

A photograph of a pond with several lily pads. One large green lily pad is in the center, with a white water lily flower blooming from it. Other lily pads in various shades of green and reddish-brown are scattered around. The background is a deep blue water surface.

Methods for Incorporating Aquatic Plant Effects into Community Level Benchmarks

EPA Development Team

Regional Stakeholder Meetings
January 11-22, 2010

Outline

- Purpose and Scope
- Existing data requirements and approaches for estimating aquatic plant effects
- Key research questions/issues
- Evaluation of approaches

Purpose and Scope

- Consider existing approaches used by OW and OPP for characterizing plant aquatic ecological effects
- Describe the best integrated use of existing tools for incorporating plant effects into aquatic community-level benchmarks.
- Characterize the uncertainty and robustness of current data for aquatic plants

OPP's Approach to Evaluate Aquatic Plant Effects

- Tier I (Limit test)
 - Needed for all pesticides with outdoor uses
 - 4 microalgae + *Lemna*: laboratory tests with Technical Grade Active Ingredient (TGAI)
 - If >50% effect, Tier II testing required
- Tier II (Dose-response test)
 - Pesticides that are known phytotoxins also tested at Tier II
 - 4 microalgae + *Lemna*: laboratory tests with TGAI
 - If >50% effect, Tier III testing may be required
- Tier III (Field test)
 - 4 vascular plant families, 3 seedless vascular plant families, 10+ families of algae, 1 bryophyte family tested with typical end-use product to determine detrimental effects at critical growth stages
 - Rarely required by the Agency

Typical Aquatic Plant Surrogates Used in US Regulatory Testing

Non-vascular plants



Pseudokirchneriella subcapitata



Anabaena flos-aquae



Navicula pelliculosa



Skeletonema costatum

Lemna gibba,
a free-floating vascular macrophyte



OW's Approach to Evaluate Aquatic Plant Effects

- Minimal plant data are required for the derivation of Water Quality Criteria (typically not used since less sensitive)
- “Results of tests with plants usually indicate that criteria which adequately protect aquatic animals and their uses will probably also protect aquatic plants and their uses.”
 - May not be supported when addressing certain chemical classes (e.g., herbicides)
- Plant value based on a 96-hr test conducted with an alga or a chronic test conducted with an aquatic vascular plant
- Final Plant Value: lowest value from a test with an “important” plant species where test concentrations are measured, and endpoint is biologically “important”.

Approaches Used Internationally

■ Canada

- At least one vascular plant or alga to derive guidelines (if the compound is highly phytotoxic, 4 species are required)
- Safety factors
 - 10 applied for LOEC
 - 100 for acute data on persistent chemicals
 - 20 for acute data on non-persistent chemicals

■ European Union

- Requires a green algae test (for herbicides, tests on an alga and a vascular plant)
- Safety factor of 10 to the lowest plant test value

State Approach (MN)

- Protect overall integrity of plant community from significant impacts; protect the most sensitive species
- For 2 herbicides: target 20th percentile level of protection
- Acute criterion derived using Great Lakes Initiative Tier II methodology with standard animal data
- Chronic criterion derived using distribution of plant data only
- Both EC₅₀ values and/or maximum acceptable toxic concentration (MATCs) were collected and put in separate distributions; distributions with most robust data set were used to derive criteria
 - 5th percentile of EC₅₀ distribution
 - 20th percentile of MATC distribution

Key Issues

- Minimum/type of data requirements to document aquatic plant sensitivity
 - aquatic plant grouping into subsets to draw better surrogates
 - representativeness of current microalgal species for non-vascular plants
 - representativeness of *Lemna* for aquatic macrophytes
- Endpoint selection
 - The appropriateness of the current plant measurement end points (EC_x versus NOAEC)
 - Specific measurement endpoint-related questions
- Miscellaneous

Key Issues

1. **Types/Minimum Data to Document Sensitivity**

- Do we need to group aquatic plants into new subsets to draw better surrogates
 - Non-vascular vs. vascular (currently used)
 - Habitat
 - Life history patterns
 - Physiology

Key Issues

- Are the sensitivities of current microalgal species representative of non-vascular plant sensitivities?
 - Limited information available for comparison of sensitivities of standard algal species to other non-vascular families such as mosses and liverworts
 - Many tests compared sensitivities of various freshwater microalgal species - great variation (2 to 10 orders of magnitude) between species for same toxicant
 - Sensitivities of freshwater vs. saltwater algae are not well understood

Key Issues

- Is the sensitivity of *Lemna* representative of vascular plants sensitivity?
 - *Lemna*, a free floater, may not be a suitable surrogate to represent the diversity of types of aquatic vascular plants (emergent, submerged, rooted floating, and free floating)
 - Many vascular plants are rooted in the sediment, which could provide another route of exposure

Key Issues

2. Endpoint Selection

- Appropriateness of EC_x vs. point estimates such as NOEC/MATC
- Are plant endpoints acute or chronic?
- Use of plant and animal data in the same SSD
- Use of non-traditional endpoints
- Inclusion of reproduction-based endpoints
- Can endpoints from different test methods, test durations, and light intensities be combined? If so how?

Key Issues

3. Miscellaneous

- How should plant recovery be incorporated?
 - Exponential growth over short periods vs. aquatic animal life cycle and reproductive strategies
 - Current frequency and duration for acute and chronic effects to aquatic animals is once in 3 years – appropriate for plants?
- How to address community level impacts
 - Community shifts?
 - Other measures?

Strategy for Addressing Key Issues

- Toxicity data of at least 2 herbicides with “large” data sets will be utilized
- What approaches to take when only OPP data are available?
- What approaches to take when more data are available?
- Application of safety factors? (as used by Canada, EU/Denmark etc.) – are there other factors that are more scientifically defensible?

Summary

- Aquatic plant testing needs are becoming more apparent.
- Key issues
 - Representativeness of current tested species
 - Determining minimum data set
 - Potential use of safety factors
 - Use of non-traditional or reproductive endpoints
- Issues discussed in white paper will need to be readdressed in the future.