

REPRODUCED	AT GOVERNMENT	EXPENSE
------------	---------------	---------

# LONG-TERM EFFECTS OF DREDGING **OPERATIONS PROGRAM**

11.A	
$\bigcirc$	

**TECHNICAL REPORT D-84-6** 

DIETARY ACCUMULATION OF PCBs FROM A CONTAMINATED SEDIMENT SOURCE BY A DEMERSAL FISH SPECIES (Leiostomus xanthurus)

by

Norman I. Rubinstein, Wallace T. Gilliam Norman R. Gregory

Environmental Research Laboratory US Environmental Protection Agency Gulf Breeze, Florida 32561

20030109190

FILE COP/

3110



JAN 1 4 1985

November 1984 **Final Report** 

Approved For Public Release; Distribution Unlimited

Frepared for DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY US Army Corps of Engineers Washington, DC 20314-1000

and US Army Engineer District, New York New York, New York 10007

Under Interagency Agreement AR-21-F-2-5770

01

04

Monitored by Environmental Laboratory US Army Engineer Waterways Experiment Station PO Box 631, Vicksburg, Mississippi 39180-0631 004

# **REPRODUCTION QUALITY NOTICE**

This document is the best quality available. The copy furnished to DTIC contained pages that may have the following quality problems:

- Pages smaller or larger than normal.
- Pages with background color or light colored printing.
- Pages with small type or poor printing; and or
- Pages with continuous tone material or color photographs.

Due to various output media available these conditions may or may not cause poor legibility in the microfiche or hardcopy output you receive.

If this block is checked, the copy furnished to DTIC contained pages with color printing, that when reproduced in Black and White, may change detail of the original copy.

REPRODUCED AT GOVERNMENT EXPENSE

Destroy this report when no longer needed. Do not return it to the originator.

The findings in this report are not to be construed as an official Department of the Army position unless so designated by other authorized documents.

> The contents of this report are not to be used for advertising, publication, or promotional purposes. Citation of trade names does not constitute an official endorsement or approval of the use of such commercial products.

The D-series of reports includes publications of the Environmental Effects of Dredging Programs:

Dredging Operations Technical Support

Long-Term Effects of Dredging Operations

Interagency Field Verification of Methodologies for Evaluating Dredged Material Disposal Alternatives (Field Verification Program)

. . . . .

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE	READ INSTRUCTIONS BEFORE COMPLETING FORM		
I. REPORT NUMBER			
Technical Report D-84-6 PP-H149	415		
4. TITLE (and Substitio)	5. TYPE OF REPORT & PERIOD COVERED		
DIETARY ACCUMULATION OF PCEs FROM A CONTAMINATED	Final report		
SEDIMENT SOURCE BY A DEMERSAL FISH SPECIES	6 PERFORMING ORG. REPORT NUMBER		
(LEIOSTOMUS XANTHURUS)	6. PERFORMING ONG. REFORT NUMBER		
7. AUTHOR(#)	8. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(*)		
Norman I. Rubinstein, William T. Gilliam,	Interagency Agreement		
Norman R. Gregory	AR-21-F-2-5770		
. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS	10. PROGRAM ELEMENT, PROJECT, TASK AREA & WORK UNIT NUMBERS		
Environmental Research Laboratory	Long-Term Effects of		
US Environmental Protection Agency	Dredging Operations Progra		
Gulf Breeze, Florida 32561			
I. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS	12. REPORT DATE November 1984		
DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY, US Army Corps of Engineers, Washington, DC 20314-1000 and	13. NUMBER OF PAGES		
US Army Engineer District, New York	25		
New York, New York 10007	15. SECURITY CLASS, (of this report)		
14. MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS(II dillerent from Controlling Office)	-  Unclassified		
US Army Engineer Waterways Experiment Station Environmental Laboratory	15. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE		
PO Box 631, Vicksburg, Mississippi 39180-0631 6. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the Report) Approved for public release; distribution unlimit	)		
PO Box 631, Vicksburg, Mississippi 39180-0631 B. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report)	;		
PO Box 631, Vicksburg, Mississippi 39180-0631 6. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report) Approved for public release; distribution unlimit	)		
PO Box 631, Vicksburg, Mississippi 39180-0631 16. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report) Approved for public release; distribution unlimit 17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the obstract entered in Block 20, 11 different f	;		
PO Box 631, Vicksburg, Mississippi 39180-0631 16. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report) Approved for public release; distribution unlimit 17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the obstract entered in Block 20, 11 different f 18. SUPPLEMENTARY MOTES	rom Report)		
PO Box 631, Vicksburg, Mississippi 39180-0631 6. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report) Approved for public release; distribution unlimit 17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the observed in Block 20, 11 different f 18. SUPPLEMENTARY MOTES Available from National Technical Information Ser	rom Report)		
PO Box 631, Vicksburg, Mississippi 39180-0631 16. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report) Approved for public release; distribution unlimit 17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the obstract entered in Block 20, 11 different f 18. SUPPLEMENTARY MOTES	rom Report)		
PO Box 631, Vicksburg, Mississippi 39180-0631 16. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the Report) Approved for public release; distribution unlimit 17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the obstract entered in Block 29, 11 different f 18. SUPPLEMENTARY POTES Available from National Technical Information Ser Springfield, Virginia 22161.	rom Report)		
PO Box 631, Vicksburg, Mississippi 39180-0631 6. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report) Approved for public release; distribution unlimit 17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the observed in Block 20, 11 different f 18. SUPPLEMENTARY MOTES Available from National Technical Information Ser	rom Report)		
PO Box 631, Vicksburg, Mississippi 39180-0631 16. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the Report) Approved for public release; distribution unlimit 17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the obstract entered in Block 29, 11 different f 18. SUPPLEMENTARY POTES Available from National Technical Information Ser Springfield, Virginia 22161.	rom Report)		
PO Box 631, Vicksburg, Mississippi 39180-0631 16. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the Report) Approved for public release; distribution unlimit 17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the obstract entered in Block 29, 11 different f 18. SUPPLEMENTARY POTES Available from National Technical Information Ser Springfield, Virginia 22161.	rom Report)		
PO Box 631, Vicksburg, Mississippi 39180-0631 16. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the Report) Approved for public release; distribution unlimit 17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the obstract entered in Block 29, 11 different f 18. SUPPLEMENTARY POTES Available from National Technical Information Ser Springfield, Virginia 22161.	rom Report)		
PO Box 631, Vicksburg, Mississippi 39180-0631 16. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report) Approved for public release; distribution unlimit 17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the obstract entered in Block 20, 11 different f 18. SUPPLEMENTARY MOTES Available from National Technical Information Ser Springfield, Virginia 22161. 19. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number 10. ABSTRACT (Canthus an reverse side if necessary and identify by block number	ron Report) rvice, 5285 Port Royal Road, ""		
PO Box 631, Vicksburg, Mississippi 39180-0631 16. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report) Approved for public release; distribution unlimit 17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the obstract entered in Block 20, 11 different f 18. SUPPLEMENTARY MOTES Available from National Technical Information Ser Springfield, Virginia 22161. 19. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number V Accumulation and dietary transfer of polychl	rom Report) rvice, 5285 Port Royal Road, ""		
PO Box 631, Vicksburg, Mississippi 39180-0631 Approved for public release; distribution unlimit Approved for public release; distribution unlimit 17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the obstract entered in Block 20, 11 different f 18. SUPPLEMENTARY MOTES Available from National Technical Information Ser Springfield, Virginia 22161. 19. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side II necessary and Identify by block number V Accumulation and dietary transfer of polychl contaminated harbor sediments were studied in a 1	rom Report) rvice, 5285 Port Royal Road, ") orinated biphenyls (PCBs) from aboratory food chain consist-		
PO Box 631, Vicksburg, Mississippi 39180-0631 Approved for public release; distribution unlimit Approved for public release; distribution unlimit 17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the obstract entered in Block 20, 11 different f 18. SUPPLEMENTARY MOTES Available from National Technical Information Ser Springfield, Virginia 22161. 19. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number V Accumulation and dietary transfer of polychl contaminated harbor sediments were studied in a 1 ing of sediments, polychaetes (Nereis virens), ar	ron Report) rvice, 5285 Port Royal Road, "" orinated biphenyls (PCBs) fro aboratory food chain consist- ad a predatory fish (Leiostomu		
PO Box 631, Vicksburg, Mississippi 39180-0631 Approved for public release; distribution unlimit Approved for public release; distribution unlimit 17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the observed in Block 20, 11 different f 18. SUPPLEMENTARY MOTES Available from National Technical Information Ser Springfield, Virginia 22161. 19. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number V Accumulation and dietary transfer of polychl contaminated harbor sediments were studied in a 1 ing of sediments, polychaetes ( <u>Nereis virens</u> ), ar <u>xanthurus</u> ). The study was conducted in two phase	rom Report) rvice, 5285 Port Royal Road, "" orinated biphenyls (PCBs) from aboratory food chain consist- id a predatory fish (Leiostomu es to distinguish dietary		
PO Box 631, Vicksburg, Mississippi 39180-0631 Approved for public release; distribution unlimit Approved for public release; distribution unlimit 17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the observed entered in Block 20, 11 different f 18. SUPPLEMENTARY MOTES Available from National Technical Information Ser Springfield, Virginia 22161. 19. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number V Accumulation and dietary transfer of polychl contaminated harbor sediments were studied in a 1 ing of sediments, polychaetes ( <u>Nereis virens</u> ), ar <u>xanthurus</u> ). The study was conducted in two phase uptake from PCB accumulation resulting from sedim	rom Report) rom Report) rvice, 5285 Port Royal Road, "" orinated biphenyls (PCBs) from aboratory food chain consist- id a predatory fish ( <u>Leiostomu</u> ; es to distinguish dietary ment exposure alone.		
PO Box 631, Vicksburg, Mississippi 39180-0631 Approved for public release; distribution unlimit Approved for public release; distribution unlimit 17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the observed in Block 20, 11 different f 18. SUPPLEMENTARY MOTES Available from National Technical Information Ser Springfield, Virginia 22161. 19. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number V Accumulation and dietary transfer of polychl contaminated harbor sediments were studied in a 1 ing of sediments, polychaetes ( <u>Nereis virens</u> ), ar <u>xanthurus</u> ). The study was conducted in two phase	rom Report) rom Report) rvice, 5285 Port Royal Road, "" orinated biphenyls (PCBs) from aboratory food chain consist- id a predatory fish (Leiostomu: es to distinguish dietary ment exposure alone.		

and a superior of the second second second

Service .

Preface

This study was conducted by the US Environmental Protection Agency, Environmental Research Laboratory, Gulf Breeze, Fla. (ERLGB). Financial sponsorship was primarily from the US Army Engineer District, New York, through the Environmental Laboratory (EL) of the US Army Engineer Waterways Experiment Station (WES), Vicksburg, Miss. The WES also supported the work under the Long-Term Effects of Dredging Operations (LEDO) research program, which it is conducting under sponsorship of the Office, Chief of Engineers (OCE), Washington, DC. Broader questions being addressed under LEDO benefited from this specific study and vice versa. The study was conducted under the general supervision of Dr. Al Bourquin, Chief, Processes and Effects Branch, ERLGB. The Director of ERLGB during this study was Dr. Henry Enos. The authors of this report were Messrs. N. I. Rubinstein, W. T. Gilliam, and N. R. Gregory, ERLGB. The authors gratefully acknowledge the assistance of ERLGB personnel: Ms. T. Dunn for technical assistance, Mrs. B. Jackson for editing, and Ms. J. Seites for typing.

The New York District project manager was Mr. J. M. Mansky. Technicalmonitors of the LEDO program were Dr. John Hall, Operations Division, OCE; Dr. W. L. Klesch, Planning Division, OCE; and Mr. C. W. Hummer, Dredging Division, Water Resources Support Center.

The WES project manager was Dr. R. K. Peddicord, under the general supervision of Dr. C. R. Lee, Chief, Contaminant Mobility and Regulatory Criteria Group; Mr. D. L. Robey, Chief, Ecosystem Research and Simulation Division; and Dr. John Harrison, Chief, EL. The LEDO is managed in EL through the Environmental Effects of Dredging Programs (EEDP), Mr. C. C. Calhoun, Jr., Manager, and Mr. R. L. Lazor, EEDP LEDO Program Coordinator.

Commander and Director of the WES during conduct of the study and preparation of the report was COL Tilford C. Creel, CE. Technical Director was Mr. F. R. Brown.

This report should be cited as follows:

Rubinstein, N.I., Gilliam, W.T., and Gregory, N.R. 1984. "Dietary Accumulation of PCBs from a Contaminated Sediment Source by a Demersal Fish Species (Leiostomus xanthumus)," Technical Report D-84-6, prepared by US Environmental Protection Agency, Gulf Breeze, Fla., for the US Army Engineer Waterways Experiment Station, Vicksburg, Miss.

# Contents

	Page
Preface	2
List of Tables	4
List of Figures	5
Introduction	6
Background	6
ObjectiveScope	7 7
Methods and Materials	8
Organisms	8
Sediments	8 9
Phase II: Sediment and Dietary Exposure	10
Chemical Analysis	12
Tissues	12
Sediments.,	12
Cleanup	13
Results and Discussion	14
Phase I Phase II	14 18
Conclusions	20
References	22



# List of Tables

No.		Page
1	Analysis of Variance of PCB Body-Burden Measurements	15
2	Phase I - PCB Whole Body Residues (µg/g wet wt.) in Spot and Sandworms	16
3	Phase II – PCB Whole Body Residues ( $\mu g/g$ wet wt.) in Spot	18
4	PCB Concentrations (µg/g wet wt.) in Weekly Food Composites (Sandworms, gut unpurged)	15

4

# List of Figures

No.		Page
1	Exposure design for spot and sandworms in 100-L aquaria during Phase I and Phase II	11
2	Average PCB whole body residues (µg/g wet weight) in spot during Phase I and Phase II	15

# DIETARY ACCUMULATION OF PCBs FROM A CONTAMINATED SEDIMENT SOURCE

BY A DEMERSAL FISH (LEIOSTOMUS XANTHURUS)

# Introduction

#### Background

1. Bioaccumulation of organic contaminants by marine organisms occurs through at least three pathways: direct partitioning from the aqueous phase via the gills; integumental sorption; and diet (Swartz and Lee 1980). Water is the probable medium of exchange for all pathways and it appears that equilibrium partitioning determines the distribution of organic contaminants between the organism and the environment. Of these three routes of uptake, direct partitioning from water across the gills is generally considered to be dominant (Hamelink et al. 1971; Scura and Theilacker 1977; Macek et al. 1979; Ellgehausen et al. 1980). However, for extremely hydrophobic compounds, such as polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs), a number of recent studies indicate that diet is a major source of body residues at least for a number of fish species (Thomann 1981; Jensen et al. 1982; Pizza and O'Connor 1983: Thomann and Connolly 1984).

2. Because of their hydrophobic nature, PCBs have a strong affinity for particulate material; consequently, in aquatic systems they are commonly associated with bottom sediments, particularly in urbanized and industrialized areas. Previous studies have demonstrated that a variety of marine organisms incuding infaunal species can accumulate PCBs from contaminated sediments (e.g., McLeese et al. 1980; Wyman and O'Connors 1980; Fowler et al. 1978; Courtney and Langston 1978; Rubinstein et al.

1983). Many of these species are important food sources for higher trophic organisms. The relative importance of sediments as a contaminant source for the accumulation and transfer of PCBs within marine food webs remains unclear at this time. However, this question becomes extremely pertinent when evaluating the potential impact of dredged material disposal in equatic systems.

# Objective

3. The objective of this study was to determine the extent to which a contaminated sediment (collected from the field) could serve as a source of PCBs for uptake and dietary transfer in a simplified laboratory food chain consisting of sediments, polychaetes, and a predatory fish. The predator species selected for study was the spot, <u>Leiostomus</u> <u>xanthurus</u>, a commercially important demersal fish which feeds predominantly on polychaetes during its early years (Sheridan 1979). An infaunal polychaete, the sandworm, <u>Nereis virens</u>, was chosen as the prey species. Both of these organisms have been shown to accumulate PCBs from water and sediments (Hansen et al. 1971; McLeese et al. 1980; Rubinstein et al. 1983).

# Scope

4. This study was conducted in two phases to distinguish "CB residues originating from the spec's diet from residues resulting from environmental exposure alone (direct partitioning via gills and integument). During Phase I, fish and polychaetes were allowed to establish an "apparent" steady-state concentration. Actual steady-state or equilibrium may not be achieved for PCBs within the time frame of this exposure (40 days), especially for the more highly chlorinated isomers (Shaw

and Connell 1980). In addition, during Phase I the effect of direct contact with sediments on PCB bioaccumulation potential by the spot was examined. In Phase II, we determined the dietary fraction of PCB accumulation by selectively feeding exposed and control groups of fish polychaetes having a known PCB body burden.

#### Methods and Materials

東京などの記念が設定に見たいなど

しいたいというたいをななるのでいたとうないとう

## Crganisms

5. This study was conducted at the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Environmental Research Laboratory, Gulf Breeze, Fla., from November 1982 through January 1983. Sandworms (average  $(\bar{x})$  wet weight = 6 g) were purchased from the Maine Bait Co., Newcastle, Maine, and shipped via air freight to Gulf Breeze. Spot ( $\bar{x} = 17$  g) were collected (by seine) from Santa Rosa Sound, Fla. Both species were acclimated to exposure conditions in the laboratory for at least 2 weeks prior to testing.

# Sediments

6. Contaminated sediment was collected from Newark Bay, N.J., shipped to Gulf Breeze by refrigerated truck, and maintained at 4°C until initiation of the study. Sediment was sieved (2-mm mesh) to remove large debris and macrofauna, thoroughly mixed to ensure uniformity, and analyzed for particle size, percentage moisture, and percentage organics (EPA/CE 1981). PCB contentrations (as Aroclor 1242 and 1254  $\mu g/g$  dry weight) in sediments were measured at the beginning and end of the study.

# Phase I: Sediment Exposure

7. Fish and polychaetes were separately exposed for 40 days to contaminated and control sediments (washed beach sand) in 100-g glass aquaria (86 x 50 x 25 cm) receiving flowing seawater. Seawater was pumped from Santa Rosa Sound, Fla., filtered to 20  $\mu$ m, and delivered to a headbox in the laboratory; temperature was maintained at 20°C ± 2°C. Water flowed by gravity from the headbox to a constant head trough where siphons delivered seawater at 30 g/hr to aquaria. During the study, salinity ranged from 20 to 30 °/oo and dissolved oxygen (measured weekly using a YSI Model 57 DO meter) never fell below 5.0 mg/g. Aquaria were set up and designated as follows (Figure 1):

- a. Tank 1 (Exposed Worms) A 4-ca layer (172) of contaminated sediment and 200 sandworms.
- b. Tank 2 (Exposed Fish) A 4-cm layer of contaminated sediment and 35 spot.
- c. Tank 3 (Isolated Fish) A 4-cm iayer of contaminated sediment and 20 spot separated from the sediment by a nitex<sup>®</sup> screen (1-mm mesh) placed 3 cm above the substrate to isolate fish from direct contact with the sediment.
- d. Tank 4 (Control Fish) A 4-cm layer of control sediment and 40 spot.
- e. Tank 5 (Control Worms) A 4-cm layer of control sediment and 200 sandworms.

A sediment trap was placed in the effluent line of tank 2 to collect sediment resuspended by the swimming activity of the fish. This material was periodically returned to tank 2. During Phase I, fish and polychaetes were fed a maintenance diet of flake food (Tetra SM80, Tetra Werke, West Germany) at approximately 2 percent of body weight per day.

8. Prior to initiation of the sediment exposure (Phase I), three fish and three polychaetes were collected from holding aquaria and analyzed (whole body) for background concentrations of PCBs. Fish (N = 3) collected from tank 2 (sediment exposed) were analyzed for PCBs following 10 and 40 days of exposure to test sediments; fish from Tank 3 (sediment isolated) and Tank 4 (control) were analyzed on day 10 and 35. Polychaetes (N = 3) from Tank 1 (sediment exposed) and Tank 5 (control) were analyzed for PCBs on days 10, 20, and 35. Fish and polychaetes were placed in uncontaminated flowing seawater for 24 hr prior to tissue analysis to evacuate their intestinal tracts.

# Phase II: Sediment and Dietary Exposure

9. Following exposure for 40 days to sediment, fish and sediment from tank 2 were equally divided into two aquaria so that exposure conditions were maintained identical to Phase I. Control fish (Tank 4) were divided similarly. During the last 2 weeks of Phase I, the diet of the spot was gradually adjusted to include increasing portions of uncontaminated (control) sandworms from tank 5. At the end of this acclimation period, fish were feeding voraciously on polychaetes. For Phase II, aquaria were redesignated as follows (Figure 1):

- a. Tank A Contaminated sediment and 13 spot (from tank 2) fed a daily ration of contaminated sandworms (from tank 1).
- b. Tank B Contaminated sediment and 13 spot (from tank 2) fed a daily ration of uncontaminated sandworms (from tank 5).
- c. Tank C Control sediment and 15 spot (from tank 4) fed a daily ration of contaminated sandworms (from tank 1).
- d. Tank D Control sediment and 15 spot (from tank 4) fed a daily ration of uncontaminated sandworms (from tank 5).



# PHASE II. SEDIMENT AND DIETARY EXPOSURE

(#2)Fed (#2)Fed Exposed Control	ontrol Spot (#4)Fed Exposed andworms (#1) Control Spot (#4)Fed Control Sandworms (#5)
------------------------------------	--

Figure 1. Exposure design for spot and sandworms in 100-2 aquaria during Phase I and Phase II

10. Daily food rations for all fish during Phase II were estimated at 10 percent of body weight. Sandworms were collected daily from aquaria and cut into pieces small enough for ingestion by spot. Daily samples of contaminated and control sandworms used as food were composited into weekly samples, homogenized, and analyzed for PCBs in triplicate. Sandworms used as food were not purged. 11. Fish in all aquaria consumed their respective food ration very quickly. Excess food was never observed in aquaria following a feeding event. Five fish were sampled for chemical analysis from each aquaria after 10 and 20 days of feeding. Fish were placed in flowing uncontaminated seawater and not fed for 24 hr to evacuate the digestive tract prior to PCB analysis.

#### Chemical Analysis

#### Tissues

12. Whole fish and polychaetes weighing from 3 to 15 g were cut into small pieces and slurried with an equal weight of distilled water using a polytron (Brinkman, Model PCU-2 with a PT-10 generator). Subsamples (maximum slurry weight of 16 g) were homogenized with aliquots of 10.5 and 5 ml of acetonitrile. After each homogenization, the samples were centrifuged and the supernatant was decanted. Acetonitrile extracts (20 ml) were combined with 75 ml of 2 percent aqueous  $Na_2SO_4$  and extracted three times with 10 ml hexane. The hexane extracts were reduced to 1 to 2 ml by gentle warming under a stream of dry nitrogen. The concentrates were then transferred to a Florisil column for cleanup.

# Sediments

13. Sediments were slowly air dried at room temperature to 3 to 5 percent moisture content and then ground to a fine powder using a high speed blade mill. Subsamples of up to 4 g were then extracted by the Soxhlet method of Bellar et al. (1980). Extracts were reduced to a volume of 1 to 2 ml for Florisil cleanup. Cleanup

14. A 9-mm (outside diameter) column was packed with 4 g of activated Florisil and topped with 25 mm of anhydrous Na<sub>2</sub>SO<sub>4</sub>. The column was preeluted with 10 ml hexane (not collected) and the 1- to 2-ml samples immediately were introduced and eluted with several washes of hexane (total of 10 ml). This was followed by additional elutions with 10 ml hexane and 10 ml 1 percent diethylether in hexane. Elutriates originating from sediment samples were reduced to 5 ml and tumbled with 0.1 to 0.3 ml metallic Hg for 1 hr to remove sulfur interferences. All samples were then reduced to a final volume of 1 ml for analysis by gas chromatography.

15. Analysis was performed on a Hewlett-Packard 5710 gas chromatograph with an electron-capture detector operated at  $300^{\circ}$ C and a 1.8-mglass column (4 mm inside diameter x 6 mm outside diameter) packed with 3 percent OV-101 on 80/100 mesh-Supelcoport maintained at 200°C for Aroclor 1242 and at 220°C for Aroclor 1254. The carrier gas was 10 percent monthane in argon at a flowrate of 60 m2/min.

16. PCB quantification was done by the method of Webb and McCall (1973). The reference standard, obtained from the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Analytical Standards Branch, Cincinnati, Ohio, was described by Sawyer (1978). Only Aroclor 1242 and 1254 isomers were quantified. Recoveries from spiked samples averaged 86 percent. Concentrations reported were not corrected for percentage recovery. Instrument detection limits for sediments (dry weight) and tissues (wet weight) were 5 ng PCB/g.

### **Results and Discussion**

17. Test sediment contained 21.8 percent total organic carbon and 70 percent moisture. Particle-size distribution was 0 percent sand, 88 percent silt, and 12 percent clay. A net loss of PCBs in sediment was observed during the exposure period. Initial sediment concentrations which averaged  $5.68 \pm 0.51 \ \mu\text{g/g}$  (N = 5, dry weight) dropped to  $4.13 \pm$  $0.51 \ \mu\text{g/g}$  (N = 5) at the termination of the study. Test sediment was not acutely toxic to fish or polychaetes. No mortality was observed in spot and very few polychaetes died (< 2 percent) during the test period.

# Phase I

18. Phase I was designed to expose fish to environmentally realistic concentrations of PCBs prior to dietary exposure and to provide a PCBcontaminated food source. Whole body concentrations of PCBs in spot and sandworms exposed to contaminated sediments reached an apparent equilibrium concentration during Phase I (Figure 2). In previous studies conducted with these species, steady-state concentrations of PCBs were attained within 40 days of exposure (Hansen et al. i970; McLeese et al. 1980; Rubinstein et al. 1983). Significant differences (p < 0.05, ANOVA, Duncans Multiple Range Test; SAS 1982) in PCB residues between control and exposed treatments were detected in Phase I for both fish and polychaetes (Tables 1, 2). At the end of Phase I, PCB body burdens averaged 0.31 µg/g (wet weight) for fish and 0.21 µg/g (wet weight) for polychaetes (Table 2).



Figure 2. Average PCB whole body residues ( $\mu g/g$  wet weight) in spot during Phase I (N = 3) and Phase II (N = 5)

Table l
---------

Test	Source	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	F-value	<u>Pr &gt; F</u>
Phase I - Spot	Treatment	2	0.2021	108.69	0.301
•	Time	1	0.0082	8.87	0.0107
	Error	13	0.0120		
Phase I · Sandwor	ms Treatment	1	0.0699	41.02	0.002
	Time	1	0.000004	0	0,9621
	Error	8	0.0136		
Phase II - Spot	Treatment	3	3.0938	39.41	0.0001
•	Time	1	0.1198	4.58	0.0398
	Error	33	0.8635		

Analysis of Variance of PCB Body-Burden Measurements

ay O Background	Tank #	Sample	Interval
Phasa I - P	CB whole body residues ( $_{\mu\ell}$	g/g wet wt.) i	n spot
0.07 0.10 0.07	2 (Sediment Exposed)	Day 14 0.38 0.38	Day 40 0.29 0.29
x 0.08		0.31	0.35
SD 0.02		x 0.36 SD 0.04	0.31 0.04
	3 (Sediment isolated)	Day 10	Day 35
		0.19 0.15 0.09	0.06 0.11 0.08
		x 0.14 SD 0.05	0.08 0.02
	4 (Control)	0.12 0.10 *	0.07 0.06 0.07
		x 0.11 SD 0.01	0.07 0.01
Phase I - PCB who	le body residues (µg/g we	t wt.) in sand	Worms
0.01	l (Sediment exposed)	Day 10 Day	

# Phase I - PCB Whole Body Residues ( $\mu g/g$ wet wt.) in Spot and Sandworms

Table 2

· · .

0.01

x 0.01 SD 0.00

0.01

\*Sample lost

16

5 (Control)

0.21

0.13

0.20

0.08

0.01

0.23 \*

0.04

x 0.20 SD 0.03 0.22

0.20

0.21

0.01

0.02

19. Fish isolated from direct contact with sediment (tank 3) contained significantly less PCB (p < 0.05, ANOVA, Duncans Multiple Range Test; SAS 1982) than fish in contact with sediment (tank 2). Average PCB concentrations in fish isolated from test sediment for 35 days were statistically indistinguishable from control fish (Figure 2). halter and Johnson (1977) showed that a freshwater fish (fathead minnow, Pimphales promelas) in direct contact with contaminated sediment accumulated PCB residues at six times the rate of fish screened from direct contact with sediments. This is particularly interesting because a method now being considered to diminish the impact of contaminated dredged material (sediment) disposal in the marine environment involves "capping" (covering) contaminated materia. with a layer of clean (uncontaminated) sediment (O'Connor 1983). The data reported herein support the contention that physical isolation of contaminated sediment can effectively reduce the availability of PCBs for bioaccumulation by water column organisms. However, it is important to note that due to the use of a flow-through seawater design, th' PCB distribution in the exposure system does not reflect PCB partition equilibrium between sediment and overlying water. Although this may obfuscate the ultimate contribution of water mediated uptake observed, we feel that: (a) flow-through conditions are more simulative of open ocean disposal sites where mixing and water movement over the bottom are substantial; (b) static conditions are unacceptable for bioaccumulation studies in that secondary uptake (resulting from depuration) cannot be readily quantified; and (c) flow-through conditions are preferable to meet the life support requirements of test organisms in contact with anaerobic sediments for extended periods of time.

Phase II

20. During Phase II significant differences (p < 0.05) in PCB whole body residues in spot were detected (ANOVA, Duncans Multiple Range Test; SAS 1982) between contaminated and control feeding regimes (Table 3).

Ta	Ь	1	e	3

Days of Exposure	Days of Feeding		Tank A	Tank B	Tank C	Tank D
50	10		0.57	0.62	0.33	0.08
20			0.60	0.37	0.34	0.11
			1.04	0.60	0.33	0.02
			0.88	0.58	0.29	0.10
			0.89	0.62	0.35	*
		x	0.80	0.56	0.33	0.08
		SD	0.20	0.11	0.02	0.04
60	20		0.75	0.56	0.33	0.08
			0.96	0.33	0.57	0.10
		,	0.91	0.64	0.64	0.11
		Ň	1.54	0.56	0.58	0.10
		/	*	0.52	0.55	0.11
		x	1.04	0.48	0.60	0.10
		SD	0.35	0.13	0.06	0.02

Phase II - PCB Whole Body Residues ( $\mu g/g$  wet wt.) in Spot

## \*Sample Lost

Fish exposed to contaminated sediments and fed a daily diet of polychaetes from the same sediments for 20 days accumulated more than twice the PCB residues than sediment-exposed fish fed control polychaetes (Figure 2). Average (N = 5) PCB body burdens on day 60 (20 days of feeding) for fish in tank A were 1.04  $\pm$  0.35 µg/g while fish in tank B (environmental exposure only) measured 0.48  $\pm$  0.13 µg/g. Sandworms exposed to contaminated sediments provided the only source of PCBs for control fish during Phase II. Average PCB whole body residues measured in unpurged sandworms used as food during Phase II was 0.49  $\mu$ g/g wet weight (SD = 0.09, N = 8) for sediment exposed, and 0.01  $\mu$ g/g (SD = 0.004, N = 8) for control treatments (Table 4). Average PCB whole body residues in control fish maintained on a diet of contaminated polychaetes for 20 days (tank C) measured 0.60  $\mu$ g/g wet weight, while control fish fed control polychaetes during the same period contained 0.01  $\mu$ g/g wet weight (Table 4).

# Table 4

PCB Concentrations ( $\mu g/g$  wet wt.) in Weekly Food Composites

Treatment		Week 1	Week 2	Week 3
Exposed		0.45	0.58	0.50
-		0.46	0.59	0.34
		0.47	*	0.43
	x	0.46	0.59	0.43
	SD	0.01	0.01	0.08
Centrol		0.02	0.02	0.01
		0.01	0.02	0.01
		0.01	0.02	*
	x	0.01	0.02	0.01
	SD	0.00	0.00	0.00

(Sandworms, gut unpurged)

\*Sample lost

21. On day 60 the PCB dietary contribution to whole body residues in fish was still increasing (Figure 2) and rates of uptake were similar between exposed fish (0.030 µg PCB/g per day) and control fish (0.025 µg PCB/g per day) fed contaminated polychaetes. A comparison of the regressions for PCB whole body residue vs. time for these two treatments (Tank A and Tank C) showed no significant difference ( $\alpha = 0.05$ ) in the slopes of the lines. Fish in all treatments grew during this study period. Increases in wet weight of individual fish during phase II averaged 2.83 ± 1.28 g (N = 16) for all treatments.

「「こうないない」を考えていたかな。ないかいには、「「「こうちょう」をついていた。」 ディック

# Conclusions

22. These results demonstrate that contaminated harbor sediments can serve as a source of PCBs for accumulation and dietary transfer by sandworms and spot. Following 20 days of feeding the dietary contribution of PCBs accounted for 53% of the total body residue measured in spot, and this percentage appeared to be increasing (Figure 2). This observation is in agreement with previous findings by Thomaun (1981), Jensen et al. (1982), and Pizza and O'Connor (1983), who identified diet as the major source of PCBs for a variety of predatory fish species. Although the relative contribution of direct partitioning across the gills is extremely high for organic compounds and produces very large bioconcentration factors, one must consider the ultimate distribution of hydrophobic compounds in the marine environment. These compounds (of which PCBs serve as an excellent model) have very low solubilities and very high partition coefficients. Consequently, little of the compound is available

for aqueous uptake compared to the amount of compound which is associated with particulate organic material that can serve as a potential food source for infaunal and epibenthic food webs.

23. Current regulations dealing with conditions for the release of contaminated material in the marine environment (i.e., Ocean Dumping Act, Public Law 92-532) utilize laboratory bioaccumulation tests as part of the permit evaluation process. Bioaccumulation testing of representative marine organisms provides a direct measure of bioavailability of sedimentassociated contaminants. Results from this study support the utility of this approach by demonstrating a direct relationship between residue concentration in infauna and the potential for dietary transfer to a commercially important fish species.

シュアニュアンションションの変更な アイクション 山田市 バックト・シャン 国家市 アイク オンシング 道像でたい ひょうかん 日本アンドラクシン 日本アイティング ション・ション 日本市 アイクション 日本市

:

・シンシン 二丁

# References

ASTM.	1983.	Proposed	standard	practice	for	conducting	bioconcentration
t	ests wi	th fishes	and salt	water biva	alve	molluscs.	Draft #7.

J.L. Hamelink and J.G. Eaton, co-chairpersons. E-47.01.

- Bellar, T.A., J.J. Lichtenberg and S.C. Lonneman. 1980. Recovery of organic compounds from environmentally contaminated bottom material. <u>In</u>: Contaminants and Sediments, Vol. 2, edited by R.A. Baker, Ann Arbor Science Publishers, Ann Arbor, MI, pp. 57-70.
- Courtney, W.A. and W.J. Langston. 1978. Uptake of polychlorinated biphenyl (Aroclor 1254) from sediment and from seawater in two intertidal polychaetes. Environ. Polluc. 15:303-309.
- Elder, D.L., S.W. Fowler and G.G. Folikarpov. 1979. Remobilization of sediment-associated FCB's by the worm <u>Nereis diversicolor</u>. Bull. Environ. Contam. Toxicol. 21:448-452.
- Eligehausen, H., J.A. Guth and H.O. Esser. 1980. Factors determining the bioaccumulation potential of pesticides in the individual compartments of aquatic food chains. Ecotoxicol. and Environ. Safety 4:134-150.

EPA/CE. 1981. Procedures for handling and chemical analysis of sediment and water samples. Environmental Effects Laboratory, U.S. Army Engineer Waterways Experiment Station, Vicksburg, MS.

Fowler, W., C.G. Polekarpov, D.L. Elder and J.P. Villeneuve. 1978. Polychlorinated biphenyls: accumulation from contaminated sediments and water by the polychaete <u>Nereis diversicolor</u>. Mar. Biol. 48:303-309.

- Halter, M.T. and H.E. Johnson. 1977. A model system to study the desorption and biological availability of PCB in hydrosoils. <u>In</u>: Aquatic Toxicology and Hazard Evaluation; edited by F.L. Mayer and J.L. Hamelink. American Society for Testing Materials: ASTM STP 634:178.
- Hamelink, J.L., R.C. Waybrand and R.C. Ball. 1971. A Proposal: Exchange equilibria control the degree chlorinated hydrocarbons are biologically magnified in lentic environments. Trans. Am. Fish. Soc. 100:207-213.
- Hansen, D.J., et al. 1971. Chronic toxicity, uptake and retention of Aroclor 1254<sup>®</sup> in two estuarine fishes. Bull. Environ. Contam. Toxicol. 6(2):113-119.
- Jensen, A.L., S.A. Spigarelli and M.M. Thommes. 1982. PCB uptake by five species of fish in Lake Michigan, Green Bay of Lake Michigan, and Cayuga Lake, New York. Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci. 39:700-709.
- Macek, K.J., S.R. Petrocelli and B. Sleight. 1979. Considerations in assessing the potential for, and significance of, biomagnification of chemical residues in aquatic food chains. Aquatic Toxicology, ASTM STP 667, L.L. Marking and R.A. Kimerle, Eds., American Society for Testing and Materials, pp. 251-268.
- McLeese, D.W., C.D. Letcalfe and D.S. Pezzack. 1980. Uptake of PCB's from sediments by <u>Nereis virens</u> and <u>Crangon septemspinosa</u>. Arch. Environ. Contag. Toxicol. 9:507-518.
- O'Connor, J.M. 1983. Evaluation of the 1980 capping operations at the experimental mud dump site N.Y. bight apex. Technical Report D-83-3. U.S. Army Engineer Waterways Experiment Station, Vicksburg, MS.

- Pizza, J.C. and J.M. O'Connor. 1983. PCB dynamics in Hudson River striped bass. 11. Accumulation from dietary sources. Aquatic Toxicology 3:313-327.
- Rubinstein, N.I., E. Lores and N. Gregory. 1983. Accumulation of PCB's, mercury and cadmium by <u>Nereis virens</u>, <u>Mercenaria mercenaria</u> and <u>Palemonetes pugio</u> from contaminated harbor sediments. Aquatic Toxicology 3:249-260.
- SAS. 1982. Users guide: Statistics. SAS Institute, Inc., Gary. NC. 582 pp.
- Sawyer, L.D. 1978. Quantitation of polychlorinated biphenyl residues by electron capture gas-liquid chromatography: Collaborative Study. J. Assoc. Off. Anal. Chem. 6:282-291.
- Seelye, J.G., R.J. Hesselberg and M.J. Moc. 1982. Accumulation by fish of contaminants released from dredged sediments. Environ. Sci. Technol. 16:459-464.
- Scura, E.D. and G.H. Theilacker. 1977. Transfer of the chlorinated hydrocarbon PCB in a laboratory food chain. Mar. Biol. 40:317-325.

Shaw, G.R. and D.W. Connell. 1980. Relationship between steric factors and bioconcentration of polychlorinated biphenyls (PCB's) by the sea mullet (Mugil cephalus). Chemosphere 9:731-743.

Sheridan, P.F. 1979. Trophic resource utilization by three species of sciaenid fishes in a northwest Florida estuary. Northwest Gulf Sci. 3:1-15.

24

Swartz, R.C. and H. Lee, Ií. 1980. Biological processes affecting the distribution of pollutants in marine sediments, Part I: accumulation, trophic transfer, biodegradation and migration. In: Contaminants and sediments, Vol. I. edited by R.A. Baker, Ann Arbor Science Publishers, Ann Arbor, MI, pp. 553-555.

Thomann, R.V. 1931. Equilibrium model of fate of microcontaminants in diverse aquatic food chains. Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci. 38:280-296.

Thomann, R.V. and J.P. Connolly. 1984. Model of PCB in the Lake Michigan Lake Trout Food Chain, Environ. Sci. Technol., 18(2) 65-71.

Webb, R. and A. McCall. 1973. Quantitative PCB standards for electron capture gas chromatography. Chromatogr. Sci. 11:366.

Wyman, K.D. and H.B. O'Connors, Jr. 1980. Implications of short-term PCB uptake by small estuarine copepods (genus <u>Acartia</u>) from PCBcontaminated water, inorganic sediments and phytoplankton. Estuarine and Marine Coastal Science 11:121-131.