

Research Paper

Wastewater-based epidemiology for comprehensive communitywide exposome surveillance: A gradient of metals exposure

Lu Cai¹, Rochelle H. Holm^{2*}, Donald J. Biddle³, Charlie H. Zhang⁴, Daymond Talley⁵, Ted Smith^{2#}, and J. Christopher States^{6#*}

#Joint senior authors

*Joint corresponding authors

Rochelle H. Holm, Christina Lee Brown Envirome Institute, School of Medicine, University of Louisville, 302 E. Muhammad Ali Blvd., Louisville, KY 40202, United States; rochelle.holm@louisville.edu

J. Christopher States, Department of Pharmacology and Toxicology, Center for Integrative Environmental Health Sciences, University of Louisville, 505 S. Hancock St. Rm 304, Louisville, KY 40202; jcstates@louisville.edu

Addresses:

¹Department of Pediatrics, Pediatrics Research Institute, Center for Integrative Environmental Health Sciences, University of Louisville, Louisville, KY

²Christina Lee Brown Envirome Institute, School of Medicine, University of Louisville, 302 E. Muhammad Ali Blvd., Louisville, KY 40202, United States

³Department of Geographic and Environmental Sciences, Center for Geographic Information Sciences, University of Louisville, Louisville, KY

⁴Department of Geographic and Environmental Sciences, Center for Integrative Environmental Health Sciences, University of Louisville, Louisville, KY

⁵Morris Forman Water Quality Treatment Center, Louisville, KY, USA

⁶Department of Pharmacology and Toxicology, Center for Integrative Environmental Health Sciences, University of Louisville, Louisville, KY

Abstract

Community wastewater surveillance is an established means to measure health threats. Exposure to toxic metals as one of the key environmental contaminants has been attracting public health attention as exposure can be related to contamination across air, water, and soil as well as associated with individual factors. This research uses Jefferson County, Kentucky, as an urban exposome case study to analyze sub-county metal concentrations in wastewater as a possible indicator of community toxicant exposure risk, and to test the feasibility of using wastewater to identify potential community areas of elevated metals exposure. Variability in wastewater metal concentrations were observed across the county; 19 of the 26 sites had one or more metal results greater than one standard deviation above the mean and were designated areas of concern. Additionally, thirteen of the nineteen sites were of increased concern with levels greater than two standard deviations above the mean. This foundational research found variability in several instances between smaller nested upstream contributing neighborhood sewersheds when measured in the associated downstream treatment plant. Wastewater provides an opportunity to look at integrated toxicology to complement other toxicology data, looking at where people live and what toxicants need to be focused on to protect the health of people in that area.

Keywords: chemical biomarkers, exposome, health equity, heavy metals, wastewater-based epidemiology, toxicity

Acknowledgement of funding and grants

This research was supported by funds from the National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences grant (P30ES030328), University of Louisville Center for Integrative Environmental Health Sciences, the James Graham Brown Foundation, and the Owsley Brown II Family Foundation.

1. Introduction

Wastewater has been used to monitor toxicants including illicit drugs (Banta-Green et al., 2016; Choi et al., 2019; Croft et al., 2020), tobacco metabolites (Choi et al., 2019), and biological agents as weapons (Sinclair et al., 2008). Wastewater surveillance has also been used successfully to monitor disease health threats across geographic scales from buildings and neighborhoods to entire cities (Cohen et al., 2022; Holm et al., 2022; Mercier et al., 2022; National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine, 2023; Weidhaas et al., 2021). Exposure to toxic metals as one of the key environmental contaminants has been attracting public health attention as exposure can be related to contamination across air, water, and soil as well as associated with individual factors (Barcelos et al., 2020; Menke et al., 2016; Nadal et al., 2011). Metals voided in human excreta entering a wastewater system can have wide variation; intake of elements is highly dependent on the dietary intake and is equal to the output in human excreta (Rose et al., 2015). However, research into using sub-county wastewater sewersheds to detect smaller neighborhood/multi-neighborhood scales of human exposure to environmental toxicants with spatial variability as part of a comprehensive communitywide exposome surveillance has been limited.

Chronic exposure to environmental pollutants is recognized as even more important than individual genetic predisposition in causing common chronic diseases (Bhatnagar, 2006; Lamas et al., 2023; Vineis et al., 2020). However, clinically relevant toxicity is much less prevalent, and when occurring may present with non-specific symptoms, resulting in a large differential for clinicians to consider (El-Kersh et al., 2022; El-Kersh et al., 2023; Tan et al., 2023).

Metals are categorized based on their various features: transition metals versus non-transition metals based on their chemical features; heavy metals versus non-heavy metals from atomic weight; and essential versus non-essential metals from their biological effects.. Heavy metals are those with either a high atomic weight or density. Essential metals are those required for human health, like zinc and copper; while non-essential metals are not at all necessary for life and include metals such as cadmium, lead, and mercury among others. However, metal toxicity can be caused by both essential and non-essential metals. Essential metals can be toxic when accumulating to excessive levels systemically or in specific tissues or organs. The toxicity caused by nonessential metals can occur directly by the displacement of essential metals in normal biological processes or by binding to reactive groups on biological molecules or indirectly by reducing antioxidant expression and activity thereby dysregulating redox reactions (Briffa et al., 2020; Cai et al., 2005; Zoroddu et al., 2019). Therefore, monitoring metals in drinking water and wastewater is an important surveillance measure for regional public health concerns (Mehnaz et al., 2023; Nabulo et al., 2010; Oloruntoba et al., 2022; States et al., 1985). As well, the difference between drinking water and wastewater concentrations could be an indicator of community metal exposure, once ruling out industrial/commercial discharge, and when compared to national drinking water guidelines (EPA, 2009). That 90% of the American public support wastewater monitoring of toxicants as a standard complement of public health tools indicates the potential for the growth of this form of community health surveillance (LaJoie et al., 2023).

Sewers offer an alternative community health monitoring tool to complement clinical toxicity presentation. Approximately 95% of urban household in the U.S. uses a wastewater treatment

sanitation system that could be monitored at a community level (WHO/UNICEF, 2023). The potential for rural community wastewater monitoring via sewerred or non-sewerred sanitation system also remains (Holm et al., 2023a). This research aims to use Jefferson County, Kentucky, as an urban exposome case study to analyze the sub-county metal concentrations in the wastewater as a gradient of community toxicant exposure, and to test the feasibility of using wastewater to identify community areas of elevated metals exposure.

2. Methods

2.1 Study site

Our study took place in Louisville/Jefferson County, Kentucky (USA) (Fig. 1). Twenty-six sample locations were selected across the county to represent geographic and demographic sub-county variability, and purposive site selection for neighborhoods with known environmental exposures and risks (Fig. 1). Of the sample locations, 21 were upstream corresponding (sub-county nested area) sewersheds which eventually flowed to a water quality treatment center (WQTC). Some sample locations were a combined sanitary sewer and storm water system, which may cause dilution or contribute toxicants from the environment during high rainfall events. The five downstream WQTCs offer an aggregated 97% coverage of county households (Holm et al., 2022). We assume metals emitted by environmental polluting sources (e.g., Toxics Release Inventory (TRI) facilities) could reach wastewater via disposal of human excreta after human exposure to abovementioned metals, or from environmental polluting facilities in the form of industrial discharge to the sewer through permitted discharge limits or environmentally by wind, rain or surface runoff.




Fig. 1. Location of wastewater sampling sites studied, Jefferson County, Kentucky (USA).

2.2 Wastewater sample collection and handling

Influent wastewater samples were collected on 12/12/2022 (N = 27). A grab sample was collected into four 50 ml polypropylene tubes per site. Samples were transported on ice to a laboratory in the University of Louisville for analysis. One blank sample using PFAS free water was collected by pouring over the sampling equipment to test for quality assurance and metals contamination in the sample collection process. Additionally, one sample location was sampled at two different times on the same day to test for sample site variability.

2.3 Metal analysis

Wastewater samples were stored at -20°C until analysis. Samples were thawed, mixed, 1mL was transferred to a 15 mL metal-free tube (VWR #89049-172) and 3 mL 70% nitric acid (trace metal grade, Fisher Scientific Cat#A509-P500) was added to the sample tube and mixed again. Samples were digested in a 65°C shaker for 5 h until the solution became clear with no residues. After digestion, samples were cooled to room temperature, then diluted 10-fold with deionized water (Millipore, Milli Q Academic). The resulting assay volume was 10 mL. Metal content was measured using an Agilent 7800 ICP-MS (Inductively Coupled Plasma Quadrupole Mass Spectrometer, Agilent Technologies, Japan). Optimization was by performance check with 1 ppb tuning solution, and the assay program was auto tuned by a 10 ppb tuning solution (Agilent Cat#5188-6564). The auto sampler SPS 4 was used for sample introduction. The analysis was performed to test 26 metals. Platinum standard solution (Cat#: CGPTN1) and the calibration standard for the remaining 25 metals (Cat# IV-STOCK-50) were purchased from Inorganic Ventures (Christiansburg, VA). Serial metal standard dilutions were made with the same acid matrix as samples. The internal standard (Cat#5188-6525) was purchased from Agilent. The

assay program was run by Agilent MassHunter software with He mode, each sample was read in triplicate and averaged for a final mean value (Table S1).

2.4 Data analysis

The Louisville-Jefferson County Metropolitan Sewer District (MSD) provided GIS feature data representing the local sewer system in ESRI Geodatabase format (MSD, 2022). These data included features and attributes for sewer main lines, utility access hole points, and property service connection (PSC) points. Land parcel polygons published by the Jefferson County Property Valuation Administration (PVA, 2022) were also obtained as an ArcGIS Online feature service. A trace network was created from the sewer line features facilitating the use of the Upstream Trace function to select the lines associated with each sampling site. To determine the properties connected to the selected upstream lines, a related feature class of PSC point features was queried. This step allowed us to identify the properties that were directly linked to the sewer infrastructure lines contributing to the sampling location. A location query was then used to select the land parcels containing these service connections, establishing the spatial extent of the properties connected to the selected sewer mains. The selected land parcels, represented as polygons, were converted to point geometry and then aggregated to obtain a single bounding area, effectively delineating the sewershed area for each sampling location. Limited manual feature edits were made to the resulting sewershed area polygons to remove any artifacts from the automated processing. Estimates of selected population variables within each sewershed area were obtained from the U.S Census Bureau using the Enrich tool in ArcGIS Pro (Table 1). Vulnerable communities were determined by overlaying sampled sewersheds with ancillary data on household income and known environmental pollution sources (i.e., TRI facilities,

brownfields, superfund sites, and major roads) to explore the spatial associations of metal concentrations in wastewater and aforementioned environmental risk factors.

For each of the 26 studied metals, sample concentrations with values greater than 1 or 2 standard deviations above the mean were designated areas of concern and hot spots, respectively. Further analysis considered the five-wastewater treatment plant sewersheds and our selection of nested upstream smaller neighborhood/multi-neighborhood scales that flow into the treatment plants for the role of sewershed scale dynamics.

1 **Table 1. Sample site characteristics, Jefferson County, Kentucky (USA).**

Sampling Site	Household income (USD) 2020 Median HH Income (ACS 5-Yr)	Population	Race: White (%)	Race: Black (%)	Hispanic Population (%)	Area (km ²)	Sample site type	Does sewershed include combined sewer overflow?	Material and year
E1	0	0	0	0	0	0.01	Nested sewershed leading to E27	Yes	Clay 1916
E2	34,490	8,258	51	32	10	4	Nested sewershed leading to E27	Yes	Clay 1916
E3	36,812	3,459	57	24	13	1	Nested sewershed leading to E27	Yes	Concrete 1928
E4	37,059	1,610	61	22	10	1	Nested sewershed leading to E27	Yes	Concrete 1938
E5	40,168	3,587	56	21	12	3	Nested sewershed leading to E27	Yes	Concrete 1930
E7	31,050	10,949	13	82	2	5	Nested sewershed leading to E27	Yes	Concrete 1924
E8	27,752	9,073	57	36	2	5	Nested sewershed leading to E27	Yes	Concrete 1950
E9/E12	27,517	23,751	55	32	6	12	Nested sewershed leading to E27	Yes	Brick 1910
E10	65,791	145,346	70	14	7	112	Nested sewershed leading to E27	Yes	Concrete 1932
E11	56,672	8,838	80	9	3	3	Nested sewershed leading to E27	Yes	Brick 1912
E13	74,500	95,603	80	7	5	80	Nested sewershed leading to E27	Yes	Concrete 1977
E14	101,140	11,444	91	2	3	12	Nested sewershed leading to E27	Yes	PVC 1993
E15	86,478	40,824	73	11	6	67	WQTC	-	
E16	81,994	5,781	70	12	5	11	Nested sewershed leading to E15	No	Concrete 1969
E17	108,021	37,193	78	8	4	88	WQTC	-	
E18	55,433	78,206	52	27	13	55	Nested sewershed leading to E21	No	Concrete 1954
E19	76,796	60,885	75	12	7	80	WQTC	-	
E20	72,401	24,969	70	15	9	23	Nested sewershed leading to E21	No	Concrete 1995
E21	55,436	309,998	61	21	11	332	WQTC	-	
E22	61,923	45,148	62	19	12	37	Nested sewershed leading to E21	No	Concrete 1994
E23	45,794	37,972	47	41	7	28	Nested sewershed leading to E21	No	Concrete 1978
E24	53,857	23,135	71	17	6	21	Nested sewershed leading to E21	No	Concrete 1979
E25	61,081	309,184	71	16	5	242	Nested sewershed leading to E27	Yes	Concrete 1958

Sampling Site	Household income (USD) 2020 Median HH Income (ACS 5-Yr)	Population	Race: White (%)	Race: Black (%)	Hispanic Population (%)	Area (km ²)	Sample site type	Does sewershed include combined sewer overflow?	Material and year
E26	28,054	41,777	38	52	5	20	Nested sewershed leading to E27	Yes	Concrete 1912
E27	52,751	350,766	62	25	5	280	WQTC	-	
E28	20,000	74	11	80	4	3	Nested sewershed leading to E27	Yes	Concrete 1960

Note: E6 was a blank sample; E9/E12 was a duplicate


2

3. Results


3.1 Places of concern

Nineteen sites had one or more metal results greater than one standard deviation above the mean and were designated areas of concern (Fig. 2) across the county. All 26 studied metals had at least one site of concern (Fig. 3), in total there are 59 instances of exceedance amongst the nineteen sites. The 7 sites with no exceedances were a mix of neighborhood (5) and WQTC (2, sites E27 and E19) sites. Additionally, thirteen of the nineteen sites were of increased concern with levels two standard deviations above the mean and designated ‘hot spots.’ Again, all 26 studied metals had at least one hot spot site, in total there are 37 instances of exceedance amongst the 19 sites. WQTC concentrations tended to be closer to the countywide mean though the 13 sites with no exceedances above two standard deviations were a mix of neighborhood (9) and WQTC (4) sites.

Both neighborhood sites feeding into the treatment plants and WQTCs had levels of at least one metal 1 or 2 standard deviations above the county-wide mean. Of the five treatment plants, two had a single elevated metal of either Ag (site E17) or Sb (site E15) of only 1 standard deviation above the mean. However, one WQTC (site E21) had levels of Cr, Fe, Cu, Zn, Ag, Sb, Pb, and U greater than one standard deviation above the mean, and of Fe, Cu, Ag, and U were 2 standard deviations above the mean. In comparison, 9 neighborhood sites had a single elevated metal 1 standard deviation above the mean; but it was also common (8/26 sites) for a cluster of two to eight metals at a site. Where there was more than two metal exceedance, no two sites had the same list of metals.



25
26 **Fig. 2. Location of wastewater sampling treatment plants (left) and corresponding**
27 **sewershed areas (right) which had metal concentrations greater than 1 or 2 standard**
28 **deviations above the mean, Jefferson County, Kentucky (USA).**



29

30 **Fig. 3. Metal concentration variability for studied sewersheds (N=26), Jefferson County,**
31 **Kentucky (USA). Metal concentrations are plotted as log concentrations. The box regions**
32 **represent the first to third quartile, and the black dots represent the outliers. Data were**
33 **transformed by adding 0.001 to values of 0 or not detected for data distributions.**

34

35 3.2 Contributing sewershed areas

36 Previous work in the study area (Holm et al., 2022) showed for SARS-CoV-2 in wastewater that
37 concentrations across the sewershed area (comparing downstream aggregated treatment plant to
38 nested upstream contributing sewersheds), that the community sites were not different from the
39 respective treatment plants. Variability in metal concentrations is evident in several instances
40 between smaller nested upstream contributing neighborhood sewersheds when measured in the
41 associated downstream treatment plant. The 21 nested upstream contributing neighborhood
42 sewersheds level sites flowed to three WQTCs. Two treatment plants did not have nested sites
43 included in this study due to the small population served.

44

45 There are several nested sites interesting cases to detail in regard to variance in arsenic, barium,
46 cadmium, chromium, lead, selenium, and silver which have human health risks (Fig. 4). Lead
47 was observed to be elevated at two sample locations, a neighborhood site (site E23; 8.8 ng/mL)
48 and also the downstream WQTC to which it flows (site E21; 5.48 ng/mL); within this sewershed
49 area the service area user discharge limits allow three times higher than for the other countywide
50 zones. For the remaining sample locations, lead was below 4.2 ng/mL. These results uniquely
51 indicate a high likelihood that the nearly 38,000 residents of sewershed site E23 have lead
52 exposure which is not seen in other areas of the treatment plant zone, or wider county. A similar
53 trend is also observed for Sb at neighborhood Site E16 (1.17 ng/mL) which flows to Site E15
54 (0.78 ng/mL), where the neighborhood site concentration is higher than the treatment plant.

55

56 At site 27, which is the largest WQTC in the county and the state, there are no elevated metals.
57 Site 27 has a population of 350,000. But, of the 15 sites that flow downstream to Site E27, 13
58 sites have exceedances greater than 1 or 2 standard deviations above which are mixed across the
59 countywide and eventually reach the WQTC. Five sites that flow to this treatment plant (Site 27)
60 have elevated levels of a cluster of 4 or more metals; each of these sites has old pipes, in some
61 cases dating back to 1910-1920 with the newest dating back to 1960. That the sewer network for
62 Site 27 is combined sewer whereby stormwater and sewer waste mix in the same pipes may be
63 the cause of additional mixing. The historical infrastructure brings to attention the possibility of
64 pipe leaks and leaching to groundwater as a source of metals contamination and associated
65 rationale for the discrepancy of the results. Site E1 has no households associated with it but is
66 showing elevated metals; a review of the sewersheds revealed industrial land uses including

67 chemical manufacturing and automotive repair but these concentrations of Al (8,580 ng/mL), Ni
68 (87.39 ng/mL), Cu (72.08 ng/mL), Mo (356.17 ng/mL), and Th (0.13 ng/mL) are diluted when
69 they reach the treatment plant.

70

71 The exception is observed at treatment plant site E21 which has 8 metals at levels greater than 1
72 standard deviations above the mean, but only 3 of the neighborhood sites studied are elevated for
73 only one metal each. Because fully encompassing sewersheds were not included, this may just
74 mean we missed coverage and the metals source area was not sampled. But these results indicate
75 a high likelihood that the nearly 310,000 residents of sewershed site E21 have a cluster of metals
76 exposure somewhere within the treatment plant zone.

77


78 Of the community sites (21 total), two of the six separate sewer system zone sites had elevated
79 metals (2/6). As well, there were fewer exceedances where the newest pipes were present. Of the
80 three sites with pipes from the 1990s there were no exceedances.

81

82 For the seven locations with no exceedances, which may indicate no or comparatively lower
83 metals exposure, they are spread geographically throughout the county and across a range of
84 population size (from 8,800 to 350,000) and sewershed size (from 280 km² to 3 km²).

85 Household income where there are exceedances ranges from the lowest (\$20,000) to the highest
86 (\$108,000) in our study area, of the two sites with median household income over \$100,000,
87 only Site E17 has elevated levels of Ag. Of the two neighborhood sites with the greatest numbers
88 of metal exceedances (7 metals at Site E26 with median household income of \$28,054 and 8

89 metals at site E28 with median household income of \$20,000), household income was low.
90 These results disprove that environmental exposure for metals is solely an issue in low-income
91 areas of the county and rather requires countywide surveillance.



92


93 **Fig. 4. Comparison of metals total concentrations for contributing sites flowing from the**
94 **upstream locations for arsenic, barium, cadmium, chromium, lead, selenium, and silver**
95 **versus the water quality treatment center concentration. Derek R. Guthrie Water Quality**
96 **Treatment Center (Site E21; N = 5 contributing sewersheds) (A) and Morris Forman**
97 **Water Quality Treatment Center (Site E27; N = 16 contributing sewersheds) (B).**

98 3.3 Proximity to other environmental sources of pollution

99 Environmental polluting sources including TRI facilities, brownfield sites, superfund sites, and
100 metal recycling facilities in proximity to our sampling sites could have contributed to the
101 observed metal concentrations (Fig. 5). Most polluting facilities are concentrated in the
102 northwest portion of Jefferson County, which is represented by more low-income households
103 and African American residents. Using arsenic as an example (Fig. 6), countywide
104 concentrations ranged up to 1.76 ng/mL, but the highest levels of metal concentrations are in the
105 northwestern part of the county and the east and southeastern zones were as low as 0.32-0.69
106 ng/mL.


107

108 Inclusion or exclusion of environmental polluting sources was not always the only factor, within
109 the sewershed area for Site E17 there are no sources but the site remains with elevated Ag. As
110 well, within the northwest portion of Jefferson County where the majority of these sources are
111 located, a cluster of 6 neighborhood level sites (E9/E12, E13, E8, E7, E11 and E26) we sampled
112 are within the urban core of the county, but only 5 of these sites have elevated metals, and some
113 sites have just one or two elevated metals.



114

115 **Fig. 5. Location of environmental polluting sources including brownfield sites, metal**
116 **recyclers, superfund sites and toxics release inventory (TRI) facilities, Jefferson**
117 **County, Kentucky (USA).**



118

119

120 **Fig. 6. Spatial variations of arsenic concentrations across sampling sites and environmental**
121 **polluting sources, Jefferson County, Kentucky (USA).**

122 3.4 Comparison to Maximum Contaminant Level and service area wastewater discharge permits
123 In the absence of metal concentrations in wastewater health standards, our results were
124 additionally compared to the limits established by the Safe Drinking Water Act clean drinking
125 water act as an indicator of metal exposure per the enforceable Maximum Contaminant Level
126 (MCL; Environmental Protection Agency, 2009). These were available for 11 of the 26 studied
127 metals. For each site, results were below the MCL (Table 2). For most of the metals (antimony,
128 arsenic, barium, cadmium, chromium, copper, selenium, thallium, and uranium), the maximum
129 metals concentrations in our study were less than 20% of the MCL. However, the maximum
130 concentration of two metals (beryllium and lead) in our study were each about half of the MCL.
131 For beryllium there were 2 samples (2/27) close to half of the MCL; for lead there was only one
132 sample (1/27) close to half of the MCL. EPA (2009) also lists secondary standards for four of the
133 metals assayed (aluminum, iron, manganese, silver, and zinc). Of these, Aluminum, Iron and
134 Manganese were found above the secondary standard for drinking water.

135
136 The area user wastewater discharge permit standards (MSD, 2022) are higher concentrations
137 than the MCL standards. The permit limits vary across the county based on the wastewater
138 treatment plant sewershed zone. Industrial input varies from 1 to 30% across the WQTCs. For
139 each studied site, results were below the service area user discharge permit standards (MSD,
140 2022; Table 2). The maximum metals concentrations in our study were less than 5% of permit
141 standards. Even removing those sites with higher industrial input (~30%; Site 15 and E15)
142 results in sites that have elevated levels. However, the metals in the samples likely have suffered
143 dilution and do not necessarily reflect the concentrations in any industrial discharge.

144 **Table 1. Concentration of studied metals, maximum concentration, Maximum Contaminant Level and five service area user**
 145 **discharge permit standards.**

Metal	Maximum concentration (N = 27) (ng/mL)	MCL ¹ standards (ng/mL)	Site E15 ² standards (ng/mL)	Site E17 ² standards (ng/mL)	Site E19 ² standards (ng/mL)	Site E21 ² standards (ng/mL)	Site E27 ² standards (ng/mL)
Aluminum	20354.55	-	-	-	-	-	-
Antimony	1.17	6	-	-	-	-	-
Arsenic	1.76	10	30	340	1700	570	170
Barium	399.41	2000	-	-	-	-	-
Beryllium	2.16	4	-	-	-	-	-
Cadmium	0.48	5	3	40	550	47	77
Calcium	3410126.39	-	-	-	-	-	-
Chromium	6.88	100	4470	5000	5000	5000	5000
Cobalt	7.49	-	-	-	-	-	-
Copper	72.08	1300	430	1400	1400	7900	2410
Iron	1295.69	-	-	-	-	-	-
Lead	8.80	15	60	830	830	2400	310
Magnesium	71162.80	-	-	-	-	-	-
Manganese	1038.72	-	-	-	-	-	-
Molybdenum	356.17	-	-	-	-	-	-
Nickel	219.09	-	310	2060	1500	6900	1500
Platinum	0.84	-	-	-	-	-	-
Potassium	363040.57	-	-	-	-	-	-
Selenium	6.62	50	-	-	-	-	-
Silver	0.57	-	150	3340	400	2500	950
Sodium	1124646.59	-	-	-	-	-	-
Thallium	0.36	2	-	-	-	-	-
Thorium	0.20	-	-	-	-	-	-
Uranium	1.13	30	-	-	-	-	-
Vanadium	7.68	-	-	-	-	-	-
Zinc	397.39	-	1140	8200	8200	5300	8360

146 ¹Maximum Contaminant Level (MCL) from Environmental Protection Agency (2009)

147 ²Treatment plant sewershed zone permit limit from Louisville/Jefferson County Metropolitan Sewer District (MSD) (2022)

148 - No standard available

149 3.5 Quality control samples

150 The Environmental Protection Agency (2023a) wastewater sampling procedure recommends
151 equipment rinse blank samples especially in cases of low-level contamination. One equipment
152 rinse blank was collected during field sample collection. Despite that PFAS free water was used,
153 quantified metals were detected for 22 of 26 metals (Table S2).

154

155 One site (E9/E12) was sampled at two different times on the same day to test for site variability,
156 approximately one hour apart with two separate field sample collection technicians. The field
157 duplicate sample pair both showed elevated metals, but with different cluster compositions
158 (Table S3). One sample was elevated in Be, Na, Al, K, and Pt, while the second sample was
159 elevated in Be, Na, Al, K, Fe, and As, although all seven metals were detected in both samples.
160 Although a single quality control case, the quantitative variability indicates a requirement for
161 further research attention into temporal dynamics of metals in wastewater. The field duplicate
162 sample site is also uniquely near a neighborhood heavily contaminated with arsenic which was
163 used for manufacture of pesticides and for treating lumber. Much (but not all) of the
164 neighborhood had its topsoil removed and replaced by the EPA. Whether the variability in this
165 site is from temporal differences or a result of the historical contamination needs further
166 investigation.

167 **4. Discussion**

168 4.1 Community vulnerability

169 Wastewater can be part of the health equity discussion (Holm et al., 2023b), especially where
170 little or no toxicity data exist in places and times. Wastewater may offer a new environmental
171 matrix to learn how vulnerable residents are exposed to environmental toxicants and guide
172 remediation and prioritize federal and state regulatory requirements, and as needed for
173 emergency surveillance. Certain metals are associated with an increased risk of cancer and other
174 chronic diseases. However, the relationship between metals and cancer is complex, and not all
175 metals are considered carcinogenic. Examples of metals that may increase cancer risk include
176 arsenic, cadmium, nickel, beryllium and chromium (IARC Working Group on the Evaluation of
177 Carcinogenic Risks to Humans, 2012). Because blood and/or urine levels of many of these
178 metals in our study are uncommon, with the exception of childhood blood lead levels,
179 wastewater provides an alternative opportunity to test for community level metals concentration
180 at one time for an aggregate picture of exposome. The gradients of metals observed in this study
181 show that wastewater may provide a unique approach to identifying risk of exposure within a
182 community to guide intervention.

183

184 People are exposed to non-essential and essential metals via ingestion, inhalation, and dermal
185 contact. From the initial site of exposure, heavy metals affect nearby tissues and enter the
186 bloodstream to accumulate in sites far from the initial area of exposure. Ingestion though is a
187 major route of exposure. Industrial waste and contamination pollute local air, water and soil
188 affecting heavy metal levels in crops and agricultural animals. Some food crops bioaccumulate
189 specific metals, e.g., grains can bioaccumulate cadmium, and rice can bioaccumulate arsenic.

190 Thus, when humans ingest food and water affected by this pollution, they ingest heavy metals
191 which can lead to toxicity. Wastewater sampling is beneficial in terms of broad low-cost
192 surveillance of these elements.

193

194 The impact of metal toxicity on human health can vary depending on the specific metal involved,
195 the duration and intensity of exposure, and individual factors such as age, overall health, and
196 genetic predispositions, with certain general effects: [1] Metals can target and accumulate in
197 specific organs, leading to damage and dysfunction. For example, lead primarily affects the
198 central nervous system and can impair brain development in children, leading to cognitive and
199 behavioral problems. Lead also targets heme synthesis and can induce anemia. Mercury can
200 damage the nervous system and kidneys, while cadmium primarily targets the kidneys and can
201 cause kidney disease; [2] Metals impact the developing fetus and reproductive health. Exposure
202 to certain metals during pregnancy can result in developmental abnormalities, birth defects, and
203 impaired growth. Some metals, like lead and mercury, can also affect fertility and disrupt the
204 normal functioning of the reproductive system; [3] Many metals have neurotoxic effects and can
205 cause neurological disorders. Symptoms may include cognitive impairment, memory loss,
206 tremors, coordination problems, and sensory disturbances. For instance, mercury poisoning can
207 lead to Minamata disease, a neurological condition characterized by vision and hearing loss,
208 muscle weakness, and in severe cases, coma and death; [4] Some metals, such as lead, arsenic
209 and cadmium, can contribute to cardiovascular diseases. They can promote the development of
210 atherosclerosis (hardening of the arteries), increase blood pressure, disrupt heart rhythm, and
211 lead to heart attacks and strokes; [5] Ingesting or inhaling certain metals can irritate the
212 gastrointestinal tract and cause symptoms like abdominal pain, nausea, vomiting, and diarrhea.

213 Prolonged exposure may lead to chronic gastrointestinal problems. Metals like arsenic, cadmium,
214 and mercury can accumulate in the liver and kidneys, impairing their normal function. This can
215 result in liver and kidney damage, leading to a range of symptoms such as fatigue, jaundice, fluid
216 retention, and compromised detoxification; [6] Metal toxicity can interfere with the immune
217 system's ability to defend against infections and diseases resulting in compromised immune
218 responses and making individuals more susceptible to illnesses (Tokar et al., 2013).

219

220 4.2 Public health policy implications

221 Due to both exposure situations and dietary intake, we would expect some variation in metals
222 concentrations across the studied areas. The mean values for all the metals analyzed were up to
223 46 times the levels in tap water samples. The highest wastewater values observed were up to
224 381.3 times the levels in the tap water samples. Thus, the increases observed in the wastewater
225 must have come from either the environment sources, or excretion from human environmental
226 exposure. With national reporting systems and networks of laboratories in place for infectious
227 disease surveillance, there is an opportunity to extend this framework to other population health
228 risks from the environment. While previous research has shown promise for the surveillance of
229 toxicants including illicit drugs (Banta-Green et al., 2016; Choi et al., 2019; Croft et al., 2020),
230 tobacco metabolites (Choi et al., 2019), and biological agents as weapons (Sinclair et al., 2008),
231 the examination of exposure to pollutants may hold even greater promise when combined with
232 other exposome emphases. Additionally, given the great interest in the social and other
233 environmental determinants of health and matters of environmental justice, better understanding
234 of place-based exposure risk is timely. This work also has proof of concept to support
235 prioritizing resources and expertise for using wastewater monitoring around the EPA's (2023b)

236 National Enforcement and Compliance Initiatives for 2024-2027 which include air toxics and
237 chemical accidents while supporting environmental justice considerations to protect public
238 health. There is also a role for the American Society for Testing and Materials standards to
239 assess sampling wastewater for metals as part of large-scale natural disasters or chemical post-
240 incident emergency response or impact monitoring.

241

242 4.3 Future research

243 There are several areas that the field of comprehensive communitywide exposome surveillance
244 using wastewater should consider. Although the comparability of 24-hour composite and grab
245 samples for exposome investigations using wastewater media has been studied for disease
246 (Kmush et al., 2022), it has not been studied for metals in wastewater which may be more stable.
247 Finer sampling and sampling both over different times of day and different days will be needed
248 to gain a more complete picture and to localize the source areas for the metals. Our studied sites
249 were in both combined and non-combined sewer systems. Sewage in combined sewer systems
250 includes surface runoff in addition to sanitary system. Thus, metals present in these samples may
251 represent runoff from rain on streets and soil in addition to effluent from households and
252 businesses. It will be important to perform more extensive sampling upstream in the sewersheds
253 to determine whether the metals are coming from a specific area. But the contribution of runoff
254 reflects potential environmental exposures in the source areas which can be helpful to capture.
255 Also, we found arsenic in a sample from a site close to an old industrial site that used arsenic for
256 synthesizing pesticides and treating lumber. Soil from the adjoining household yards surrounding
257 this area was removed (although not from all the yards), but the site itself was not remediated.
258 Thus, the arsenic concentration observed suggests wastewater monitoring can be additionally

259 used to detect residual environmental contamination in areas that were heavily contaminated
260 with metals and may not have been adequately remediated. It would also help to look at human
261 toxicology data (from research cohorts) to help interpret wastewater levels. Lastly, case studies
262 are needed in communities if exposome inclusion of metals in wastewater is useful for estimation
263 of waste following large-scale natural disasters or chemical incidents to support emergency
264 response.

265

266 **5. Limitations**

267 The wastewater samples were collected as grab samples, and although a good representation
268 across the county at a specific point in time, composite samples would likely provide a more
269 representative sample. The variability in our field duplicate and equipment rinse blank show the
270 need for quality control samples to evaluate the sampling and handling activities of the
271 investigation; despite not being required for a research investigation, quality control samples
272 following the Environmental Protection Agency (2023b) wastewater sampling procedure, as
273 applicable, is recommended for future work. We cannot make a definitive statement about
274 human exposure without other data sources such as biospecimens from clinical research
275 participants or case data.

276 **6. Conclusion**

277 The findings of this foundational research contribute to the existing literature on environmental
278 injustice and shed light on potential linkages between metal exposures measured in wastewater
279 and their concomitant adverse health outcomes after accounting for other social and
280 environmental confounding factors. Wastewater can indirectly capture soil, water, air quality,
281 and human exposure impact for an area with a single sample, widening exposome at a
282 community level. Variability is evident in several instances between smaller nested upstream
283 contributing neighborhood sewersheds when measured in the associated downstream treatment
284 plant; there is a benefit to sampling both scales across a large county. Wastewater provides an
285 opportunity to look at integrated toxicology to complement other toxicology data, looking at
286 where people live and what toxicants need to be focused on to protect the health of people in that
287 area.

288 **Author contributions**

289 Conceptualization: RHH, TS, JCS; Methodology: LC, RHH, DJB, CHZ, DT, TS, JCS; Formal
290 analysis: LC, RHH, DJB, CHZ, TS, JCS; Writing-original draft preparation: LC, RHH, DJB,
291 CHZ, TS, JCS; Writing-review and editing: LC, RHH, DJB, CHZ, DT, TS, JCS; Supervision:
292 TS, JCS; All the authors have read and agreed to the published version of this manuscript.

293

294 **Acknowledgements**

295 We thank the Louisville/Jefferson County Metropolitan Sewer District for their valuable
296 collaboration with the wastewater sample collection. The authors are grateful to Dr. Jason Xu
297 from the Pediatric Research Institute for his excellent assistance for the metal measurements with
298 ICP-MS, and to Mr. J. David Hoetker from the Christina Lee Brown Envirome Institute for his
299 excellent assistance for the wastewater sample delivering and preparation of these samples for
300 the assay.

301

302 **Data Availability Statement**

303 Data generated in this study can be found in the article and its supplementary files.

304

305 **Declaration of competing interest**

306 The authors declare that other than the research funding acknowledged, they have no known
307 competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the
308 work reported in this paper.

309 **References**

- 310 Banta-Green, C.J., Brewer, A.J., Ort, C., Helsel, D.R., Williams, J.R., Field, J.A., 2016. Using
311 wastewater-based epidemiology to estimate drug consumption—Statistical analyses and
312 data presentation. *Sci. Total Environ.* 568, 856–863.
313 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2016.06.052>
- 314 Barcelos, D.A., Pontes, F.V., da Silva, F.A., Castro, D.C., Dos Anjos, N.O., Castilhos, Z.C.,
315 2020. Gold mining tailing: Environmental availability of metals and human health risk
316 assessment. *J. Hazard. Mater.* 397, 122721.
317 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhazmat.2020.122721>
- 318 Bhatnagar, A., 2006. Environmental cardiology: studying mechanistic links between pollution
319 and heart disease. *Circ. Res.* 99(7), 692–705.
320 <https://doi.org/10.1161/01.RES.0000243586.99701.cf>
- 321 Briffa, J., Sinagra, E., Blundell, R., 2020. Heavy metal pollution in the environment and their
322 toxicological effects on humans. *Heliyon* 6(9).
323 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2020.e04691>
- 324 Cai, L., Li, X.K., Song, Y., Cherian, M.G., 2005. Essentiality, toxicology and chelation therapy
325 of zinc and copper. *Curr. Med. Chem.* 12(23), 2753–2763.
326 <https://doi.org/10.2174/092986705774462950>
- 327 Choi, P.M., Tschärke, B., Samanipour, S., Hall, W.D., Gartner, C.E., Mueller, J.F., et al., 2019.
328 Social, demographic, and economic correlates of food and chemical consumption
329 measured by wastewater-based epidemiology. *P. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* 116(43), 21864–
330 21873. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1910242116>

- 331 Cohen, A., Maile-Moskowitz, A., Grubb, C., Gonzalez, R.A., Ceci, A., Darling, A., et al., 2022.
332 Subsewershed SARS-CoV-2 wastewater surveillance and COVID-19 epidemiology using
333 building-specific occupancy and case data. *ACS ES&T Water* 2(11), 2047–2059.
334 <https://doi.org/10.1021/acsestwater.2c00059>
- 335 Croft, T.L., Huffines, R.A., Pathak, M., Subedi, B., 2020. Prevalence of illicit and prescribed
336 neuropsychiatric drugs in three communities in Kentucky using wastewater-based
337 epidemiology and Monte Carlo simulation for the estimation of associated uncertainties. *J*
338 *Hazard. Mater.* 384, 121306. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhazmat.2019.121306>
- 339 El-Kersh, K., Hopkins, C.D., Wu, X., Rai, S.N., Cai, L., Huang, J., 2022. Plasma level of
340 antimony correlates with pulmonary arterial hypertension severity. *Current Research in*
341 *Toxicology* 3, 100080. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.crttox.2022.100080>
- 342 El-Kersh, K., Hopkins, C.D., Wu, X., Rai, S.N., Cave, M.C., Smith, M.R., et al., 2023.
343 Metallomics in pulmonary arterial hypertension patients. *Pulm. Circ.* 13(1), e12202.
344 <https://doi.org/10.1002/pul2.12202>
- 345 Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). 2009. National Primary Drinking Water Regulation.
346 https://www.epa.gov/sites/default/files/2016-06/documents/npwdr_complete_table.pdf
347 (accessed 14 September 2023).
- 348 Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). 2023a. Wastewater sampling.
349 [https://www.epa.gov/sites/default/files/2017-](https://www.epa.gov/sites/default/files/2017-07/documents/wastewater_sampling306_af.r4.pdf)
350 [07/documents/wastewater_sampling306_af.r4.pdf](https://www.epa.gov/sites/default/files/2017-07/documents/wastewater_sampling306_af.r4.pdf) (accessed 14 September 2023).

- 351 Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). 2023b. National Enforcement and Compliance
352 Initiatives. [https://www.epa.gov/enforcement/national-enforcement-and-compliance-](https://www.epa.gov/enforcement/national-enforcement-and-compliance-initiatives)
353 [initiatives](https://www.epa.gov/enforcement/national-enforcement-and-compliance-initiatives) (accessed 14 September 2023).
- 354 Holm, R.H., Mukherjee, A., Rai, J.P., Yeager, R.A., Talley, D., Rai, S.N., et al., 2022. SARS-
355 CoV-2 RNA abundance in wastewater as a function of distinct urban sewershed size.
356 Environmental Science: Water Research & Technology 8(4), 807–819.
357 <https://doi.org/10.1039/d1ew00672j>
- 358 Holm, R.H., Pocock, G., Severson, M.A., Huber, V.C., Smith, T., McFadden, L.M., 2023a.
359 Using wastewater to overcome health disparities among rural residents. Geoforum 144,
360 103816. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoforum.2023.103816>
- 361 Holm, R.H., Osborne Jelks, N.T., Schneider, R., Smith, T., 2023b. Beyond COVID-19:
362 designing inclusive public health surveillance by including wastewater monitoring.
363 Health Equity, 7(1), 377–379. <https://doi.org/10.1089/heq.2022.0055>
- 364 IARC Working Group on the Evaluation of Carcinogenic Risks to Humans. Arsenic, metals,
365 fibres, and dusts. IARC monographs on the evaluation of carcinogenic risks to humans.
366 2012;100(Pt C):11.
- 367 Kmush, B.L., Monk, D., Green, H., Sachs, D.A., Zeng, T., Larsen, D.A., 2022. Comparability of
368 24-hour composite and grab samples for detection of SARS-2-CoV RNA in wastewater.
369 FEMS microbes 3, xtac017. <https://doi.org/10.1093/femsmc/xtac017>
- 370 LaJoie, A.S., Holm, R.H., Anderson, L., Ness, H., Smith, T.R., 2023. Tracking national opinion
371 about wastewater monitoring as a standard complement of public health tools in the
372 United States. medRxiv, pp.2023-06.

- 373 Lamas, G.A., Bhatnagar, A., Jones, M.R., Mann, K.K., Nasir, K., et al., 2023. Contaminant
374 Metals as Cardiovascular Risk Factors: A Scientific Statement From the American Heart
375 Association. *Journal of the American Heart Association*, p.e029852.
- 376 Louisville/Jefferson County Metropolitan Sewer District (MSD). 2022. Wastewater/ Stormwater
377 Discharge Regulations. Louisville, KY.
- 378 [dataset] Louisville-Jefferson County Metropolitan Sewer District (MSD), Sewer System
379 Geodatabase, Louisville-Jefferson County Information Consortium (LOJIC) Databases,
380 2022.
- 381 [dataset] Jefferson County Property Valuation Administration (PVA), Jefferson County KY
382 Parcels, Louisville-Jefferson County Information Consortium (LOJIC) Databases, 2022.
383 <https://data.lojic.org/datasets/LOJIC::jefferson-county-ky-parcels-1/about>
- 384 Mehnaz, M., Jolly, Y.N., Alam, A.R., Kabir, J., Akter, S., Mamun, K.M., et al., 2023. Prediction
385 of hazardous effect of heavy metals of point-source wastewater on fish (*Anabas cobojius*)
386 and human health. *Biol. Trace Elem. Res.* 201(6), 3031–3049.
387 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12011-022-03378-1>
- 388 Menke, A., Guallar, E., Cowie, C.C., 2016. Metals in urine and diabetes in US adults. *Diabetes*
389 65(1), 164–171. <https://doi.org/10.2337/db15-0316>
- 390 Mercier, E., D’Aoust, P.M., Thakali, O., Hegazy, N., Jia, J.J., Zhang, Z., et al., 2022. Municipal
391 and neighbourhood level wastewater surveillance and subtyping of an influenza virus
392 outbreak. *SCI REP-UK* 12(1), 15777. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-022-20076-z>

- 393 Nabulo, G., Young, S.D., Black, C.R., 2010. Assessing risk to human health from tropical leafy
394 vegetables grown on contaminated urban soils. *Sci. Total Environ.* 408(22), 5338–5351.
395 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2010.06.034>
- 396 Nadal, M., Schuhmacher, M., Domingo, J.L., 2011. Long-term environmental monitoring of
397 persistent organic pollutants and metals in a chemical/petrochemical area: human health
398 risks. *Environ. Pollut.* 159(7), 1769–1777. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envpol.2011.04.007>
- 399 National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine, 2023. *Wastewater-based Disease*
400 *Surveillance for Public Health Action*. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press.
401 <https://doi.org/10.17226/26767>
- 402 Oloruntoba, E.O., Wada, O.Z., Adejumo, M., 2022. Heavy metal analysis of drinking water
403 supply, wastewater management, and human health risk assessment across secondary
404 schools in Badagry coastal community, Lagos State, Nigeria. *Int. J. Environ. Heal. R.*
405 32(9), 1897–1914. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09603123.2021.1926438>
- 406 Rose, C., Parker, A., Jefferson, B., Cartmell, E., 2015. The characterization of feces and urine: a
407 review of the literature to inform advanced treatment technology. *Crit. Rev. Env. Sci.*
408 *Tec.* 45(17), 1827–1879. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10643389.2014.1000761>
- 409 Sinclair, R., Boone, S.A., Greenberg, D., Keim, P., Gerba, C.P., 2008. Persistence of category A
410 select agents in the environment. *Appl. Environ. Microb.* 74(3), 555–563.
411 <https://doi.org/10.1128/AEM.02167-07>
- 412 States, S.J., Conley, L.F., Ceraso, M., Stephenson, T.E., Wolford, R.S., Wadowsky, R.M., et al.,
413 1985. Effects of metals on *Legionella pneumophila* growth in drinking water plumbing

- 414 systems. *Appl. Environ. Microb.* 50(5), 1149–1154.
- 415 <https://doi.org/10.1128/aem.50.5.1149-1154.1985>
- 416 Tan, Y., El-Kersh, K., Watson, S.E., Wintergerst, K.A., Huang, J., Cai, L., 2023. Cardiovascular
417 effects of environmental metal antimony: redox dyshomeostasis as the key pathogenic
418 driver. *Antioxid. Redox. Sign.* 38(10-12), 803–823. <https://doi.org/10.1089/ars.2022.0185>
- 419 Tokar, E.J., Boyd, W., Freedman, J.H., Waalkes, M.P., 2013. Toxic Effects of Metals, Chapter
420 23; In: Klaassen, C. D. (Ed): Casarett and Doull's Toxicology: The Basic Science of
421 Poisons, 8th Edition, McGraw-Hill Medical, New York.
- 422 Vineis, P., Robinson, O., Chadeau-Hyam, M., Dehghan, A., Mudway, I., Dagnino, S., 2020.
423 What is new in the exposome? *Environ. Int.* 143, 105887.
424 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envint.2020.105887>
- 425 Weidhaas, J., Aanderud, Z.T., Roper, D.K., VanDerslice, J., Gaddis, E.B., Ostermiller, J., et al.,
426 2021. Correlation of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in wastewater with COVID-19 disease burden
427 in sewersheds. *Sci. Total Environ.* 775, 145790.
428 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2021.145790>
- 429 World Health Organization (WHO) and the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF). Progress
430 on household drinking water, sanitation and hygiene 2000-2022. 2023.
431 <https://data.unicef.org/resources/jmp-report-2023/> (accessed 14 September 2023).
- 432 Zoroddu, M.A., Aaseth, J., Crisponi, G., Medici, S., Peana, M., Nurchi, V.M., 2019. The
433 essential metals for humans: a brief overview. *J Inorg. Biochem.* 195, 120–129.
434 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jinorgbio.2019.03.013>
- 435

436 Supplementary Material

437 **Wastewater-based epidemiology for comprehensive communitywide exposome**

438 **surveillance: A gradient of metals exposure**

439 Lu Cai¹, Rochelle H. Holm^{2*}, Donald J. Biddle³, Charlie H. Zhang⁴, Daymond Talley⁵, Ted
440 Smith^{2#}, J. Christopher States^{6#*}

441

442 #Joint senior authors

443 *Joint corresponding authors

444 Rochelle H. Holm, Christina Lee Brown Envirome Institute, School of Medicine, University of
445 Louisville, 302 E. Muhammad Ali Blvd., Louisville, KY 40202, United States;
446 rochelle.holm@louisville.edu

447 J. Christopher States, Department of Pharmacology and Toxicology, Center for Integrative
448 Environmental Health Sciences, University of Louisville, 505 S. Hancock St. Rm 304,
449 Louisville, KY 40202; jcstates@louisville.edu

450

451 Addresses:

452 ¹Department of Pediatrics, Pediatrics Research Institute, Center for Integrative Environmental
453 Health Sciences, University of Louisville, Louisville, KY

454 ²Christina Lee Brown Envirome Institute, School of Medicine, University of Louisville, 302 E.
455 Muhammad Ali Blvd., Louisville, KY 40202, United States

456 ³Department of Geographic and Environmental Sciences, Center for Geographic Information
457 Sciences, University of Louisville, Louisville, KY

458 ⁴Department of Geographic and Environmental Sciences, Center for Integrative Environmental
459 Health Sciences, University of Louisville, Louisville, KY

460 ⁵Morris Forman Water Quality Treatment Center, Louisville, KY, USA

461 ⁶Department of Pharmacology and Toxicology, Center for Integrative Environmental Health
462 Sciences, University of Louisville, Louisville, KY

463 **Table of Contents**

464 Table S1. Metals studied by Inductively Coupled Plasma Quadrupole Mass Spectrometer,
465 detection limit, and standard curve levels. 43
466 Table S2. Metal concentrations of equipment rinse blank field sample..... 44
467 Table S3. Mean metal concentrations by site. 45
468
469

470 **Table S1. Metals studied by Inductively Coupled Plasma Quadrupole Mass Spectrometer,**
471 **detection limit, and standard curve levels.**

Metal	Detection limit (ng/mL)	Standard curve level
Ag	0.002	0, 1, 2, 5, 10, 50 ng
Al	0.357	0, 1, 2, 5, 10, 50 ng
As	0.007	0, 1, 2, 5, 10, 50 ng
Ba	0.008	0, 1, 2, 5, 10, 50 ng
Be	0	0, 1, 2, 5, 10, 50 ng
Ca	21.82	0, 100, 200, 500, 1000, 5000
Cd	0	0, 1, 2, 5, 10, 50 ng
Co	0.003	0, 1, 2, 5, 10, 50 ng
Cr	0.038	0, 1, 2, 5, 10, 50 ng
Cu	0.009	0, 1, 2, 5, 10, 50 ng
Fe	0.1	0, 100, 200, 500, 1000, 5000
K	8.31	0, 100, 200, 500, 1000, 5000
Mg	0.064	0, 100, 200, 500, 1000, 5000
Mn	0.043	0, 1, 2, 5, 10, 50 ng
Mo	0.005	0, 1, 2, 5, 10, 50 ng
Na	4.23	0, 100, 200, 500, 1000, 5000
Ni	0.031	0, 1, 2, 5, 10, 50 ng
Pb	0	0, 1, 2, 5, 10, 50 ng
Pt	0	0, 1, 2, 5, 10, 50 ng
Sb	0.003	0, 1, 2, 5, 10, 50 ng
Se	0.321	0, 1, 2, 5, 10, 50 ng
Th	0.001	0, 1, 2, 5, 10, 50 ng
Tl	0.001	0, 1, 2, 5, 10, 50 ng
U	0.001	0, 1, 2, 5, 10, 50 ng
V	0.006	0, 1, 2, 5, 10, 50 ng
Zn	0.136	0, 1, 2, 5, 10, 50 ng

472

473 **Table S2. Metal concentrations of equipment rinse blank field sample.**

Metal	Concentration (ng/mL)
Ag	0.120
Al	235
As	0.467
Ba	40.347
Be	0.093
Ca	46103
Cd	0.053
Co	0.427
Cr	Below quantification
Cu	6.573
Fe	108.92
K	16837
Mg	16485
Mn	19.65
Mo	52.600
Na	68647
Ni	3.280
Pb	0.253
Pt	0.107
Sb	0.933
Se	2.347
Th	0.000
Tl	Below quantification
U	0.440
V	0.320
Zn	60.253

474

475 **Table S3. Mean metal concentrations by site.**

Sample #	Ag ng/mL	Al ng/mL	As ng/mL	Ba ng/mL	Be ng/mL	Ca ng/mL	Cd ng/mL	Co ng/mL	Cr ng/mL	Cu ng/mL	Fe ng/mL	K ng/mL	Mg ng/mL
E1	0.040	8580	1.093	53.147	0.000	27645	0.107	0.440	0.280	72.080	392.52	3967	11896
E2	0.040	142	0.773	31.293	0.093	54968	0.027	0.400	0.560	8.800	498.03	10835	13820
E3	0.040	53	1.760	40.453	0.000	63087	0.013	0.333	0.280	7.173	665.27	17957	22103
E4	0.280	151	1.027	60.613	0.187	48311	0.027	0.573	0.380	13.053	505.32	12648	16581
E5	0.227	80	1.027	37.467	0.280	53295	0.173	7.493	1.680	15.667	244.43	8199	18402
E7	0.027	110	0.973	27.613	0.093	37148	0.080	0.400	0.360	13.093	287.15	11495	12220
E8	0.067	212	1.040	399.413	0.000	41114	0.080	0.573	1.820	12.907	1154.79	14983	13506
E9	0.040	20355	1.200	54.147	1.680	63572	0.067	0.480	0.973	8.293	597.85	230955	16127
E10	0.067	56	0.653	48.840	0.280	72859	0.040	0.187	0.320	10.947	171.97	5203	14174
E11	0.107	120	0.453	42.987	0.000	66355	0.107	0.240		11.720	262.61	5075	12354
E12	0.040	19104	1.493	60.453	2.160	67386	0.093	0.467	1.400	34.187	866.28	261422	21387
E13	0.053	93	0.440	41.480	0.093	71186	0.080	0.280	5.787	10.400	598.20	6047	18655
E14	0.160	138	0.333	39.507	0.000	70766	0.120	0.427	1.800	29.587	297.44	9497	13500
E15	0.080	573	0.693	43.547	0.093	46049	0.040	0.653	1.520	16.413	509.61	20782	20317
E16	0.020	286	0.320	42.213	0.093	30519	0.027	0.533		3.453	99.39	20650	13063
E17	0.253	144	0.667	40.707	0.093	78044	0.067	0.227	0.040	13.853	173.47	9646	23073
E18	0.120	192	0.627	44.480	0.000	67560	0.480	0.573	0.240	32.667	509.69	9305	19137
E19	0.067	121	0.693	36.613	0.093	66923	0.027	0.267	0.520	12.453	226.56	11526	26593
E20	0.093	127	0.373	39.680	0.187	54919	0.053	0.267	0.040	16.853	195.85	10668	24562
E21	0.573	2766	1.147	74.667	0.187	59506	0.120	1.573	5.200	55.787	1295.69	10080	21922
E22	0.080	111	0.707	45.427	0.093	58811	0.027	0.320	0.360	14.747	271.15	11241	26226
E23	0.080	201	0.840	29.680	0.093	50687	0.067	0.373	1.600	23.627	657.33	16272	18862
E24	0.133	127	0.733	33.333	0.373	42384	0.053	0.347	5.200	23.947	421.32	13801	15209
E25	0.027	42	0.493	39.147	0.000	70539	0.040	0.333		11.880	480.37	16802	18333
E26	0.040	17394	1.560	29.347	1.880	45913	0.053	0.573	6.880	9.227	496.04	363041	16422
E27	0.147	1180	1.080	38.040	0.093	85790	0.120	1.133	1.373	26.267	754.63	36019	19356
E28	0.040	152	0.720	199.133	0.280	3410126	0.173	2.067		19.947	151.56	22609	71163

476

Sample #	Mn ng/mL	Mo ng/mL	Na ng/mL	Ni ng/mL	Pb ng/mL	Pt ng/mL	Sb ng/mL	Se ng/mL	Th ng/mL	Tl ng/mL	U ng/mL	V ng/mL	Zn ng/mL
E1	23.99	356.173	281538	87.387	0.707	0.120	0.187	5.000	0.133	0.000	0.133	0.507	15.453
E2	116.47	1.667	29330	4.027	1.613	0.133	0.253	2.640	0.107	0.000	0.187	0.427	38.053
E3	201.25	1.387	49938	6.547	0.787	0.133	0.187	3.960	0.040		0.240	0.213	26.347
E4	81.57	1.160	81944	6.107	1.427	0.133	0.320	4.860	0.027		0.307	0.440	36.907
E5	79.04	3.827	48540	219.093	1.027	0.120	0.533	1.760	0.200	0.360	0.347	0.547	35.173
E7	40.85	0.813	42983	1.640	1.867	0.133	0.333	6.180	0.000	0.000	0.453	0.427	28.213
E8	233.61	1.493	46298	2.787	4.227	0.120	0.640	4.720	0.000		0.493	7.680	46.013
E9	158.79	2.267	538474	1.693	0.813	0.387	0.333	4.420	0.027	0.020	0.467	1.573	78.413
E10	82.40	0.320	39067	1.240	0.773	0.107	0.133	6.620	0.000		0.453	0.280	33.547
E11	73.99	0.360	39920	1.467	2.680	0.120	0.147	2.200	0.000		0.413	0.307	43.227
E12	178.15	2.173	519013	2.787	1.253	0.293	0.507	1.320	0.013	0.000	0.493	1.880	54.600
E13	53.69	0.613	56266	2.493	1.173	0.107	0.187	4.400	0.067		0.440	0.493	397.387
E14	49.73	0.747	45989	2.320	2.027	0.107	0.200	2.200	0.040	0.060	0.467	0.440	79.733
E15	27.91	45.787	83557	4.707	3.240	0.133	0.787	2.053	0.013	0.000	0.413	0.493	115.667
E16	18.39	79.253	78686	4.320	0.133	0.133	1.173	1.320			0.347	0.267	57.933
E17	22.52	1.467	49306	1.147	0.373	0.093	0.320	3.080	0.000		0.467	0.347	72.520
E18	86.19	2.187	55692	3.160	2.587	0.093	0.240	2.200	0.000	0.000	0.493	0.613	70.893
E19	22.92	1.147	56050	1.400	0.400	0.093	0.333	2.200	0.000	0.000	0.547	0.307	52.040
E20	30.60	0.653	46599	1.907	0.880	0.120	0.373	3.960	0.000	0.000	0.600	0.320	64.333
E21	214.87	4.813	47839	12.213	5.480	0.107	0.827	0.880	0.040	0.027	1.133	1.013	175.400
E22	68.13	1.000	43767	1.720	1.200	0.093	0.307	3.520	0.000	0.000	0.493	0.427	60.560
E23	72.92	1.280	48357	2.733	8.800	0.080	0.520	5.280	0.027		0.267	0.453	75.800
E24	84.65	0.813	56362	3.347	2.093	0.093	0.267	3.980	0.000		0.293	0.267	56.613
E25	80.11	1.000	62629	4.800	0.587	0.093	0.213	3.520	0.000	0.000	0.427	0.360	27.120
E26	128.07	2.440	630457	2.973	1.653	0.147	0.320	3.080	0.000	0.000	0.467	2.960	40.253
E27	114.28	7.147	100994	12.120	3.320	0.160	0.480	1.760	0.053	0.000	0.427	0.987	75.787
E28	1038.72	8.040	1124647	7.613	1.053	0.840	0.960	3.227	0.000	0.013	0.707	0.960	66.133