Postprint of: Sulej-Suchomska A., Polkowska Ż., Wolska L., Cieszyńska M., Namieśnik J., Toxicity and chemical analyses of airport runoff waters in Poland, Environmental Science: Processes & Impacts, Vol. 16, Iss. 5 (2014), pp. 1083-1093, DOI: 10.1039/C3EM00448A

#### **1** Toxicity and chemical analyses of airport runoff waters in Poland.

# 2 Anna Maria Sulej<sup>a</sup>, Żaneta Polkowska<sup>a</sup>, Lidia Wolska<sup>a,b</sup>, Monika Cieszyńska<sup>b</sup>, Jacek

#### 3 Namieśnik<sup>a</sup>

4 <sup>a</sup>Gdańsk University of Technology, Chemical Faculty, Department of Analytical Chemistry, Narutowicza

5 11/12 Street, 80- 233 Gdańsk, Poland, phone: +48 58 347 1010, fax: +48 58 347 2694

6 <sup>b</sup> Medical University of Gdansk, Faculty of Health Sciences, Department of Environmental Toxicology,

7 Powstania Styczniowego 9b Street, 81-519 Gdynia, Poland, phone/fax: +48 58 622 33 54

8 e-mail: <u>anna.maria.sulej@gmail.com</u>

#### 9 Abstract

10 The aim of this study was to assess the ecotoxicological effect of various compounds in 11 complex airport effluents using a chemical and ecotoxicological integrated stategy. The 12 present work deals with the determination of PCBs sum, PAHs, pesticides, cations, anions, 13 phenols, anionic, cationic, non-ionic detergents, formaldehyde and metals- as well as TOC 14 and conductivity in runoff water samples collected from 2009 to 2011 at several locations on 15 two Polish international airports. Two microbiotests (Vibrio fischeri bacteria and the 16 crustacean Thamnocephalus platyurus) have been used to determine the ecotoxicity of 17 airport runoff waters. The levels of many compounds exceeded several or even several tens 18 of times the maximum permissible levels. Analysis of the obtained data shows that samples that displayed maximum toxicity towards the bioindicators Vibrio fischeri were not toxic 19 20 towards Thamnocephalus platyurus. Levels of toxicity towards T. platyurus are strongly 21 correlated with pollutants that originate from the technological operations related to the 22 maintenance of airport infrastructure. The integrated (chemical-ecotoxicological) approach 23 to environmental contamination assessment in and around airports yields extensive 24 information on quality of the environment. These methodologies can be then used as tools 25 for tracking the environmental fate of these compounds and for assessing the environmental 26 effect of airports. Subsequently, these data will provide a basis for airport infrastructure 27 management.

# Key words: airport; runoff water; stormwater; pollutants; toxicity; Vibrio fischeri; Thamnocephalus platyurus;

- 30
- 31

#### 32 **1. Introduction**

33 Despite the positive aspects of the intensive development of aviation, airports are large-scale polluters <sup>1-6</sup>, and various kinds of pressure on the environment are a consequence of the 34 35 activities of airports and air traffic. In this regard runoff waters (stormwater), formed while precipitation or atmospheric deposits flush the airport surface during everyday activities e.g.: 36 37 fuelling operations, cleaning of aircrafts, ground vehicles and airport aprons, de/anti-icing 38 operations, combustion of aviation and engine fuels, aircraft and vehicle maintenance and 39 repairs (including painting and metalwork), removing weeds, other vegetation and microorganisms from the airport apron and aircraft surface pose a serious problem 1-20. The 40 41 most toxic cancerogenic and mutagenic pollutants identified on airport premises include: 42 polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs), polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs), pesticides phenols, formaldehyde, detergents, glycols, benzotriazoles and metals<sup>1, 6, 15, 16, 21-30</sup>. These 43 44 contaminants penetrate into all components of the environment. In most cases airports do 45 not possess their own waste water treatment plants (WWTPs) so all effluents carrying 46 metals, petroleum compounds, surfactants, de-icing agents used in winter and other organic 47 and inorganic pollutants run off together with rain water or melted snow into drainage ditches, from where they enter mainly to the soil and coastal water bodies <sup>31 32</sup>. The 48 pollutants present in runoff water have different effects on humans and the environment <sup>2, 5-7,</sup> 49 12, 33 50

51

52

53

54

55

56

In order to assess the extent to which surface waters are endangered by these pollutants, it is crucial to identify and quantitatively determine the chemical compounds in airport stormwater <sup>2, 6, 17, 34-36</sup>. Determining all various harmful chemicals in such runoff water is a demanding task, because this kind of research is expensive and time-consuming. Although chemical analysis enables the identification and quantification of organic and inorganic pollutants, it does not provide sufficient information to assess environmental

hazards, since it is not possible to investigate all the possible substances and their interactions in ecosystems <sup>37</sup>. Effective risk assessment requires finding a relationship between water chemistry and toxicity endpoints. At the present state of the art one common approach is to link chemical concentrations to toxicity data <sup>38-43</sup>. However, it is difficult to extrapolate between chemical concentrations and potential biological effects for the purpose of risk assessment. Only a relatively small amount of data is currently available for the analysis and ecotoxicological assessment of airport runoff waters <sup>1, 15, 16, 28, 44-48</sup>.

64 The aim of this study was to assess the ecotoxicological effect of various compounds in complex airport effluents by means of an integrated chemical and ecotoxicological 65 66 strategy. The present study focused on the determination of pH, conductivity, total organic 67 carbon (TOC), metals, detergents and formaldehyde, the sum of phenols, PAHs, PCBs, pesticides, cations and anions found in airport stormwater, as well as measuring toxicity of 68 samples using Microtox $^{\ensuremath{\mathbb{R}}}$  and Thamnotoxkit  $F^{\ensuremath{\mathsf{TM}}}$  tests. Microtox $^{\ensuremath{\mathbb{R}}}$  test which was employed 69 in this paper is very popular whilst Thamnotoxkit F<sup>TM</sup> test for the airport runoff toxicity has 70 been mentioned in the literature only once <sup>48</sup>. The relationship between water chemistry and 71 72 toxicity data can be used to identify the potential toxic impact of airport storm water runoff 73 discharges on recipient waters. Chemical and toxicity testing represents a relatively recent 74 and powerful tool for the management of storm water pollution and protection of the aquatic 75 ecosystem. The results of this type of study will provide essential information for assessing the threat to surface and groundwaters in the vicinity of airports. 76

#### 77 **2. Experimental**

In view of the difficulties with toxicity in-situ testing, various chemical analyses were performed on samples brought to the laboratory. The procedures used for sample collection, handling, chemical and toxicity measurements in the laboratory are described in the following sections.

#### 82 **2.1** Storm water sampling, collection and handling

The samples of runoff water were collected during precipitation, defined as steady lasting for at least 5 h. Samples were collected usually within 30 min from the beginning of the precipitation event (first flush). During the research period the amount of the precipitation ranged from 2 to 10 mm and the events lasted from 3 to 5 h.

The samples of runoff water were collected at the international Polish airports with high and low capacity of passenger movement, in three seasons- winter, spring and summerfrom 2009 to 2011. The runoff samples were collected from depressions in the terrain where rainwater accumulated and from the airport drainage system. The sampling locations at the airports were areas with the highest concentration of technical service operations, where the largest amounts of pollutants enter drainage ditches with runoff and may be released into the environment.

94 Runoff waters at each location at the airport with low capacity of passenger 95 movement were collected manually with a plastic scoop (100 ml) and tubing, while at the 96 airport with high capacity of passenger movement, they were scooped from the drainage 97 system with a bucket. The material for analysis was then poured into 500 ml water-tight plastic bottles (for the determination of inorganics) or into 1000 ml dark glass bottles 98 99 (analysis of organics) and transported to the laboratory (usually within less than 1h after 100 collection). Prior to use, the syringes, tubing and bucket were rinsed with MilliO water and 101 then with the water to be sampled. No chemicals were added to preserve the samples, 102 therefore the determinations were typically initiated immediately after the samples arrived at the laboratory. Prepared extract of runoff water samples were stored at 4 °C in the dark until 103 final determination <sup>49-53</sup>. 104

106 Chemical analysis of the samples included various instrumental methods compliant 107 with different chemical and ecotoxicity variables. Technical specifications, reagents for 108 determining selected parameters and analyte contents in samples and basic validation 109 parameters of the proposed analytical procedures are summarized in Table 1.

Milli-Q deionized water was used during the determination of the various target analyte groups. The concentrations of organic and inorganic compounds, metals, cations and anions in water runoff samples were determined by ion chromatography (IC), gas chromatography coupled with mass spectrometry (GC-MS), inductively conjugated plasma mass spectrometry (ICP/MS) and spectrophotometric methods.

#### 115 2.3 Test organisms and test methods

For toxicity assessment small-scale aquatic tests known as microbiotests were used <sup>54</sup>. These bioassays do not require maintaining continuous culture of organisms and are based on immobilized or dormant (cryptobiotic) stages of selected aquatic species set free or hatched when needed <sup>41, 42</sup>. The following bioassays for freshwater were applied:

• Thamnotoxkit F<sup>TM</sup> is a test using the crustacean *Thamnocephalus platyurus*. The test reaction is the mortality of the organism. The test was carried out in accordance with the manufacturer's standard procedure (Tigret, Poland).

Microtox® is a test using the luminescent bacteria *Vibrio fischeri*. The test reaction is
 the attenuation of the sample luminescence after 30 minutes' incubation. The test was
 carried out according to procedure PN-EN ISO 1138-3:2002 <sup>55</sup> using the Microtox model
 500 instrument (Strategic Diagnostic Inc., Newark, NJ, USA) for freeze-dried bacteria.
 The results were calculated using the manufacturer's MicrotoxOmni programme.

128

129

## **2.4 Quality assurance/ quality control (QA/QC)**

130 All data were subjected to strict quality control procedures. The analytical 131 procedures applied for the determination of individual components in varius environmental 132 matrix compositions should be validated against certified reference materials. In this study 133 Reference Material No. 409 (BCR-409, Institute for Reference Materials and Measurements, 134 Belgium); Inorganic ventures ANALITYK-CAL-8 (10 mg/L: Ag, Al., As, B, Ba, Ca, Cd, 135 Co, Cr3, Cu, Fe, Mg, Na, Ni, Pb, Sb, Se, Sr, V, Zn) and Analytical Reference Material TM-136 DWS.2, Envronnment Canada Al: 58.3 µg/L, Sb: 3.20 µg/L, As: 4.20 µg/L, Ba: 146 µg/L, 137 Be: 13.4 µg/L, Bi: 14 µg/L, B: 81.0 µg/L, Cd: 4.20 µg/L, Cr: 44.4 µg/L, Co: 64.2 µg/L, Cu: 138 167 μg/L, Ga: 0.04 μg/L, Fe: 223 μg/L, Pb: 7.82 μg/L, Li: 20.1 μg/L, Mg: 47.2 μg/L, Mo: 66.7 µg/L, Ni: 82.3 µg/L, Rb: 0.42 µg/L, Se: 8.69 µg/L, Ag: 9.91 µg/L, Sr: 243 µg/L, Tl: 139 140 8.32 μg/L, Sn: 12.1 μg/L, Ti: 15.1 μg/L, U: 14.1 μg/L, V: 44.3 μg/L, Zn: 379 μg/L) were 141 applied. The sensitivity of the applied methods was tested by injecting standard mixtures of 142 the analytes in the measurement range concentration. Linear calibration curves obtained by 143 plotting the peak area against concentration of the respective standards and the correlation 144 coefficients (R<sup>2</sup>) were in the range of 0.898-0.999 for all standards. On the basis of the 145 calibration curves, it was possible to determine concentration levels of certain substances in 146 real samples. Each sample was analyzed in triplicate. During the samples analysis, 147 procedural blanks were prepared for every six samples to check the instrumental 148 background. Duplicate samples and calibration check standards were run after every five 149 samples to assure the precision of each run. The limit of detection (LOD) was determined 150 for the analytes in quality control samples based on three replicates of measurement. LOD 151 was calculated using the equation LOD=3.3SD/b (b is the slope of the calibration curve; SD 152 is the standard deviation of the curve). The quantification limit (LOQ) was set to three times the LOD <sup>56-58</sup>. The numerical values of the all mentioned validation parameters determined
for researched analytes, using particular analytical methods, were presented in Table 1.

155 Quality control for biotests is a real challenge as the tests operate with a 'living 156 reagent' and thus many factors may affect the results. Therefore, the laboratory which 157 carries out the measurements is involved in the comparative and calibration tests for 158 interlaboratory results check. Moreover, in the case of Microtox® test with Vibrio fischeri 159 bacteria the laboratory ran the internal quality control with the reference toxicant ZnSO<sub>4</sub> 160  $7H_2O$  to confirm the quality of bacteria guaranteed by producer. EC<sub>50</sub> values fell into the 161 accepted range of 0.6-2.2 mg/L. Other parameters that interfere with the test results such as 162 turbidity, colour, pH and temperature were also checked and controlled. In the laboratory the 163 repeatability of the results is constantly checked, coefficient of variation (CV) falls in the 164 range of  $\pm 10\%$ .

#### 165 **3. Results and discussion**

Table 2 lists the results of target analyte groups, physicochemical parameters determination as well as toxicity towards the *Vibrio fischeri* bacteria and the freshwater crustaceans *Thamnocephalus platyurus* in runoff water samples collected from 2009 to 2011 at various characteristic sites of two Polish international airports (*airports with low and high capacity of passenger movement*).

In the majority of the analysed runoff waters samples the levels of examined analytes did not exceed the maximum permissible levels of concentrations according to the available standard for conditions which should be met while discharging sewage to waters or ground and for substances particularly harmful for aquatic environment <sup>59</sup>. This standard is cited due to the fact that in case of a lack or inadequate work of a waste water treatment plant, a significant amount of airfield effluents get to the surface water or to the soil with runoff waters. However, the contents of some studied analytes and measured parameters exceeded 178 considerably permissible concentration levels of pollutants introduced into the environment. 179 For example, the numerical value of the determined parameter of total organic carbon 180 (TOC) exceeded extremely the permissible level of the total organic compound content 181 introduced into surface waters and soil both in case of the airport with high capacity of 182 passenger movement and the airport with low capacity of passenger movement. Such a high 183 value of the TOC parameter in the airport runoff water samples can be associated with a 184 seriuos ground and water pollution first of all with oil derivatives and substances from the 185 polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbon group emitted in particular during combustion and 186 uncontrolled aviation fuel overflows. Exceeding the permissible standard (0,1 mg/L) was 187 also noticed for the determined total phenol content in the runoff water samples from the 188 airport with both high and low capacity of passenger movement. It is acknowledged that phenolic compounds (at mg/L level) are extremely toxic for aquatic organisms <sup>60</sup>. Moreover 189 190 damages following exposure to substantial doses of phenols affect the nervous and 191 circulatory systems, with a reduction in the number and growth of blood cells (for example erythrocytes, total proteins and cholesterol) <sup>61</sup>. Precise assessment of phenolic compound 192 193 sources of emission into runoff waters at the airport areas is relatively difficult; the 194 detergents, containing phenolic compounds, used at the airports have been recognized as 195 their main source. The detergents are employed at the airport areas in large amounts to keep 196 airplanes, the airport platform and infrastructure clean. As a result, the increased content 197 level of these types of analytes in the tested airrport runoff water samples can be observed.

Table 1 Validation parameters, technical specifications, reagents used in the proposed analytical procedures.

Analytical	Measure-ment	LOD	LOQ		Measurement instrumentation		Reagents/Standards		
techniques	0 15 4 00	0.05	0.15	(%)			Sodium hydroxide solution 1 mol/L Sulphonic acid 0.5 mol/L		
Sum of phenols <sup>*</sup>	0.13-4.00	0.05	0.15	5.9			Chloroform, Phenol (Merck, Darmstadt, Germany);		
Formaldehyde <sup>*</sup>	0.03-5.00	0.01	0.030	3.8			Formaldehyde solution min.37% (Merck, Darmstadt, Germany);		
Cationic detergents <sup>*</sup>	0.01-2.00	0.003	0.010	4.5	UV/A/IS anastropho	tomaton 6200 (January Falatad Fasar IIK)	Sodium hydroxide solution 1mol/L, Sulphonic acid 0.5mol/L, N- Cetyl-N,N,N-trimethylammonium bromide (CTBA), Hydrochloric acid 25%, Methanol (Merck,Darmstadt, Germany);		
Anionic detergents*	0.05-15.00	0.017	0.050	4.0	- UV/VIS spectropho	tometer 0300 (Jenway, Feisted, Essex, UK)	Sodium hydroxide solution 1mol/L, Hydrochloric acid 1mol, Sodium 1-dodecanesulphonate, Hydrochloric acid 25%,Methanol (Merck, Darmstadt, Germany);		
Non-ionic detergents <sup>*</sup>	0.01-7.50	0.003	0.010	4.9			Sodium hydroxide solution 1mol/L, Sulphonic acid 0.5mol/L, Triton X-100, Hydrochloric acid 25%,Methanol (Merck,Sarmstadt,Germany);		
Cations <sup>*a</sup>	0.03-500	0.01	0.030	0.9	X 3000 tograph NEX, yvale, JSA)	column: Ion Pac® CS14 (3x250mm); suppressor: CSRS-300, 2mm, mobile phase: 38 mM metasulfonic acid, flow rate: 0.36 ml/min, detection: conductivity	Cation Standards (Na <sup>+</sup> , NH <sub>4</sub> <sup>+</sup> , K <sup>+</sup> , Ca <sup>2+</sup> , Mg <sup>2+</sup> ) 1000±5 mg/dm <sup>3</sup> ; (Merck, Darmstadt, Germany);		
Anions <sup>*a</sup>	0.06-500	0.055- 0.09	0.027- 0.17	0.6	DIONE chromat (DIO) Sunny CA,I	column: Ion Pac®AS22 (2x250 mm); suppressor: ASRS-300, 2mm, mobile phase: $4.5 \text{ mM CO}_3^{2-}$ , 1.4 mM HCO <sup>3-</sup> , flow rate: 0.38ml/min, detection: conductivity	Anion Standards (F, Cl, Br, NO <sub>2</sub> , NO <sub>3</sub> , PO <sub>4</sub> <sup>3-</sup> , SO <sub>4</sub> <sup>2-</sup> ) 1003±5 mg/dm <sup>3</sup> ; (Merck, Darmstadt,Germany);		
TOC <sup>*a</sup>	0.5-500	0.17	0.50	5.0	<b>Total Organic Carbon Analyzer TOC-V</b> <sub>CSH/CSN</sub> (Shimadzu, Kyoto, Japan) Method of catalytic combustion (oxidation) with using of NDIR detector		Potassium Biphthalate, $C_6H_4(COOH)$ FW204.23, purity 99,9%, (Kanto CO., INC, Tokyo, Japan)		
PAHs**	0.15-9.00	0.05- 1.40	0.15-4.20	1.5 – 5.5	Gas chromatograph Clara, CA, USA) coup MSD – Agilent Techn 5975C) with electron	<b>7890A</b> (Agilent Technologies, Santa oled with a mass spectrometer (5975C inert ologies), detector (Agilent Technologies ionization (SIM mode). Autosampler (7683B	Dichloromethane, Methanol (Merck, Darmstadt, Germany); Naphthalene-d8, Benzo(a)anthracene-d12, Supelco, St. Louis, MO, USA; Mixtures of 16 PAHs (2000 µg/mL), Restek Corporation, Bellefonte, PA, USA;		
PCBs**	0.05-2.00	0.017	0.050	2.0 - 6.0	<ul> <li>Agilent Technologie</li> <li>m;0.25mm;0.25μm); t</li> <li>°C/min),120-280 °C (5</li> <li>ml·min<sup>-1</sup>, injection vol</li> </ul>	es), column: ZB – 5MS (30 emperature program: 40-120 °C (40 5 °C/min), carried gas: helium, gas flow: 1 lume: 2μl (splitless), inlet temperature 295°C,	Dichloromethane, Methanol (Merck, Darmstadt, Germany); PCB standards, IUPAC Nos. 28,52,101,118,153,138,180 (10µg/mL in isooctane) Restek Corporation, Bellefonte, PA, USA;Certified standards of <sup>13</sup> C- labelled PCB 28 and PCB 180 (40µg/mL in nonane), Cambridge Isotope Laboratories, Tewksbury, MA, USA;		
Pesticides	0,05-2,00	0,022	0,066	0.5-6.0	Gas chromatograph Italy) coupled with ele MA, USA); column: Z Torrance, USA, tempe 300 °C (10 °C/min), 30 1 ml·min <sup>-1</sup> , injection y	<b>6000 Vega Series 2</b> (Carlo Erban,Milan, ectron capture detector (Finnigan, Waltham, ZB-5MS, 30m;0,25mm;0,25µm, Phenomenex, erature program: 80 °C -180 (15 °C/min), 180- 00 °C (3 min) carried gas: hydrogen, gas flow: olume: 2µl (splitless), inlet temperature 80°C, ner Waltham MA_USA) gas fed to the	Dichloromethane, Methanol, n-hexane MERCK, Germany; Pesticide standards, Hexachlorobenzene, γ-HCH, Acetochlor, Vinclozolin, Alachlor, Metolachlor, Aldrin, captan, α-endosulfan, 4,4-DDE, Endrin, 4,4-DDT, Mirex (100 µg/mL in isooctane), LGC Standards, London, UK		
Metals <sup>**</sup>	0.002-1000	0.0007	0.002	1.5	atomizer $\rightarrow$ Ar:0,98 l/r	nin, plasma gas → Ar: 15 l/min	Christiansburg, VA, USA.		

\* $[mg/L]^{**}$  [µg/L] <sup>a</sup> the measurement range can be expanded towards the greater range of concentrations

Torgot analytas			c <sub>min</sub>	c <sub>max</sub>	Median	c <sub>min</sub>	c <sub>max</sub>	Median
Target analytes	Units	n	Airport	with low co	apacity of	Airport with high capacity		
			passenger movement			of passenger movement		
<u> </u>	[µg/L]	79	ND <sup>a</sup>	1.49	0.04		NT <sup>b</sup>	
	[µg/L]	111	0.01	5.69	0.25	0.05	8.55	0.31
∑Pesticides	[µg/L]	50	0.02	8.29	0.26		NT	
Conductivity	[µS]	107	0.01	40.5	0.33	0.12	1.52	0.65
∑Anions	[mg/L]	100	0.15	10527	5.59	0.56	47.0	9.43
∑ <b>Cations</b>	[mg/L]	81	8.38	15339	114	26.6	49.5	36,5
$\sum$ Anionic detergents	[mg/L]	107	0.20	14.9	0.55	0.23	1.08	0.42
$\sum$ Cationic detergents	[mg/L]	107	0.03	0.90	0.29	0.29	0.78	0.34
$\sum$ Non-ionic detergents	[mg/L]	105	0.07	7.50	0.83	0.28	7.50	2.49
Formaldehyde	[mg/L]	106	0.01	2.90	0.25	0.28	1.63	0.39
∑Phenols	[mg/L]	106	ND	1.59	0.14	0.16	3.33	0.26
ТОС	[mg/L]	106	0.96	5510	141	3.89	21999	46.7
Metals	[µg/L]							
Li		33	0.50	10.4	2.31	3.00	363	7.60
Be		1	ND			0.06	0.06	0.06
В		33	2.86	48.8	12.0	16.0	165	128
Al		45	12.0	938	32.5	5.30	289	25.0
V		45	3.50	120	24.8	8.30	171	16.0
Cr		45	1.40	42.7	18.8	7.40	50.2	8.50
Mn		45	1.40	94.1	12.4	0.60	680	12.9
Со		36	0.07	1.88	0.24	0.28	0.81	0.59
Ni		44	0.50	6.95	2.03	0.60	2.80	1.60
Cu		45	3.20	67.6	12,3	1.10	25.8	4.35
Zn		45	10.2	106	38.2	23.2	162	46.3
As		45	0.30	5.70	2.12	1.20	4.20	1.80
Se		33	0.01	1.09	0.28	0.46	1.39	1.03
Rb		45	1.92	287	40.6	6.86	684	12.0
Sr		45	3.80	105	25.6	5.20	1953	373
Мо		45	0.18	16.1	2.09	0.91	41.4	1.51
Ag		24	0.01	1 37	0.07	ND	1 1 1	1.01
Cd		37	0.04	0.42	0.14	0.08	5 28	0.40
Sn		31	0.01	1.00	0.11	0.00	0.50	0.10
Sb		45	0.10	2.82	0.42	0.50	4 17	1 14
Cs		43	0.17	0.50	0.07	0.03	5.64	0.05
Ba		45	2.00	0.39	12.1	4.20	2.04	61.1
Tl		0	2.90	90.9	12,1	4.20	265	01.1
h		135		7.96	0.67		12.1	0.10
		135	0.02	7.80	0.07		2.91	0.19
ovicity	[%]	155	0.02	0.61	0.25	0.04	2.81	1.8/
ibrio fischeri	/0] Iminescence	108	4.00	50.0	20.0	20.0	06.0	20.0
hamnocephalus platvurus Mortality		68	4.90	30.8 100	20.0	20.0	90.U NT	20.0
<sup>a</sup> ND- not detected; <sup>b</sup> NT- not tes	sted; $\Sigma$ Anions	: PO <sub>4</sub> <sup>3-</sup> .F <sup>-</sup> .	HCOO <sup>-</sup> , Cl <sup>-</sup>	, NO <sub>2</sub> ,NO <sub>3</sub> , I	23.0 Br, SO <sub>4</sub> <sup>2</sup> $\Sigma$ C	ations: Na	$^{+}, \mathrm{NH}_{4}^{+}, \mathrm{K}^{+}, \mathrm{M}_{4}^{+}$	$1g^{2+}, Ca^{2+}$
2								

200 Table 2 Minimum, maximum and median concentrations of different compounds determined in airport runoff water.

MOST WIEDZY Downloaded from mostwiedzy.pl

203 In the case of PCBs and pesticide compound determination, the concentration levels of these 204 analytes which were found in runoff waters from the airport with low capacity of passenger 205 movement were also too high, according to the standard mentioned above. The concentration values of PCBs, pesticides in effluents discharged into water or ground should be zero <sup>59</sup>. 206 207 Compounds from the PCB group can be emitted to airport runoff waters during aircraft 208 maintenance operations (heat exchanger fluids, chemical stabilizers and from hydraulic 209 systems) and overflows of lubricants, paints, and oil varnishes at airports. Pesticides can be 210 emitted to runoff water from airport infrastructure during daily washing and maintenance of the 211 crop spraying aircrafts. They can also originate from combustion of fuel process and leakage of 212 fuel, lubricants, oils which contain an addition of biocides which are applied to reduce the 213 growth of microorganisms in fuels and lubricating oils. The content of particular metals in the 214 analyzed samples did not exceed permissible concentration levels according to the standard. 215 However, some high metal concentrations, in particular of strontium, boron, barium and zink, 216 whose median numerical values were 373, 128, 61.1 and 46.3 µg/L respectively, were observed 217 in the runoff water samples collected from the area of the airport with high capacity of 218 passenger movement. The metal content, especially heavy metals, in the airport runoff water <u>\_</u>219 samples can be connected mostly with the combustion of the large amount of aviation fuel (the 220 emission may be a result of releasing analytes contained in the fuel) and the corrosion of 221 different protective coatings (e.g. galvanized) of the fuselage and other parts of the aircraft. The 222 لو analytes from the metal group can be also emitted to the airport runoff waters during the take-00223 off and landing abrasion of the aircraft tyres, varnishing or painting of aircrafts and the airport 224 platform, also after welding waste or lead batteries and accumulators. Heavy metals from these 5 sources can be dispersed into the environment and pollute water, soil and air or get directly or б through the plants into animal and human organisms <sup>62</sup>.

227 While analyzing available measurement data the surprising differences in analytes determined in the samples collected from the airports which differ in capacity of passenger 228 229 movement significantly content can be observed. The airports with high capacity of passenger 230 movement do not always emit considerable amount of pollutants because in most cases huge 231 international airports have larger budgets to create a reliable infrastructure management system 232 (own waste water pre-treatment and treatment plants, the system of waste recirculation, ecological detergents and de-icing agents etc.) which enables to reduce considerably the 233 234 sources of pollutants emission. To illustrate this, the maximum TOC level in runoff waters 235 from Newark International Airport (one of the busiest international airports in the United 236 States, 33.8 million passengers/year), was 1120 mg/L, whereas the equivalent level at Polish 237 airport with high capacity of passenger movement (9.4 million passengers/year) was twice as 238 high. This difference is significant since the Polish airport serves a three times smaller number of passengers than Newark (USA)<sup>6</sup>. Again, the mean phenol content in samples from Kansas 239 240 City International Airport, USA (10 million passengers/year) was 93 mg/L, but at Bradley (ca 5.6 million passengers/year) it was three times higher <sup>6</sup>. For instance, the runoff water collected 241 242 from monitored airport with high capacity of passenger movement showed the ca. 1,8 times <u>\_</u>243 higher contents of total metals (501 µg/L) in comparison with the monitored airport with low Zpej244 capacity of passenger movement. These examples show that the level of environmental A150245 pollution at an airport is not always directly correlated with either its size or its capacity.

0

Assessing the contamination level of runoff waters from airports requires monitoring of many parameters, which is time-consuming and expensive. Moreover, the results of chemical analyses do not take into account interactions between the compounds present (synergism and antagonism). Therefore it is essential to set up a system integrating selected chemical parameters and ecotoxicological tests <sup>1, 16, 22, 25</sup>.

251 Table 3 lists the sites at the Polish airports, with high and low capacity of passenger 252 movement, with the most toxic runoff waters. It also points the chemical parameters and the 253 target analyte groups with the highest concentrations in accordance with the Polish law 169/27 <sup>59</sup>. Two microbiotests (*Vibrio fischeri* bacteria and the crustacean *Thamnocephalus platvurus*) 254 255 have been used to determine the ecotoxicity of airport runoff waters. The sample taken at the 256 aircraft refuelling point of the airport with high capacity of passenger movement was most 257 toxic towards Vibrio fischeri bacteria. This sample contained high levels of the following 258 parameters and target analyte groups: TOC, metals, anions, phenols, detergents, formaldehyde. 259 More than a dozen of samples were highly toxic towards Thamnocephalus platyurus: all of 260 them had high concentrations of sodium ions and formate ions. Thamnocephalus platyurus is mentioned by Kiss<sup>63</sup>, to show a real specificity to some substances and may be used for 261 detection of high Na and Cd concentrations. A considerable effect of sodium, chloride and 262 formate ions on aquatic invertebrates was mentioned by Corsi et al. <sup>16</sup>. Sodium formate is 263 264 included in pavement de-icer materials while sodium itself is a constituent of road salt which is 265 used to clear snow and ice from paved airport surfaces such as roads, parking lots and 266 sidewalks. Both compounds have a potential to impact aquatic toxicity. In the study no <u>-</u>267 correlation between toxicity tests results and pesticide content/concentration was observed. 268 From conducted research it was also noticed that runoff water samples collected during the 2692<sup>1</sup> winter and early spring season were of the highest toxicity (Table 3). During these seasons the ول 270 ل highest number of operations such as de-icing of both aircrafts and the airport area is made, the page 271 biggest amount of aviation fuel is burnt (especially during take-offs when the aircraft engines 272 require more energy and time to warm up and start the vehicle because of the reduced ambient 3 temperature) in comparison with the other seasons, which may account for the above 4 characteristic relation. Figure 1 shows the additional exemplary graph presenting the correlation between the season of the sample collection (from the airport with low capacity of 276 passangen movement in 2009) and determined toxicity towards indicator organisms 277 Thamnocephalus platyurus and Vibrio fischeri. The presented graph confirms the thesis that 278 especially during the winter season the determined toxicity (connected directly with quantity 279 and the specific character of emitted pollutants) of samples is significantly higher in 280 comparison with the toxicity determined for the samples collected in the other seasons of the 281 year when intensity of everyday operations referred to the airport maitenance is much lower 282 than the amount of operations carried out during the winter season.



Figure 1 Toxicity determined in runoff water samples collected in airport area in different season in year 2009.

Principal components analysis (PCA) was used to explore the data and explain the relationships between the analysed parameters. The results the PCA analysis of are presented in Table 4 and Figure 2. Pesticides were not included in the PCA analysis due to gaps in the database. Principal component 1 (PC1) included 47.2% of the overall variance and was influenced by eight variables: TOC, anions, cations, EC, toxicity towards Thamnocephalus platyurus, the sum of detergents, anionic and non-ionic detergents. These parameters are clustered in the plane PC1 and PC2 at the area II (Figure 2). PC1 represents pollutants associated with technological processes carried out during airport operations and related to the maintenance of airport infrastructure, such as cleaning and washing aircraft and airport aprons. The results show that toxicity towards Thamnocephalus platyurus is correlated with the other variables forming

2

3

4

cluster II, and that this organism can be successfully used as a screening parameter. The
number of necessary chemical determinations could be reduced by measurement of toxicity
towards *Thamnocephalus platyurus* instead.

299 PC2 explained 15.0% of the total variance in the data, and was determined primarily by 300 phenols, formaldehyde, PCBs and PAHs. These variables created the cluster denoted as I with 301 positive values of PC2 (Fig.2). They may be referred to as environmental pollutants included in 302 the airport runoff water samples commonly occurring as a result of combustion processes, 303 transportation, etc. The variation of parameters included in the cluster I differs from the 304 variation of toxicity towards Vibrio fisheri and Thamnocephalus platyrus. This may suggest the 305 presence in the samples of compounds that were not determined during the research. Many 306 compounds which are not determined in this study are mentioned in the literature as capable of 307 influencing aquatic toxicity of airport runoff waters: urea, glycols, benzotriazole, tolyltriazole, alkylphenols ethoxylates, de-icer and anti-icer additives and other constituents <sup>1, 15, 47 22, 23, 45</sup>. 308

The toxicity towards *Vibrio fischeri* appears in third and fourth principal components (PC3 and PC4). The variation of the toxicity towards the *Vibrio fischeri* parameter is positively correlated with the variation of non-ionic (PC3) and cationic detergents (PC4) and negatively correlated with cationic detergents in PC3 (Table 4).

Anionic detergents and the sum of detergents data show the similar variation on the first five PCs, which may indicate that these detergents occur mainly in anionic form (Table 4).

In contrast, the cationic detergent loadings suggest that the variation of the cationic detergents data differs from the variation of the data for all other parameters in the PC1 (Figure 2). This could be attributed to the fact that these compounds are used occasionally.

The results of the PCA of the measurement data revealed that the crustacean *Thamnocephalus platyurus* and bacteria *Vibrio fischeri*, two organisms from different trophic levels, respond differently to the target analytes. This study revealed that *Thamnocephalus* 

*platyurus* is more sensitive to some of the pollutants (cluster II) determined in the samples than *Vibrio fischeri* bacteria. However, toxicity to *Vibrio fischeri* bacteria may be important to indicate other parameters which were either not determined at all or not included in the monitoring study. For example Pillard et al. in studies on toxicity of benzotriazole and benzotriazole derivatives mentioned that Microtox® test is more sensitive that tests on invertebrates (*Ceriodaphnia dubia*) and vertebrates (*P. Promelas*)<sup>64</sup>.



Figure 2 Loadings of the parameters in the plane defined by PC1 and PC2.

Figure 3 features the research results (covering the research period from 2009 to 2011) referring to determined concentrations of particular organic analytes from detergent and phenol groups, formaldehyde and TOC in the samples of runoff waters collected from the area of the monitored airport with low capacity of passenger movement. On the graph the clear increasing tendency of the content level of analytes in airport effluents was observed, beginning with the year 2009. The successive increase of the pollutant concentration levels in the airport runoff waters from 2008 to 2011 can be associated with the increased aviation activity at this airport

during the research period, which was also presented in Figure 4. Figure 4 shows the concentration level of the total amount of emitted pollutants while taking into accout the number of passengers handled at the monitored airport with low capacity of passenger movement from 2009 to 2011. The amount of pollutants present in runoff waters is influenced mainly by two parameters: aircraft traffic intensity (connected with the increased number of passengers) and the effort, undertaken by managers of this airport, to reduce the sources of pollutants emission related to the airport exploitation started in 2010. The documented fundamental increase of aviation activity at the monitored airports seems to confirm the prediction of the global growth in the air transport, which is likely to be doubled within the next 15-20 years, and expected therefore considerable growth of the environment pollution being the result of the airport operations <sup>1</sup>. The results from this study show that it is important to carry out both chemical analyses and toxicity tests to be able to correctly evaluate the potential impact of airport stormwater on the environment.



Figure 3 Concentration levels of some selected organic pollutants and TOC parameter in airport runoff water samples.

Site / Date		Analysis of results	Number of times permissible norms exceeded	Toxicity %
		Vibrio fischer		
Airport with high capacity of passenger movement	Municipal water catchment area14.01.11 <sup>*</sup>	Naphthalene= 0.125 $[\mu g/L]$ ; $G_{Napth}^{**} = 0.015$ $F = 0.278[mg/L]$ ; $G_{F} = 33.1$ $\sum$ metals= 1817 $[\mu g/L]$ ; $G_{\sum metals} = 216$ $Zn = 162[\mu g/L]$ ; $Al = 209 [\mu g/L]$ ; $G_{Zn} = 19.3$ ; $G_{Al} = 24.9$ $TOC = 21999 [mg/L]$ ; $G_{TOC} = 2.61 \times 10^{6}$ Formaldehyde=1.63 $[mg/L]$ ; $G_{Formaldehyde} = 194$ $\sum$ Phenols= 3.33 $[mg/L]$ ; $G_{\sum Phenols} = 396$ Non-ionic detergents= 7.50 $[mg/L]$ ; $G_{Non-ionic d} = 893$ Cationic detergents= 0.78 $[mg/L]$ ; $G_{Cationic d} = 92.8$	TOC- permissible norm exceeded 733 times ∑Phenols - permissible norm exceeded 33. 3 times	96
of passenger movement	Vicinity of an airport passenger terminal 24.03.2009	PO <sub>4</sub> <sup>3-</sup> = 4.99 [mg/L] $\sum$ Phenols= 0.302 [mg/L] Non-ionic detergents= 2.01 [mg/L] TOC= 289 [mg/L] $\sum$ PCB= 0.13 [µg/L] $\gamma$ -HCH= 0.149 [µg/L] Aldrin= 0.131 [µg/L] Endrin= 0.123 [µg/L] DDT= 0.00076 [µg/L]	TOC- permissible norm exceeded 9.6 times $\sum$ Phenols- permissible norm exceeded 3 times PCB exceeded by 0.13 µg/L $\gamma$ -HCH, Aldrin, Endrin, DDT permissible norm exceeded by 0.149 µg/L, 0.131 µg/L, 0.123 µg/L, 0.00076 µg/L respectively.	51
apacity	Vicinity of an airport passenger terminal 07.01.11	$\sum Phenols= 0.45 [mg/L]$ $\sum PCB= 0.14 [\mu g/l]$ $\sum PAH= 5.70[\mu g/l]$	$\sum$ Phenols- permissible norm exceeded 4.5 times PCB- permissible norm exceeded by 0.14 [µg/L]	44
Airport with low c	Parking places 24.03.2009	TOC= 231 [mg/L] $\sum$ Phenols= 0.29 [mg/L] $\sum$ PCB=1.02 [µg/L] $\gamma$ -HCH=0,039 [µg/L] Aldrin= 0,0018 [µg/L] Endrin=0,0017 [µg/L] DDT=0,0028 [µg/L]	TOC- permissible norm exceeded 7.7 times $\sum$ Phenols - permissible norm exceeded 2.9 times PCB - permissible norm exceeded by 1.02 [µg/L] $\gamma$ -HCH, Aldrin, Endrin, DDT permissible norm exceeded by 0,039 µg/L, 0,0018 µg/L, 0,0017 µg/L, 0,0028 µg/L respectively.	42
	· · · ·	Thamnocephalus pla	ityurus	
v capacity ovement	Vicinity of an airport passenger terminal 19.01.2009	HCOO <sup>-</sup> =8701 [mg/L]; Na <sup>+</sup> = 4765[mg/L] Anionic detergents=13.5[mg/L] Non-ionic detergents=1.85[mg/L] TOC=3260 [mg/L]	TOC- permissible norm exceeded 109 times Anionic detergents permissible norm exceeded 2.7 times	100
with low senger m	Machinery park 19.01.2011	HCOO <sup>-</sup> =10505 [mg/L] Na <sup>+</sup> = 5031 [mg/L] TOC=3435 [mg/L]	TOC- permissible norm exceeded 115 times	100
Airport of pass	The periphery of an airport 19.01.2011	∑WWA=2.01 [µg/l] Na <sup>+</sup> = 56501[mg/L]; HCOO <sup>-</sup> =9415 [mg/L] TOC=5510 [mg/L]	TOC- permissible norm exceeded 184 times	100

# 372 Table 3. The sites at airports with high/low capacity of passenger movement with the most toxic runoff waters.

\*Only data about flow of this site was available, Runoff water flow=119 [L/s] \*\*Mass yield (G)= flow\*concentration [mg/s]

**Table 4.** PCA results obtained for airport runoff water. The table lists variable loadings, eigenvalues and the proportion of the variance explained for the first five PCs. Boldfaced values represent parameters with significant loadings (p=0.05).

the variance explained for the first five I es. Dolutaced	values repres	in parameters	with significa	in loadings (p	-0.05).
Variables	PC1	PC2	PC3	PC4	PC5
РСВ	0.12	0.68	0.35	-0.19	-0.20
PAHs	-0.15	0.56	-0.49	0.33	-0.09
EC	-0.92	0.03	-0.25	-0.07	-0.23
ANIONS	-0.95	0.03	-0.19	-0.07	-0.07
CATIONS	-0.93	0.03	-0.21	-0.06	-0.21
ANIONIC DETERGENTS	-0.83	-0.22	0.13	0.15	0.26
CATIONIC DETERGENTS	0.40	-0.16	-0.50	0.55	0.12
NON-IONIC DETERGENTS	-0.65	-0.18	0.52	0.08	0.18
SUM OF DETERGENTS	-0.85	-0.24	0.18	0.19	0.28
FORMALDEHYDE	-0.39	0.75	-0.11	0.11	0.11
∑PHENOLS	-0.17	0.77	0.26	0.04	0.39
TOC	-0.96	-0.04	-0.12	-0.03	-0.15
<b>VIBRIO FISCHERI</b> TOXICITY	-0.22	0.02	0.67	0.51	-0.45
THAMNOCEPHALUS PLATYURUS TOXICITY	-0.90	-0.05	-0.12	-0.16	0.09
Eigenvalues	6.6	2.1	1.6	0.8	0.7
% of variance explained	47.2	15.0	11.8	6.0	5.3
% of cumul. variance	47.2	62.2	74.0	80.0	85.3



**Figure 4** Concentration levels of summary amount of emitted contaminants determined in airport stormwater in correlation with passengers movement during period 2009-2011.

## **5. Conclusions**

Contaminants generated from different sources of airport infrastructure; including leakage of fuel, paint materials, tire debris, use the brakes at high speeds especially during of sharp turns, small fragments of road surfaces and metals, peeled off rust and varnish, vehicle components, dissolved agents against glazed frost and detergent remains; are washed off the airport platform into drainage system by rain water, sometimes retained in the drainage system for a while, and finally transported mainly to the receiving water. Airport runoff

water is considered to be an important source of environmental contamination, because
runoff not only gets into surface waters, but also to soil, and even to ground water sources of
drinking water, and organisms living in this soil and waters as final receptors.

405 The results of this airport runoff waters analysis confirmed that this type of 406 environmental samples has a complex chemical composition. Commonly occurring 407 environmental pollutants emitted from fuel combustion processes, leakage of fuel and the 408 maintenance operations were detected and determined in the samples: PAHs, PCBs, 409 pesticides, formaldehyde, metals; parameters such as TOC, conductivity; pollutants 410 principally associated with the technological operations related to the cleaning of airport 411 infrastructure (washing of aircraft and airport aprons) like detergents, cations, anions, 412 phenols. The levels of some compounds exceeded several or even several tens of times the 413 maximum permissible levels stipulated by Polish legislation for treated effluents, which can 414 be discharged into surface waters. In the light of these figures, it is imperative that 415 monitoring of airport runoff waters is implemented as soon as possible.

Analysis of the measurement data obtained shows that *Vibrio fischeri* and *Thamnocephalus platyurus*, the two organisms from different trophic levels respond differently to the studied parameters. Levels of toxicity towards *T. platyurus* are correlated with like anionic and non-ionic detergents, anions and cations, pollutants originating from the technological operations related to the maintenance of airport infrastructure (such as cleaning and washing of aircraft and airport aprons).

The results presented here point the usefulness of biotests in assessing the quality of the runoff waters. The integrated chemical-ecotoxicological approach to assessing environmental contamination in and around airports yields more complete information on environmental quality, thereby enabling the better management of runoff waters and to limiting their effects on the environment.

## 427 Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank the Ministry of Science and Higher Education for the grant

429 awarded within the framework of the Project No. 0528/IP3/2011/71 for financing this

430 investigation. The authors express their gratitude for the scholarship awarded within the

- 431 framework of the interdisciplinary project "The development of interdisciplinary PhD studies
- 432 in modern technologies at the Gdansk University of Technology," co-funded by the
- 433 European Union. The authors would like to thank Dariusz Ufnal and Grzegorz Trzoska for
- 434 the help and enabling sampling possibility from investigated airports.
- 435 **References**
- S. R. Corsi, S. W. Geis, J. L. Rosales, C. Rice, R. Sheesley, G. Failey and D. A.
   Cancilla, *Environ. Sci. Technol.*, 2006, 40, 3195-3202.
- 438 2. EPA, ed. O. o. Water, Washington, Editon edn., 2000, vol. 4303.
- 439 3. M. B. Yunker, R. W. Macdonald, R. V. Reginald, H. Mitchelld, D. Goyettee and S.
  440 Sylvestrec, *Organic Geochemistry*, 2002, 33, 489–515.
- 4. M. B. Yunker, L. R. Snowdon, R. W. Macdonald, J. Smith, M. G. Flower, D. N.
  442 Skibo, F. A. Mclughlin, A. I. Danyushevskaya, V. I. Petrova and G. I. Ivanov,
  443 *Environ. Sci. Technol.*, 1996, **30**, 1310-1320.
- S. Ray, P. S. Khillare, T. Agarwal and V. Shridhar, *Journal of Hazardous Materials*2008, **156**, 9–16.
- 446
  447
  447
  S. Barash, J. Covington and C. Tamulonis, ed. U. S. E. P. Agency, Washington, Editon edn., 2000, vol. 4303.
- 448 7. I. Pison and L. Menut, *Atmospheric Environment*, 2004, **38**, 971-983.
- 449 8. Hi Takada, T. Onda and N. Ogura, *Environ. Sci. Technol*, 1990, **24**, 1179–1186.
- 450 9. M. B. Yunker and R. W. Macdonald, *Organic Geochemistry*, 2003, **34**, 1429–1454.
- 451 10. P. Baumard, H. Budzinski and P. Garrigues, *Environ Toxicol Chem* 1998, **17**, 765–
  452 776.
- 453 11. P. Baumard, H. Budziński and P. Garrigues, *Marine Pollution Bulletin*, 1998, 36,
  454 577-586.
- 455 12. M. O'Donnell, ed. U. S. D. o. Transportation, Federal Aviation Administration,
  456 Editon edn., 2008.
- 457 13. D. o. Transportation, ed. F. A. Administration, Editon edn., 2008.
- 458 14. M. Switzenbaum, S. Veltman, M. D. Wagoner and T. Schoenberg, *Chemosphere*, 2001, 43, 1051-1062.
  - 15. S. R. Corsi, G. R. Harwell, S. W. Geis and D. Bergman, *Environmental Toxicology and Chemistry*, 2006, **25**, 2890-2900.
  - 16. S. R. Corsi, Si Wi Geis, G. Bowman, G. Failey and T. D. Rutter, *Environ. Sci. Technol.*, 2009, **43**, 40-46.
- 464 17. A. M. Sulej, Ż. Połkowska and J. Namieśnik, *Critical Reviews in Analytical Chemistry*, 2011, **41**, 190–213.
  - 18. W. Siegert, in *11th international conference on the stability, handling and use of liquid fuels*, Czech Republic, Editon edn., 2009, pp. 1-22.

460

461

462

463

466

- 468 19. B. T. Haile, University of KwaZulu-Natal, 2004.
- RobMcConnell, F. Pacheco, K. Wahlberg, W. Klein, O. Malespin, RalphMagnotti, 469 20. 470 M. Dkerblom and DouglasMurray, Environmental Research Section A, 1999, 81, 87-471 91.
- 472 C. Sun, J. Fitzpatrick, S. Goebel and J. Loos, Contaminated Stormwater Runoff 21. 473 Management, University of Missouri-Columbia, 2011.
- 474 22. S. I. Hartwell, D. M. Jordahl, J. E. Evans and E. B. May, Environ. Toxicol. Chem., 475 1995, **14**, 1375-1386.
- 476 D. A. Cancilla, J. Martinez and G. C. v. Aggelen, Environ. Sci. Technol., 1998, 32, 23. 477 3834-3835.
- 478 D. H. Zitomer, Marquette University, 2001. 24.
- 479 D. J. Fisher, M. H. Knott, Steven Di Turley, B. S. Turkley, L. T. Yonkos and V. 25. 480 Gregory Pi Ziegler., No 6, pp., 195, Environmental Toxicology and Chemistry, 481 1995, **14**, 1103-1111.
- 482 M. S. Schwitzenbaum, S. Vetman, T. Schoenberg, C. M. Durand, D. Mericas and B. 26. 483 W. No.173, Best Management Practies for airport Deicing StormwaterPublication, 484 1999.
- 485 H. K. French, S. E. A. V. d. Zee and A. Leijnse, J. Contam. Hydrol, 2001, 49, 23-48. 27.
- 486 28. S. R. Corsi, D. J. Zitomer, J. Field and D. A. Cancilla, Environ. Sci. Technol, 2003, 487 **37**, 4031-4037.
- 488 J. Hermens, H. Canton, P. Janssen and R. D. Jong, Aquat. Toxicol, 1984, 5, 143–154. 29.
- 489 30. G. D. Breedveld, R. Roseth, M. Sparrevik, T. Hartnik and L. J. Hem, Water, Air, Soil *Pollut*, 2003, **3**, 91-101. 490
- 491 A. M. Sulej, Ż. Połkowska and J. Namieśnik, Sensors, 2011, 11, 11901-11920. 31.
- A. M. Sulej, Ż. Połkowska and J. Namiesnik, Pol. J. Environ. Stud., 2012, 21, 725-492 32. 493 739.
- 494 M. D. Erickson, Analytical chemistry of PCBs, Lewis, Chelsea, 1992. 33.
- 495 34. A. Sulej, Ż. Połkowska and J. Namieśnik, Critical Reviews in Science and 496 Technology, 2011.
- 497 L. Luther, ed. S. Environmental Policy Analyst Resources, and Industry Division, 35. 498 Editon edn., 2007.
- 499 A. M. Sulej, Ż. Połkowska and J. Namieśnik, Critical Reviews in Science and 36. 500 Technology, 2012, 42, 1691-1734.
- 501 L. Wolska and Z. Polkowska, Bull Environ Contam Toxicol, 2001, 67, 52-58. 37.
- 502 38. S. Tsakovski, B. Kudlak, V. Simeonova, LidiaWolska and J. Namiesnik, Analytica 503 *Chimica Acta*, 2009, **631**, 142–152. 504
- 39. D. MacDonald, C. Ingersoll and T. Berger, Arch. Environ. Contam. Toxicol, 2000, **39**, 20. 506
  - R. E. Dewhurst, A. Callaghan, R. Connon, M. Crane, J. D. Mather and R. Wood, 40. Water and Environment Journal, 2005, 19, 17-24.
  - M. Isidori, M. Lavorgna, A. Nardelli and A. Parrella, Chemosphere, 2003, 52, 85-41. 94.
  - M. Byrne, J. Pollak, D. Oakes and E. Laginestra, Australasian Journal of 42. ecotoxicology, 2003, 9, 19-28.
  - L. Ferrat, C. Pergent-Martini and M. Rome'o, Aquatic Toxicology, 2003, 65, 187-43. 204.
  - 44. D. Cancilla, J. C. Baird, S. W. Geist and S. Corsi, Environmental Toxicology and chemistry, 2003, 22, 134-140.
  - D. A. Cancilla, A. Holtkamp, L. Matassa and X. Fang, Environmental Toxicology 45. and Chemistry, 1997, 16, 430-434.

505

507

508

509

510

511

512

513

514

515

516

- 518 46. J. B. Ellis, D. M. Revitt and N. Llewellyn, J. CIWEM, 1997, 11, 170-177.
- 519 47. M. Koryaka, L. J. Stafforda, R. J. Reillya, R. H. Hoskina and M. H. Habermana,
  520 *ournal of Freshwater Ecology*, 1998, 13, pages 287-298.
- 48. L. J. Novak, K. Holtze, R. A. Kent, C. Jefferson and D. Anderson, *Environmental Toxicology and Chemistry*, 2000, **19**, 1846-1855.
- 523 49. Ż. Polkowska, K. Skarżyńska, T. Górecki and J. Namieśnik, *Atmospheric Environment*, 2002, **36**, 361-369.
- 525 50. M. Korhonen, A. Kiviranta and R. Ketola, *Toxicological and Environmental* 526 *Chemistry*, 1998, **66**, 37-45.
- 527 51. K. Levsen, S. Behnert, B. Prieb, M. Svoboda, H. DiWinkeler and J. Zietlow,
  528 *Chemosphere*, 1990, **21**, 1037–1061.
- 529 52. W. F. Rogge, L. M. Hildeman, M. A. Mazurek, G. R. Cass and B. R. Simoneit,
  530 *Environmental Science and Technology*, 1993, 9, 1892–1904.
- 531 53. E. Manoli and C. Samara., *Trends in Analytical Chemistry*, 1999, **6**, 417–428.
- 532 54. L. Wolska and Ż. Połkowska, *Rev. Environ. Contamin. Toxicol.*, 2001, **67**, 52–58
- 533 55. ISO, in *11348-3:2002*, Editon edn., 2002.
- 534 56. E. Olkowska, Ż. Polkowska, J. Namieśnik, *Talanta*, 2013, **116**, 210–216.
- 535 57. A. Sulej, Ż. Połkowska, A. Astel, J. Namieśnik, *Talanta*, 2013, **117**, 158-167.
- 536 58. A. M. Sulej, Ż. Połkowska, A. Astel and J. Namieśnik, *Talanta*, 2013, **117**, 158–167.
- 537 59. E. Minister, in *169*, ed. M. o. Environment, Journal of Laws, Editon edn., 2009, pp.
  538 2532-2554.
- 539 60. I. Buttino, M. Filipi and N. Cardellicchio, *Aqua aria*, 1991, **9**, 853-861.
- 540 61. R. Guerra, *Chemosphere*, 2001, **44**, 1737-1747.
- 541 62. I. Bojakowska, D. Lech and J. Jaroszyńska, *Mining and Geology*, 2012, **7**, 71-83.
- 542 63. I. Kiss, in *Exposure and Risk Assessment of Chemical Pollution: Contemporary*543 *Methodology*, eds. L. I. Simeonov and M. A. Hassanien, Springer, Sofia, Editon edn.,
  544 2009, pp. 233-245.
- 545 64. D. Pillard, J. Cornell, D. Dufresne and M. Hernandez, *Water Res.*, 2001, **35**, 557-560.