

## Comment on "Wildlife and the Coal Waste Policy Debate: Proposed Rules for Coal Waste Disposal Ignore Lessons from 45 Years of Wildlife Poisoning"

David Kleve DeForest, Robin J Reash, and John E Toll

*Environ. Sci. Technol.*, **Just Accepted Manuscript** • DOI: 10.1021/es3053575 • Publication Date (Web): 22 May 2013

Downloaded from <http://pubs.acs.org> on June 11, 2013

### Just Accepted

"Just Accepted" manuscripts have been peer-reviewed and accepted for publication. They are posted online prior to technical editing, formatting for publication and author proofing. The American Chemical Society provides "Just Accepted" as a free service to the research community to expedite the dissemination of scientific material as soon as possible after acceptance. "Just Accepted" manuscripts appear in full in PDF format accompanied by an HTML abstract. "Just Accepted" manuscripts have been fully peer reviewed, but should not be considered the official version of record. They are accessible to all readers and citable by the Digital Object Identifier (DOI®). "Just Accepted" is an optional service offered to authors. Therefore, the "Just Accepted" Web site may not include all articles that will be published in the journal. After a manuscript is technically edited and formatted, it will be removed from the "Just Accepted" Web site and published as an ASAP article. Note that technical editing may introduce minor changes to the manuscript text and/or graphics which could affect content, and all legal disclaimers and ethical guidelines that apply to the journal pertain. ACS cannot be held responsible for errors or consequences arising from the use of information contained in these "Just Accepted" manuscripts.



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7 **Comment on “Wildlife and the Coal Waste Policy**  
8  
9  
10  
11 **Debate: Proposed Rules for Coal Waste Disposal**  
12  
13  
14  
15 **Ignore Lessons from 45 years of Wildlife**  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20 **Poisoning”**  
21  
22  
23  
24

25 *David K. DeForest,\*† Robin J. Reash,‡ John E. Toll†*  
26  
27

28 † Windward Environmental LLC, Seattle, Washington, USA, 98119  
29  
30

31 ‡ American Electric Power, Columbus, Ohio, USA, 43215  
32  
33  
34

35 A recent assessment of direct and indirect costs of fish and wildlife poisoning attributable to  
36 surface impoundments of coal combustion waste (CCW) was based on 21 surface impoundment  
37 case studies in the United States.<sup>1</sup> Selenium was the primary chemical stressor in 14 of the 21  
38 case studies. For those 14 case studies the authors noted that the initial “Period of Damage”  
39 ranged between 1967 and 1981. This is prior to and during the time when the potential effects of  
40 elevated selenium concentrations on fish populations were just beginning to be understood,  
41 mainly due to the observations and research being conducted at Belews Lake (NC).  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50

51 It is inappropriate to base an analysis of contemporary policy on sites with historical selenium  
52 inputs that are not allowed today. Of the total direct and indirect costs of fish and wildlife  
53 poisoning calculated by Lemly and Skorupa, 70% was for historical poisoning in Belews Lake,  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Hyco Reservoir (NC), and Martin Lake (TX), which in the mid- to late-1970s received  
4 discharges containing selenium concentrations of 150-200, 50-200, and 2,200-2,700  $\mu\text{g/L}$ ,<sup>2</sup>  
5  
6 respectively. These concentrations are 30- to 540-fold greater than the U.S. Environmental  
7  
8 Protection Agency's (USEPA's) current chronic selenium criterion (5  $\mu\text{g/L}$ ) which in fact was  
9  
10 derived based on Belews Lake field data.<sup>3</sup> Since Lemly and Skorupa argue that surface  
11  
12 impoundments of CCW should be prohibited, their analysis should have been based on case  
13  
14 studies reflecting today's regulatory and management policies for CCW surface impoundments.  
15  
16 Since 1982 the USEPA has prohibited the wet disposal of CCWs to surface impoundments for  
17  
18 new power plants. Some utilities have already converted existing wet ash disposal to dry ash  
19  
20 disposal, and others are in the process of doing so.  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26

27 Our understanding of selenium fate and effects in aquatic systems has grown immensely over  
28  
29 the last 30 years. A 2009 Society of Environmental Toxicology and Chemistry (SETAC)  
30  
31 workshop on the *Ecological Assessment of Selenium in the Aquatic Environment* that engaged 46  
32  
33 selenium experts representing academia, government, industry, and nongovernmental  
34  
35 organizations from four different countries exemplifies the progress that has been made. This  
36  
37 workshop provided a comprehensive review of selenium fate and effects in aquatic ecosystems,  
38  
39 and how to assess the potential risks from selenium exposure. The workshop publication  
40  
41 provides a concise overview of the state-of-the-science.<sup>4</sup>  
42  
43  
44  
45

46 Lemly and Skorupa's cost analysis relies on numerous technical assumptions that deserve  
47  
48 careful scrutiny, including issues of temporal and spatial scale of selenium concentrations in  
49  
50 water bodies, consideration of multiple lines of evidence, and recovery time periods. One  
51  
52 particularly important assumption is Lemly and Skorupa's use of a 4 mg/kg dry wt whole body  
53  
54 fish selenium concentration for defining resource damages. A point of agreement in the 2009  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 SETAC workshop was that the critical exposure route for fish is dietborne organic selenium.<sup>5,6</sup>  
4  
5 Based on our own review of several toxicity studies in which fresh water fish were exposed to a  
6  
7 series of dietborne organic selenium concentrations,<sup>7-14</sup> effect levels for endpoints such as larval  
8  
9 mortalities, deformities, and edema and juvenile survival and growth are insignificant (less than  
10  
11 10% relative to control) at whole body selenium concentrations  $\leq 4$  mg/kg dry wt. The lowest  
12  
13 whole body fish selenium concentration at which statistically significant effects have been  
14  
15 observed relative to control is 16 mg/kg dry wt. This casts doubt on the biological significance of  
16  
17 the 4 mg/kg threshold.  
18  
19

20  
21  
22 There is also field evidence that a 4 mg/kg threshold of is a poor indicator of population-level  
23  
24 effects. For example, Finley and Garrett<sup>15</sup> reported that median whole body selenium  
25  
26 concentrations in representative species in Hyco and Belews, including recovered sensitive taxa  
27  
28 previously extirpated from these systems such as bluegill, had median whole body selenium  
29  
30 concentrations ranging from approximately 6 to 10 mg/kg dry wt. from 2003-2006 (wet fly-ash  
31  
32 disposal was eliminated in 1985 and 1990 in Belews and Hyco, respectively). Second, whole  
33  
34 body fish selenium concentrations near to or exceeding 4 mg/kg can be measured in fish from  
35  
36 reference sites. Some studies have even reported comparable whole body selenium  
37  
38 concentrations in control fish from laboratory studies, such as Vidal et al.<sup>16</sup> and Tashjian et al.<sup>12</sup>  
39  
40 This further raises the question of whether a 4 mg/kg threshold is a relevant predictor of effects.  
41  
42  
43  
44

45  
46 Finally, there is a general consensus that fish egg and ovary selenium concentrations are better  
47  
48 predictors of selenium toxicity to fish than whole body selenium.<sup>5,6</sup> Lemly and Skorupa<sup>1</sup> did not  
49  
50 include this line of evidence. Consideration of these data could have had an important influence  
51  
52 on their analysis. For example, to interpret selenium concentrations in Mayo Reservoir (Case  
53  
54 #3), Carolina Power and Light<sup>17</sup> conducted a reproductive study with largemouth bass and  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 determined that an ovary selenium concentration of 19 mg/kg dry wt. was associated with a  
4 larval mortality rate of 1%. Ovary selenium concentrations in largemouth bass have not exceeded  
5 this 1% effect threshold and there has been no evidence of population-level effects in Mayo  
6 Reservoir.<sup>18</sup>  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11

12 The sources of discharges in Lemly and Skorupa's case studies must also be considered. Most  
13 of the discharges were/are permitted releases, not accidental spills, seepage, or structural failure.  
14 If permitted discharges are resulting in concentrations that pose an unacceptable risk, the issue is  
15 not the surface impoundment *per se*, but permit limits. If on the other hand surface  
16 impoundments based on current technologies, are prone to spills, leaks, or structural failure, then  
17 those issues need to be weighed in assessing the development of additional controls for surface  
18 impoundments.  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

29 The question of developing appropriate controls for storage of CCW in surface impoundments  
30 is best addressed within a risk-based framework that will provide the regulatory decision makers  
31 the necessary information to make informed decisions.  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36

## 37 AUTHOR INFORMATION

### 38 **Corresponding Author**

39  
40  
41  
42 \*E-mail: [DavidD@windwardenv.com](mailto:DavidD@windwardenv.com); phone: 206-812-5426  
43  
44

### 45 **Author Contributions**

46  
47 The manuscript was written through contributions of all authors. All authors have given approval  
48 to the final version of the manuscript.  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## ACKNOWLEDGMENT

This correspondence was funded by the Utility Solid Waste Activities Group (USWAG); however, the opinions are the authors'.

## REFERENCES

(1) Lemly, A. D.; Skorupa, J. P. Wildlife and the coal waste policy debate: Proposed rules for coal waste disposal ignore lessons from 45 years of wildlife poisoning. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* **2012**, *46*, 8595-8600.

(2) Skorupa, J. P. Selenium poisoning of fish and wildlife in nature: lessons from twelve real-world examples. In *Environmental Chemistry of Selenium*; Frankenberger, W. T., Engberg, R. A., Eds.; Marcel Dekker, Inc.: New York 1998; pp. 315-354.

(3) U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. *Ambient water quality criteria for selenium*. Office of Water, Washington, D.C., 1987; EPA-440/5-87-006.

(4) Chapman, P. M.; Adams, W. J.; Brooks, M. L.; Delos, C. G.; Luoma, S. N.; Maher, W. A.; Ohlendorf, H. M.; Presser, T. S.; Shaw, D. P.; Eds. *Ecological Assessment of Selenium in the Aquatic Environment*. SETAC Press: Pensacola, FL 2010a. 339 pp.

(5) Chapman, P. M.; et al. Executive summary. In *Ecological Assessment of Selenium in the Aquatic Environment*; Chapman, P. M.; Adams, W. J.; Brooks, M. L.; Delos, C. G.; Luoma, S. N.; Maher, W. A.; Ohlendorf, H. M.; Presser, T. S.; Shaw, D. P.; Eds.; SETAC Press: Pensacola, FL 2010b; pp. 5-6.

(6) Janz, D. M.; et al. Selenium toxicity to aquatic organisms. In *Ecological Assessment of Selenium in the Aquatic Environment*; Chapman, P. M.; Adams, W. J.; Brooks, M. L.; Delos, C.

1  
2  
3 G.; Luoma, S. N.; Maher, W. A.; Ohlendorf, H. M.; Presser, T. S.; Shaw, D. P.; Eds.; SETAC  
4  
5 Press: Pensacola, FL 2010; pp. 141-231.  
6  
7

8  
9 (7) Ogle, R. S.; Knight, A. W. Effects of elevated foodborne selenium on growth and  
10 reproduction of the fathead minnow (*Pimephales promelas*). *Arch. Environ. Contam. Toxicol.*  
11 **1989**, *18*, 795-803.  
12  
13

14  
15  
16 (8) Hamilton, S. J.; Buhl, K. J.; Faerber, N. L.; Wiedmeyer, R. H.; Bullard, F. A. Toxicity of  
17 organic selenium in the diet to chinook salmon. *Environ. Toxicol. Chem.* **1990**, *9*, 347-358.  
18  
19

20  
21 (9) Cleveland, L.; Little, E. E.; Buckler, D. R.; Wiedmeyer, R. H. Toxicity and  
22 bioaccumulation of waterborne and dietary selenium in juvenile bluegill (*Lepomis macrochirus*).  
23 *Aquat. Toxicol.* **1993**, *27*, 265-280.  
24  
25  
26

27  
28 (10) Coyle, J. J.; Buckler, D. R.; Ingersoll, C. G.; Fairchild, J. F.; May, T. W. Effect of dietary  
29 selenium on the reproductive success of bluegills (*Lepomis macrochirus*). *Environ. Toxicol.*  
30 *Chem.* **1993**, *12*, 551-565.  
31  
32  
33

34  
35 (11) Hermanutz, R. O.; Allen, K. N.; Detenbeck, N. E.; Stephan, C. E. *Exposure of bluegills*  
36 (*Lepomis macrochirus*) *to selenium in outdoor experimental streams*. U.S. Environmental  
37 Protection Agency: Duluth, MN, 1996.  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44

45  
46 (12) Tashjian, D. H.; The, S. J.; Sogomonyan, A.; Hung, S. S. O. Bioaccumulation and chronic  
47 toxicity of dietary L-selenomethionine in juvenile white sturgeon (*Acipenser transmontanus*).  
48 *Aquat. Toxicol.* **2006**, *79*, 401-409.  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 (13) McIntyre, D. O.; Pacheco, M. A.; Garton, M. W.; Wallschläger, D.; Delos, C. G. *Effect of*  
4 *selenium on juvenile bluegill sunfish at reduced temperature*. Office of Water, U.S.  
5  
6 Environmental Protection Agency, 1987; EPA-822-R-08-020.  
7  
8

9  
10  
11 (14) McDonald, B. G.; deBruyn, A. M. H.; Elphick, J. R. F.; Davies, M.; Bustard, D.;  
12  
13 Chapman, P. M. Developmental toxicity of selenium to Dolly Varden char (*Salvelinus malma*).  
14  
15 *Environ. Toxicol. Chem.* **2010**, *29*, 2800-2805.  
16  
17

18  
19 (15) Finley, K.; Garrett, R. Recovery at Belews and Hyco Lakes: Implications for fish tissue  
20  
21 selenium thresholds. *Integr. Environ. Assess. Manag.* **2007**, *3*, 297-299.  
22  
23

24  
25 (16) Vidal, D.; Bay, S. M.; Schlenk, D. Effects of dietary selenomethionine on larval rainbow  
26  
27 trout (*Oncorhynchus mykiss*). *Arch. Environ. Contam. Toxicol.* **2005**, *49*, 71-75.  
28  
29

30  
31 (17) Carolina Power & Light. *Largemouth bass selenium bioassay*. Carolina Power & Light  
32  
33 Company, Environmental Services Section, 1997.  
34  
35

36  
37 (18) Progress Energy Service Company. *Mayo Steam Electric Plant 2011 environmental*  
38  
39 *monitoring report*. Progress Energy Service Company, LLC, Raleigh, NC, 2012.  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60