

1 **Sustainability of Land-Application of Class B Biosolids**

2 **Ian L. Pepper^a, Huruy Zerzghi^b, John P. Brooks^c, and Charles P. Gerba^b**

3
4 **ABSTRACT**

5 Land-application of Class B biosolids is routinely undertaken in the United States.
6 However, due to public concern over potential hazards, the long term sustainability of land-
7 application has been questioned. Thus, the objective of this review article was to evaluate the
8 sustainability of land-application of Class B biosolids. To do this we evaluated: 1) the fate and
9 transport of biological and chemical hazards within biosolids that could be harmful to human
10 health; and 2) the influence of long term land-application on the microbial and chemical
11 properties of the soil. Direct risks to human health posed by pathogens in biosolids have been
12 shown to be low. Risks from indirect exposure such as aerosolized pathogens or microbially
13 contaminated groundwater are also low. A long term land-application study showed enhanced
14 microbial activity and no adverse toxicity effects on the soil microbial community. Long term
15 land-application also increased soil macro-nutrients including C N and in particular P. In fact,
16 care should be taken to avoid contamination of surface waters with high phosphate soils.
17 Available soil metal concentrations remained low over the 20 year land-application period, due
18 to the low metal content of the biosolids and a high soil pH. Soil salinity increases were not
19 detected due to the low salt content of biosolids and irrigation rates in excess of consumptive use
20 rates for cotton. Our conclusion based on these studies is that long term land application of Class
21 B biosolids is sustainable.

INTRODUCTION

1
2 The world population of 6.8 billion people all produce sewage. In the developed world
3 most of this is treated in wastewater treatment plants which results in large volumes of biosolids.
4 In the United States, the term biosolids implies treatment to produce Class A or Class B biosolids
5 that meet the land-application standards in the Part 503 Environmental Protection Agency
6 regulations (EPA, 1994). Currently about 60% of all biosolids are land applied in the United
7 States with most of the land receiving Class B biosolids (NRC, 2002). Class B biosolids are
8 normally produced as a “cake” ($\approx 20\%$ solids) or as liquid biosolids ($\approx 5\text{-}8\%$ solids). In either
9 case, Class B biosolids usually result from mesophilic anaerobic digestion, and by definition are
10 likely to contain human pathogenic bacteria, viruses and protozoan parasites (Pepper et al.,
11 2006).

12 Although the type of land and crops to which Class B biosolids are applied is controlled,
13 public concern in some areas of the United States such as parts of California, has resulted in the
14 banning of land-application of Class B biosolids. This has raised the issue of the sustainability of
15 land-application in general, and in particular, application of Class B material. In some cases,
16 public concern has been warranted due to the limited amount of data on the fate and transport of
17 pathogens after land-application. Studies have been needed on indirect routes of exposure, such
18 as contact with bioaerosols at some distance from land-application sites, or consumption of
19 groundwater beneath sites where land application takes place. Because of this concern, over the
20 past several years, the University of Arizona, National Science Foundation Water Quality Center
21 has sponsored numerous studies on major biological issues related to land-application. In this

1 review, we provide an evaluation of the relative risk of each hazard to human health based on a
2 summary of the University of Arizona studies and other relevant studies.

3 Sustainability of land-application has also been questioned based on the long term effects
4 of continuous biosolid applications on soil physical, microbial and chemical properties. To
5 answer these issues we document a long term University of Arizona study on the effects of land-
6 application on soil properties. Based on this study and a review of the literature, we provide an
7 assessment of the sustainability of land-application of Class B biosolids.

8 9 **POTENTIAL BIOLOGICAL HAZARDS ASSOCIATED WITH LAND APPLICATION** 10 **OF CLASS B BIOSOLIDS**

11 **Occurrence of Known Human Pathogens in Class B Biosolids**

12 The known principal pathogens of concern in Class B biosolids are shown in Table 1.
13 Types of pathogens are categorized as: bacteria, viruses, protozoa, and helminth worms. Of
14 these, *Salmonella*, enteric viruses and helminth ova concentrations are utilized to discriminate
15 between Class A and Class B biosolids (EPA, 1994). Potentially, Class B biosolids may contain
16 some or all of these known pathogens, and because of this, site restrictions are placed on land-
17 application sites that are meant to preclude initial human contact with biosolids. Essentially site
18 restrictions are implemented to allow for die off of human pathogens to non-detectable levels.
19 Despite this, public concern has focused on indirect routes of exposure such as bioaerosols to off-
20 site locations, or the leaching of pathogens into groundwater. In addition, from time to time,
21 concerns have arisen about the presence of specific or emerging human pathogens that could be
22 present in biosolids. An example of this is the *Staphylococcus aureus* controversy of 2002.

1 **Incidence of *Staphylococcus aureus* in Sewage and Biosolids**

2 *S. aureus* is the agent of a wide variety of skin and wound infections in humans and is
3 commonly found in the nares and skin of warm blooded animals. Although there was no
4 scientific documentation of *S. aureus* transmittal from wastewater or biosolids, claims were made
5 that land-applied biosolids were the source of infections in residents living close to the
6 application site (Lewis and Gattie, 2002). Staphylococci have been reported in aerosols from
7 wastewater treatment plants using aeration treatments (Brandi et al., 2000). However, it was not
8 confirmed that these were in fact *S. aureus*. However, raw sewage has been shown to be a
9 definitive source of *S. aureus* in a more recent University of Arizona study, but it was not
10 detected in Class A or B biosolids (Table 2), suggesting that the organism did not survive
11 biosolid treatment (Rusin et al., 2003). In addition the organism was never detected in
12 bioaerosols resulting from land-application sites. Based on these data, it was concluded that
13 biosolids were not a significant source of *S.aureus* exposure (Rusin et al., 2003).

14 **Offsite Exposure of Bioaerosols to Residents Close to Land-Application Sites**

15 Closely related to the *S.aureus* issue was the question of bioaerosols. Specifically,
16 concern centered on the potential for movement of aerosolized pathogens away from a land-
17 application site to local residential communities. The risk of infection to residents living close to
18 land-application sites was identified as an area where data were lacking in the National Research
19 Council report on land-application (NRC, 2002). A limited number of studies have been
20 conducted on the generation of bioaerosols from biosolids land application. Notably, Sorber et
21 al. (1984) concluded that little or no risk was associated with the land application of liquid
22 biosolids based on the lack of pathogenic viral presence in large volumes of sampled air. Other

1 studies have focused on large piles of biosolids, unloaded by trucks on site, and subsequently
2 loaded with front-end loaders into biosolids spreaders or hoppers (Pillai et al., 1996; Dowd et al.,
3 2000). Loading events proved to be sources of increased concentration of faecal microbial
4 indicators such as, H₂S producing bacteria, and *Clostridium* spp. No risk analyses were
5 conducted in the former study although the investigators concluded that the microbial indicator
6 concentrations were below levels that could be construed as a risk to public health. The latter
7 study conducted microbial risk analyses based on the use of complex transport models first
8 proposed for the transport of chemical aerosols (Pasquill, 1961). Through the use of these
9 models, aerosol concentrations could effectively be predicted at downwind distances from both
10 point (biosolids pile) and area sources (a biosolids applied field) (Dowd et al., 2000). Because of
11 the lack of data on bioaerosols, the University of Arizona undertook a large national study to
12 evaluate community risks from aerosols derived from land-application sites (Brooks et al.,
13 2005a,b; Tanner et al., 2005). Risks of infection from *Salmonella* and Coxsackie virus A21 were
14 determined at various distances from land-applied biosolids. An example of the data generated is
15 illustrated in Table 3, which shows the annual community risk of infection from aerosolized
16 *Salmonella* from land application at a distance of 30 m from the site. Risks were determined
17 using the β -Poisson infectivity model for ingestion of nontyphoid *Salmonella* spp. (Brooks et al.,
18 2005a). Risks of infection for Coxsackie virus A21 were also low. The most likely explanation
19 for risks being so low is that for community risk, fate and transport of pathogens are important
20 factors, allowing for dilution and natural attenuation of pathogens due to environmental factors
21 such as desiccation and ultraviolet light. In addition, it was postulated that organisms were
22 bound to soil and or biosolid particles with limited subsequent transport. Occupational risks to

1 biosolid workers were also evaluated and were found to be low, but higher than community risks.
2 The higher risks are due to enhanced duration of exposure and proximity to the land application
3 site.

4 In a more recent study, the diversity of aerosolized bacteria during land-application of
5 Class B biosolids was determined (Brooks et al., 2007a). Specifically, sequence analyses of
6 clones obtained from community DNA extractions were evaluated as to their source. Essentially
7 the bacterial diversity of clone sequences from the following samples were obtained: 1) aerosols
8 resulting from tractor operations on an agricultural field prior to land-application (aerosol-soil);
9 2) aerosols obtained during land-application (aerosol-biosolids); 3) Class B biosolids; and 4)
10 control soil (no biosolids). The most likely predominant source of aerosols obtained during land-
11 application of Class B biosolids can be determined from Figure 1. Interpretation of the Venn
12 diagram shows that the majority of bacterial aerosols obtained during land-application of
13 biosolids appear to be associated with the onsite soil, not the biosolids.

14 Recent work has concentrated on determining the source of bioaerosols from land
15 application sites, utilizing methods developed for source tracking fecal contamination in
16 watersheds (Paez-Rubio et al., 2006; Baertsch et al., 2007; Paez-Rubio et al., 2007). Microbial
17 source tracking (MST) methods were utilized, in which the authors used bacterial DNA from the
18 class *Chloroflexi* and the phylum *Euryarchaeota* , which are typically present in high
19 concentrations in biosolids (Baertsch et al., 2007). These MST methods consisted of screening
20 concentrated aerosol samples for the presence of these organisms using polymerase chain
21 reaction (PCR). In addition, the investigators also used innovative approaches to indirectly
22 report bioaerosol concentrations associated with Class B biosolids sites in the desert

1 southwestern United States (Paez-Rubio et al., 2006; Paez-Rubio et al., 2007). These approaches
2 involved the use of particulate matter (PM) measurements, and bulk biosolid chemical and
3 biological measurements. The biological and chemical composition of downwind aerosols were
4 estimated based on PM₁₀ and bulk biosolid measurements. Through these three studies it was
5 determined that biosolids/soil derived particulate matter do in fact aerosolize during disking
6 operations, often to concentrations greater than 1.5 mg m⁻³. The investigators estimate that
7 biosolids derived particulate matter make up approximately less than 1/1000th of this
8 concentration particularly during disking operations in which soil is the dominant particle.
9 Overall this research confirmed that the majority of aerosols obtained during land application
10 arise from soil sources rather than biosolids.

11 Based on all of these studies, we conclude that the community risk of human infection
12 from pathogenic bioaerosols emanating from biosolids is low. However, another concern related
13 to bioaerosols has been the issue of endotoxin, which can also be aerosolized. Endotoxin,
14 lipopolysaccharide derived from the cell wall of Gram-negative bacteria, is a highly
15 immunogenic class of molecules that when introduced into the bloodstream or airways has
16 demonstrated the ability to cause a broad range of health effects, such as fever, asthma, and shock
17 (hence the suffix “toxin”) (Bradley 1979; Olenchok 2001; Michel 2003). Lipopolysaccharide is
18 present ubiquitously throughout the environment, as Gram-negative bacteria continuously release
19 lipopolysaccharide during both cell decay and active cell growth. Most surfaces contain some
20 traces of endotoxin due to dust-associated endotoxin, and therefore most human populations
21 come into contact with some endotoxin (Gereda et al., 2001; Sharif et al. 2004). Although

1 endotoxin is present in everyday environments, it is primarily of concern as an aerosol, since
2 most human endotoxin ailments are pulmonary associated.

3 Exposures to aerosolized endotoxin have been specifically studied regarding occupational
4 exposures from cotton dust, composting plants, and feed houses (Clark et al. 1983; Rylander et
5 al., 1983; Castellan et al. 1987; Smid et al. 1992; Epstein 1994; Donham et al. 2000). Exposures
6 to levels of endotoxin as low as 0.2 endotoxin unit (EU) m^{-3} , derived from poultry dust, have
7 been found to cause acute pulmonary ailments, such as decreases in forced expiratory volume
8 (Donham et al. 2000). Chronic conditions such as asthma and bronchitis have been found to be
9 due to exposures of endotoxin from cotton dust as low as 10 EU m^{-3} on a daily basis (Olenchock
10 2001).

11 Past studies that have been conducted evaluating environmental exposures to endotoxin
12 have used methods such as membrane trapping of aerosolized endotoxin. Recently, a study
13 compared two methods of collection of aerosolized endotoxin: traditional membrane trappings
14 and collection via impingement (Duchaine et al. 2001). Results suggest differences between the
15 two methods, and that impingement may result in higher percent recoveries and greater precision.
16 This same study focused on aerosolized endotoxin exposure in occupational settings, specifically
17 swine barns and sawmills. It was shown that swine barns were found to contain mean
18 concentrations of endotoxin 10 times greater than that of sawmills, 4,385 and 740 EU m^{-3} ,
19 respectively. Endotoxin concentration ranged from a minimum of 208 to 17,063 EU m^{-3} for
20 sawmills and from 2,026 to 11,297 EU m^{-3} for swine barns, as collected by impingement
21 sampling.

1 To determine the extent of endotoxin attributable to land-application, aerosol samples
2 were recently collected during land-application of biosolids, during tractor operations on an
3 agricultural field (no biosolids), and from an aeration basin located within an open-air
4 wastewater treatment plant (Brooks et al., 2006). Data in Table 4 show that the greatest source
5 of endotoxin was from a wastewater treatment plant aeration basin, although differences were not
6 significant. In addition, an evaluation of the agricultural operations shows that on average, more
7 endotoxin is aerosolized during tractor operations without biosolids, than with biosolids.
8 Therefore, the majority of endotoxin may in fact be of soil origin, Work conducted by Paez-
9 Rubio et al. (2006, 2007) corroborated these findings. These data also agree with the Brooks et
10 al. (2007a) study which showed that soil was the major source of aerosolized bacteria.

11 **Off-site Exposure to Pathogens via Groundwater Contamination**

12 The transport and fate of viruses in porous media have received significant attention
13 (Goyal and Gerba, 1979; Gerba et al., 1981; Bales et al., 1991; 1993; 1997; Jin et al., 1997;
14 Dowd et al., 1998). Such studies have focused primarily on the adsorption, transport, and fate of
15 viruses in aqueous (e.g., sewage effluent) systems. Conversely, minimal information with regard
16 to the transport of indigenous coliphage associated with land application of biosolids is available.

17 The potential for groundwater contamination with pathogens due to land-application of
18 biosolids is dependent on transport through soil and the vadose zone. Such transport is affected
19 by a complex array of abiotic and biotic factors, including adhesion processes, filtration effects,
20 physiological state of the cells, soil characteristics, water flow rates, predation and intrinsic
21 mobility of the organism (Newby et al., 2000). Recent work at the University of Arizona showed
22 that viruses are embedded and/or adsorbed to biosolids, which likely influences the potential for

1 release and subsequent transport of the virus through soil under saturated conditions (Chetochine
2 et al., 2006). Overall, less than 8% of indigenous coliphage initially present in Class B biosolids
3 were leached out of the biosolids/soil matrix. Such binding reduces the mobility of viruses, and
4 limits the potential for significant leaching. An additional study also showed that dissolved
5 organic carbon had no influence on viral transport (Cheng et al., 2007). In agreement with this,
6 Pancorbo et al. (1981) seeded anaerobically digested sewage sludge with poliovirus type 1 to a
7 concentration of 10^6 PFU/ml. They recovered 60% by use of a serial extraction protocol suitable
8 for poliovirus. Their findings indicated that the seeded polioviruses were adsorbed to the solid
9 component of the sewage. Wellings et al. (1976) and Stagg et al. (1978) both reported that
10 indigenous viruses were solid associated in wastewater-activated sludge. Stagg et al.
11 demonstrated that 85% of the indigenous coliphage was adsorbed to solids present in sewage
12 effluent. Bales et al. (1993) also reported that organic matter inhibited transport of phage and
13 human viruses due to hydrophobic interactions. In contrast to these studies, other researchers
14 have demonstrated enhanced transport of virus in the presence of organic matter (Pieper et al.,
15 1997; Jin et al., 2000; Jin and Flury, 2002; Bradford et al., 2006a). This enhanced transport has
16 been attributed to the blocking of favorable attachment sites by organic matter (Guber et al.,
17 2005a). Dissolved organic matter from manure suspensions has also been shown to enhance
18 transport of bacteria in soil (Guber et al., 2005b). Filling of straining sites has also been used to
19 explain this enhanced transport (Bradford et al., 2006b). The different results obtained by
20 different researchers are most likely due to the different types and concentrations of organic
21 matter used in these studies. In the University of Arizona study (Chetochine et al., 2006), phage
22 were shown to be tightly sorbed to biosolids such that 58 sequential extractions of the same

1 biosolid sample were required to remove all phage from the biosolids. Thus, adsorbed and/or
2 embedded viruses are less likely to be transported. Based on this, groundwater contamination
3 from land-application of biosolids does not appear to be likely other than in areas where karst
4 soils predominate with the potential for preferential flow.

5 **Antibiotic-Resistant Bacteria**

6 The antibiotic era began following Alexander Fleming's discovery of penicillin nearly 80
7 years ago. After the first introduction of antibiotics, overuse has been an issue, as over-
8 prescription of first generation antibiotics has led to many resistant bacterial strains (Monroe and
9 Polk 2000, Lieberman 2003). Human bacterial pathogens such as *Salmonella*, *Shigella*, and
10 *Campylobacter* can all be potentially present in biosolids, and as such may present a cause for
11 concern, due to the potential for gene transfer, which could include antibiotic resistance (Rensing
12 et al. 2002, Dzidic and Bedekovic 2003). Of these, pathogenic antibiotic resistant bacteria
13 (ARB) strains may be of most concern as these organisms are already resistant to many
14 commonly prescribed antibiotics (Low 2001, Marshall et al 2004). Non-pathogenic ARB can
15 potentially transfer their resistance genes horizontally to pathogenic strains through antibiotic
16 resistant plasmids, either in the environment or human host (Rensing et al 2002, Dzidic and
17 Bedekovic 2003, Salyers et al 2004). Therefore, potentially when soil, water, or food that has
18 been in contact with biosolids is consumed, there exists the possibility of these ARB, and
19 subsequent transfer of resistance genes occurring within the host. To date however, this has not
20 yet been demonstrated.

21 The evaluation of the influence of land-application of biosolids on the incidence of ARB
22 within soil was recently investigated (Brooks et al., 2007b). Table 5 illustrates the influence of

1 land-application of Class B biosolids on the incidence of soil bacterial resistance to four
2 antibiotics: ampicillin; cephalothin; ciprofloxacin; and tetracycline. Data from soil samples
3 collected prior to land-application, and up to 450 days following land-application show that the
4 influence of biosolids on the incidence of soil-borne antibiotic resistant bacteria was negligible.

5 **Risk of Infection from *Salmonella* Regrowth in Biosolids**

6 Regrowth of *Salmonella* in biosolids during storage after it has left the wastewater
7 treatment plant is one of the more recent concerns with respect to land-application of biosolids.
8 Many laboratory studies have been conducted in the past, focusing on survival and potential
9 growth of inoculated organisms in sterile and nonsterile biosolids and compost. Regrowth of
10 inoculated salmonellae in sterile biosolids is commonly documented, but few studies have
11 documented survival and regrowth of indigenous pathogens in biosolids after levels have
12 decreased below levels of detection. Due to limited available data regarding regrowth of
13 salmonellae in biosolids used for land application, there are conflicting views on this topic.
14 Some studies have shown that regrowth does occur, while other studies have shown that
15 regrowth does not occur. These differences are most likely due to whether indigenous
16 salmonellae are studied or whether biosolids are reseeded with salmonellae. Recently the
17 regrowth potential of both Class A and Class B biosolids and biosolid amended soil was
18 evaluated at the University of Arizona (Zaleski et al., 2005a; Castro del Campo et al., 2007).

19 Regrowth of *Salmonella* does not normally occur in Class B biosolids (Zaleski et al.,
20 2005a). However during solar drying of Class B liquid biosolids in concrete lined drying beds,
21 we did observe regrowth. Specifically during the solar drying, the initially Class B biosolids
22 material (both aerobically and anaerobically) attained Class A status with respect to *Salmonella*

1 levels (<3MPN per 4g). However, following rainfall events the biosolids became saturated and
2 hence anaerobic, allowing regrowth of *Salmonella* to $\approx 10^5$ /g (Zaleski et al., 2005b). For Class A
3 biosolids, regrowth also occurred when biosolids were maintained under saturated anaerobic
4 conditions (Castro-Del Campo et al., 2007). This is consistent with other cited studies. For
5 example Burge et al. (1987) observed that growth of *Salmonella* in Class B biosolids required
6 moisture content greater than 20%. This also agrees with the earlier study of Thomason et al.
7 (1975) who also detected *Salmonella* within wet environments. No regrowth occurred from
8 Class A or B biosolids when the material was added to soil, regardless of whether samples were
9 saturated or not (Zaleski et al., 2005b). The risks of infection from *Salmonella* from direct
10 contact with, or aerosolization from, land applied Class A biosolids in which regrowth had
11 occurred or land applied Class B biosolids, are shown in Table 6. Risks from land-applied Class
12 B were low regardless of whether the route of exposure was from the ingestion of *Salmonella*
13 following direct exposure, or from ingestion following inhalation of an aerosol. Note that
14 *Salmonella* infections due to inhalation has not been documented at this time. In contrast, risks
15 from contact with Class A biosolids following regrowth in the initial biosolids were significant.
16 Therefore, care must be taken to prevent regrowth in Class A biosolids prior to land-application.
17 Regrowth can be prevented by covering biosolids and precluding saturated anaerobic conditions
18 (Gerba et al., 2007).

19
20 **LONG TERM EFFECTS OF LAND-APPLICATION OF LIQUID**
21 **CLASS B BIOSOLIDS ON SOIL PROPERTIES**

1 Sustainability of any process implies that the process can be maintained indefinitely.
2 Further, sustainability necessitates addressing the needs of the present without compromising the
3 ability of future generations to meet their needs. Within this context, the sustainability of land
4 application of Class B biosolids needs to be evaluated over long time periods, and the influence
5 of repeated annual applications of biosolids on soil properties must be documented.
6 Fundamentally, soil quality is maintained through the integration of soil physical, microbial, and
7 chemical properties.

8 **Influence on Soil Physical Properties**

9 Soil physical properties are controlled by soil texture, which is intrinsic to any given soil,
10 and soil structure, which is highly variable. Long term additions of biosolids have been shown to
11 improve the physical properties of the amended soil in several studies. Aggelides and Londra
12 (2000) documented improved physical properties including: saturated and unsaturated hydraulic
13 conductivity; water retention capacity; soil resistance to penetration; bulk density; total porosity;
14 pore size distribution; aggregation and aggregate instability. This study was conducted in a semi-
15 arid climate and improvements were greater in a loamy soil than in a clay soil. Similarly, even
16 three years of land application of biosolids improved the physical properties of a clay loam soil
17 (Tsadilas et al., 2005). This field study was conducted in Mediterranean conditions in central
18 Greece and documented enhanced water retention capacity, available water, and improved
19 infiltration rates. The improvement of physical properties is most likely due to the increased soil
20 organic matter content following land application. Organic matter content has been positively
21 correlated with water retention and infiltration rate, and negatively correlated with bulk density
22 and aggregate instability index (Tsadilas et al., 2005). Although the increased soil organic matter

1 content that occurs following an application is always likely to improve soil physical properties,
2 care must be taken to avoid compaction that can occur due to increased traffic operations.
3 Stamatiadis et al. (1999) documented soil compaction and decreased water infiltration rates
4 following land application of liquid municipal sewage sludge in eastern Nebraska. However,
5 provided that land application is carefully managed i.e., avoidance of traffic over saturated soils,
6 than land application is likely to be sustainable with respect to soil physical properties.

7 **Influence on Soil Microbial Properties**

8 The influence of long term land-application on the soil microbial community and soil
9 chemical properties was evaluated in a University of Arizona 1986-2005 field study (Zerzghi,
10 2008). Essentially this 20 year study provides one basis for the evaluation of the sustainability of
11 land-application since it is one of the longest studies of its kind. This replicated field plot study
12 had 4 treatments: i) control (no amendment); ii) inorganic fertilizer control; iii) biosolids at an
13 agronomic rate (1X) based on the nitrogen requirements for the growth of cotton (160 kg N/ha).
14 The land applied biosolids contained 8% solids; and iv) biosolids at a 3X rate. Twenty annual
15 land applications were applied from 1986-2005. All plots were utilized for the growth of cotton
16 and furrow irrigated as necessary for optimum plant growth. Water supplied as irrigation was
17 approximately 100 cm per growing season, since the consumptive water use requirements for
18 cotton are 92 cm per season. This is approximately twice the evapotranspiration requirements for
19 cotton allowing for leaching of soluble salts through the soil profile. The influence of land-
20 application on the soil microbial community was evaluated in terms of microbial numbers,
21 microbial activity and microbial diversity. The survival of indicator and pathogenic organisms
22 was also determined. Finally note that some parameters were not only evaluated at the

1 termination of the 20 year study, but also earlier in the study (Artiola and Pepper, 1992;
2 Brendecke et al, 1993).

3 Land-application of Class B biosolids resulted in numbers of heterotrophic bacteria, fungi
4 and actinomycetes that were similar to numbers found in control plots. This is not unexpected
5 since the surface soil samples for microbial analyses were collected in December 2005, nine
6 months after the last application of biosolids in March 2005. During this interval, a crop of
7 cotton was grown and harvested, and all available microbial substrate would have been utilized.
8 The lack of adverse affects of 20 years of land application of biosolids on soil microbial numbers
9 agrees with earlier analyses within this study that were conducted in 1990 after 4 annual land
10 applications (Brendecke et al., 1993). In these analyses, 4 years of land application had no
11 significant effect on numbers of soil bacteria, fungi or actinomycetes. In addition, soil
12 respiration rates (as measured by CO₂ evolution) were similar in land applied and control plots.
13 In a recent British study, 3 years of land application at 3 different sites likewise resulted in no
14 observed effect on soil respiration rates, or biomass carbon concentrations (Gibbs et al., 2006a).
15 In addition, numbers of indigenous clover *Rhizobium* were also unaffected by biosolid additions.
16 After 20 years of land application in the University of Arizona study, total coliform and fecal
17 coliform counts did not exceed 3 MPN/g in plots that received biosolids. Control and fertilizer
18 control plots did not contain detectable indicators, or coliphage, *Salmonella* and enteroviruses
19 were not detected in any plots.

20 These data agree with other studies on the survival of indicators and pathogens introduced
21 into soil via land application of biosolids. Specifically, limited survival of *E.coli* and other
22 enteric organisms in biosolids-amended agricultural soil was documented in laboratory and field

1 studies (Lang and Smith, 2007; Lang et al., 2007; Lang et al., 2003; Pepper et al., 1993). Lang
2 and Smith (2007) concluded that the indigenous soil biota were involved in pathogen reduction
3 processes in biosolid amended soil. Survival of enteroviruses in biosolid-amended soils was also
4 evaluated earlier in the University of Arizona study. Specifically the duration of survival of
5 poliovirus type 1 was less than 7 days in the summer months, and 7-14 days during winter
6 months (Straub et al., 1993). Thus it is not surprising that viruses were not detected in the U of
7 A study, 9 months after the last land application.

8 Microbial activity in the University of Arizona 20 year land application study was
9 assessed by studies on the common microbial transformations: nitrification and sulfur oxidation,
10 where rates of both microbial transformations increased in soils from the biosolid amended plots,
11 and increased with increased rate of biosolids application. Dehydrogenase activity also increased
12 with increased biosolid amendment. This is in contrast to trends earlier in this study, when after
13 4 years of land application, dehydrogenase activity was unaffected by biosolid additions
14 (Brendecke et al., 1993). After 20 years of land application, bacterial diversity in all plots was
15 evaluated through cloning and sequence analysis of bacterial 16S rRNA (Zerzghi, 2008). Here,
16 data showed that the known number of identifiable species increased in the high rate biosolid
17 plots, when compared to control (no biosolid) plots.

18 In summary, the soil microbial community did not appear to be adversely affected by 20
19 years of land-application. In fact, land-application appeared to have been beneficial as evidenced
20 by increased microbial diversity, and enhanced microbial activity. In addition, no known
21 pathogens were detected in soils sampled 9 months after the last biosolid application.

22 **Influence on Soil Chemical Properties**

1 At the termination of the 20 year land application study, soil chemical properties were
2 also evaluated in all plots. Specifically, soil core samples were collected from 0-150 cm depths
3 in 30 cm intervals. As in the case for surface soil samples collected for microbial analyses,
4 samples were taken in December 2005, nine months after the 20th land application in March
5 2005. These soil core subsurface samples allowed for an evaluation not only of the influence of
6 long term land-application of biosolids on soil chemical properties, but also the influence of land
7 application on various parameters as a function of soil depth. Analysed soil chemicals clustered
8 into three main groups: soil macro elements (N,P,C); heavy metals, and endocrine disruptors.

9 Soil Macro Elements

10 Soil nitrate concentrations in both biosolid amended plots and plots that received
11 inorganic fertilizers for 20 years were significantly higher than control (no amendment) plots
12 when averaged over all soil depths (0-150 cm). Total nitrogen increased in biosolid-amended
13 soil (Table 7). Nitrate values in both biosolid and fertilizer treated plots exceeded 10 ppm NO₃-
14 N at most soil depths down to 150 cm. These data indicate the potential for nitrate pollution of
15 groundwater regardless of whether biosolids or inorganic fertilizer are applied to the soil. Land
16 application of biosolids also significantly increased total and available soil phosphate
17 concentrations, particularly in the surface (0-30 cm) soil. These data are not unexpected since
18 several other studies have documented phosphate increases following land application (Mantovi
19 et al., 2005). Increases in soil phosphate concentrations of biosolid amended soil were already
20 evident in soil samples collected from the same study after 4 years of land application
21 (Brendecke et al., 1993). Elliott and O'Connor (2007) recently stated that “phosphorus is at the
22 forefront of biosolids-related issues that may adversely affect the long term sustainability of land-

1 based recycling programs in the U.S.” Such concern is based on the potential for water quality
2 deterioration that can occur in surface waters due to eutrophication following phosphate
3 accumulations in surface water runoff. However, these issues are more important in the eastern
4 USA, since in the arid southwest, surface waters are rare. That notwithstanding, phosphorus
5 management will continue to be important for sustainable biosolids recycling in the United
6 States.

7 Total organic carbon significantly increased in biosolid amended soil after 20 years of
8 land application (U of A study). This is in contrast to analyses of the same plots following 5 land
9 applications. Data from samples collected in 1990 showed no differences in the soil total organic
10 carbon in control versus biosolid amended soils (Artiola and Pepper, 1992). However dissolved
11 organic carbon increases were detected in the 1990 biosolid-amended soil samples. These data
12 illustrate how difficult it is to increase soil organic matter in soils of the arid southwest USA, due
13 to high mineralization rates (Artiola and Pepper, 1992). But it is important to note that even
14 modest increases in total organic carbon are important to soil fertility in soils which are
15 traditionally low in soil organic matter (0.5-1%) (Fuller, 1991). Land application of biosolids has
16 also been shown to increase soil organic carbon in other studies (Gibbs et al., 2006b; Mantovi et
17 al., 2005).

18 No increases in soil salinity were observed following the 20 years of land application , no
19 doubt in part because irrigation rates were in excess of consumptive water use rates for cotton,
20 resulting in the leaching of salts through the soil profile.

21 Soil Heavy Metals

1 The biosolids applied in the University of Arizona 20 year land-application study
2 contained relatively low levels of heavy metals (Table 8). After 20 annual land applications,
3 significant but modest increases in available concentrations of some metals were detected
4 including Cu, Cd, Zn, and Ni (Table 7). However, biosolid-amended soil concentrations of
5 available metals were low and not hazardous. In addition, the metal concentrations found within
6 biosolids have decreased over the past 20 years due to improved point-source controls. Finally,
7 metal concentrations attenuated rapidly with increasing soil depth, and were generally similar to
8 values found in control soils at a depth of 150 feet. Overall, the potential for metal
9 contamination of soil or surface waters from land application of biosolids has decreased.
10 Recently, Tian et al. (2006) concluded that application of biosolids for land reclamation at high
11 loading rates from 1972-2002 only impacted surface water quality prior to the promulgation of
12 the 40 CFR Part 503 regulations. After the promulgation, metal impacts on surface water quality
13 were minimal. In addition to reduced concentrations of metals in biosolids, new understanding
14 of trace element chemistry in biosolid-amended soil has shown that following termination of land
15 application, available metal concentrations essentially remain constant provided the soil pH
16 remains constant, or even decreases (Basta et al., 2005). Such decreases are thought to be due to
17 sorption to inorganic oxide surfaces or very recalcitrant organics present in soil of non-biosolid
18 origin (Basta et al., 2005).

19 Endocrine Disruptors

20 Endocrine disrupting compounds (EDCs) are chemicals that interfere with endocrine
21 glands or their hormones. Polybrominated diphenyl ethers (PBDEs) are compounds utilized as
22 flame retardants for everyday household items including carpets and cushions. PBDEs are a

1 known class of EDCs that are typically present at ppm levels in municipal biosolids produced in
2 the USA. Data on the fate of PBDEs following land application are limited, but was recently
3 evaluated at the University of Arizona. Following 20 years of land application, 50–70% of the
4 (estimated) applied PBDE mass was accounted for in the upper two feet of receiving soil,
5 suggesting that PBDEs are conserved in soil over periods of decades or longer, most likely due to
6 the hydrophobic nature of PBDEs (Quanrud et al., 2007). Due to sorption, biodegradation of the
7 PBDEs would be unlikely. However, although the consequences of PBDE accumulation in soil
8 are unknown, it is important to note that PBDE concentrations in household dust are similar to
9 concentrations found in biosolids (Quanrud et al., 2007).

10 Biosolids are also known to contain other endocrine disrupting compounds including the
11 estradiol and estrone (Drewes and Shore, 2001) and can contain other synthetic endocrine
12 disruptors present in pharmaceuticals and personal care products (Daughton and Ternes, 1999).
13 However to date, little is known of the fate and transport of these compounds following land
14 application. Lorenzen et al. (2006) showed that a wide range of endocrine disruptors including
15 4-nonylphenol, ethynylestradiol, estradiol and estrone are rapidly degraded from biosolids or
16 animal wastes following land application. Roberts et al. (2006) also showed that 4-nonylphenol
17 was rapidly mineralized in soil. In addition, they found that plant uptake of nonylphenol was
18 minimal. Finally, they concluded that “the spreading of nonylphenol contaminated waste to soil
19 probably poses a very low environmental risk to freshwater ecosystems and human health.”
20 Based on this land application of biosolids is likely to be sustainable with respect to endocrine
21 disruptors.

1 **SUMMARY: SUSTAINABILITY OF LAND-APPLICATION**
2 **OF CLASS B LIQUID BIOSOLIDS**

3 The overall conclusion we have reached based on all of our land-application studies over
4 the past two decades and an in depth review of other relevant land application studies is that
5 land-application of Class B biosolids is sustainable. Specifically, the risks to human health posed
6 by many microbiological entities within biosolids have been shown to be low if current EPA
7 regulatory guidelines are followed. In addition, risks from indirect exposures such as aerosolized
8 pathogens or contaminated groundwaters appear to be particularly low. This is not to say that the
9 risks are zero, but that the risks or concerns can be managed to safeguard human health and
10 provide a sustainable environment. Of course, vigilance is always necessary as new contaminants
11 continue to emerge, and their presence and fate in biosolids need to be assessed to ensure current
12 practices and guidelines are protective. Long term land-application in the University of Arizona
13 study showed enhanced microbial activity and diversity. Overall these are positive beneficial
14 effects, and there was no evidence of adverse toxicity effects on the soil microbial community
15 with respect to numbers, activity or diversity. Long term land-application also increased soil
16 macro-nutrients including C, N, and P. In addition, increases in available metal concentrations
17 were modest, and no increase in soil salinity was observed. This lack of increased salinity was
18 likely due to leaching of salts out of the root zone, following row irrigations throughout each
19 growing season. Since irrigation rates were in excess of consumptive water use rates for cotton,
20 such leaching may ultimately impact groundwater quality. To date there does not appear to be
21 any chemical entity likely to limit land-application other than phosphate loadings in areas
22 sensitive to surface water contamination.

1 Also in the University of Arizona study, there was no evidence of long term persistence
2 of enteric pathogens in the soil, nor migration of pathogens to groundwater. In addition it is well
3 documented that endocrine disruptors such as 4-nonylphenol and estrone are rapidly degraded in
4 soils. Other hydrophobic endocrines such as PBDEs are strongly sorbed to soil colloids and are
5 relatively immobile in soil. Finally it should be noted that the University of Arizona study was
6 conducted in the arid southwest and as such results are site specific. Application of these
7 findings to other locations needs to be conducted carefully.

8

1 **REFERENCES**

2 Aggelides, S.M. and P.A. Landra. 2000. Effects of compost produced from town wastes and
3 sewage sludge on the physical properties of a loamy and a clay soil. *Bioresource Technol.*
4 71:253-259.

5
6 Artiola, J.F., and I.L. Pepper. 1992. Long term influence of liquid sewage sludge on the organic
7 carbon and nitrogen content of a furrow-irrigated desert soil. *Biol. Fertil. Soils* 14:30-36.

8
9 Baertsch, C., T. Paez-Rubio, E. Viau and J. Peccia. 2007. Source tracking aerosols released
10 from land-applied class B biosolids during high-wind events. *Appl. Environ. Microbiol.*
11 73:4522-4531.

12
13 Bales, R.C., S.R. Hinkle, T.W. Kroeger, K. Stocking, and C.P. Gerba. 1991. Bacteriophage
14 adsorption during transport through porous media: chemical perturbations and reversibility.
15 *Environ. Sci. Technol.* 25:2088-2095.

16
17 Bales, R.C., S. Li, K.M. Maguire, M.T. Yahya, and C.P. Gerba. 1993. MS-2 and poliovirus
18 transport in porous media: hydrophobic effects and chemical perturbations. *Water Resour. Res.*
19 29:957-963.

1 Bales, R.C., S. Li, T.C. J. Yeh, M.E. Lenczewski, and C.P. Gerba. 1997. Bacteriophage and
2 microsphere transport in saturated porous media: force-gradient experiment at Borden, Ontario.
3 Water Resour. Res. 33:639-648.
4
5 Basta, N.T., J.A. Ryan and R.L. Chaney. 2005. Trace element chemistry in residual-treated soil:
6 key concepts and metal bioavailability. J. Environ. Qual. 34:49-63.
7
8 Bradford, S.A., Y.F. Tadassa, and Y. Jin. 2006a. Transport of coliphage in the presence and
9 absence of manure suspensions. J. Environ. Qual. 35:1692-1701.
10
11 Bradford, S.A., J. Simunek, and S.L. Walker. 2006b. Transport and straining of *E.coli* 0157:H7
12 in saturated porous media. Water Resour. Res. 42, W12S12, doi:10.1029/2005WR4805.
13
14 Bradley, S.G. 1979. Cellular and molecular mechanisms of action of bacterial endotoxins. Ann.
15 Rev. Microbiol. 33:67-94.
16
17 Brandi, G., M. Sisti, and G. Amagliani. 2000. Evaluation of the environmental impact of
18 microbial aerosols generated by wastewater treatment plants utilizing different aeration systems.
19 J. Appl. Microbiol. 88:845-852.
20

1 Brendecke, J.W., R.D. Axelson and I.L. Pepper. 1993. Soil microbial activity as an indicator of
2 soil fertility: long term effects of municipal sewage sludge on an arid soil. *Soil Biol. Biochem.*
3 *25:751-758.*

4

5 Brooks, J.P., B.D. Tanner, C.P. Gerba, C.N. Haas, and I.L. Pepper. 2005a. Estimation of
6 bioaerosol risk of infection to residents adjacent to a land applied biosolids site using an
7 empirically derived transport model. *J. Appl. Microbiol.* *98:397-405.*

8

9 Brooks, J.P., B.D. Tanner, K.L. Josephson, C.N. Haas, C.P. Gerba, and I.L. Pepper. 2005b. A
10 national study on the residential impact of biological aerosols from the land-application of
11 biosolids. *J. Appl. Microbiol.* *99:310-322.*

12

13 Brooks, J.P., B.D. Tanner, C.P. Gerba, and I.L. Pepper. 2006. The measurement of aerosolized
14 endotoxin from land-application of Class B biosolids in Southeast Arizona. *Can. J. Microbiol.*
15 *52:150-156.*

16

17 Brooks, J.P., C.P. Gerba, and I.L. Pepper. 2007a. Diversity of aerosolized bacteria during land-
18 application of biosolids. *J. Appl. Microbiol.* *103:1779-1790.*

19

20 Brooks, J.P., P.A. Rusin, S.L. Maxwell, C. Rensing, C. Gerba, and I.L. Pepper. 2007b.
21 Occurrence of antibiotic-resistant bacteria and endotoxin associated with the land-application of
22 biosolids. *Can. J. Microbiol.* *53:1-7.*

1 Burge, W.D., Enkiri, N.K., Hussong, D. (1987) *Salmonella* regrowth in compost as influenced
2 by substrate (*Salmonella* regrowth in compost). *Microbiol. Ecol.* 14:243-253.
3

4 Castellan, R.M., S.A. Olenchock, K.B. Kinsley, and J.L. Hankinson. 1987. Inhaled endotoxin
5 and decreased spirometric values: an exposure-response relation for cotton dust. *New Engl. J.*
6 *Med.* 317:605-610.
7

8 Castro-del Campo, N., I.L. Pepper, and C.P. Gerba. 2007. Assessment of *Salmonella*
9 typhimurium growth in Class A biosolids and soil/biosolid mixtures. *J. Res Sci & Technol.*
10 4:83–88.
11

12 Cheng, L., A.S. Chetochine, I.L. Pepper, and M.L. Brusseau. 2007. Influence of DOC on MS-2
13 bacteriophage transport in a sandy soil. *Water Air Soil Pollution* 178:315–322.
14

15 Chetochine, A., M.L. Brusseau, C.P. Gerba, and I.L. Pepper. 2006. Leaching of phage from
16 Class B biosolids and potential transport through soil. *Appl. Environ. Microbiol.* 72:665–671.
17

18 Clark, C.S., R. Rylander, and L. Larsson. 1983. Levels of Gram-negative bacteria, *Aspergillus*
19 *fumigatus*, dust, and endotoxin at compost plants. *Appl. Environ. Microbiol.* 45:1501-1505.
20

21 Daughton, C.G., and T.A. Ternes. 1999. Pharmaceuticals and personal care products in the
22 environment: agents of subtle change. *Environ. Health Perspectives* 107:907-938.

1 Donham, K.J., D. Cumro, S.J. Reynolds, and J.A. Merchant. 2000. Dose-response relationships
2 between occupational aerosol exposures and cross-shift declines of lung function in poultry
3 workers: recommendations for exposure limits. *J. Occup. Environ. Med.* 42:260-269.
4
5 Dowd, S.E., S.D. Pillai, S. Wang, and M.Y. Corapcioglu. 1998. Delineating the specific
6 influence of virus isoelectric point and size on virus adsorption and transport through sandy soils.
7 *Appl. Environ. Microbiol.* 64:405-410.
8
9 Dowd, S.E., C.P. Gerba, I.L. Pepper, and S.D. Pillai. 2000. Bioaerosol transport modeling and
10 risk assessment in relation to biosolid placement. *J. Environ. Qual.* 29:343-348.
11
12 Drewes, C.G., and L.A. Shore. 2001. Concerns about pharmaceuticals in water reuse,
13 groundwater recharge and animal waste. In: *Pharmaceuticals and Personal Care Products in the*
14 *Environment: Scientific and Regulatory Issues.* Eds C.G. Daughton and T.L. Jones-Lepp.
15 Washington, DC. American Chemical Society. 791:206-228.
16
17 Duchaine, C., P.S. Thorne, A. Merizux, Y. Grimard, P. Whitten, and Y. Cormier. 2001.
18 Comparison of endotoxin exposure assessment by bioaerosol impinger and filter-sampling
19 methods. *Appl. Environ. Microbiol.* 67:2775-2780.
20
21 Dzidic, S., and V. Bedekovic. 2003. Horizontal gene transfer-emerging multidrug resistance in
22 hospital bacteria. *Acta Pharmacologica Sinica* 24:519-526.

1 Elliott, H.A. and G.A. O'Connor. 2007. Phosphorus management for sustainable biosolids
2 recycling in the United States. *Soil Biol. Biochem.* 39:1318-1327.

3

4 EPA (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency). 1994. A Plain English Guide to the EPA Part
5 503 Biosolids Rule. EPA 832/R-93/003 U.S. Environmental Protection Agency.

6

7 Epstein, E. 1994. Composting and bioaerosols. *Biocycle.* 35:51-58.

8

9 Fuller, W.H. 1991. Organic matter applications. *In* Skujins, J. (ed). *Semiarid Lands and*
10 *Deserts: Soil resource and reclamation.* Marcel Dekker, New York, pp. 507-541.

11

12 Gerba, C.P., N. Castro-del Campo, J.P. Brooks and I.L. Pepper. 2007. Exposure and risk
13 assessment of *Salmonella* in recycled residuals. IWA 6th Conference on Wastewater and
14 Reclamation and Reuse for Sustainability, October 9-12, 2007, Antwerp, Belgium.

15

16 Gerba, C.P., S.M. Goyal, I. Cech, and G.F. Bogdan. 1981. Quantitative assessment of the
17 adsorptive behavior of viruses to soils. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* 15:94-944.

18

19 Gereda, J.E., M.D. Klinnert, M.R. Price, D.Y.M. Leung, and A.H. Liu. 2001. Metropolitan
20 home living conditions associated with indoor endotoxin levels. *J. Allergy Clin. Immun.*
21 107:790-796.

22

1 Gibbs, P.A., B.J. Chambers, A.M. Chaudri, S.P. McGrath and C.H. Carlton-Smith. 2006a.
2 Initial results from long-term field studies at three sites on the effects of heavy metal-amended
3 liquid sludges on soil microbial activity. *Soil Use Management*. 22:180-187.
4
5 Gibbs, P.A., B.J. Chambers, A.M. Chaudri, S.P. McGrath, C.H. Carlton-Smith, J.R. Bacon, C.D.
6 Campbell and M.N. Aitken. 2006b. Initial results from a long term multi-site field study of the
7 effects on soil fertility and microbial activity of sludge cakes containing heavy metals. *Soil Use*
8 *Management* 22:11-21.
9
10 Goyal, S.M. and C.P. Gerba. 1979. Comparative adsorption of human enteroviruses simian
11 rotavirus, and selected bacteriophages to soils. *Appl. Environ. Microbiol.* 38:241-247.
12
13 Guber, A.K., D.R. Shelton, and Y.A. Pachepsky. 2005a. Transport and retention of manure-
14 borne coliforms in undisturbed soil columns. *Vadose Zone J.*, 4:828-837.
15
16 Guber, A.K., D.R. Shelton, and Y.A. Pachepsky. 2005b. Effect of manure on *Escherichia coli*
17 attachment to soil. *J. Environ. Qual.* 34:2086-2090.
18
19 Jin, Y., E. Pratt, and M.V. Yates. 2000. Effect of mineral colloids on virus transport through
20 saturated sand columns. *J. Environ. Qual.* 29:532-539.
21

1 Jin, Y., and M. Flury. 2002. Fate and transport of viruses in porous media. *Adv. Agronomy*
2 77:39-102.

3

4 Jin, Y., M.V. Yates, S.S. Thompson, and W.A. Jury. 1997. Sorption of viruses during flow
5 through saturated sand columns. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* 31:548:555.

6

7 Lang, N.L., M.D. Bellett-Travers and S.R. Smith. 2007. Field investigations on the survival of
8 *Escherichia coli* and presence of other enteric microorganisms in biosolids-amended agricultural
9 soil. *J. Appl. Microbiol.* 103:1868-1882.

10

11 Lang, N.L. and S.R. Smith. 2007. Influence of soil type, moisture content and biosolids
12 application on the fate of *Escherichia coli* in agricultural soil under controlled laboratory
13 conditions. *J. Appl. Microbiol.* 103:2122-2131.

14

15 Lang, N.L., S.R. Smith, D.M. Bellett-Travers, E.B. Pike, and C.I. Rowlands. 2003. Decay of
16 *Escherichia coli* in soil following the application of biosolids to agricultural land. *Water Environ.*
17 *Management. J.* 17:23-28.

18

19 Lewis, D.L., and D.F. Gattie. 2002. Pathogen risks from applying sewage sludge to land.
20 *Environ. Sci. Technol.* 36:286A-293A.

21

1 Lieberman, J.M. 2003. Appropriate antibiotic use and why it is important: the challenges of
2 bacterial resistance. *Pediatric Infectious Disease Journal* 22:1143-1151.

3

4 Lorenzen, A., K. Burnison, M. Servos and E. Topp. 2006. Persistence of endocrine disrupting
5 chemicals in agricultural soils. *J. Env. Engineering and Science* 5:211-219.

6

7 Low, D.E. 2001. Antimicrobial drug use and resistance among respiratory pathogens in the
8 community. *Clinical Infectious Diseases* 33 (Suppl 3): S206-S213.

9

10 Mantovi, P., G. Baldoni and G. Toderi. 2005. Reuse of liquid dewatered and composted sewage
11 sludge on agricultural land: effects of long term application on soil and crop. *Water Res.*
12 39:289-96.

13

14 Marshall, C., S. Wesselingh, M. McDonald, and D. Spelman. 2004. Control of endemic
15 MRSA—what is the evidence? A personal view. *Journal of Hospital Infection* 56:253-268.

16

17 Michel, O. 2003. Role of lipopolysaccharide (LPS) in asthma and other pulmonary conditions.
18 *J. Endotoxin Res.* 9:293-300.

19

20 Monroe, S., and R. Polk. 2000. Antimicrobial use and bacterial resistance. *Current Opinion in*
21 *Microbiology* 3:496-501.

22

1 Newby, D.T., I.L. Pepper, and R.M. Maier. 2000. Microbial transport. pp. 147–175 *In* R.M.
2 Maier, I.L. Pepper and C.P. Gerba (eds) *Environmental Microbiology*. Academic Press, San
3 Diego, CA.

4

5 Olenchock, S.A. 2001. Airborne endotoxin. *In* *Manual of environmental Microbiology*. 2nd ed.
6 *Edited by* C.J. Hurst, R.L. Crawford., G.R. Knudsen, M.J. McInerney, and L.D. Stetzenbach.
7 ASM Press. Washington, DC. Pp. 814-826.

8

9 NRC (National Research Council). 2002. *Biosolids applied to land: advancing standards and*
10 *practices*. pp. 1–12. National Academy Press, Washington, DC.

11

12 Olenchock, S.A. 2001. Airborne endotoxin. *In* *Manual of Environmental Microbiology*. 2nd ed.
13 *Edited by* C.J. Hurst, R.L. Crawford. G.R. Knudsen, M.J. McInerney, and L.D. Stetzenbach.
14 ASM Press, Washington, DC. pp 814-826.

15

16 Paez-Rubio, T., H. Xin, J. Anderson, and J. Peccia. 2006. Particulate matter composition and
17 emission rates from the disk incorporation of Class B biosolids into soil. *Atmos. Environ.*
18 *40:7034-7045*.

19

20 Paez-Rubio, T., A. Ramarui, J. Sommer, H. Xin, J. Anderson, and J. Peccia. 2007. Emission
21 rates and characterization of aerosols produced during the spreading of dewatered class B
22 biosolids. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* *41:3537-3544*.

1 Pancorbo, O.C., P.R. Scheuerman, S.R. Farrah, and G. Bitton. 1981. Effect of sludge type on
2 poliovirus association with and recovery from sludge solids. *Can. J. Microbiol.* 27:279-287.
3

4 Pasquill, F. 1961. The estimation of the dispersion of wind borne material. *Meteorol. Mag*
5 90:33-49.
6

7 Pepper, I.L., K.L. Josephson, R.I. Bailey, M.D. Burr, and C.P. Gerba. 1993. Survival of
8 indicator organisms in Sonoran Desert soil amended with sewage sludge. *J. Environ. Sci. Health*
9 *A.* 28:1287-1302.
10

11 Pepper, I.L., J.P. Brooks, C.P. Gerba. 2006. Pathogens in biosolids. p. 1–41. *In* D.L. Sparks
12 (ed.) *Advances in Agronomy.* Elsevier Science/Academic Press, San Diego, CA.
13

14 Pieper, A.P., J.N. Ryan, R.W. Harvey, G.I. Amy, T.H. Illangasekare, and D.W. Metge. 1997.
15 Transport and recovery of bacteriophage PRD1 in a sand and gravel aquifer: Effect of sewage-
16 derived organic matter. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* 31:1163-1170.
17

18 Pillai, S.D., K.W. Widmer, S.E. Dowd, and S.C. Ricke. 1996. Occurrence of airborne bacteria
19 and pathogen indicators during land application of sewage sludge. *Appl. Environ. Microbiol.*
20 62:296-299.
21

1 Quanrud, D., J. Chorover and E. Saez. 2007. Polybrominated diphenyl ethers in biosolids:
2 Assessment of relative risk after land application. University of Arizona National Science
3 Foundation Water Quality Center Report, Spring 2007.
4

5 Rensing, C., D.T. Newby, and I.L. Pepper. 2002. The role of selective pressure and selfish DNA
6 in horizontal gene transfer and soil microbial community adaptation. *Soil Biology and*
7 *Biochemistry* 34:285-296.
8

9 Roberts, P., J.P. Roberts, and D.L. Jones. 2006. Behavior of the endocrine disrupting chemical
10 nonylphenol in soil: Assessing the risk associated with spreading contaminated waste to land.
11 *Soil Biol. Biochem.* 38:1812-1822.
12

13 Rusin, P., S. Maxwell, J. Brooks, C. Gerba, and I. Pepper. 2003. Evidence for the absence of
14 *Staphylococcus aureus* in land applied biosolids. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* 37:4027–4030.
15

16 Rylander, R., M. Lundholm, and C.S. Clark. 1983. Exposure to aerosol of microorganisms and
17 toxin during handling of sewage sludge. *In* Biological health risk of sludge disposal to land in
18 cold climates. *Edited by* P.M. Wallis and D.L. Lehemann. University of Calgary Press, Calgary,
19 Alberta. Pp. 69-78.
20

21 Salyers, A.A., A. Gupta, and Y. Wang. 2004. Human intestinal bacteria as reservoirs for
22 antibiotic resistance genes. *Trends in Microbiology* 12:412-416.

1 Sharif El, N., J. Douwes, P.H.M. Hoet, G. Doekes, and B. Nemery. 2004. Concentrations of
2 domestic mite and pet allergens and endotoxin in Palestine. *Allergy*. 59:623-631.
3

4 Smid, T., D. Heederik, R. Houba, and P.H. Quanjer. 1992. Dust and endotoxin related
5 respiratory effects in the animal feed industry. *Am. Rev. Respir. Dis.* 146:1474-1479.
6

7 Sorber, C.A., B.E. Moore, D.E. Johnson, H.J. Harding, and R.E. Thomas. 1984.
8 Microbiological aerosols from the application of liquid sludge to land. *J. Water Pollut Control*
9 *Fed* 56:830-836.
10

11 Stagg, C.H., C. Wallis, C.H. Ward, and C.P. Gerba. 1978. Chlorination of solids-associated
12 coliphages. *Prog. Water Technol.* 10:381-387.
13

14 Stamatiadis, S., J.W. Doran, and T. Kettler. 1999. Field and laboratory evaluation of soil quality
15 changes resulting from injection of liquid sewage sludge. *Appl. Soil Ecol.* 12:263-272.
16

17 Straub, T.M., I.L. Pepper, and C.P. Gerba. 1993. Virus survival in sewage sludge amended
18 desert soil. *Wat. Sci. Technol.* 27:421-424.
19

20 Tanner, B.D., J.P. Brooks, C.N. Haas, C.P. Gerba, and I.L. Pepper. 2005. Bioaerosol emission
21 rate and plume characteristics during land-application of liquid Class B biosolids. *Environ Sci &*
22 *Technol* 39:1584–1590.

1 Thomason, B.M., Biddle, J.W., and W.B. Cherry. 1975. Detection of *Salmonellae* in the
2 environment. *Appl. Microbiol.* 30:764-767.

3

4 Tian, G., T.C. Granato, R.I. Pietz, C.R. Carlson, Z. Abedin. 2006. Effect of long term
5 application of biosolids for land reclamation on surface water chemistry. *J. Environ. Qual.*
6 35:101-113.

7

8 Tsadilas, C.D., I.K. Mitsios, and E. Golia. 2005. Influence of biosolids application on some soil
9 physical properties. *Communications Soil Sci Plant Analysis.* 36:709-716.

10

11 Wellings, F.M., A.L. Lewis, and C.W. Mountain. 1976. Demonstration of solids-associated
12 virus in wastewater and sludge. *Appl. Environ. Microbiol.* 31:354-358.

13

14 Zaleski, K.J., K.L. Josephson, C.P. Gerba, and I.L. Pepper. 2005a. Survival, growth, and
15 regrowth of enteric indicator and pathogenic bacteria in biosolids, compost, soil, and land applied
16 biosolids. *J. Residuals Sci. Technol.* 2:49-63.

17

18 Zaleski, K.J., K.L. Josephson, C.P. Gerba, and I.L. Pepper. 2005b. Potential regrowth and
19 recolonization of *Salmonella* and indicators in biosolids and biosolid amended soil. *Appl.*
20 *Environ. Microbiol.* 71:3701-3708.

21

1 Zerzghi, H. Sustainability of long-term land-application of Class B biosolids: influence on soil
2 microbial and chemical properties. 2008. Ph.D. Dissertation. University of Arizona, Tucson,
3 Arizona.
4

FIGURE CAPTION

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9

Figure 1. (A) Number of shared orders associated with unique aerosolized clone isolates detected from downwind of aerosolized soil without biosolids, from downwind of biosolids land-application operations when compared to onsite soil; (B) when compared to Class B biosolids; (C) Number of shared orders associated with unique clone isolates detected from onsite soil, Class B biosolids when compared to aerosols collected during biosolids land-application operations; (D) when compared to aerosolized soil without biosolids. (Source: Brooks et al., 2007a)

1 Table 1. Known principal pathogens of concern in Class B biosolids in the U.S.

BACTERIA	PROTOZOA
<i>Salmonella</i> sp.	<i>Cryptosporidium</i>
<i>Shigella</i> sp.	
<i>Yersinia</i>	<i>Giardia lamblia</i>
<i>Vibrio cholerae</i>	
<i>Campylobacter jejuni</i>	<i>Toxoplasma gondii</i>
<i>Escherichia coli</i>	
ENTERIC VIRUSES	HELMINTH WORMS
Hepatitis A virus	<i>Ascaris lumbricoides</i>
Adenovirus	<i>Ascaris suum</i>
Norovirus	<i>Trichuris trichiura</i>
Sapporovirus	<i>Toxocara canis</i>
Rotavirus	<i>Taenia saginata</i>
Enterovirus	<i>Taenia solium</i>
- Poliovirus	<i>Necator americanus</i>
- Coxsackievirus	<i>Hymenolepisnana</i>
- Echovirus	
- Enterovirus 68-91	
Reovirus	
Astrovirus	
Hepatitis E virus	
Picobirnavirus	

2

3

1 Table 2. Incidence of *Staphylococcus aureus* in sewage, biosolids, and bioaerosols.

Sample	Number of Samples	Incidence of <i>S.aureus</i>
Raw sewage	3	1/3 positive
Undigested primary sewage	2	2/2 positive
Class B biosolids—anaerobic mesophilic	6	All negative
Class B biosolids—aerobic mesophilic	1	Negative
Class B biosolids—aerobic mesophilic, lime	9	All negative
Class A biosolids—aerobic thermophilic	1	Negative
Class A biosolids—anaerobic thermophilic	1	Negative
Class A biosolids—heat dried pellets	4	All negative
Class A composted biosolids	1	Negative
Bioaerosols from land-application sites	27	All negative

2 Source: Adapted from Rusin et al. (2003).

3
4
5
6

1 Table 3. Annual community risk of infection from aerosolized *Salmonella* during land-
 2 application of Class B biosolids¹ (Modified from Brooks et al., 2005b).

Annual Risk					
Number of <i>Salmonella</i>					
500 <i>Salmonella</i> g⁻¹ Biosolids		50 <i>Salmonella</i> g⁻¹ Biosolids		5 <i>Salmonella</i> g⁻¹ Biosolids	
----- Exposure Time -----					
<i>1h</i>	<i>8h</i>	<i>1h</i>	<i>8h</i>	<i>1h</i>	<i>8h</i>
4.5×10^{-8}	3.6×10^{-7}	4.5×10^{-9}	3.6×10^{-8}	4.5×10^{-10}	5.6×10^{-9}

3
 4 ¹Risk of infection based on 6 days per year of land-application at a distance of 30.5 m from the
 5 application site during loading conditions.

1 Table 4. Aerosolized endotoxin concentrations detected downwind of various operations
 2 (Modified from Brooks et al., 2006).

Source of Sample	Number of Samples Collected	Endotoxin Concentration (EU m ⁻³)		
		Range	Average	Median
Ambient background	12	2-4	2.6	2.5
Biosolids - loading	39	6-1808	344	92
Biosolids - land-application	24	5-143	34	6
Wastewater treatment plant - aeration basin	6	294-891	627	639
Tractor on field - no biosolids	5	284-659	470	491

3
 4 EU = endotoxin units

5
 6
 7
 8
 9
 10

1 Table 5. Percentage of heterotrophic plate count (HPC) bacteria exhibiting antibiotic
 2 resistance from soil collected at a land-application site (Modified from Brooks et
 3 al., 2007b).

Time (days)	----- % Resistant ¹ -----			
	Ampicillin	Cephalothin	Ciprofloxacin	Tetracycline
One day prior to land application	12.1	12.4	1.6	1.1
0	5.3	7.9	0.9	1.4
7	11.5	11.5	2.8	2.0
14	5.4	6.1	1.5	0.6
30	14.6	13.6	4.8	3.1
60	8.7	10.7	1.9	1.6
90	8.2	8.4	2.1	1.8
120	8.4	11.0	2.2	2.0
150	9.1	11.1	2.0	1.8
180	5.3	6.6	2.7	1.3
450	6.7	10.5	2.3	1.9

Mean Value Post Biosolid	8.7	9.9	2.3	1.9
--------------------------	-----	-----	-----	-----

Land-application

(7-450 days)

1

2 ¹Antibiotic concentrations of cultured plates: ampicillin = 32 $\mu\text{g ml}^{-1}$; cephalothin = 32 $\mu\text{g ml}^{-1}$;

3 ciprofloxacin = 4 $\mu\text{g ml}^{-1}$; and tetracycline = 16 $\mu\text{g ml}^{-1}$.

4

5

1 Table 6. Risk of infection from *Salmonella* from direct contact with, or aerosolization
 2 from, land applied Class A (following regrowth) or Class B land applied biosolids
 3 (Modified from Gerba et al., 2007).

Class of Biosolids Land-Applied	Number of <i>Salmonella</i>/gm	Route of Exposure	Risk of Infection
B	105	Ingestion of 50 mg via direct contact	6×10^{-6}
B	105	Ingestion of 480 mg via direct contact	6×10^{-5}
B	500	Ingestion of 50% ¹ of aerosol inhaled	1×10^{-4}
A	10^6	Ingestion of 50 mg via direct contact	5×10^{-3}
A	10^6	Ingestion of 480 mg via direct contact	3×10^{-1}
A	10^6	Ingestion of 50% ¹ of aerosol inhaled	1×10^{-2}

4
 5 ¹8 hr exposure per day for 6 days annually at 30m distance from the site.

1 Table 7. Influence of 20 years of land-application of liquid Class B biosolids on soil
 2 chemical properties. Adapted from Zerzghi, 2008.

Soil Chemical Parameter	Influence of Land-Application
pH	None
Electrical Conductivity (EC)	None
% CaCO ₃	Values increased with rate of biosolid addition and soil depth
Total N	Higher in biosolid plots
Total Organic Carbon	Higher in biosolid plots
Total P	Higher in biosolid plots
Available P	Higher in biosolid plots
Total Metals: Cu; Cd; Zn	Higher in biosolid plots
Total Metals: Pb; Ni	No discernable effect
DTPA Metals: Cu; Zn; Pb; Ni	Higher in biosolid plots
DTPA Cd	No discernable effect
Total Metals: As; Hg; Mo; Se; Cr and B	No discernable effect
Polybrominated diphenyl ethers (PBDEs)	Higher in biosolid plots

3 ¹DTPA = diethylene triamine penta acetic acid

1 Table 8. Representative heavy metals in land-applied biosolids in the University of
2 Arizona study.

Metal	Range (mg kg⁻¹ dry biosolids)
Zn	800-1590
Cu	568- 957
Pb	89-221
Ni	26-51
Cr	32-95
Cd	7-15
Ag	3-60

3
4
5
6
7

8
9