Biogeochemical Variables Driving Temporal Dynamics and Spatial Variability in Mercury Bioaccumulation in *Gambusia* in the Everglades – A Model Analysis using R-EMAP

Curtis D. Pollman, Ph.D.

Aqua Lux Lucis, Inc. & University of Florida

#### Peter I. Kalla

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

&

Daniel J. Scheidt

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency





## Introduction

- Between 1995 and 2005 US EPA conducted synoptic field campaigns in the Everglades Protection Area that included measurements of Hg concentrations in *Gambusia* spp. and periphyton, as well as a number of biogeochemical variables that can influence the aquatic cycling of Hg. Eight field campaigns (cycles) were conducted (4 wet and 4 dry) during this period.
- In 2014, STOTEN publishes a paper by Pollman that uses structural equation modeling (SEM) to quantify the significance and relative contributions of different biogeochemical pathways direct and indirect on fish Hg concentrations. This paper included a model for *Gambusia* Hg specific for the Everglades based on the R-EMAP data for Cycles 0 7. The model indicates that sulfate concentrations are an important driver of *Gambusia* Hg.
- In 2014, US EPA conducts another synoptic campaign in the Everglades during the dry season (Cycle 11). A comparison of *Gambusia* Hg results for Cycle 11 with previous cycles indicates a dramatic drop in *Gambusia* Hg during Cycle 11.

### Changes in *Gambusia* Hg over Time R-EMAP data for Dry and Wet Cycles, 1995 - 2014



## Objective and Approach

- The primary objective is to use the Pollman (2014) SEM model<sup>\*</sup> to evaluate whether changes in sulfate concentrations – or other variables included in the model – will result in declines in predicted *Gambusia* Hg concentrations consistent with observed declines.
- The model is revised slightly to help account for the fact that, *ceteris paribus, Gambusia* Hg concentrations are generally lower in Everglades National Park.
- The model is calibrated only to Cycles 0 7 data to evaluate *post hoc* the predictive performance of the model when applied to Cycle 11 data.

\*Pollman, C.D. 2014. Mercury cycling and trophic state in aquatic ecosystems: Implications from structural equation modeling. Sci. Tot. Env. 499:62-73.

## Pollman (2014) SEM Model Modifications

- Include dummy variable for whether sites are located in the ENP
- Use inferred PW sulfide values for Cycle 11 obtained for mixed level regression modeling of bottom water – PW sulfide relationship, and adjusted for surface water sulfate concentrations.
- Modifications to how periphyton MeHg concentrations are aggregated by compartment to ensure consistency across all cycles, including cycle 11.

## Inferring Porewater Sulfide for Cycle 11

Use sulfate relationship from previous cycles to identify constant for shift in PW sulfide inferred for Cycle 11 based on *fixed* relationship with bottom water sulfide



## SEM Model

#### 

ENP\_Dummy  $\rightarrow$  MeHg SW (p = 0.015) ENP\_Dummy  $\rightarrow$  Gambusia Hg (p = 0.001) SO4  $\rightarrow$  MeHg Soil (p = 0.010)

ENP effect in *Gambusia* Hg is 0.125 *In* units (increase)



## SEM Fit Statistics Cycles 0 – 7; N = 579

Fit statistic	Value	Description	
Likelihood ratio	12 020	model we estumated	
n > chi2	0.461		Should be $> 0.05$
chi2 bs(35)	1765.645	baseline vs. saturated	3110010 DE > 0.03
p > chi2	0.000		
Population error			
RMSEA	0.000	Root mean squared error of approximation	
90% CI, lower bound	0.000		
upper bound	0.041	<	Should be < 0.05
pclose	0.989	Probability RMSEA <= 0.05	
Information criteria			
AIC	15354.608	Akaike's information criterion	
BIC	15581.396	Bayesian information criterion	
Baseline comparison			[
CFI	1.000	Comparative fit index <	Should be > 0.95
TLI	1.000	Tucker-Lewis index	
Size of residuals			
CD	0.883	Coefficient of determination	

#### **SEM** – Observed *vs.* Predicted Values – Model Residuals Comparison of calibrated results (Cycles 0 – 7) and *post hoc* (Cycle 11) results



## **SEM** – Variable Contributions to *Gambusia* Hg



Primary exogenous driving variable in SEM model is sulfate methylation potential, followed by H<sub>2</sub>S

# **SEM** – Variable Contributions to Periphyton and Surface Water Methyl Hg



Periphyton Methyl Hg

Surface Water Methyl Hg

## Trends in SEM Contributing Variables

Sulfate Methylation Potential



## Trends in Other Model Exogenous Variables



Comparison of Observed with Predicted Changes in *Gambusia* Hg between 1999 and 2014 Dry season / Co-located sites<sup>\*</sup>



\*Pollman (2012) grid system for identifying proximal sites.

## Model Prediction Bias Dry season / Co-located sites / N = 64 sites



SEM model under predicts magnitude of change between 1999 and 2005 by an average value of 42%



## Conclusions and Next Steps

- Pollman (2014) SEM model was recalibrated to R-EMAP Cycles 0-7 data to help resolve some bias in predicted *Gambusia* concentrations in Everglades National Park.
- The recalibrated model was used to predict *post hoc Gambusia* Hg concentration for R-EMAP Cycle 11 sampling (2014 wet season).
- SEM predicts a large decline in *Gambusia* Hg concentrations across the model domain between 1999 and 2005.
- Based on pairwise comparison of co-located sites, median predicted decline is 48 ng/g.
- Examination of trends in SEM independent variables suggests that a large shift in sulfate methylation potential is largely responsible of predicted declines. No other shifts in variable distributions appear to support the declines.

## Conclusions and Next Steps

- Pairwise comparison of changes in *Gambusia* Hg concentrations for proximal sites between 1999 and 2014 indicate that the SEM under-predicts the magnitude of observed changes by an average of 42%.
- Plots of spatial changes for 1999-2014 time interval also indicates some concordance between observed and predicted changes. Overall comparison shows a highly significant correlation between observed and predicted *Gambusia* Hg equal to  $r^2 = 0.274$  (p < 0.0001).
- Modeling supports the notion that Everglades biota Hg concentrations will react favorably to changes in sulfate methylation potential related to appropriate changes in sulfate concentrations, although it also indicates other variable dynamics (either not included or not measured) are likely important as well.
- Uncertainty in these effects could be evaluated with more work, including Monte Carlo simulations.
- Further model evaluation should be undertaken to identify further improvements (if possible given possible limitations to R-EMAP database).

## Le Fin



