

MERCURY DISTRIBUTION IN SOILS AND STREAM SEDIMENTS OF CENTRAL
INDIANA, USA

Carrie Lynn Hatcher

Submitted to the faculty of the University Graduate School
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree
Master of Science
in the Department of Earth Sciences
Indiana University

July 2009

Accepted by the Faculty of Indiana University, in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Science.

Gabriel M. Filippelli, Ph.D., Chair

Master's Thesis
Committee

Kathy Licht, Ph.D.

Pierre-Andre Jacinthe, Ph.D.

DEDICATION

Earning a masters degree is about more than just learning how to observe, study, and experiment to describe and explain natural phenomena. It includes the development of an individual from being the hesitant student to the confident scientist. Along this path we encounter people who facilitate this development – people who will be remembered as teachers. One of the most influential teachers I must credit is Rosalice Buehrer.

As the biogeochemistry lab manager, she's tasked with overseeing graduate students and aiding in their learning of how to run laboratory procedures. She was witness to my success through my own trials and frustration; she put my failures into perspective. Rosalice always found the time to offer support whether work or personal. Never hesitating to drop whatever she is doing to listen, understand, and give advice about lab work, looking at research papers, analyzing data, personal life, and other difficulties of being a student. She takes it in and guides in a warm and realistic manner, not only giving answers, but asking pointed questions.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Rudy Banerjee, Meghna Babbar-Sebens, Bob Barr, Rosalice Buehrer, Julie Crewe, Gabriel Filippelli, Bob Hall, Vince Hernly, Pierre-Andre Jacinthe, Kathy Licht, Brice Mabry, Debbie Morrison, Angela Robertson, Alex Rowan, and Erdal Yilmaz.

ABSTRACT

Carrie Lynn Hatcher

Mercury Distribution In Soils and Stream Sediments of Central Indiana, USA

An investigation of mercury (Hg) in soils and stream sediments was conducted to understand the impact of urbanization on Hg deposition and accumulation on the upper west fork of the White River watershed in central Indiana. Samples were collected to the north and east (i.e., downwind) of emission sources to understand the anthropogenic influences on Hg distribution in soil. Stream sediment sampling was designed to characterize the riverine particulate deposition of Hg through Indianapolis and to predict the potential for stream sediments with high Hg to become sources of methylmercury (MeHg). Spatial analysis revealed that soil Hg was elevated downwind of known industrial emission sites, indicating a local footprint of Hg deposition in central Indiana. Hg in streambank sediments was generally low in up-river sites to the northeast of Indianapolis, and increased markedly as the White River flowed through downtown, with high Hg persisting to downstream rural locations far to the south approximately 40 miles.

The stream sediment results also revealed variations in total Hg ($Hg_{(T)}$) as a function of local depositional sources, sub-watershed location, combined sewer outflows (CSOs), and impoundments along the White River. Low Hg values were recorded where the White River flow rate increased south of the 16th street dam at the confluence of the Fall Creek, where bankside industry and development confine the river. Three tributaries feeding into the White River were included in this study site, all having CSOs. Fall

Creek and Pleasant Run have higher values of Hg with Lick Creek having lower values in comparison to the White River and other tributaries. The highest values occur right before confluences to the White River where the flow rate slows and drops sediment. Mercury values typically increased immediately downstream of dams and impoundments. $Hg_{(T)}$ deposition and transport processes pose a problem to anglers fishing south of Indianapolis who may not be aware of the potential dangers related to elevated stream sediment Hg values and the greater potential for MeHg production from these sediments.

Gabriel M. Filippelli, Ph.D., Chair

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction

Introduction.....1

Objectives.....1

Background

 Depositional Sources.....2

 Anthropogenic Atmospheric Emissions Sources.....2

 Waterway Transport in Urban Areas.....3

Human Exposure Risk.....3

 Cell Energy and Hg.....4

Hg Chemistry and Cycling.....5

 Aqueous Phase5

 Deposition Processes.....6

 Waterway Transport and Methyl-Mercury Production.....7

Study Area and Methods

Study Area

Site Description.....9

 Stream Flow Rates of the White River and Tributaries.....10

 Industrial Sources of Hg.....10

 Emissions Data.....11

 Wind Data.....11

Methods

Field

Soil.....11

Bankside Sediments.....12

Survey Methods.....13

Sampling Approach.....13

Sample Analysis.....14

Reproducibility.....15

Results

Spatial Distribution.....15

Geospatial Analysis Results.....16

Relationships Between Soil Hg-Sources-Wind.....17

Other Sources of Hg to Soil.....17

Linear Patterns of Hg

Bankside Sediments Hamilton County (Noblesville) to Marion.....17

Bankside Sediments South of Marion County.....18

Tributaries East and West of White River

Fall Creek.....19

Pleasant Run Creek and Citizens Coke.....20

Lick Creek.....20

Creeks West of the White River.....20

Stream Sediments as a Monitor of Transport Processes and Fisheries Risk

Explanation of Hg Normalization.....20

Relationship of Stream Sediment Values to Landscape Use.....	21
Northeast to Southwest Increase.....	21
Grain Size Analysis.....	22
Analysis of 5 Sample Transect.....	22
Angler Survey.....	22
Results of Survey.....	23

Discussion

Patterns of Hg Deposition Relative to Airborne Emitters.....	23
Soil Retention in Soil.....	23
General Soil Hg Distribution.....	23
Hg in Bankside Sediment.....	24
Impacts of Wastewater and CSOs, City-Urban.....	24
Factors Affecting Sediment Hg _(T)	25
Watershed Soil Hg _(T) Values Versus Sediment Hg _(T) Values.....	25
Risk to angler.....	26
Southern Push of Hg to Rural Areas.....	26
Limitations and Advantages of Sampling Method.....	26

Conclusions.....	27
-------------------------	-----------

Table Captions

Tables

Table 1. Global Budgets.....	28
Table 2. Anthropogenic Hg Emissions.....	29
Table 3. Indiana Hg Polluting Power-Plants.....	30

Table 4. Top 10 Emitters in Central Indiana.....	31
Table 5. Standard Error.....	32
Table 6. Sampling Reproducibility.....	33
Table 7. Wind Statistics.....	34
Table 8. Soil and Sediment Ratio.....	35
Table 9. Hg _(T) , Hg(norm.), and OM Values Based on Impoundment.....	36

Figure Captions

Figures

Figure 1. Bankside Sediment Sampling Area.....	37
Figure 2. Soil Sampling Area.....	38
Figure 3. CSO, Impoundment, Water Flow, and Industrial Locations.....	39
Figure 4. Sampling Strategy.....	40
Figure 5. Soil Hg _(T) Concentrations.....	41
Figure 6. Soil Hg _(T) Concentrations of Sites South	42
Figure 7. Map of Soil Hg Concentrations and Median Wind Direction.....	43
Figure 8. Soil Hg _(T) Concentration and Ordinary Krig Prediction.....	44
Figure 9. Soil Concentration Map Ordinary Krigged Prediction Error Map.....	45
Figure 10. Normal QQPlot.....	46
Figure 11. Log- Histogram	47
Figure 12. Semi-variogram Cloud.....	48
Figure 13. North to South Overview of Bankside Sediment Sampling Sites.....	49
Figure 14. Banksediment Hg Values Normalized.....	50
Figure 15. Bankside Sediment and Total Hg (ppb)	51

Figure 16. Grain Size Analysis.....	52
Figure 17. Analysis of Sample Transects.....	53
Figure 18. Grain Size, Hg _(norm.) and OM Compared.....	54

Appendices

Appendix A. Mercury Chemistry and Cycling

Table A3. Species of Hg and Transformations.....	55
Table A4. Species of Hg and Solubility Constants.....	56
Figure A1. Conceptual Biogeochemical Mercury Cycle.....	57
Figure A2. Chemical Cycling.....	58

Appendix B. Hydro-geological Background

Table B4. Stream Flow Rates.....	59
Figure B1. Location of Study Site Watershed.....	60
Figure B2. Hydromorphic Regions.....	61
Figure B3. Land-use	62
Figure B5. Visual Description of Deposition at Lowhead Dams.....	63

Appendix C. Survey

Figure 1. Survey.....	64
-----------------------	----

References.....	74
------------------------	-----------

Curriculum Vitae