

This is a repository copy of *Simplifying environmental mixtures—An aquatic exposure-based approach via land use scenarios*.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:

<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/127982/>

Version: Accepted Version

---

**Article:**

Posthuma, Leo, Brown, Colin David orcid.org/0000-0001-7291-0407, de Zwart, Dick et al. (6 more authors) (2018) Simplifying environmental mixtures—An aquatic exposure-based approach via land use scenarios. *Environmental Toxicology and Chemistry*. pp. 671-673. ISSN 1552-8618

<https://doi.org/10.1002/etc.4063>

---

**Reuse**

Items deposited in White Rose Research Online are protected by copyright, with all rights reserved unless indicated otherwise. They may be downloaded and/or printed for private study, or other acts as permitted by national copyright laws. The publisher or other rights holders may allow further reproduction and re-use of the full text version. This is indicated by the licence information on the White Rose Research Online record for the item.

**Takedown**

If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing [eprints@whiterose.ac.uk](mailto:eprints@whiterose.ac.uk) including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.

**Environmental Toxicology  
& Chemistry**

**SIMPLIFYING ENVIRONMENTAL MIXTURES –  
AN AQUATIC EXPOSURE-BASED APPROACH VIA LAND USE  
SCENARIOS**

Journal:	<i>Environmental Toxicology and Chemistry</i>
Manuscript ID	Draft
Wiley - Manuscript type:	Special Section
Date Submitted by the Author:	n/a
Complete List of Authors:	Posthuma, Leo; RIVM, Laboratory for Ecological Risk Assessment Brown, Colin; University of York, Environment Department de Zwart, Dick Diamond, Jerome ; Tetra Tech, Dyer, Scott; Procter & Gamble Company, ESS Hamer, Mick ; Syngenta, Holmes, Christopher; Waterborne Environmental, Inc., Marshall, Stuart; Unilever, SEAC Burton, G. Allen; University of Michigan, Natural Resources & Environment; Wright State University, Department of Earth & Environmental Sciences
Mandatory Keywords:	mixtures, ecological risk assessment, environmental chemistry
Additional Keywords (Optional):	land use, scenario
Abstract:	Exposure to chemical mixtures is a fact of life. Mixture risk assessments should therefore be common, but that is not the case. As mixture exposures, risks and impacts are common, and as consensus approaches are available for practical risk assessments, the current challenge is to operationalize methods that can handle the immense diversity of mixture exposures. This challenge was taken up by the SETAC Pellston® workshop "Simplifying environmental mixtures - an aquatic exposure-based approach via exposure scenarios" which was held in March 2015 in Valencia, Spain. The outcomes of the workshop are summarized in a series of four consecutive papers. Those consider exposures and risks of mixtures of chemicals related to various land use example scenarios. Based on the overall set of results, it is concluded that mixture risk assessments via land use exposure scenarios provide useful and necessary insights into the potential effects of mixtures in the environment.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

Page 1 of 8

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11 1  
12  
13  
14 2 **SIMPLIFYING ENVIRONMENTAL MIXTURES –**  
15  
16 3 **AN AQUATIC EXPOSURE-BASED APPROACH VIA LAND USE**  
17 4 **SCENARIOS**  
18  
19  
20 5  
21  
22 6

23 7 Leo Posthuma <sup>a,b\*</sup>, Colin Brown <sup>c</sup>, Dick De Zwart <sup>d</sup>, Jerry Diamond <sup>e</sup>, Scott D. Dyer <sup>f</sup>, Mick  
24 8 Hamer <sup>g</sup>, Christopher M. Holmes <sup>h</sup>, Stuart Marshall <sup>i</sup>, G. Allen Burton, Jr. <sup>j</sup>

25  
26 9  
27 10  
28 11 <sup>a</sup> National Institute for Public Health and the Environment (RIVM), Centre for Sustainability,  
29 12 Environment and Health, P.O. Box 1, 3720 BA Bilthoven, the Netherlands

30 13 <sup>b</sup> Radboud University, Department of Environmental Science, Institute for Wetland and Water  
31 14 Research, Faculty of Science, Radboud University, Nijmegen, The Netherlands

32 15 <sup>c</sup> University of York, Environment Department, Heslington, York, YO10 5DD, UK

33 16 <sup>d</sup> Mermayde, Groet, the Netherlands

34 17 <sup>e</sup> Tetra Tech, Owings Mills, USA

35 18 <sup>f</sup> The Procter and Gamble Company, Cincinnati, USA

36 19 <sup>g</sup> Syngenta, Jealott's Hill, Bracknell, UK

37 20 <sup>h</sup> Waterborne Environmental, Inc., Leesburg, Virginia, USA

38 21 <sup>i</sup> Unilever, Safety and Environmental Assurance Centre, Unilever, Sharnbrook, Bedford, UK  
39 22 (retired)

40 23 <sup>j</sup> University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, U.S.A.

41 24  
42  
43 25  
44 26 **Running Head:**

45 27 Land use and mixture exposure scenarios for risk assessment

46  
47 28 **Word count: 1324 words.**  
48  
49 29  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

**Comment [LP1]:** LP to Editor / co-authors:

This list might apply if authors are needed at all!!

For now the list is alphabetic, constructed from the name list of the workshop organizers / paper-series conference call regular attendants.

The list can be adapted for sure.

Page 2 of 8

## 30 INTRODUCTION

31 Exposure to chemical mixtures is a fact of life. Therefore the expectation would be that mixture  
32 risk assessments are common, but that is not the case. This may relate partly to the immense  
33 variability of mixture exposures that may occur, which would place an additional burden on the  
34 already immense task of regulating vast numbers of individual chemicals (e.g., Hartung and  
35 Rovida (2009), Hendriks (2013)). It may also relate to difficulties in bridging the science-  
36 practice interface: are scientifically sound methods ready to be applied, and what formats do they  
37 take?

38 So far, some technical guidance documents have handled mixtures by assuming that potential  
39 mixture effects are sufficiently addressed via the application factors that are already in use to  
40 derive regulatory protective concentration criteria from available ecotoxicity data. Given  
41 frequent concerns voiced on mixture exposures, various other approaches to mixture risk  
42 assessment may be needed in addition to application factor approach, ranging from prospective  
43 methods that help to evaluate whether environmental and human health protection is sufficient  
44 under conditions of realistic mixture exposures, to retrospective methods that characterize the  
45 risk of polluted environmental compartments using measured data.

## 47 PELLSTON WORKSHOP ON MIXTURES

48 As mixture exposures (e.g., USEPA (2009)), risks (e.g., Malaj, von der Ohe et al. (2014)) and  
49 impacts (e.g., Posthuma, Dyer et al. (2016)) are common, and as consensus approaches are  
50 available for practical risk assessments (e.g., Kortenkamp, Backhaus et al. (2009)), the challenge  
51 is to operationalize methods that can handle the immense diversity of mixture exposures. This

challenge was taken up by the SETAC Pellston<sup>®</sup> workshop “*Simplifying environmental mixtures - an aquatic exposure-based approach via exposure scenarios*” which was held in March 2015 in Valencia, Spain. The basis of the workshop was the idea that whilst mixtures can be immensely complex in their nature when considering separate chemicals and their concentrations, it may be expected that specific land uses could imply specific, recognizable ‘signatures’ of chemical emissions. Would algae, daphnids, fish or whole species assemblages ‘recognize’ that they were exposed to a mixture, that can be seen as a ‘multi-constituent compound’ from city run-off, or from agricultural land use upstream, or from wastewater treatment plant emissions? It was hypothesized that it is likely that land use is associated with distinct emission profiles, and that such profiles could be helpful in operational prospective and retrospective mixture assessments. The SETAC Pellston<sup>®</sup> workshop addressed the need to improve on mixture risk assessments by looking at land-use related exposure scenarios. The aims of the workshop were:

- (1) to investigate whether a simplified scenario-based approach could be used to help determine whether mixtures of chemicals posed a risk greater than that identified using single-chemical based approaches, and if so:
- (2) what might be the magnitude and temporal aspects of the risks associated to mixture exposures, so as:
- (3) to determine whether the application of the approach provides insights in mixtures of greatest concern, and the compounds dominating those mixtures (prioritization).

## APPROACHES TO MIXTURE SCENARIOS AND RISKS

The workshop defined various scenarios with typical chemical emission ‘signatures’, namely: two agricultural land-use scenarios (one in the U.S and one in Europe), an urban storm water

75 run-off scenario, and a scenario looking at emissions of household chemicals via wastewater  
76 treatment plants. The scenarios were specified and the chemicals that may be emitted from them  
77 were investigated via literature research, survey databases, and querying expert users. Existing  
78 and custom emission models were used.

79 Efforts focused on characterizing the land-use based emissions and the chemical identities  
80 typically emitted from these land uses. Subsequently, exposure scenarios were defined and  
81 investigated. Resulting mixture exposures were evaluated in a tiered fashion, most often via risk  
82 characterization ratio's (defined as the ratio of exposure concentration and an ecotoxicity  
83 endpoint), aggregated over compounds in the mixture by assuming concentration additivity as  
84 default model.

85

## 86 **WORKSHOP RESULTS**

87 The workshop discussions and analyses resulted in four research papers, published in this issue  
88 of *Environmental Toxicology and Chemistry*:

89 (1) Holmes, Brown et al. (2017 (in press)). Prospective aquatic risk assessment for chemical  
90 mixtures in agricultural landscapes;

91 (2) Diamond, Altenburger et al. (In press (2017)). Use of prospective and retrospective risk  
92 assessment methods that simplify chemical mixtures associated with treated domestic  
93 wastewater discharges;

94 (3) De Zwart, Adams et al. (In press 2017). Aquatic exposures of chemical mixtures in urban  
95 environments: approaches to impact assessment;

96 (4) Posthuma, Brown et al. (2017 (early online)). Prospective mixture risk assessment and  
97 management prioritizations for river catchments with diverse land uses.

98 The papers of Holmes et al., Diamond et al., and De Zwart et al. describe the specifications of  
99 three specific land use- and exposure scenarios, and the associated risks of the associated  
100 chemical mixtures, including the analysis of the relative contributions of chemicals to the  
101 mixture risks. The papers of Holmes et al. and Posthuma et al. describe full land-use based  
102 emission – exposure – mixture risk model approaches, in which the emissions were combined  
103 with a suite of realistic data, e.g. on rainfall events, stormwater overflows, plant protection and  
104 veterinary product applications and hydrology. Following this mimicking of realistic land use  
105 exposure scenarios, these studies resulted in a systematic, tiered set of mixture risk assessments.  
106 Mixture risk assessments were thereby increasingly specific regarding the exposure variation  
107 over time (related to e.g. weather and applications) and the taxonomic groups potentially  
108 affected.

## 110 **MAIN FINDINGS**

111 Based on data reviews and (in part) modelling, the four studies illustrated that specific land uses  
112 likely result in aquatic environments being exposed to typical sets of chemicals. The exposures  
113 were further characterized by typical time-related patterns (e.g., relatively continuous exposures  
114 resulting from the emissions of household chemicals, and more variable over time for city run off  
115 and agriculture). The studies further generated evidence to support the need to prospectively  
116 considering mixtures in addition to single compounds, as (based on a concentration-additive risk  
117 assessment assumption) situations considered sufficiently protected regarding single-chemical  
118 emissions appeared insufficiently protected in realistic mixture scenarios. Within the scenarios,  
119 there was evidence to suggest that the taxonomic groups likely most affected could be identified  
120 in higher tiers of the assessment and there was also evidence to suggest that in many cases the



121 occurrence of mixture risks can be attributed to relatively few compounds contributing most to  
122 the predicted risk. The latter has been observed more frequently based on measured  
123 environmental concentrations (e.g., Backhaus and Karlsson (2014) Vallotton and Price (2016)).  
124 One of the common characteristics of mixture risk assessments is a difference in the availability  
125 of ecotoxicity data for the compounds involved in causing the potential risk. The studies  
126 illustrate that this may result in an interpretation pitfall, when an apparently large contribution of  
127 a compound to the mixture risk is not necessarily associated with greatest toxicity, but rather  
128 with greatest uncertainty (least data). Overall, the methods that were explored support the  
129 prioritization of mixtures for further investigation or management.

130

## 131 **POTENTIAL IMPLICATIONS**

132 The result imply that risk assessment and associated risk management strategies may be  
133 developed, potentially by the solution-focused approach to risk assessment (e.g., U.S. NAS  
134 (2009), Munthe, Brorström-Lundén et al. (2017)), by focusing on a few 'multi-constituent  
135 compounds' – the typical mixtures found downstream of a land use – rather than solely on all  
136 individual compounds. The set of papers suggests that emissions from true catchments and land  
137 uses can be addressed through science-based approaches that consider exposure scenarios for a  
138 wide-range of ecosystems and land-use types.

139 The proposed approach for evaluating chemical mixture risks has a wide range of potential  
140 applications. This can be supported by the development of a set of typical "road maps", being  
141 scenarios with typical emissions, exposure and risk signatures. These scenarios can serve both  
142 prospective and retrospective risk assessments, and could also support the development of (cost-  
143 )effective management actions that may be as typical to the land uses as the typical chemical

144 signatures. Opportunities to reduce the emissions caused by city run-off are different from those  
145 to reduce emissions from household chemicals or agricultural chemicals (Munthe, Brorström-  
146 Lundén et al. 2017, Van Wezel, Ter Laak et al. 2017), and this has recently been recognized as  
147 basis for e.g. stormwater management and urban planning (Sharley, Sharp et al. 2017).

## 148 **ACKNOWLEDGMENT**

149 The authors thank SETAC for initiating and funding the SETAC-Pellston workshop "*Simplifying*  
150 *environmental mixtures: an aquatic exposure-based approach via exposure scenarios*". This  
151 workshop was funded by CEFIC-LRI, CONCAWE, ERASM, American Cleaning Institute,  
152 ECETOC, European Crop Protection, Monsanto, Unilever, Crop Life America, and Waterborne  
153 Environmental, and supported by SETAC.

154  
155 **Disclaimer** – The opinions expressed in the present study are those of the authors and not  
156 their respective employers.

## 157 **REFERENCE LIST**

158 Backhaus, T. and M. Karlsson (2014). "Screening level mixture risk assessment of pharmaceuticals in STP  
159 effluents." *Water Research* **49**: 157-165.  
160 De Zwart, D., W. Adams, M. Galay Burgos, J. Hollender, M. Junghans, G. Merrington, D. Muir, T.  
161 Parkerton, K. A. C. De Schampelaere, G. Whale and R. Williams (In press 2017). "Aquatic exposures of  
162 chemical mixtures in urban environments: approaches to impact assessment".  
163 Diamond, J., R. Altenburger, A. Coors, S. D. Dyer, M. Focazio, K. Kidd, A. A. Koelmans, K. M. Y.  
164 Leung, M. Servos, J. Snape, J. Tolls and X. Zhang (In press (2017)). "Use of prospective and  
165 retrospective risk assessment methods that simplify chemical mixtures associated with treated domestic  
166 wastewater discharges".  
167 Hartung, T. and C. Rovida (2009). "Chemical regulators have overreached." *Nature* **460**.  
168 Hendriks, A. J. (2013). "How to deal with 100,000+ substances, sites, and species: Overarching principles  
169 in environmental risk assessment." *Environmental Science and Technology* **47**(8): 3546-3547.  
170 Holmes, C., C. Brown, M. Hamer, R. Jones, L. Maltby, L. Posthuma, E. Silberhorn, J. S. Teeter, M. S. J.  
171 Warne and L. Weltje (2017 (in press)). "Prospective aquatic risk assessment for chemical mixtures in  
172 agricultural landscapes." *Environ. Toxicol. Chem.*

- 173 Kortenkamp, A., T. Backhaus and M. Faust (2009). State of the art report on mixture toxicity. Directorate  
174 General for the Environment, EC.
- 175 Malaj, E., P. C. von der Ohe, M. Grote, R. Kühne, C. P. Mondy, P. Usseglio-Polatera, W. Brack and R. B.  
176 Schäfer (2014). "Organic chemicals jeopardize the health of freshwater ecosystems on the continental  
177 scale." Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences **111**(26): 9549–9554.
- 178 Munthe, J., E. Brorström-Lundén, M. Rahmberg, L. Posthuma, R. Altenburger, W. Brack, B. Bunke, G.  
179 Engelen, B. M. Gawlik, J. Van Gils, D. López Herráez, T. Rydberg, J. Slobodnik and A. Van Wezel  
180 (2017). "An expanded conceptual framework for solution-focused management of chemical pollution in  
181 European waters." Environmental Sciences Europe **29**(13): 1-16.
- 182 Posthuma, L., C. Brown, D. De Zwart, J. Diamond, S. D. Dyer, C. M. Holmes, S. Marshall and G. A.  
183 Burton (2017 (early online)). "Prospective mixture risk assessment and management prioritizations for  
184 river catchments with diverse land uses." Environmental Toxicology and Chemistry: n/a-n/a.
- 185 Posthuma, L., S. D. Dyer, D. de Zwart, K. Kapo, C. M. Holmes and G. A. Burton Jr (2016). "Eco-  
186 epidemiology of aquatic ecosystems: Separating chemicals from multiple stressors." Science of The Total  
187 Environment **573**: 1303-1319.
- 188 Sharley, D. J., S. M. Sharp, S. Marshall, K. Jeppe and V. J. Pettigrove (2017). "Linking urban land use to  
189 pollutants in constructed wetlands: Implications for stormwater and urban planning." Landscape and  
190 Urban Planning **162**(Supplement C): 80-91.
- 191 U.S. NAS (2009). Science and Decisions: Advancing Risk Assessment, The National Academies Press.
- 192 USEPA (2009). The national study of chemical residues in lake fish tissue. Washington, DC, U.S.  
193 Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Water.
- 194 Vallotton, N. and P. S. Price (2016). "Use of the Maximum Cumulative Ratio As an Approach for  
195 Prioritizing Aquatic Coexposure to Plant Protection Products: A Case Study of a Large Surface Water  
196 Monitoring Database." Environmental Science and Technology **50**(10): 5286-5293.
- 197 Van Wezel, A., T. Ter Laak, A. Fischer, P. Bauerlein, J. Munthe and L. Posthuma (2017). "Mitigation  
198 options for chemicals of emerging concern in surface waters; Operationalising solutions-focused risk  
199 assessment." Environmental Science: Water Research & Technology (**early online, May 2017**).

200