 19-43

What is an endocrine disrupter (ED)?

• EU definition (COM(1999) 706):

Exogenous substance or mixture that alters function(s) of the endocrine system and consequently causes adverse health effects in an intact organism, or its progeny, or (sub)populations

• EDs may affect growth, development and reproduction by modulating the hormone system, often at trace concentrations

Nepipin





 Lack of males and no reproduction in fathead minnows beyond 1 ng EE2/L:







 Vitellogenin (VTG) induction in male rainbow trout exposed to WWTP effluents:



Jobling et al. (2003): Aquatic Toxicol. 65, 205-220





• 'Superfemales': Enlarged sex glands ... & ruptured oviducts:





Oehlmann et al. (2006): EHP 114, 127-133



- Huge differences in sensitivity for many EDs:
 - snails more sensitive to BPA than fish (by factor 1,000)
- Resulting Environmental Quality Standard (EQS) for BPA:
 - 1.6 µg/L to protect fish populations,
 - 0.0014 µg/L based on effects in snails
- Predicted Environmental Concentration for European surface water (PEC_{water}): 0.12 µg/L





- Damage in kidney, gill and liver at ≥ 1 µg/L by the antiinflammatory drug
- Example kidney: Protein accumulation, epithelial degeneration and interstitial proliferation



Oncorhynchus mykiss, control

O. mykiss, 100 µg diclofenac/L

Schwaiger et al. (2004): Aquatic Toxicol. 68, 141-150

- Advantages compared to *in vivo* tests: sensitive, specific, easy to use and inexpensive
- Disadvantages: no assessment of transformation products, test batteries necessary and not available for many MoA
- Examples:
 - ED activity: E-screen, YES, YAS
 - Mutagenicity: umu test, Ames test
 - Various cyctoxicity tests

Nephur

In vitro biotests for wastewater (cont.)



• Estrogenic activity in the YES and BPA concentration during ozonation (WWTP Düsseldorf):



Schwätter et al. (2007): Water Sci. Technol. 56, 9-13

Nephun

In vitro biotests for wastewater (cont.)



 Androgenic activity in the YAS and BPA concentration during ozonation (WWTP Düsseldorf):



Schwätter et al. (2007): Water Sci. Technol. 56, 9-13



• Androgenic vs. estrogenic activity in WWTP Düsseldorf effluents:



In vivo biotests for wastewater



- Case study 1: WWTP Regensdorf (25,000 PE)
- Comparative onsite testing of three treatment steps, including full-scale ozonation:

(C)

- After final sedimentation (FS)
- After ozone reactor
 (O)
- After sand filter (OS)
- Control



In vivo biotests for wastewater



- Case study 2: WWTP Neuss (120,000 PE)
- Pilot treatment plant with ozonation and powdered activated carbon treatment in parallel lines; samples tested :





• Continuous exposure under flow-through conditions:



In vivo and in vitro test systems

Species Duration (d) Endpoints Media exchange/d frond area Jill è bideas NO28 Lemna minor 6 fold Chironomus development 4 fold riparius reproduction reproduction Lumbriculus 28 4 fold variegatus biomass Potamopyrgus 28 reproduction 4 fold antipodarum development Oncorhynchus 65 biomass 2-6 fold mykiss (FELST) vitellogenin YES/YAS (anti-) estrogenicity (anti-) and rogenicity + anti-screens





• YES (Yeast Estrogen Screen): Reduction of estrogenicity below EQS values after advanced treatment :





22



 In vivo confirmation of reduced estrogenicity following ozonation and activated carbon treatment: Vitellogenin in fish in Regensdorf (left) and embryos in snails in Neuss (right)







 Delayed development in the fish early life stage toxicity test (FELST) at WWTP Regensdorf, significant for O:







• Significantly enhanced mortality in all treatments at Regensdorf (left) and in **FS** and **O** at Neuss (right):



Significant vs. C: \star = p < 0.05-0.001; Fisher's exact test

Stalter et al.: Water Res., submitted and unpublished

Neptur





• Significantly reduced biomass and reproduction for **O** but not for **OS** and AC at Regensdorf (left) and Neuss (right):





	Species	Endpoints	0	OS	AC
Se	Lumbriculus variegatus	reproduction biomass			
	Oncorhynchus mykiss (FELST)	development biomass mortality			

- Significant <u>negative</u> effects compared to FS
- No difference compared to FS
- Significant <u>positive</u> effects compared to FS
- Different results for both WWTPs



	Species	Endpoint	FS	0	OS	AC
	Saccharomyes cerevisiae (YES)	estrogenicity				
	Potamopyrgus antipodarum	reproduction				
ナンドレー	Oncorhynchus mykiss (FELST)	vitellogenin				

Significant <u>negative</u> effects compared to other wastewater samples
 Significant <u>positive</u> effects compared to FS



- Concentrations of 'emerging contaminants' may exceed EQS values in surface waters, requiring advanced treatment processes in WWTP for micropollutant removal
- During ozonation toxic metabolites may arise temporarily, however these effects are annihilated during sand filtration
- *In vivo* tests represent the 'gold standard' for effluent testing but are costly and time consuming
- *In vitro* assays are a promising alternative in the future but exhibit still some disadvantages currently



- The support of the staff at WWTPs Regensdorf and Neuss is greatly acknowledged
- We thank Stefan Ingenhaag (DPU) and Adriano Joss (EAWAG) for technical support
- This study was financed by:
 - EU project NEPTUNE (contract no 036845, SUSTDEV-2005-3.II.3.2) within the Energy, Global Change and Ecosystems Programme of the 6th Framework (FP6-2005-Global-4)
 - Swiss Federal Office for the Environment (FOEN) within the Strategy *MicroPoll* (contract no 05.0013.PJ / F471-0916)
 - EU project COMPRENDO (contract no EVK1-CT-2002-00129, 5th Framework)