

Evaluating improvements to exposure estimates from fate and transport models by incorporating environmental sampling effort and contaminant use



Samantha L. Rumschlag^{a, b, *}, Scott M. Bessler^a, Jason R. Rohr^{a, b}

^a Department of Biological Sciences, Eck Institute for Global Health, and Environmental Change Initiative, 721 Flanner Hall, University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, IN, USA

^b Department of Integrative Biology, 4202 East Fowler Avenue, University of South Florida, Tampa, FL, USA

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received 10 December 2018
Received in revised form
18 March 2019
Accepted 19 March 2019
Available online 22 March 2019

Keywords:

Pesticide
Field concentration
Pesticide in water calculator
Pesticide regulation
Pond pollution
Exposure assessment
Exposure characterization
Estimated environmental concentrations

ABSTRACT

Widespread chemical contamination represents one of the largest threats of the Anthropocene. The Pesticide in Water Calculator (PWC) is a fate and transport model used by the Environmental Protection Agency and Health Canada to estimate pesticide exposures in lentic freshwater ecosystems and make pesticide registration decisions. Here, we show that maximum measured concentrations of 31% of herbicides and 42% of insecticides exceeded maximum estimated environmental concentrations (EECs) produced by the PWC, suggesting that EECs often do not represent worst-case exposure as they have been purported to do. Based on this observation, we generated statistical models using EECs and over 600,000 field measurements of 31 common insecticides and herbicides to document if the congruence of EECs and maximum field measurements could be improved by accounting for environmental sampling effort (number of times a pesticide is sampled) and contaminant application, factors commonly ignored in most fate and transport models. For lentic systems, variance in pesticide field measurements explained by EECs increased by 50% when sampling effort was included. For lotic systems, variance explained increased by only 4%, most likely because lotic systems are sampled over 4.9 times as much as lentic systems. Including use more than doubled the ability of the EECs to predict maximum pesticides concentrations in lentic systems. Our results suggest that exposure characterization in risk assessment can likely be improved by considering sampling effort and use, thus providing more defensible environmental standards and regulations.

© 2019 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

1. Introduction

Chemical pollution represents one of the most widespread and destructive forms of human disturbance on earth (Bernhardt et al., 2017; Nel et al., 2006; Rhind, 2009), threatening the health and wellbeing of humans (Braun, 2017; Kampa and Castanas, 2008; Larsen et al., 2017) and the environment (Fleeger et al., 2003; Meybeck and Helmer, 1989; Rohr and McCoy, 2010). The distribution of pesticides, in particular, is globally widespread in surface waters presenting a major threat to aquatic biodiversity (Beketov et al., 2013; Malaj et al., 2014; Stehle and Schulz, 2015). In the

United States (US), more than 500 million pounds of active ingredients of pesticides are applied annually (Atwood and Paisley-Jones, 2017), leading to well-documented contamination of freshwater systems (Dudgeon et al., 2006; Gilliom and Hamilton, 2006; Stone et al., 2014) that provide habitat for about 10% of all described taxa on earth (Strayer and Dudgeon, 2010). Therefore, the ability to predict levels of contamination in the field is critical to accurately assessing human and wildlife exposures and designing effective management strategies to minimize risks in sensitive systems.

Fate and transport models are important tools for predicting contaminant exposures. For instance, the United States (US) Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and Health Canada use the Pesticide in Water Calculator (PWC) model to generate a peak estimated environmental concentration (EEC) (US EPA, 1992) of a focal pesticide in a standardized lentic waterbody that is a set distance from a site of application (Young, 2016). The model

* Corresponding author. Department of Biological Sciences, Eck Institute for Global Health, and Environmental Change Initiative, 721 Flanner Hall, University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, IN, USA.

E-mail addresses: rumschl@gmail.com, srumschl@nd.edu (S.L. Rumschlag).

calculates an EEC based on inputs of pesticide traits (e.g. half-life and Koc), application amount and frequency (based on crop of interest), and soil and climatic characteristics (based on crop and region of interest) (Young, 2016). EECs of a variety of chemicals, including those that are not pesticides, are used in human health and ecological risk assessments. Generally, the EPA uses the PWC to predict pesticide EECs in ponds and reservoirs, which are used in ecological risk assessments and drinking water assessments, respectively (Luo, 2014). Ecological risk assessments play a role in the registration of pesticide before they come to market and the reregistration of pesticides, which occurs at least every 15 years once a pesticide is approved. Historically, the maximum EEC for pesticides has been regarded as a “worst-case” chemical exposure scenario in freshwater systems by the EPA (US EPA, 1992). In risk assessment, EECs are compared against toxicity values (e.g. LC50) to characterize the likelihood of toxicity at a given level of exposure (US EPA, 2004, 1992). Evaluation of EECs in this way informs the development of environmental standards, policies, guidelines, and regulations, as well as the registration and reregistration of chemicals for legal use (US EPA, 2004).

The availability of large-scale data within the US on pesticide use (Baker and Stone, 2015; Thelin and Stone, 2013) and monitoring (Read et al., 2017) provides an opportunity for the accuracy of PWC exposure estimates to be evaluated and improved. Recently, the ability of the European Union’s “FORum for the Coordination of pesticide fate models and their Use” (FOCUS) model was evaluated for its accuracy in predicting worst-case scenario exposures using monitoring data. These evaluations revealed that the model performed poorly in predicting environmental concentration of insecticides and fungicides (Knäbel et al., 2014, 2012). The true or actual peak environmental concentration of any given pesticide is an extremely rare event in time and space (Leu et al., 2005; Stehle et al., 2013; Thurman et al., 1991), and thus evaluating model predictions of peak environmental concentrations necessitates copious field measurements, many more than are required to reliably predict mean environmental concentrations (Crawford, 2004). Fortunately, over the last three decades, federal agencies including the EPA and US Geological Survey (USGS) have compiled hundreds of thousands of field measurements of pesticides from lotic (streams and rivers) and lentic (ponds and reservoirs) freshwater ecosystems across the US. These publicly available data allow us here to: 1) evaluate if EECs are indeed indicative of worst-case exposure scenarios and 2) determine if the congruence between predicted EECs from the PWC and measured maximum concentrations of pesticides in the field can be improved.

An important consideration for evaluating the congruence between predicted EECs and measured maximum concentrations might be environmental sampling effort, defined as the total number of times a pesticide is surveyed across locations and time. If we are to determine how well maximum EECs predict maximum field concentrations of contaminants that are currently used, we must account for the variance in maximum field concentrations that is a function of sampling effort. For instance, we propose that sampling effort should be related asymptotically to the maximum environmental concentration of a contaminant, such that increases in sampling effort increase the likelihood of detecting the true peak environmental concentration at low (gray section in Fig. 1A) but not high sampling efforts (white section in Fig. 1A). Given this proposed relationship, we hypothesize that incorporating information on environmental sampling effort will improve the ability of EECs to predict maximum environmental concentrations, but only for systems that are not well sampled and thus fall on the section of the sampling effort-maximum field concentration curve that is increasing rather than at or near the asymptote. No study to our

knowledge, has incorporated sampling effort of monitoring data into their evaluations of the predictions of pesticide exposure models, which could be an important consideration in assessing model accuracy.

The ability of EECs to predict maximum field concentrations might also be improved by accounting for multiple sources of contaminant use or release. Most fate and transport models, including the PWC, assume a single point source of contamination, but measured concentrations in freshwater ecosystems are often the result of runoff and aerial deposition from multiple sources of contamination across the landscape. The input of pesticides from multiple sources of contamination across the landscape is likely many orders of magnitude greater than application amounts on a single agricultural field (Larsen and Noack, 2017), the sole point source assumed by the PWC model. The inaccurate assumption of a single point source could misrepresent the true or actual peak concentration in the environment that the PWC seeks to model. Thus, we hypothesize that incorporating information on use of chemicals might improve the congruence between EECs and maximum field concentrations because use is a proxy for multiple sources of contamination within a watershed. The USGS recently provided pesticide use estimates across the US, allowing us to evaluate how a proxy for multiple sources of contamination within a watershed affects the ability of the PWC to predict maximum measured concentrations in the environment.

To test the hypotheses that the abilities of fate and transport models to predict maximum field concentrations can be improved by accounting for environmental sampling effort and contaminant release information, we selected 31 of the most commonly used pesticides and compiled data describing their use, application rate, environmental mobility, EECs from the PWC, and maximum measured environmental concentrations in lentic and lotic systems. Only a single study has used measured environmental concentrations to validate EECs from the PWC. However, implications from this study are limited because few focal pesticides were evaluated, environmental concentrations were taken from a limited geographic region (a single state), and EECs were not compared to maximum measured field concentrations (Xie et al., 2018).

We predicted that EECs would not represent worst-case scenarios of exposure because EECs fail to incorporate multiple sources of contamination and instead model a commonly unrealistic single point-source. Given the postulated importance of sampling effort, we predicted that the PWC would more accurately predict maximum concentrations in lotic than lentic systems because lotic systems are sampled for pesticides nearly 4.9 times as much as lentic systems (mean number \pm standard deviation of lotic versus lentic samples per pesticide from federal databases: $16,111 \pm 10,301$ vs. 3304 ± 3005). Finally, we predicted that the PWC’s predictions of maximum EECs could be improved by incorporating use or release information to account for likely multiple sources of pesticides to freshwater ecosystems.

2. Methods

2.1. Pesticide selection

Our analyses focus on the 31 most commonly used herbicides and insecticides applied on corn in the US (Table 1). We focus on corn because corn was the most commonly harvested crop by area in the US from 1992 to 2012, the time span of current study (US Department of Agriculture, National Agricultural Statistics Service) – making corn the most widespread source of pesticide contamination to aquatic systems of all crops. To select this group of 31 pesticides, we first ranked all insecticides and herbicides based on their estimated use in the US by summing 2006 county-level




Fig. 1. **A)** Predicted asymptotic relationship between sampling effort and maximum (max.) field concentration. As sampling effort increases, the likelihood of detecting a peak concentration increases when sampling effort is at low to mid-levels as shown in gray. At mid to high levels of sampling effort, the influence of increased sampling effort on the likelihood of detecting a peak concentration reaches a limit, and no discernible relationship exists between sampling effort and max. field concentration as shown in white. We predict that sampling effort would account for more variance between maximum field concentration and maximum estimated environmental concentration (EEC) when sampling effort occurs in the lower range (in gray) compared to the higher range (in white). **B)** Observed relationship between sampling effort and maximum field concentration in lotic (circles, solid line) and lentic (triangles, dashed line) systems. Increased sampling effort is positively associated with maximum lentic concentration (Table 2, $F = 4.552$, $p = 0.043$) but not maximum lotic concentration (Table 2, $F = 0.436$, $p = 0.515$). The positive relationship for lentic systems matches the positive relationship at low to mid-sampling effort shown in gray in Fig. 1B. The absence of a relationship for lotic systems matches the asymptote at mid to high sampling effort in Fig. 1B. **C)** Observed relationship between sampling effort and the residuals of maximum field concentrations in lotic (circles) and lentic (triangles) in systems and EEC (Table 2, $\chi^2 = 12.339$, $p < 0.001$). As sampling effort increases, the likelihood of a field concentration exceeding an EEC increases, which is represented by a positive residual. Gray band represent a 95% confidence interval, and a light gray reference line at 0 represents where maximum field concentration would equal maximum EEC.

pesticide use estimates from the Estimated Annual Agricultural Pesticide Use dataset provided by Pesticide National Synthesis Project of the National Water Quality Assessment (NAWQA) Program (US Geological Survey [USGS]) (<https://water.usgs.gov/nawqa/pnsp/usage/maps/county-level/>). We classified each pesticide as an herbicide or insecticide using the primary use type classifications indicated by the Pesticide Action Network (PAN) Pesticide Database (<http://www.pesticideinfo.org/>). We excluded mineral or biologic (e.g. bacteria) pesticides, because we were

interested in examining the transport and fate of synthetic compounds. From these most commonly used synthetic herbicides and insecticides, we selected compounds that were detected in streams from 1992 to 2012 by the USGS NAWQA program (www.waterqualitydata.us/portal, obtained on 30 March 2017). Finally, we examined commercial product use labels and only included compounds that were used on corn because standard EPA scenarios used in the calculation of EECs (see below) are more frequently available across geographic regions in the US for corn than other

Table 1

List of pesticide active ingredients and type included in the present analyses. Pesticide abbreviations are used as point labels in the subsequent figures.

Pesticide Active Ingredient	Pesticide Abbreviation	Pesticide Type
2,4-D	24D	herbicide
Acetochlor	ACE	herbicide
Alachlor	ALA	herbicide
Atrazine	ATR	herbicide
Bromoxynil	BRO	herbicide
Dicamba	DIC	herbicide
Dimethenamid	DID	herbicide
Diuron	DIU	herbicide
Glyphosate	GLY	herbicide
MCPA	MCP	herbicide
Metolachlor	MET	herbicide
Metribuzin	MTR	herbicide
Oxyfluorfen	OXY	herbicide
Pendimethalin	PEN	herbicide
Simazine	SIM	herbicide
Trifluralin	TRI	herbicide
Aldicarb	ALD	insecticide
Carbaryl	CAR	insecticide
Carbofuran	CBO	insecticide
Chlorpyrifos	CHL	insecticide
Clothianidin	CLO	insecticide
Diazinon	DIA	insecticide
Dimethoate	DIM	insecticide
Imidacloprid	IMD	insecticide
Malathion	MAL	insecticide
Methomyl	MTH	insecticide
Methyl Parathion	MLP	insecticide
Phorate	PHO	insecticide
Propargite	PRO	insecticide
Tefluthrin	TEF	insecticide
Terbufos	TER	insecticide

crops. This selection process resulted in 16 herbicides and 15 insecticides (Table 1).

2.2. Building a dataset characterizing herbicides and insecticides

We built a dataset describing each selected pesticides' use, application rate, environmental mobility and persistence, and maximum measured environmental concentration (Tables S1 and S2). For each compound, we determined an estimate of national use by summing all county-level pesticide estimates from the Estimated Annual Agricultural Pesticide Use dataset from 1992 to 2012. These use estimates represent use for all crops. Maximum concentrations of pesticides in lotic systems were taken from stream survey data from 1992 to 2012 from the USGS NAWQA program (from <https://www.waterqualitydata.us/>, obtained on 30 March 2017, filtered by NAWQA program and stream site type). The total number of stream surveys from which maximum concentrations were taken totaled 499,435. Maximum concentrations of pesticides in lentic systems were taken from surveys of lakes, reservoirs, impoundments, and wetlands from 1992 to 2012 available from National Water Quality Monitoring Council (<https://www.waterqualitydata.us/>, obtained on 9 November 2017, filtered by site type to include lakes, reservoirs, impoundments, and wetlands). The total number of surveys from these lentic systems from which maximum concentrations were taken totaled 129,471. For each pesticide, a single maximum concentration was taken from across lentic and lotic survey locations and times. To help ensure data quality for measured maximum concentrations, we excluded data that were not measured in mass/volume units (e.g. µg/L), excluded measurements that were a result of QA-QC for pesticide testing (e.g. spiked water samples acting as controls), and ensured all concentrations were converted to the same units (e.g. µg/L). Finally, to help limit the influence of timing of sampling on

detection of maximum concentrations, we excluded samples that were triggered by a hydrologic event (i.e., event-based sampling), such as a flood or a storm. Instead, we focused on field samples that were gathered as part of routine-based sampling efforts. In preliminary analyses, event-based samples were included but did not change the results described in this current manuscript. Since we wanted to record maximum observed pesticide concentrations, both filtered and whole water sample were considered. More information regarding the methods of data collection for the resulting pesticide concentrations (e.g. water sampling, lab testing) is provided in Tables S3 and S4. We also recorded sampling effort for each pesticide in lentic and lotic systems, which was the number of times a pesticide was surveyed for across locations and time.

In addition, we gathered maximum field concentrations from lakes, ponds, agricultural ditches, and tailwaters by reviewing the published scientific literature to evaluate whether maximum EECs are indeed worst-case scenarios of exposure using the most information possible on maximum lentic concentrations. We conducted a literature search using Web of Science and Google Scholar using combinations of the following terms: "concentration", "tailwater", "pond", "ditch", "runoff", "field concentration", and the name of the focal pesticide (e.g. atrazine). In the final dataset, we include only values from the literature that exceeded pesticide field database values in lentic systems. Individual maximum concentrations of pesticides gathered from databases or the literature represent observed maximum measured concentrations and not the true or actual peak concentrations, which can only be greater than or equal to the maximum observed concentration (Crawford, 2004).

2.3. Overview of the PWC model

The PWC is a graphic user interface developed by the EPA Office of Pesticide Programs that links the output of the Pesticide Root Zone Model (PRZM) and the Variable Volume Water Model (VVWM). The PWC generates EECs for a fixed volume, no flow, 1-ha by 2-m farm pond or a 5.26-ha by 2.74-m reservoir based on runoff (water, suspended solids, and pesticides) and overspray from an adjacent 10-ha pesticide-treated field (Burns, 2000; Young, 2015, 2016). The PWC uses mass balance equations and assumes that all materials in the two modeled compartments, the water and sediment, are at thermodynamic equilibrium. The inflow of dissolved pesticides or drift is delivered to the water compartment, and sorbed pesticides are delivered to both water and sediment. Pesticides are removed from the water body via sediment burial, volatilization, and degradation. Additional background on the PWC can be obtained from Young (2016).

2.4. Generating estimated environmental concentrations

Data describing the environmental mobility and persistence of herbicides used in the calculation of EECs, including Koc, water column metabolism half-life, benthic metabolism half-life, foliar half-life, aqueous photolysis half-life, molecular weight, vapor pressure, and solubility, were taken primarily from the Pesticide Properties DataBase from the University of Hertfordshire (PPDB, <https://sitem.herts.ac.uk/aeru/ppdb/en/>). Values for hydrolysis half-life and aerobic soil half-life were taken from PAN Pesticide Database. When values were not available for certain pesticides from PAN or PPDB, we used data from the Toxicology Data Network (TOXNET) from the National Institutes of Health (<https://toxnet.nlm.nih.gov/newtoxnet/hsdb.htm>) as indicated in Tables S1 and S2.

Additional pesticide traits included Henry's constant, heat of Henry, air diffusion coefficient, and application information (Tables S1 and S2). Henry's constant and the heat of Henry were taken from the EPA's Estimation Program Interface (EPI) Suite,

specifically HENRYWIN. Henry's constant was calculated using the bond contribution method. We calculated the air diffusion coefficient using the EPA's On-line Tools for Site Assessment Calculation (<https://www3.epa.gov/ceampubl/learn2model/part-two/onsite/estdiffusion-ext.html>). Data concerning number of applications per year, timing of applications, and maximum recommended application rate and method were taken from US commercial pesticide product labels. For herbicides, product instructions for pre-emergent applications for corn were followed when available. We assumed that the last application of pre-emergent herbicides would occur just after planting, 12 days prior to corn emergence. For herbicides that are exclusively applied post-emergence, we assumed applications would occur 10 days after corn emergence. We assumed all herbicides would be applied by direct ground spray, unless product labels indicated the need for soil incorporation. In those cases, applications were set to occur at the suggested depth of soil incorporation based on the product label. For insecticides, product application instructions for post-emergent applications for corn were used when available. We assumed that the first applications would occur 30 days after emergence by spray above the plant. For insecticides that are applied pre-emergence, we assumed applications would occur 12 days before emergence by ground spray at the depth of soil incorporation according to the product labels.

Using the EPA's Pesticide in Water Calculator v. 1.52 (PWC, <https://www.epa.gov/pesticide-science-and-assessing-pesticide-risks/models-pesticide-risk-assessment#PWC>), we generated EECs of the selected pesticides. Model inputs consisted of mobility, persistence, and application data for individual pesticide compounds (Tables S1 and S2). For all pesticide compounds, water, benthic, and soil reference temperatures were assumed to be 23°C, and photolysis reference latitude was 40°. When foliar half-life was not available for a given pesticide, foliar half-life was assumed not to be a large contributor to breakdown in the environment in the PWC model and was set to zero. Under the recommendation of the PWC user manual, efficiency was set to 0.99 and drift was set to 0.01 for all pesticide compounds. Applications were assumed to occur every year. For each pesticide compound, EECs were generated for both ponds and reservoirs in each of five different states (Illinois, Mississippi, North Carolina, Ohio, and Pennsylvania), which varied in their meteorological and geological model inputs provided by the PWC software. This resulted in 10 EECs values for each pesticide. We used the maximum EEC of these 10 estimates for each pesticide in all statistical analyses.

While we generated all EECs based on use on corn because it is the most common crop in the US, to assess how much the results might be sensitive to the use of a single crop, we gathered EEC estimates for each pesticide based on use on corn, soybean, and cotton (where possible). We then quantified how much variation in EECs there was within pesticides among crops versus among pesticides. More variation among pesticides compared to within pesticides among crops would signify our findings are relatively robust based on corn alone. We discovered that there was >4 times the variance among pesticides (47.4%) than there was within pesticide among crops (11.7%), suggesting that our analyses would likely not change substantially if we could better account for the local crop on which each pesticide was used mostly commonly (Supporting Information, Fig. S1).

2.5. Statistical analyses

To determine how often maximum EECs represent worst-case scenarios of pesticides in lentic systems, we calculated the proportion of pesticides for which the maximum environmental concentrations in lentic systems exceeded maximum EECs from PWC

models. In this evaluation, the point of comparison for the EEC was the highest concentration of pesticide found in the Water Quality Monitoring Council database or in the literature. We incorporated literature and database field measurements because we wanted to use all possible available data to describe maximum lentic field values. In all other analyses, we use maximum lentic field values from the National Water Quality Monitoring Council exclusively to ensure that the methods of estimating maximum lentic and lotic field concentrations were similar, which is an important consideration for improving the congruences between EECs and field concentrations because inconsistencies in methodologies might bias analyses. The literature concentrations had to be removed from these analyses because they did not use consistent sampling methodology across studies.

Next, we evaluated the effects of sampling effort on detection of maximum field concentrations in both lentic and lotic systems. While EECs are not generally intended to represent lotic systems, we sought to use lotic systems because of our hypothesis that increased sampling effort might increase the congruence between EECs and maximum field measurements. Lotic systems are much more sampled compared to lentic systems. If we only considered sampling effort variation within lentic systems, it is possible that we would not span a large enough range of sampling efforts to capture the hypothesized asymptotic section of the sampling effort-maximum concentration curve. In fact, our concern was validated because lotic systems seem to be at or near the asymptote, whereas many lentic systems appear to be on the section of the curve where increasing sampling effort increases the maximum EEC. To evaluate the effects of sampling effort on detection of maximum field concentrations in lentic and lotic systems, we built two separate linear models (lm function, *stats* package (R Core Team, 2018)) in which the response was either maximum lentic or lotic concentration and the predictor was sampling effort, defined as the total number of times a pesticide was surveyed for between 1992 and 2012 respective to each system, including surveys which resulted in no detection of the pesticide. To evaluate if inclusion of sampling effort improved the congruence of maximum EECs with maximum field concentrations, first we examined the effect of sampling effort on the relationship between maximum field concentration and maximum EEC. We extracted the residuals from a mixed model (lmer function, *lme4* package (Bates et al., 2015)) with maximum field concentration as the response and maximum EEC as the predictor with pesticide compound as the random effect. These residuals became the response in a subsequent mixed model, where the predictor was sampling effort, and the random effect was pesticide compound. Next, we compared models predicting maximum field concentrations from maximum EECs with and without observations weighted by sampling effort. We constructed linear models (lm function, *stats* package (R Core Team, 2018)) in which the response was either maximum field concentration detected in lentic (from NAQWA) or lotic systems (from National Water Quality Monitoring Council) and the predictors were maximum EEC, pesticide type (insecticide or herbicide), and the interaction between these two predictors. We ran each model with and without weighting observations by sampling effort. In the evaluation of the effect of maximum field concentration on maximum EEC in this set of analyses, we used a one-tailed hypothesis test because of the prediction that maximum field concentration would be positively associated with maximum EEC. To compare the amount of variance explained by each model, we calculated adjusted- R^2 values.

Lastly, we sought to evaluate if the congruence of EECs and maximum field concentrations in lentic systems could be improved by including pesticide use and release as a predictor. We

focus on improving EECs in reference to lentic field concentrations because the EPA uses the PWC to predict pesticide EECs in ponds and reservoirs for ecological and drinking water risk assessments, respectively (Luo, 2014). We used multimodel inference (*MuMIn* package (Bartoń, 2016)), which fits models using combinations of all predictors given in a global model and ranks candidate models by second-order Akaike Information Criteria corrected for small sample sizes (AICc) (dredge function). In our global model, the response was maximum lentic concentration (from the National Water Quality Monitoring Council) and the predictors included: maximum EEC, pesticide type, pesticide use, all two-way and three-way interactions between these factors. Since our purpose was to improve the ability of EECs to predict field concentrations, we only considered candidate models that included maximum EEC as a predictor. To compare the influence of model factors across all candidate models, Akaike weights for each factor were summed across models to determine relative importance scores (Burnham and Anderson, 2002). To evaluate the amount of variance explained by the top model, we calculated adjusted- R^2 values.

In all statistical models in the present analyses, all continuous variables were \log_{10} -transformed to meet assumptions of the analyses. The data analyzed contained the 27 pesticides found in lentic systems when analyses pertained exclusively to lentic data or when lentic and lotic data were combined. Analyses of all 31 pesticides occurred when lotic data were examined exclusively (e.g. for evaluation of inclusion of sampling weights in prediction of lentic field concentrations with EECs). For all models to determine if the predictors significantly influenced the responses, we used the Anova function in the *car* package (Fox and Weisberg, 2011) ($\alpha = 0.05$, Type II SS). Figures were generated using *visreg* (Breheny and Burchett, 2016) and *ggplot2* (Wickham, 2009) packages. R 3.2.1 statistical software (R Core Team, 2018) was used for all analyses.

3. Results

3.1. Do EECs represent worst-case scenarios of pesticides in lentic systems?

Historically, EECs have been described as worst-case environmental concentrations (US EPA, 1992). However, maximum concentrations in lentic systems exceeded EECs for 31.3% of herbicides (5 of 16) and 41.7% of insecticides (5 of 12), suggesting that for many pesticides, EECs did not represent worst-case scenarios of exposure in lentic systems. Pesticides for which field measurements exceeded EECs include carbaryl, phorate, terbufos, diazinon, carbofuran, glyphosate, atrazine, 2,4-D, trifluralin, and MCPA.

While this evaluation of pesticides as “worst-case” scenarios might appear to contradict Fig. 2, the proportion of pesticides for which field values exceed EECs is based both on routine surveys of lentic systems by federal agencies and literature values. All other analyses are based solely on survey data from federal agencies. We evaluated EEC exceedance values using all available data because EECs are seen as “worst-case” scenarios by the EPA suggesting that EECs should rarely, if ever, be exceeded by field measurements. However, for all other analyses, which sought to determine if EEC and environmental measurement congruence could be improved, we excluded these literature values. Environmental concentrations reported in the literature are a product of considerable variation in field survey techniques and laboratory sample analyses. To increase consistency of the methods and reduce variance in environmental measurements, we used only values from federal databases for the remaining analyses.

3.2. What is the effect of sampling effort on detection of maximum field concentrations?

We hypothesized that maximum field concentration would increase asymptotically with sampling effort (Fig. 1A). As sampling effort increases, detected maximum field concentration should increase up to a point (gray section of Fig. 1A), after which increased sampling effort should have little to no association with maximum field concentration (white section of Fig. 1A). We observed this relationship in sampling effort according to environmental systems. Sampling effort was positively associated with maximum field concentration in lotic but not lentic systems (Fig. 1B, Table 2), most likely because lotic systems were sampled 4.9 times as much as lentic systems (mean number \pm standard deviation of lotic versus lentic samples per pesticide: $16,111 \pm 10,301$ vs. 3304 ± 3005). Thus, observations from lentic systems seem to fall on the section of the hypothesized curve with a positive slope where increased sampling is associated with higher detected maximum field concentrations (i.e. gray section of Fig. 1A). In contrast, observations from lotic systems seem to fall on the section of the curve closer to the asymptote, so increases in sampling effort only have marginal effects on the maximum field concentration (i.e. white section of Fig. 1A). Given this pattern, we predicted that including sampling effort would improve the congruence of maximum EECs and maximum field concentrations in lentic but not lotic systems.

3.3. Can inclusion of sampling effort improve the congruence of maximum EECs and maximum field concentrations?

Next, we set out to evaluate if incorporating sampling effort into models could increase the variance in maximum field concentrations explained by maximum EECs. Even though the PWC intends to only predict EEC values in lentic systems, for this comparison we used both lentic and lotic systems because lotic systems are sampled more extensively than lentic systems allowing us to span a greater range of sampling efforts, which increases the likelihood that we detect the hypothesized asymptote in the sampling effort-maximum field concentration curve. This is important because it reduces the likelihood of generating the misconception that all increases in sampling effort will increase detected maximum field concentrations. First, we examined the influence of sampling effort on the relationship between maximum field concentration and EECs. We observed a positive effect of sampling effort on the residuals of a model predicting maximum field concentrations from maximum EECs (Fig. 1C, Table 2). At low to medium relative levels of sampling effort (\log_{10} (sampling effort) = 2.24 to 3.78), maximum EECs tended to overestimate observed maximum field concentrations, which is represented by negative residuals, and at medium to high relative levels of sampling effort (\log_{10} (sampling effort) = 3.78 to 4.57), maximum EECs more often underestimated maximum field concentrations, which is represented by positive residuals (Fig. 1C).

We hypothesized that sampling effort should improve the fit of maximum EECs to maximum field concentrations for lentic systems more so than for lotic systems (Fig. 2, Table 2) because they are more well sampled. The maximum EECs from the PWC, which are purported to represent maximum concentrations of pesticides in ponds and reservoirs, were not a significant predictor of maximum measured pesticide concentrations in lentic systems without weights but became nearly significant when weighting by sampling effort (Table 2). In fact, weighting observations by lentic sampling effort increased the relative amount of variance explained by 50% (Fig. 2A [Adjusted $R^2 = 0.27$], Fig. 2B [Adjusted $R^2 = 0.18$]). Regardless of whether we weighted by sampling effort or not, there was a




Fig. 2. Associations between herbicide and insecticide maximum (max.) estimated environmental concentrations (EEC) and measured maximum field concentrations in lentic (A and B) and lotic (C and D) systems. Models were built with (A and C) and without (B and D) observations weighted by sampling effort. The association between maximum EEC and maximum field concentration is significant for the lotic system with and without observations weighted by sampling effort (Table 2, $p < 0.001$, C and D) and nearly significant for lentic system when observations are weighted by sampling effort (Table 2, $p = 0.052$, A and B). In all panels herbicides are shown with solid circles and solid lines, and insecticides are shown with triangles and dashed lines. Individual pesticides are labeled above and to the left of the point (see Table 1 for abbreviations). Gray bands represent 95% confidence intervals, and light gray lines are 1:1 reference lines.

positive trend between herbicide EECs and measured concentrations of herbicides in lentic systems, but there was no discernible relationship between insecticide EECs and lentic insecticide concentrations (Fig. 2A and B). In other words, maximum EECs were a poor predictor of field concentrations for insecticides in lentic systems. For lotic systems, weighting observations by sampling effort increased the relative amount of variance explained by only 4% (Fig. 2C [Adjusted $R^2 = 0.54$], Fig. 2D [Adjusted $R^2 = 0.52$]). On the one hand, one might not expect EECs intended for ponds and reservoirs to predict measured concentrations in flowing systems well because they are not meant to represent a flowing system – but they do. Maximum EECs were a significant positive predictor of

maximum measured concentration of herbicides and insecticides in lotic systems regardless of whether we weighted by sampling effort or not (Table 2, Fig. 2C and D).

3.4. Can the inclusion of pesticide use and release improve the congruence between maximum EECs and maximum field concentrations?

Given that use of pesticides is at least six orders of magnitude greater than pesticide applications to an individual 10-ha field (Supporting Information), we hypothesized that inclusion of contaminant use and release could improve the ability of maximum

Table 2

Analyses summaries examining 1) the influence of sampling effort on maximum (max.) lentic concentration, lotic concentration, and the residuals of maximum field concentration predicted by maximum estimated environmental concentration (EEC), and 2) the influence of maximum EECs on maximum lentic and lotic concentrations with and without sampling effort weighted. In this set of analyses, we used one-tailed tests for the effect of max. EEC on field concentrations. Finally, 3) we include a summary of the best fitting model predicting maximum lentic concentrations from model selection. P -values less than 0.05 are bolded. χ^2 Statistics correspond with a mixed model. F statistics correspond with non-mixed models. The data analyzed contained the 27 pesticides detected in lentic systems for all analyses, excluding evaluations between maximum lotic concentration and maximum EEC that included all 31 pesticides.

Response	Source of Variation	F/ χ^2	p
Max. lentic concentration	Lentic sampling effort	4.552	0.043
Max. lotic concentration	Lotic sampling effort	0.436	0.515
Residuals (max. field concentration ~ max. EEC)	Sampling effort	12.339	< 0.001
Max. lentic concentration—Weighted by sampling effort	Max. EEC	2.860	0.052
	Pesticide type	2.341	0.140
	Max. EEC × Pesticide type	1.611	0.217
Max. lentic concentration—Not weighted	Max. EEC	1.569	0.112
	Pesticide type	2.028	0.168
	Max. EEC × Pesticide type	0.944	0.341
Max. lotic concentration—Weighted by sampling effort	Max. EEC	21.315	< 0.001
	Pesticide type	2.016	0.167
	Max. EEC × Pesticide type	0.362	0.552
Max. lotic concentration—Not weighted	Max. EEC	17.395	< 0.001
	Pesticide type	1.290	0.266
	Max. EEC × Pesticide type	0.775	0.386
Max. lentic concentration	Max. lotic concentration	1.702	0.204
	Pesticide use	30.594	< 0.001

EECs to predict maximum field concentrations because it might better capture multiple sources of pesticide contamination entering waterbodies. Based on model comparison, the best-fitting model of maximum measured concentrations of pesticides in lentic systems included maximum EEC and estimated use (model weight = 0.42). In this best-fitting model, estimated pesticide use but not maximum EEC significantly predicted maximum measured concentrations of pesticides in lentic systems (Table 2). In addition, maximum EEC and estimated pesticide use had the greatest relative importance scores (Fig. 3A). The most salient point of this analysis is that the best-fitting model more than doubled the ability of the PWC to predict maximum concentrations of pesticides in lentic systems (Adjusted $R^2 = 0.64$ vs. Adjusted $R^2 = 0.27$), which suggests that consideration of pesticide use in exposure models could improve our ability to accurately predict environmental concentrations. Estimated pesticide use was positively associated with maximum lentic concentration suggesting that pesticide use improves EEC predictions of herbicides and insecticides (Fig. 3B).

4. Discussion

From an ecological risk assessment perspective, the ability to accurately predict concentrations of chemical contaminants is essential for the creation of defensible environmental standards, policies, guidelines, and regulations (US EPA, 2004). Consistent with our hypotheses, we demonstrate that incorporating environmental sampling effort and contaminant use or release improves our ability to predict maximum field concentrations from EECs, an approach that can be applied to other fate and transport models. Hence, by leveraging over 600,000 field measurements of the most commonly used insecticides and herbicides to evaluate the PWC model, we offer potential improvements to contaminant fate and transport models more generally. Sampling effort greatly improves the ability of EECs to predict the variance of field concentrations in poorly sampled lentic systems but only marginally improves prediction in well-sampled lotic systems. In addition, inclusion of pesticide use as a measurement of multiple contaminant point-sources more than doubled the ability of EECs to predict maximum concentrations of pesticides in lentic systems. While these findings might not apply to pesticides that are only just coming to market, these findings have important implications for

currently-used pesticides that must be reregistered and reevaluated for environmental safety via risk assessment at least every 15 years in accordance with US law. Moreover, the findings suggest that, even for registration decisions, EECs can underestimate maximum field concentrations because they do not account for multiple contaminant sources.

4.1. The importance of sampling effort on the congruence between EECs and field concentrations

When compared against maximum lentic field measurements, maximum pesticide EECs produced by PWC models for ponds and reservoirs performed poorly. For instance, historically, maximum EECs have been considered worst-case scenarios of exposure (US EPA, 1992), but our results show that this is a mischaracterization. If a maximum EEC is truly a worst-case scenario of exposure, we would expect that field concentrations of pesticides would rarely if ever fall above an EEC, but for about ~30–40% of the most commonly used pesticides measured, field values exceed EECs. This finding is important because if risk assessors and policy makers consider maximum EECs as worst-case concentrations to gauge the greatest potential for toxicity, they would be underestimating levels of field exposures in many cases. This difference between maximum EECs and maximum field measurements indicates the need to consider factors that might improve PWC models.

Patterns of the observed relationship between sampling effort and maximum detected field concentrations lead us to the hypothesis that the importance of sampling effort on the ability of EECs to predict field concentration likely varies with lotic versus lentic systems because of differences in the amount of pesticide sampling effort in each system. For instance, lentic systems are sampled about 4.9 times as much as lotic systems. Because the relationship between sampling effort and maximum field concentration in lotic systems is positive, we hypothesized that sampling effort would be important for EECs to predict field concentrations in this system. In contrast, because sampling effort only has a marginal effect on maximum field concentrations in lotic systems, we predicted that sampling effort would have little to no effect on the ability of EECs to predict field concentrations.

Consistent with our hypothesis, we show that the ability of maximum EECs to predict maximum field concentrations can be




Fig. 3. **A)** Relative importance scores of factors from model comparisons, evaluating the best predictors of maximum concentration of pesticides in lentic systems. Maximum estimated environmental concentration is abbreviated as Max. EEC. **B)** Conditional plot displaying the significant effect of estimated pesticide use on maximum (max.) lentic concentration, controlling for maximum EEC, soil half-life, and pesticide type (based on best fitting model, Table 2, $F = 30.594$, $p < 0.001$). Gray bands represent 95% confidence intervals. Conditional plot was generated using the *visreg* package in R.

improved by weighting observations by sampling effort in both lentic and lotic systems, but the magnitude of this improvement is greater for lentic than lotic systems. Weighting observation by sampling effort increased the relative amount of variance explained by 4% for lotic systems and 50% for lentic systems. Consequently, these results demonstrate that accounting for contaminant sampling effort is important, especially when sampling efforts fall within the range in which sampling effort is positively correlated with maximum field concentrations. If scientists validate EECs by comparing maximum EECs to maximum environmental

concentrations to determine if EECs are accurate or not, they must account for the variance in maximum environmental concentrations that are a function of sampling effort. By accounting for sampling effort, scientists can more accurately determine if EECs are valid approximations of contaminant exposures.

In addition, the influence of sampling effort on maximum measured concentrations likely varies across lentic and lotic systems. In fast-moving lotic systems at low sampling effort, peak pesticide concentrations persist for only short periods of time (Cope, 1966; Thurman et al., 1991), possibly making detectable maximum pesticide concentrations lower in comparison with slow-moving lentic systems. However, as sampling effort increases in both lentic and lotic systems, an asymptotic point might be reached in which increasing sampling effort does not increase maximum detected pesticide concentration. Covariance between sampling effort and water body type precluded evaluation of this interaction in the current study, which could be an important topic for future research.

For insecticides in lentic systems, even though the variance explained in maximum field concentrations by maximum EEC increased when we accounted for sampling effort (as represented by a shift in the dotted line closer to the 1:1 reference line in Fig. A compared to Fig. B), the ability of EECs to predict field concentrations was still poor (shallow slope of the dotted lines in Fig. A. and B). The inability of the maximum EECs to predict maximum field concentrations of insecticides compared to herbicides might be a function of pesticide use. Use of herbicides is about five times greater than insecticides in the US (Grube et al., 2011), and so the power to detect an association between maximum herbicide EECs and maximum herbicide field concentrations should be greater than that for insecticides. As a result, maximum field concentration of herbicides might be closer to the true peak concentrations compared to insecticides.

4.2. Increasing the congruence of EECs and field concentrations with use and release

Even when field concentrations are the result of intensive sampling, maximum EECs can still underestimate maximum field concentrations (which is represented by positive residuals in Fig. 1C). The assumption of a single point source likely results in this underestimation of the peak environmental concentrations by EECs. For instance, most fate and transport models, including the PWC, assume a single point source of contamination, but measured concentrations of contaminants in freshwater ecosystems are often the result of runoff and aerial deposition from multiple sources of contamination across the landscape.

Based on this motivation, we attempted to improve the ability of EECs to predict field concentrations in lentic systems by accounting for pesticide use. For both herbicides and insecticides, pesticide use improved the ability of EECs to predict maximum concentrations in lentic systems, more than doubling the variance explained compared to a model without use. Most notably, when the model accounted for sampling effort and pesticide use, the ability of EECs to predict maximum field concentrations in lentic systems went from no relationship (Fig. 2A) to a significant positive relationship (Fig. 3B). These results suggest that pesticide use at the level is likely an improved indicator of pesticide loading into a freshwater ecosystem than the single point-source of contamination that is assumed in the current PWC model. USGS pesticide use estimates are likely a conservative representation of pesticide inputs because they represent only agricultural applications and ignore pesticide applications in homes and industry.

5. Conclusions

Estimated environmental concentrations from contaminant fate and transport models are favored ways to characterize exposure risk by regulatory agencies because they are low cost, low effort, and provide consistent methodology for estimates across compounds (US EPA, 1992). Currently, these models represent the best methods that have been developed to estimate concentrations of contaminants in the environment. However, these models stand to be improved to increase the accuracy of predictions; especially during reregistration processes when additional data on use and environmental measurements are available. Using current-use pesticides, we demonstrate that not only are pesticide maximum EECs produced by the PWC model poor characterizations of worst-case exposures, but they also perform poorly at predicting concentrations of pesticides in their intended lentic systems across pesticide types. The underlying PWC model can be assessed by comparing its EECs to large datasets of measured environmental concentrations. An essential consideration in this comparison is the inclusion of sampling effort. In addition, including contaminant use as a proxy for multiple-sources of contamination for currently used compounds can increase the variance in field concentration explained by EECs. Scientists active in the development of environmental fate and transport models recognize the importance of including multiple sources of contamination. For instance, models widely used in the United States and Europe incorporate multiple point sources of contamination including the Soil and Water Assessment Tool (SWAT) (Arnold et al., 1998), ChimERA Fate (Morselli et al., 2015), and Stream-EU (Lindim et al., 2016). The inclusion of field survey information and use for pesticides is easily accomplished because these data are already included separately in the most current ecological risk assessments used for pesticide regulation (Farruggia and Rossmesl, 2017). In general, because of environmental laws and regulation requiring reporting of pollution, including the Emergency Planning and Community Right-to-Know Act, the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act, the Toxic Substances Control Act, the Clean Water Act, and the Clean Air Act, there is a clear understanding of the identity and amounts of multiple point sources of many contaminants from industry and agriculture. So, the amounts of contaminants released into the environment could be feasibly incorporated into EEC models for currently used non-pesticide contaminants as well.

Given our results, the next step for improvement of the PWC model would be for EPA staff members to directly include pesticide use in the mechanistic model. Access to the proprietary computer code that underlies the PWC model prevented us from doing so in the current study. Improving the understanding of the determinants of maximum concentrations of pesticides in lentic systems is not only important for improving exposure characterization as a part of federal ecological risk assessment, but is also critical for the understanding and protecting small freshwater bodies which provide critical habitat to communities of plants and animals (Balian et al., 2008; Strayer and Dudgeon, 2010) that contribute to the functioning of ecosystems (Costanza et al., 2014). Improvement of contaminant fate and distribution models used in federal risk assessments and in the development of regulations is critical to ensure that the best science available is used to make data-driven policy decisions.

Acknowledgments

We appreciate the advice of D. Young concerning the implementation of EPA's PWC models, and M. Mahon concerning coding for figures. This work was supported by funds from the National Science Foundation (EF-1241889, EEID-1518681), the National

Institutes of Health (R01GM109499, R01TW010286-01), the U.S. Department of Agriculture (NRI 2009-35102-0543).

Appendix A. Supplementary data

Supplementary data to this article can be found online at <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.watres.2019.03.038>.

References

- Arnold, J.G., Srinivasan, R., Muttiah, R.S., Williams, J.R., 1998. Large area hydrologic modeling and assessment part I: model development. *J. Am. Water Resour. Assoc.* 34, 73–89. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1752-1688.1998.tb05961.x>.
- Atwood, D., Paisley-Jones, C., 2017. *Pesticides Industry Sales and Usage 2008–2012 Market Estimates*. United States Environmental Protection Agency, Washington, DC.
- Baker, N.T., Stone, W.W., 2015. *Estimated Annual Agricultural Pesticide Use for Counties of the Conterminous United States, 2008–2012*.
- Balian, E.V., Segers, H., Lévêque, C., Martens, K., 2008. The Freshwater Animal Diversity Assessment: an Overview of the Results. *Hydrobiologia*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10750-007-9246-3>.
- Bartoń, K., 2016. MuMIn: Multi-Model Inference, R Package, version 1.15.6.
- Bates, D., Mächler, M., Bolker, B., Walker, S., 2015. Fitting linear mixed-effects models using lme4. *J. Stat. Softw.* 67, 51. <https://doi.org/10.18637/jss.v067.i01>.
- Beketov, M.A., Kefford, B.J., Schafer, R.B., Liess, M., 2013. Pesticides reduce regional biodiversity of stream invertebrates. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* 110, 11039–11043.
- Bernhardt, E.S., Rosi, E.J., Gessner, M.O., 2017. Synthetic chemicals as agents of global change. *Front. Ecol. Environ.* 15, 84–90. <https://doi.org/10.1002/fee.1450>.
- Braun, J.M., 2017. Early-life exposure to EDCs: role in childhood obesity and neurodevelopment. *Nat. Rev. Endocrinol.* 13, 161–173. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nrendo.2016.186>.
- Breheny, P., Burchett, W., 2016. Visualization of Regression Models. R Package Version 2.3-0. <http://CRAN.R-project.org/package=visreg>.
- Burnham, K.P., Anderson, D.R., 2002. Model selection and multimodel inference: a practical information-theoretic approach. In: *Ecological Modelling*, second ed. Springer Science & Business Media, New York. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolmodel.2003.11.004>.
- Burns, L.A., 2000. *Exposure Analysis Modeling Systems (EXAMS) User Manual and System Documentation*. USEPA, Research Triangle Park, NC.
- Cope, O., 1966. Contamination of the freshwater ecosystem by pesticides. *J. Appl. Ecol.* 3, 33–44.
- Costanza, R., de Groot, R., Sutton, P., van der Ploeg, S., Anderson, S.J., Kubiszewski, I., Farber, S., Turner, R.K., 2014. Changes in the global value of ecosystem services. *Glob. Environ. Chang.* 26, 152–158. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2014.04.002>.
- Crawford, C.G., 2004. Sampling strategies for estimating acute and chronic exposures of pesticides in streams. *J. Am. Water Resour. Assoc.* 40, 485–502. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1752-1688.2004.tb01045.x>.
- Dudgeon, D., Arthington, A.H., Gessner, M.O., Kawabata, Z.I., Knowler, D.J., Lévêque, C., Naiman, R.J., Prieur-Richard, A.H., Soto, D., Stiassny, M.L.J., Sullivan, C.A., 2006. Freshwater biodiversity: importance, threats, status and conservation challenges. *Biol. Rev.* <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1464793105006950>.
- Farruggia, F.T., Rossmesl, C.M., 2017. *Preliminary Ecological Risk Assessment for Benfluralin*. Office of Pesticide Programs 084301-431029. Washington, DC.
- Fleeger, J.W., Carman, K.R., Nisbet, R.M., 2003. Indirect effects of contaminants in aquatic ecosystems. *Sci. Total Environ.* 317, 207–233. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0048-9697\(03\)00141-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0048-9697(03)00141-4).
- Fox, J., Weisberg, S., 2011. *An R Companion to Applied Regression*, second ed. Sage, Thousand Oaks, CA.
- Gillili, R.J., Hamilton, P.A., 2006. *Pesticides in the Nation's Streams and Ground Water, 1992–2001—A Summary*.
- Grube, A., Donaldson, D., Kiely, T., Wu, L., 2011. Pesticides Industry Sales and Usage: 2006 and 2007 Market Estimates. https://doi.org/https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2015-10/documents/market_estimates2007.pdf.
- Kampa, M., Castanas, E., 2008. Human health effects of air pollution. *Environ. Pollut.* 151, 362–367. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envpol.2007.06.012>.
- Knäbel, A., Meyer, K., Rapp, J., Schulz, R., 2014. Fungicide field concentrations exceed FOCUS surface water predictions: urgent need of model improvement. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* 48, 455–463. <https://doi.org/10.1021/es4048329>.
- Knäbel, A., Stehle, S., Schäfer, R.B., Schulz, R., 2012. Regulatory FOCUS surface water models fail to predict insecticide concentrations in the field. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* 48, 8397–8404. <https://doi.org/10.1021/es301649w>.
- Larsen, A.E., Gaines, S.D., Deschênes, O., 2017. Agricultural pesticide use and adverse birth outcomes in the San Joaquin Valley of California. *Nat. Commun.* 8. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-017-00349-2>.
- Larsen, A.E., Noack, F., 2017. Identifying the landscape drivers of agricultural insecticide use leveraging evidence from 100,000 fields. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. Unit. States Am.* 114, 5473–5478. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1620674114>.
- Leu, C., Singer, H., Müller, S.R., Schwarzenbach, R.P., Stamm, C., 2005. Comparison of atrazine losses in three small headwater catchments. *J. Environ. Qual.* 34, 1873–1882. <https://doi.org/10.2134/jeq2005.0049>.

- Lindim, C., van Gils, J., Cousins, I.T., 2016. A large-scale model for simulating the fate & transport of organic contaminants in river basins. *Chemosphere* 144, 803–810. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chemosphere.2015.09.051>.
- Luo, Y., 2014. *Methodology for Evaluating Pesticides for Surface Water Protection III. Module for Urban Scenarios*. Sacramento, CA.
- Malaj, E., von der Ohe, P.C., Grote, M., Kühne, R., Mondy, C.P., Usseglio-Polatera, P., Brack, W., Schäfer, R.B., 2014. Organic chemicals jeopardize the health of freshwater ecosystems on the continental scale. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. Unit. States Am.* 111, 9549–9554. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1321082111>.
- Meybeck, M., Helmer, R., 1989. The quality of rivers: from pristine stage to global pollution. *Palaeogeogr. Palaeoclimatol. Palaeoecol.* 75, 283–309. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0031-0182\(89\)90191-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/0031-0182(89)90191-0).
- Morselli, M., Semplice, M., De Laender, F., Van den Brink, P.J., Di Guardo, A., 2015. Importance of environmental and biomass dynamics in predicting chemical exposure in ecological risk assessment. *Sci. Total Environ.* 526, 338–345. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2015.04.072>.
- Nel, A., Xia, T., Mädler, L., Li, N., 2006. Toxic potential of materials at the nanolevel. *Science* (80-.) 311, 622–627. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1114397>.
- R Core Team, 2018. *R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing*. R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria.
- Read, E.K., Carr, L., De Cicco, L., Dugan, H.A., Hanson, P.C., Hart, J.A., Kreft, J., Read, J.S., Winslow, L.A., 2017. Water quality data for national-scale aquatic research: the Water Quality Portal. *Water Resour. Res.* 53, 1735–1745. <https://doi.org/10.1002/2016WR019993>.
- Rhind, S.M., 2009. Anthropogenic pollutants: a threat to ecosystem sustainability? *Philos. Trans. R. Soc. B Biol. Sci.* 364, 3391–3401. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2009.0122>.
- Rohr, J.R., McCoy, K.A., 2010. A qualitative meta-analysis reveals consistent effects of atrazine on freshwater fish and amphibians. *Environ. Health Perspect.* 118, 20–32. <https://doi.org/10.1289/ehp.0901164>.
- Stehle, S., Knäbel, A., Schulz, R., 2013. Probabilistic risk assessment of insecticide concentrations in agricultural surface waters: a critical appraisal. *Environ. Monit. Assess.* 185, 6295–6310. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10661-012-3026-x>.
- Stehle, S., Schulz, R., 2015. Agricultural insecticides threaten surface waters at the global scale. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. Unit. States Am.* 112, 5750–5755. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1500232112>.
- Stone, W.W., Gilliom, R.J., Ryberg, K.R., 2014. Pesticides in U.S. streams and rivers: occurrence and trends during 1992–2011. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* 48, 11025–11030. <https://doi.org/10.1021/es5025367>.
- Strayer, D.L., Dudgeon, D., 2010. Freshwater biodiversity conservation: recent progress and future challenges. *J. North Am. Benthol. Soc.* 29, 344–358. <https://doi.org/10.1899/08-171.1>.
- Thelin, G.P., Stone, W.W., 2013. *Estimation of Annual Agricultural Pesticide Use for Counties of the Conterminous United States, 1992–2009*.
- Thurman, E.M., Meyer, M.T., Goolsby, D.A., Kolpin, D.W., 1991. Herbicides in surface waters of the midwestern United States: the effect of spring flush. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* 25, 1794–1796. <https://doi.org/10.1021/es00022a018>.
- US EPA, 2004. *An Examination of EPA Risk Assessment Principles and Practices*. Office of the Science Advisor EPA/100/B-04/001, Washington, DC.
- US EPA, 1992. *Guidelines for exposure assessment*. Fed. Regist. 57 (104), 22888–22938. Washington, DC. <https://doi.org/EPA/600/Z-92/001>.
- Wickham, H., 2009. *ggplot2: Elegant Graphics for Data Analysis*. Springer-Verlag, New York, NY.
- Xie, Y., Luo, Y., Singhasemanon, N., Goh, K.S., 2018. Regulatory modeling of pesticide aquatic exposures in California's agricultural receiving waters. *J. Environ. Qual.* 47, 1453–1461. <https://doi.org/10.2134/jeq2018.05.0198>.
- Young, D.F., 2016. *The Variable Volume Water Model Revision A*. Office of Pesticide Programs USEPA/OPP 734S16002, Washington, DC.
- Young, D.F., 2015. *Pesticide in Water Calculator User Manual*. USEPA, Washington, DC, version 1.52.