



**BLOCK ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES**

2451 Estand Way  
Pleasant Hill, CA 94523-3911  
(925) 682-7200 FAX 686-0399


**Aquatic Toxicity Testing Results for the Grasslands Bypass Project –  
A Three-Species Chronic Screening Bioassay**


**October, 2007**

Prepared For:  
**San Luis Delta Mendota Water Authority**  
**842 Sixth Street, Suite 7**  
**P.O. Box 2157**  
**Los Banos, CA 93635**

Prepared By:  
**Block Environmental Services, Inc.**  
**2451 Estand Way**  
**Pleasant Hill, CA 94523-3911**  
**(925) 682-7200**

October 18, 2007

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
David Block, Ph.D.  
Laboratory Director

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Nanette Malan Lake  
Laboratory Manager

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The logo for Block Environmental Services (BES) is a black square with the letters "BES" in white, bold, sans-serif font.

In October 2007, Block Environmental Services (BES) conducted chronic screening bioassays, using three different species, for the Grasslands Bypass Project. These aquatic bioassay tests were performed to evaluate potential toxicity as part of an on-going monitoring program of agriculture drain water as it is conveyed through the San Luis Drain to Mud Slough and removed from Salt Slough. The toxicity program consists of monthly laboratory bioassay tests using standard protocol testing methods.

The test organisms of interest for the Grasslands Bypass Project are the freshwater green algae (*Selenastrum capricornutum*), the fathead minnow (*Pimephales promelas*), and the daphnid (*Daphnia magna*). Each test was performed under screening conditions (100% sample versus the Delta-Mendota Canal Ambient control). Additional definitive concentrations (75, 50, 25, and 12.5% diluted with Delta-Mendota Canal Ambient control) were tested for the *S. capricornutum* San Luis Drain (Site B) test. As QA/QC measures, Laboratory control water was also evaluated to assess minimum test acceptability criteria, and a standard reference toxicant test was run concurrently for each of the three test species. Due to the unavailability of organisms the *D. magna* bioassays were initiated on September 13, 2007 and required a forth sampling event on September 17, 2007. This report describes the procedures used and the results obtained for the toxicity tests initiated on October 9, 2007.

BES is an Environmental Laboratory Accreditation Program certified laboratory (#1812).

### 2.1 SAMPLE COLLECTION AND HANDLING

**2.1.1 Site Sample Collection** – Water for the laboratory study was collected three times during the seven day testing period. Site samples were collected in a clean one gallon bucket in grab form on days 0, 2, and 4 for the fathead minnow bioassays and on days 0, 2 and 5 for the water flea bioassays. The sample was then transferred to a 2.5 gallon Cubitainer and transported back to the laboratory for testing. In addition, one 250 ml sample was collected for laboratory analysis of selenium by the Bureau of Reclamation. Prior to sample collection, the bucket and sample containers were rinsed three times with station water. Samples for chemical analysis were transferred directly from the bucket to the appropriate sample container. At the laboratory, nitric acid was added to the rinsed 250 ml container for selenium analysis. All samples were transported utilizing chain of custody documentation and stored at 4 °C until use.

**2.1.2 Reference Toxicant** – Sodium Chloride (NaCl) was used as the reference toxicant for both the algae (*S. capricornutum*) and the daphnid (*D. magna*). A stock solution containing 8 g/L NaCl was used for daily preparation of the treatment levels for these organisms. The *S. capricornutum* treatment levels were 8, 4, 2, 1 and 0.5 g/L NaCl in USEPA Moderately Hard Water. The *D. magna* treatment levels were 8, 4, 2, 1, and 0.5 g/L NaCl in Moderately Hard Water (EPA salts added to Arrowhead Distilled Water). Copper sulfate (CuSO<sub>4</sub>) was used as the reference toxicant for the fathead minnow (*P. promelas*). A stock solution containing 100,000 g/L Cu<sup>+2</sup> was used for daily preparation of the treatment levels of 100, 50, 25, 12.5, and 6.25 µg/L Cu<sup>+2</sup> in USEPA Hard Water. The toxicity endpoints from the reference toxicant tests of each test method are subsequently plotted on a running control chart from the last 20 tests. The mean values as well as the upper and lower control limits ( $\pm 2$  standard deviations) are recalculated with each successive test result. The outliers, which are values falling outside the upper and lower control limits, and trends of increasing or decreasing sensitivity, are readily identified.

## 2.2 TOXICITY TEST PROCEDURES

**2.2.1 Test Procedures** – A detailed procedure for each test is outlined in DPHS-ELAP approved standard operating procedures (SOPs) which are on file at the BES laboratory. and outlined on the GBP QA/QC Plan. These SOPs are based upon the following references:

- A Short-Term Chronic Toxicity Test Using *Daphnia magna* (EPA/600/D-87/080)
- Short-Term Methods for Estimating the Chronic Toxicity of Effluents and Receiving Waters to Freshwater Organisms (EPA/821/R-02/013)

Test conditions are summarized in Table 2-1.

**2.2.2 Data Analysis** – All toxicity testing results were analyzed using the software program ToxCalc (Version 5.0). This program determines if there is a statistically significant reduction in response at the  $p = 0.05$  level and utilizes the flowchart for statistical analysis outlined in EPA/821/R-02/013. The laboratory testing compared each sample station response with the ambient control water (Delta-Mendota Canal). The parameters of interest for the screening tests are the No Observed Effect Concentration (NOEC), the Lowest Observed Effect Concentration (LOEC), and the resultant Toxic Units ( $TU = 100/NOEC$ ). In addition, the Site B definitive *Selenastrum capricornutum* and *D. magna* tests will address the (25 and 50%) Inhibition Concentrations (IC). The IC values will show the point estimate of the sample concentration that causes a given percent reduction.

**Table 2-1 Summary of Testing Parameters by Organism**

Test Conditions	Organism		
	<i>D. magna</i>	<i>P. promelas</i>	<i>S. capricornutum</i>
Test Type	Static renewal	Static renewal	Static
Temperature	25 ± 1 °C	25 ± 1 °C	25 ± 1 °C
Light Intensity	50 – 100 ft-c	50 - 100 ft-c	400 ± 40 ft-c
Photoperiod	16h light: 8h dark	16h light: 8h dark	Continuous light
Test Chamber	150 ml beaker	600 mL beaker	125 ml flask
Test Solution Volume	50 ml	400 ml	25 ml
Renewal Frequency	Daily	Daily	None
Organism Age	10 days	< 24 hours	4 - 7 days
Organism Source	Aquatic Biosystems (Fort Collins, CO)	Aquatic Biosystems (Fort Collins, CO)	In House Culture
Organisms/Chamber	1	10	10,000 cells/ml
Organisms/Concentration	10	40	1 x 10 <sup>6</sup>
Food Source	YCT & algae	<i>Artemia</i> nauplii	Culture medium
Feeding Frequency	Once/day	Twice/day	None
Cleaning	None	Siphon daily	None
Shaking Rate	None	None	Continuous
Control/Dilution Water	EPA Mod. Hard	EPA Hard	EPA Mod. Hard culture medium
Sample Concentrations	100%	100%	100% (Site B: 75, 50, 25, & 12.5% diluted w/Amb.)
Reference Toxicant	NaCl	CuSO <sub>4</sub> as Cu <sup>+2</sup>	NaCl
Reference Toxicant Concentrations	8, 4, 2, 1, and 0.5 g/L	100, 50, 25, 12.5, and 6.25 µg/L	8, 4, 2, 1, and 0.5 g/L
Test Duration	7 days	7 days	96 hours
Effects Measured	Survival & reproduction	Survival & growth	Growth
Test Acceptability (Laboratory Control)	≥ 80% survival & ≥ 10 young/adult in controls	≥ 80% survival & ≥ 0.25 mg avg. dry weight/survivor in controls	≥ 1 x 10 <sup>6</sup> cells/ml and variance should not exceed 20% in controls

### 3. RESULTS

#### 3.1 ROUTINE REPORTING

##### 3.1.1 Sample Site Identification –

- Site B = SLD at new bridge
- Site C = Mud Slough upstream of SLD discharge
- Site D = Mud Slough downstream of SLD discharge
- Site F = Salt Slough at Highway 165
- Ambient Control = Delta-Mendota Canal

3.1.2 **Sample Dates** – 10/08/2007, 10/10/2007 and 10/12/2007.

##### 3.1.3 Test Species –

- daphnid (*Daphnia magna*) at 10 days old
- fathead minnow (*Pimephales promelas*) at <24 hours old
- freshwater algae (*Selenastrum capricornutum*) between 4 and 7 days old

##### 3.1.4 Test Initiation Dates –

Test Time	<i>D. magna</i>		<i>P. promelas</i>		<i>S. capricornutum</i>	
	Date	Time	Date	Time	Date	Time
Initiation	10/09/07	1120	10/09/07	1600	10/11/07	1300
Termination	10/16/07	1130	10/16/07	1550	10/15/07	1330

**3.1.5 Summary of Water Chemistry of Site Waters** – These values represent the water quality of the samples as received at the BES laboratory.

**Site B**

<b>Water Chemistry</b>	<b>10/08/2007</b>	<b>10/10/2007</b>	<b>10/12/2007</b>
<b>D.O. (mg/L)</b>	15.20	11.90	10.30
<b>pH</b>	8.60	8.60	8.50
<b>Conductivity (µS/cm)</b>	3740	3351	3480
<b>Salinity (ppt)</b>	2.00	1.90	1.80
<b>Temperature (°C)</b>	3.00	4.00	2.00
<b>Total Chlorine (mg/L)</b>	0.23	0.24	0.19
<b>Ammonia (ppm as N)</b>	0.04	0.08	0.05
<b>Alkalinity (mg/L as CaCO<sub>3</sub>)</b>	114	120	120
<b>Hardness (mg/L as CaCO<sub>3</sub>)</b>	950	876	870
<b>Total Suspended Solids (mg/L)</b>	25	26	28

**Site C**

<b>Water Chemistry</b>	<b>10/08/2007</b>	<b>10/10/2007</b>	<b>10/12/2007</b>
<b>D.O. (mg/L)</b>	10.20	8.00	7.60
<b>pH</b>	7.60	7.60	7.60
<b>Conductivity (µS/cm)</b>	934	981	946
<b>Salinity (ppt)</b>	0.50	0.50	0.50
<b>Temperature (°C)</b>	2.00	4.00	1.80
<b>Total Chlorine (mg/L)</b>	0.03	0.03	ND
<b>Ammonia (ppm as N)</b>	0.10	0.12	0.11
<b>Alkalinity (mg/L as CaCO<sub>3</sub>)</b>	174	180	184
<b>Hardness (mg/L as CaCO<sub>3</sub>)</b>	202	224	208
<b>Total Suspended Solids (mg/L)</b>	13	36	25

ND – Not Detected (Detection limit 0.03 mg/L)

**Site D**

<b>Water Chemistry</b>	<b>10/08/2007</b>	<b>10/10/2007</b>	<b>10/12/2007</b>
<b>D.O. (mg/L)</b>	12.40	7.80	7.30
<b>pH</b>	7.70	7.60	7.60
<b>Conductivity (µS/cm)</b>	1342	1386	1359
<b>Salinity (ppt)</b>	0.70	0.70	0.70
<b>Temperature (°C)</b>	2.00	4.00	2.20
<b>Total Chlorine (mg/L)</b>	0.06	0.05	ND
<b>Ammonia (ppm as N)</b>	0.11	0.15	0.09
<b>Alkalinity (mg/L as CaCO<sub>3</sub>)</b>	164	182	178
<b>Hardness (mg/L as CaCO<sub>3</sub>)</b>	318	306	298
<b>Total Suspended Solids (mg/L)</b>	25	36	33

ND – Not Detected (Detection limit 0.03 mg/L)

**Site F**

<b>Water Chemistry</b>	<b>10/08/2007</b>	<b>10/10/2007</b>	<b>10/12/2007</b>
<b>D.O. (mg/L)</b>	10.70	9.40	8.60
<b>pH</b>	7.70	7.70	7.70
<b>Conductivity (µS/cm)</b>	1517	1490	1372
<b>Salinity (ppt)</b>	0.80	0.70	0.70
<b>Temperature (°C)</b>	4.00	7.00	2.80
<b>Total Chlorine (mg/L)</b>	0.04	ND	0.03
<b>Ammonia (ppm as N)</b>	0.16	0.14	0.14
<b>Alkalinity (mg/L as CaCO<sub>3</sub>)</b>	186	188	184
<b>Hardness (mg/L as CaCO<sub>3</sub>)</b>	296	292	288
<b>Total Suspended Solids (mg/L)</b>	48	42	86

ND – Not Detected (Detection limit 0.03 mg/L)

**Ambient Control**

<b>Water Chemistry</b>	<b>10/08/2007</b>	<b>10/10/2007</b>	<b>10/12/2007</b>
<b>D.O. (mg/L)</b>	11.10	10.20	9.30
<b>pH</b>	7.70	7.80	7.70
<b>Conductivity (<math>\mu</math>S/cm)</b>	519	482	492
<b>Salinity (ppt)</b>	0.30	0.20	0.20
<b>Temperature (<math>^{\circ}</math>C)</b>	2.00	5.00	6.00
<b>Total Chlorine (mg/L)</b>	0.04	ND	ND
<b>Ammonia (ppm as N)</b>	ND	ND	ND
<b>Alkalinity (mg/L as CaCO<sub>3</sub>)</b>	88	78	74
<b>Hardness (mg/L as CaCO<sub>3</sub>)</b>	108	98	90
<b>Total Suspended Solids (mg/L)</b>	3	6	9

ND – Not Detected (Detection limit 0.03 mg/L)

### 3.2 *D. magna* End Point Values –

#### 3.2.1 100% Site Response versus Ambient Water

##### SURVIVAL

Sample ID	7 day Survival (%)	NOEC	LOEC	TU
Lab Control	80	-	-	-
Ambient	90	-	-	-
Site B	90	100	>100	1
Site C	80	100	>100	1
Site D	100	100	>100	1
Site F	90	100	>100	1

##### REPRODUCTION

Sample ID	7 Day Neonate Production		NOEC	LOEC	TU
	# per female	Std Dev.			
Lab Control	26.20	17.07	-	-	-
Ambient	24.30	13.30	-	-	-
Site B	35.80	18.07	100	>100	>1
Site C	31.10	22.19	100	>100	1
Site D	34.40	11.98	100	>100	1
Site F	27.50	15.62	100	>100	1

#### 3.2.2 Screening Testing Notes

There were not any statistically significant reductions in the *D. magna* survival or reproduction response for any of the Site waters with respect to the Ambient control water.

The Ambient and Laboratory control waters both met the test acceptability criteria for survival ( $\geq 80\%$ ) and reproduction ( $\geq 10$  neonates/adult).

The concurrent reference toxicant test generated survival (LC50) and reproduction (IC25) endpoints that were within the control chart limitations. This *D. magna* response indicates that the values elicited for the Site Waters are valid.

## 3.3.1 Site Response versus Ambient Water

## SURVIVAL

Sample ID	7 day Survival		NOEC	LOEC	TU
	Average (%)	Std Dev.			
Lab Control	100	0	-	-	-
Ambient	98	5.00	-	-	-
Site B	88	12.58	100	>100	1
Site C	98	5.00	100	>100	1
Site D	93	5.00	100	>100	1
Site F	95	5.77	100	>100	1

## GROWTH

Sample ID	7 day Weight		NOEC	LOEC	TU
	Average (mg)	Std Dev.			
Lab Control	0.34	0.02	-	-	-
Ambient	0.36	0.03	-	-	-
Site B	0.32	0.04	100	>100	1
Site C	0.36	0.02	100	>100	1
Site D	0.34	0.02	100	>100	1
Site F	0.41	0.07	100	>100	1

## 3.3.2 Testing Notes

There were not statistically significant reductions in the *P. promelas* survival or growth response for any of the site waters with respect to the Ambient control water.

The Laboratory and Ambient control waters passed both the growth ( $\geq 0.25$  mg/surviving adult) and survival ( $\geq 80\%$ ) test acceptability criteria.

The concurrent reference toxicant test generated survival (LC50) and growth (IC25) endpoints that were within the control chart limitations. This *P. promelas* response indicates that the values elicited for the Site Waters are valid.

### 3.4 *S. capricornutum* End Point Values –

#### 3.4.1 100% Site Response versus Ambient Water

##### GROWTH

Sample ID (100%)	96 hour growth		NOEC	LOEC	TU
	Count (10 <sup>5</sup> cells/ml)	Variance (%)			
Lab Control	13.78	24.09	-	-	-
Ambient	10.84	19.69	-	-	-
Site B	12.01	11.72	100	>100	1
Site C	13.94	15.18	100	>100	1
Site D	14.13	7.98	100	>100	1
Site F	14.82	3.09	100	>100	1

#### 3.4.2 Screening Testing Notes

There were not statistically significant reductions in the growth response for any of the Site waters with respect to the Ambient control water.

The Ambient control water passed the cell density ( $\geq 1 \times 10^6$  cells/ml) and the variance acceptability criteria ( $\leq 20\%$  variance between replicates at test termination). The Laboratory control water did not meet the variance test acceptability criteria.

### 3.4.3 Definitive Site B Response versus Ambient Water



#### GROWTH

Sample ID (% Site B diluted w/Ambient)	96 hour Growth	
	Count (10 <sup>5</sup> cells/ml)	Variance (%)
Laboratory Control	13.78	24.09
Ambient Control	10.84	19.69
12.5	11.95	11.61
25	12.21	4.96
50	12.39	3.92
75	12.45	4.71
100	12.01	11.72

#### STATISTICAL ANALYSIS

End Point	IC 50	IC 25	NOEC	LOEC	Toxic Units
	>100	>100	100	>100	1

#### 3.4.4 Definitive Testing Notes

There was not a statistically significant reduction in the growth response for the Site B water compared to the Ambient control water.

The Ambient control water passed the cell density ( $\geq 1 \times 10^6$  cells/ml) and the variance acceptability criteria ( $\leq 20\%$  variance between replicates at test termination). The Laboratory control water did not meet the variance test acceptability criteria.

#### 4. CONCLUSIONS

The objective of these tests was to satisfy the monthly chronic three species bioassay requirements as described in the Grasslands Bypass Project FONSI permit. The results for the chronic bioassay tests using the site water samples collected in October 2007 indicate that:

- *D. magna* survival and reproduction were not adversely affected by any of the Site waters. Results obtained from the concurrent reference toxicant test are typical of in-house sensitivity data to NaCl, indicating that the stock culture that was used was in good condition.
- *P. promelas* survival and growth were not adversely affected by any of the Site waters. Results obtained from the reference toxicant tests are typical of in-house sensitivity data to  $\text{Cu}^{+2}$ , indicating that stock organisms used were in good condition.
- *S. capricornutum* growth was not adversely affected by any of the Site waters. The Laboratory control water did not meet the variance test acceptability criteria. Due to test system failure the reference toxicant test did not produce data typical of in-house sensitivity to NaCl.