

# Irrigated greywater in an urban sub-division as a potential source of metals to soil, groundwater and surface water

Turner, RDR, Warne, MSJ, Dawes, LA, Vardy, S & Will, GD

Author post-print (accepted) deposited by Coventry University's Repository

## Original citation & hyperlink:

Turner, RDR, Warne, MSJ, Dawes, LA, Vardy, S & Will, GD 2016, 'Irrigated greywater in an urban sub-division as a potential source of metals to soil, groundwater and surface water' *Journal of Environmental Management*, vol 183, no. 3, pp. 806-817.

DOI: 10.1016/j.jenvman.2016.09.021

<https://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvman.2016.09.021>

DOI 10.1016/j.jenvman.2016.09.021

ISSN 0301-4797

ESSN 1095-8630

Publisher: Elsevier

***NOTICE: this is the author's version of a work that was accepted for publication in *Journal of Environmental Management*. Changes resulting from the publishing process, such as peer review, editing, corrections, structural formatting, and other quality control mechanisms may not be reflected in this document. Changes may have been made to this work since it was submitted for publication. A definitive version was subsequently published in *Journal of Environmental Management*, 183, 3 (2016) DOI: 10.1016/j.jenvman.2016.09.021***

© 2016, Elsevier. Licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International

<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>

Copyright © and Moral Rights are retained by the author(s) and/ or other copyright owners. A copy can be downloaded for personal non-commercial research or study, without prior permission or charge. This item cannot be reproduced or quoted extensively from without first obtaining permission in writing from the copyright holder(s). The content must not be changed in any way or sold commercially in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.

This document is the author's post-print version, incorporating any revisions agreed during the peer-review process. Some differences between the published version and this version may remain and you are advised to consult the published version if you wish to cite from it.

Irrigated greywater in an urban sub-division as a potential source of metals to soil, groundwater and surface water

Ryan D.R. Turner<sup>a,b,d\*</sup>, Michael St. J. Warne<sup>a,c,d,e</sup>, Les A. Dawes<sup>b</sup>, Suzanne Vardy<sup>a,d</sup>, Geoffrey D. Will<sup>b</sup>.

<sup>a</sup> Water Quality and Investigations, Environmental Monitoring and Assessment Sciences, Science Division, The State of Queensland, Department of Science, Information Technology and Innovation, Dutton Park, Queensland, Australia.

<sup>b</sup> School of Physical and Chemical Sciences, Queensland University of Technology, Brisbane Queensland, Australia

<sup>c</sup> National Research Centre for Environmental Toxicology, University of Queensland, Robertson, Queensland, Australia.

<sup>d</sup> Australian Rivers Institute, Griffith University, Nathan, Queensland.

<sup>e</sup> Current address: Centre for Agroecology, Water and Resilience, Coventry, University, United Kingdom

\*Corresponding author; email: [ryan.turner@qld.gov.au](mailto:ryan.turner@qld.gov.au),

phone: +61731705608

fax: +61731705799

Keywords: greywater, groundwater, irrigation, metals, soil, water reuse

## Abstract

Increased water demands in dry countries such as Australia, have led to increased adoption of various water reuse practices. Irrigation of greywater (all water discharged from the bathrooms, laundry and kitchen apart from toilet waste) is seen as a potential means of easing water demands; however, there is limited knowledge of how greywater irrigation impacts terrestrial and aquatic environments. This study compared four greywater irrigated residential lots to adjacent non-irrigated lots that acted as controls. Accumulation and potential impacts of metals in soil, groundwater and surface water, as a result of greywater irrigation, were assessed by comparing measured concentrations to national and international guidelines. Greywater increased concentrations of some metals in irrigated soil and resulted in As, B, Cr and Cu exceeding guidelines after only four years of irrigation. Movement of metals from the irrigation areas resulted in metal concentrations in groundwater (Al, As, Cr, Cu, Fe, Mn, Ni and Zn) and

surface water (Cu, Fe and Zn) exceeding environmental quality guidelines again within four years. These results are unlikely to be universally applicable but indicate the need to consider metals in greywater in order to minimize potential adverse environmental effects from greywater irrigation.

### **Capsule abstract**

Greywater irrigation led to metal concentrations increasing (adsorption) or decreasing (leaching) in the irrigated soil. The irrigation also increased the concentration of metals in groundwater and adjacent surface water.

## **1. Introduction**

Water scarcity is a problem worldwide (Jury and Vaux, 2007; Godfrey et al., 2009). Reuse of greywater has been advocated as one potential solution (Eriksson et al., 2002; Winward et al., 2008; Eriksson and Donner, 2009; Maimon et al., 2010; Zhu et al., 2015). Greywater is wastewater and is typically generated from laundries, bathrooms (showers baths and hand sinks) (Christova-Boal et al., 1996; Eriksson et al., 2002) and sometimes includes kitchen wastewater (sinks and dishwashers) (Nolde, 2000; Friedler, 2004; Maimon et al., 2014), but does not include wastewater generated by toilets (i.e., black-water). Greywater reuse typically occurs via irrigation (Wiel-Shafran et al., 2006; Howard et al., 2007; Travis et al., 2010) although other uses, such as flushing toilets, are becoming more common (Jeppesen, 1996; Godfrey et al., 2009; March and Gual, 2009; Etchepare and Van der Hoek, 2015). Despite widespread adoption of the reuse of greywater for irrigation, there is limited research on the impacts of this wastewater on the receiving environment (Donner et al., 2010; Stevens et al., 2011; Turner et al., 2013; Reichman and Wightwick, 2013).

The environmental sustainability of greywater irrigation has been questioned as greywater contains contaminants such as nutrients, cations and anions (e.g., Wiel-Shafran et al., 2006; Turner et al., 2013) and metals (Eriksson and Donner, 2009). Metals in greywater can originate from the source water (Huston 2009), plumbing (Eriksson and Donner, 2009), household products, household appliances and personal care products (Diaper et al., 2008; Tjandraatmadja et al., 2008; Ayenimo et al., 2012). Tjandraatmadja et al., (2008) investigated the presence of As, B, Cd, Cu, Fe, Pb, Ni, Sn and Zn in a range of household and personal care products and found that

Fe and Zn were present in the majority of products, B was present in a large range of products (laundry, kitchen and bathroom) and traces of Pb and Ni were also in many products.

Although the potential risks posed by nutrients and salts are commonly addressed in Australian federal and state government guidelines (e.g., ACT Health, 2007 and DoEUS NSW, 2008), the potential hazards posed by metals in greywater are inadequately addressed. Water quality guidelines for greywater exist in Australia (e.g., EPHC, 2006), but few guidelines are available for metals and those that are included are often derived from a limited dataset (Eriksson et al., 2006; Revitt et al., 2011; Turner et al., 2013). The guidelines for metals that do exist are based on drinking water quality guidelines and irrigation guidelines taken from ANZECC and ARMCANZ (2000). These irrigation guidelines have been developed for the protection of agricultural crops and are not based on ecological considerations. Minimal research has been published assessing metals in greywater and their environmental impacts (Eriksson and Donner, 2009; Reichman and Wightwick, 2013) and no single study has assessed the impacts of metals from greywater irrigation in three connected environmental compartments: soil; groundwater; and surface water (Figure 1).




Figure 1 Conceptual diagram of greywater irrigation and metal movement; Household sources of metals (1) stored in a concrete tank then distributed via greywater sub-surface irrigation resulting in direct and indirect metal transportation (metal soil adsorption - direct (2); metal leaching - direct and indirect (3)); lateral movement of contaminated groundwater to surface water (4); and surface runoff with soil erosion - (not assessed in this study (5)) and the impacts in three connected environmental compartments: soil; groundwater (via sampling at the piezometer(s); and surface water.

Understanding the transport of metals from greywater irrigation in compartments of the environment is important as metals are highly persistent in the environment and some are toxic (Bryan and Langston, 1992; Facchinelli et al., 2000; Rattan et al., 2005; Peralta-Videa et al., 2009). Metal adsorption to soils is complex (Bradl, 2004) and desorption can lead to off-site transport of metals via leaching (Schmidt, 2003) resulting in contamination of groundwater (Rattan et al., 2005) and surface water by leachate. Erosion of contaminated soils, can also result in contamination of surface waterways (Zhong et al., 2015).

It is important that robust government environment regulation and policy is underpinned by sound science. Chartres (2006) emphasized that water resources management policy should not be made without sound evidence – unfortunately this is not always possible. For example, during the Australian millennium drought (late 1996 to mid-2010), water saving policy, including greywater reuse, was urgently needed; however, targeted science supporting greywater reuse and its impacts on the environment was not available. Consequently, in Queensland, and other Australian states, the most appropriate alternative information (onsite sewerage guidelines (e.g. DIP, 2007)) was used.

The aim of this study was to determine whether metals in greywater that was irrigated to soil could lead to elevated concentrations of metals in soils, groundwater and adjacent surface water.

Therefore, this study:

1. assessed the metal composition of the source water and greywater from four households;
2. compared metal concentrations in greywater irrigated soil to those in adjacent non-irrigated soils (controls);
3. compared soil metal concentrations in irrigated soils to national and international soil contaminant guidelines;
4. assessed the transportation of metals from greywater; and
5. compared metal concentrations in groundwater and surface water to national and international contaminant guidelines.

## **2. Methods**

### **2.1 Research design**

The design of this study included the collection and analysis of the following samples for metals:

- greywater;
- soil from four residential urban lots irrigated with greywater and from four adjacent vacant non-irrigated lots (controls);

- perched groundwater and water from an adjacent creek to identify the potential off-site transport of greywater metals from the irrigated lots.

## 2.2 Study area

The study area is a residential subdivision located approximately 10 km west of Brisbane, Queensland, Australia at the base of a High Ecological Value (HEV) area of Enoggera Reservoir catchment (EHP 2010). The study area consisted of 22 lots totaling an area of 3.8 ha that borders 200 m of Enoggera Creek (Figure 2). The subdivision is decentralised from basic utilities and requires each resident to have greywater irrigation. Individual lots ranged in area from 800 to 1800 m<sup>2</sup>. Each lot has a 200 m<sup>2</sup> grassed transpiration area that receives the greywater irrigation. The water supply for each household is captured rain water, supplemented when necessary by council potable water. Samples from the rainwater tanks were collected from each household prior to this study; during February, May, June and September 2006 and March and September 2007 and sent to a National Association of Testing Authorities (NATA) accredited laboratory – Queensland Urban Utilities – for dissolved metals analysis using inductively coupled plasma-optical emission spectrometer (ICP-OES).






Figure 2 Ariel photograph with four zoom levels showing: Zoom 1 (in black box); location of study area at the base of the High Ecological Valve - Enoggera Catchment 10 km west of Brisbane. Zoom 2 (red box); study site and Enoggera Creek location (blue line) with the surface water sites marked (black and grey boxes); reference site (R) in Enoggera Dam, upstream control (C) site and downstream impact (I) site. Zoom 3 (pink box); indicates the general topography (pink contours) of the four selected greywater irrigated lots for detailed investigation (red outline), transpiration zones (yellow outline) and control (vacant non-irrigated) sampling sites (orange circles). Zoom 4 (yellow box); lot D with the location of transpiration zone (yellow outline) and the piezometers (purple numbered P1 to P3). FIGURE 2



Four lots (lots A, B, C and D) from the six occupied sites of the subdivision were chosen for this study. They were selected based on household demographics (Turner et al., 2013), workplace health and safety and site access. Control sites were chosen on vacant land next to each lot, approximately 10 to 15 m away from the irrigated transpiration zones. All lots and controls had identical soil texture and similar carbon content (Turner et al., 2013).

### 2.3 Greywater

The greywater from the four selected lots was treated (via vermiculture) and stored onsite in concrete greywater treatment systems (Biolytix, 2005) and subsurface drip irrigated into a transpiration zone. Grab samples of greywater from each property were collected six times, over eight years: February 2006, May 2006, June 2006, November 2007, April 2009 and March 2014. Average chemical characteristics of the greywater samples taken during 2006 were presented by Beal et al. (2008). Each greywater sample was a composite 24-hour sample taken directly from the irrigation outlet by a capillary tube with a bleed valve. Samples were collected in 2L bottles, stored on ice and retrieved daily. Each sample was subsampled according to the Australian Standard: *AS/NZS 5667.1:1998* (Standards Australia, 1998a, 1998b). All samples were passed through a 0.45 µm cellulose acetate filter (Sartorius) in order to obtain an estimate of the dissolved metal concentrations. Samples were preserved with ultrapure nitric acid to a final sample concentration of 1% (Eaton et al., 2005) and then refrigerated at 4 °C till analysed. All samples were sent to a laboratory accredited by the National Association of Testing Authorities (NATA) for chemical analysis, and therefore, complied with ISO 9001 and ISO17025 as a minimum.

Greywater samples were analysed using a Varian ICP-OES with simultaneous detection analysis (Varian, 2001; Eaton et al., 2005) for Al, As, B, Be, Bi, Cd, Co, Cr, Cu, Fe, Mn, Mo, Ni, Pb, Sb, Se, Sr, Ti, V, and Zn. Ultra-trace dissolved metals analysis of greywater samples were analysed using a Thermo-Fisher, x-series, inductively coupled plasma-mass spectrometer (ICP-MS) (Thermo Electron Corporation, 2004; Eaton et al., 2005) for Ag, Al, As, B, Be, Bi, Cd, Co, Cr, Cu, La, Mn, Mo, Ni, Pb, Sb, Se, Tl, U, V, and Zn. Results for Al, B, Fe and Mn were combined between the two analytical methods (ICP-OES was used for results >500 µg L<sup>-1</sup> and ICP-MS was used for results <500 µg L<sup>-1</sup>). Further information and the analytical meta-data including; method setup, method of uncertainty and practical quantitation limits (PQL) for each analyte can be obtained in supplementary information – QA and QC.

## 2.4 Soil

Up to five individual soil cores were taken from the transpiration zone of each irrigated lot using methods based on Rayment and Lyons (2011) and Peverill et al. (1999). Each core was hand augured to a depth of 0.3 m and the core was subsequently divided into 0.1 m segments. A total of 12 control soil cores were collected from the adjacent non-irrigated vacant lots (no more than 15 m away from each transpiration zone) and were divided into 0.1 m segments. These acted as controls, as the study area had been established for four years prior to the sampling. Sampling of the irrigated and non-irrigated lots occurred between 22<sup>nd</sup> January to 5<sup>th</sup> February, 2009.

Each soil core segment (12–15 per lot and 36 controls) was air dried, ground to <2 mm and stored in air tight plastic containers. Soils were then extracted and analysed for metals. Mehlich3 extracts and ICP-OES (Rayment and Lyons, 2011) were used for Al and B as the laboratory did not have a suitable methods for acid extractable analysis due to typical contamination of ultra-pure nitric acid with Al and B. Microwave extractable metals analysis (metals were extracted with the method outlined in Eaton et al. (2005) and Standard Method No. 3051a (USEPA, 2007) using a Anton Paar 3000 microwave reaction system) was used for As, Co, Cr, Cu, Fe, Mn, Mo, Ni, Pb, Zn and also quantified by ICP-OES (Rayment and Lyons, 2011). Samples for ultra-trace metal analyses of Ag and Cd were digested by a Anton Paar 3000 microwave reaction system using nitric acid extraction based on standard method No. 3051a (USEPA, 2007; Eaton et al., 2005) and analysed by a Thermo-Fisher x-series ICP-MS. Strontium and V were not analyzed in soils, as the laboratory used did not have a validated method for these elements (for additional information supplementary information – QA and QC).

## 2.5 Groundwater

The majority of the study area is steep with slopes up to 20% facing northeast (Figure 2), with each lot being terraced. Given that the direction of groundwater flow generally follows surface topography (Apgar, 2000), three piezometers were installed in a gradient transect behind lot D (Figure 2). This impact gradient transect was designed to capture any potential infiltration of metals associated with the greywater irrigation to the groundwater and subsequent transport towards Enoggera Creek. The groundwater depth was approximately 3000 mm, which is around the same level of the water in Enoggera Creek at ambient flow. The piezometer installation was based on the following assumptions. Piezometer one (P1) and two (P2) were located 15 m apart to intercept the groundwater potentially containing metals from infiltrated greywater. It was expected that P2 would have smaller metal concentrations than P1 as it is further from the

potential source and would also have less impact by greywater infiltration due to the direction of groundwater flow. Piezometer three (P3) is 18 m from P2 and was located as a control and not expected to be affected by the greywater irrigation (Figure 2).

The piezometers were installed by a licensed drill operator using a Geoprobe® 6600 series drill rig following the procedures set out in the “Groundwater Sampling and Analysis – A Field Guide. Geoscience Australia” (Sundaram, 2009) and adhering to *Water Act 2000* (Queensland, 2015). (For further information see supplementary information - groundwater). Samples were collected (between September 2013 to June 2014) from the piezometers in accordance with the Australian Standard: AS/NZS 5667.1:1998 (Standards Australia, 1998, prepared and analysed for dissolved metal concentrations (as per section 2.3). Figures for each metal in groundwater are presented in the supplementary information - groundwater.

## 2.6 Surface water

Enoggera Creek was sampled for metals to determine if there were potential greywater irrigation impacts. Three sites were selected: a reference site located in the Enoggera Creek Reservoir (formed by a dam wall); a control site (140 m downstream of the dam wall) and an impact site (a further 200 m downstream of the control site) (Figure 2). The reference and control sites are upstream of any influence of groundwater affected by greywater, whereas the impact sites could be influenced. The majority of surface runoff and groundwater originated from the study site in this 200 m section of the creek (Figure 2). Ambient water quality sampling occurred monthly with an increased frequency of sampling during high flow conditions. Samples were collected between September 2013 and June 2014 and analysed as outlined in section 2.3. Box and whisker plots were produced for the three sites (control, impact and reference) to compare the range of metal concentrations in Enoggera Creek (see supplementary information – surface waters).

## 2.7 Guideline and trigger value comparisons

Australian long-term irrigation guideline trigger values, which aim to protect plant growth from continual irrigation (ANZECC and ARMCANZ, 2000) were compared to the concentration of metals in the greywater. Metal concentrations in the soils of the transpiration zone were compared to the Australian Ecological Investigation Levels (EILs — soil quality guidelines for contaminated soils) in the National Environment Protection (Assessment of Site Contamination) Measure (NEPM, 2013). Data were also compared to the soil cumulative contaminant loading

limit (CCL) for the cumulative amount of contaminant added (ANZECC and ARMCANZ, 2000). The CCLs are specifically designed to assess irrigation hazards.

Groundwater metal concentration data were compared to the groundwater investigation levels (GILS) provided in National Environment Protection Measure (NEPM, 2013) and when no GILS existed, metal concentration data were compared to the Australian surface water quality guidelines – as recommended by ANZECC and ARMCANZ (2000). Surface water metal concentration data were compared to the ANZECC and ARMCANZ (2000) surface water quality trigger values using the 95% level of ecosystem protection for slightly to moderately disturbed ecosystems. Where appropriate Australian guidelines did not exist, the equivalent Canadian Environmental Quality Guideline (CEQG) was used (CCME, 1999). These guidelines are presented in Table 1 and Tables 3 to 5. The exceedance of any guideline indicates an inappropriate risk to the environment that usually would lead to either immediate remedial or management action or further site-specific investigation.

## **2.8 Statistical analysis of soil, groundwater and surface water relationships**

To assess metal accumulation in the soil from greywater irrigation, box and whisker plots were produced to compare the range of concentrations of metals in the transpiration zone soils to the control soils median concentrations (supplementary information — soils). Typically, environmental data is not normally distributed (Gilbert, 1987); therefore, non-parametric tests are required. The transpiration zone soil metal concentrations were analysed for differences using the non-parametric Kruskal-Wallis test (Hollander and Wolfe, 1999; Tölgyesi, et al., 2014). A Grubbs test based on a two-tailed test where the p-value was set to  $< 0.0001$  and an alpha of 0.05, was used to identify outlying soil metal concentrations.

Groundwater samples from the piezometers were analysed for differences using the non-parametric Kruskal-Wallis test (Hollander and Wolfe, 1999; Tölgyesi, et al., 2014), in order to identify increases in metal concentrations from P3 to P1. Surface water metal concentrations were analysed using the non-parametric Kruskal-Wallis test and Steel-Dwass-Critchlow-Fligner procedure (Hollander and Wolfe, 1999) to test for significant differences ( $p \leq 0.05$ ) between the Impact, Control and Reference (Enoggera Creek Reservoir) sites. Spearman correlations were also performed to look for relationships between surface water concentrations of As and Fe in an attempt to explain results, as As and Fe commonly interact in aquatic environments (Sharma et al., 2009).



### 3. Results and Discussion

#### 3.1 Greywater

Greywater concentrations of Sb, Be, Bi, Mo, Se, Ti, Tl and U were all below their practical quantitation levels (<PQL, refer to supplementary information – QA and QC) and will not be discussed further. General chemical characteristics, i.e., pH, electrical conductivity (EC), sodium absorption ratio (SAR), and concentrations of calcium (Ca), magnesium (Mg), sodium (Na), potassium (K), total nitrogen (TN) and total phosphorus (TP) of the same samples were reported in Turner et al. (2013).

All the greywater metal concentrations – except for B, Mn and Sr – were below typical greywater concentrations (EPHC 2006) (Table 1). Silver could not be assessed as no published values were available. The rainwater tank samples (source water for greywater) were analysed for 21 of the 25 metals analysed in the greywater (Co, Ag, Sr and V were not analysed in rainwater). The greywater concentrations of Al, As, B, Cr, Cu, Fe, Pb, Mn, Ni, and Zn were greater than the rain tank water, with the maximum concentration of Al in greywater being 60-times larger than the maximum in the rain tank water (Table 1). This indicates that greywater is a potential anthropogenic source of a range of metals to the receiving environment.

Of the metals tested, only the maximum concentrations of B, Cu and Fe in greywater exceeded their long-term irrigation trigger values (Table 1). The Australian and New Zealand guidelines (ANZECC and ARMCANZ, 2000) state that when these trigger values are exceeded, potential environmental risks exist; e.g. off-site transport to groundwater and surface waters via deep drainage and leaching, effects on soil properties and effects on soil biota. In summary, in the greywater, there are elevated levels of Al, As, Mn and Sr compared to the source water and potentially hazardous concentrations of B, Cu and Fe.

**Table 1 Summary statistics of dissolved metal concentrations in greywater for all lots compared to the Australian and New Zealand long-term irrigation trigger values (ANZECC and ARMCANZ, 2000) and observed greywater concentrations as well as typical rainwater tank concentrations. Bolded purple values indicate where a trigger value was exceeded.**

Greywater metals	n	Minimum ( $\mu\text{g L}^{-1}$ )	Median ( $\mu\text{g L}^{-1}$ )	Mean $\pm$ ( $\sigma$ ) ( $\mu\text{g L}^{-1}$ )	Maximum ( $\mu\text{g L}^{-1}$ )	Irrigation guideline trigger values ( $\mu\text{g L}^{-1}$ )	Australian guidelines for water recycling - observed concentrations ( $\mu\text{g L}^{-1}$ )	Rain tank water concentrations supplied to household n= 9-18		Maximum rainwater tank concentrations	
								Mean concentration ( $\mu\text{g L}^{-1}$ )	Maximum concentration ( $\mu\text{g L}^{-1}$ )	Rodrigo et al. (2009) n= 23 ( $\mu\text{g L}^{-1}$ )	Huston et al. (2012) n= 88-363 ( $\mu\text{g L}^{-1}$ )
Al	26	50	310	380 $\pm$ (30)	1500	5000	44,000	6.6	25	114	560
As	19	0.01	0.8	1.6 $\pm$ (3)	12	100	13	2.5 <sup>b</sup>	2.5 <sup>b</sup>		3.7
B <sup>c</sup>	52	5	51	83 $\pm$ (10)	<b>520</b>	500	630 <sup>a</sup>	6.1	15		
Cd	19	0.02	0.02	0.04 $\pm$ (0.04)	0.14	10	50	0.5 <sup>b</sup>	0.5 <sup>b</sup>		
Cr	19	0.3	1	1.2 $\pm$ (0.4)	2.8	100	5.5	1 <sup>b</sup>	1 <sup>b</sup>		4.3
Co	19	0.12	0.41	0.35 $\pm$ (0.16)	0.62	50	1.5				2
Cu	26	8	41	64 $\pm$ (81)	<b>390</b>	200	490	9	33	789	1600
Fe	26	20	70	120 $\pm$ (110)	<b>560</b>	200	28,000	4.6	35	232	4400
Pb	20	0.19	0.85	1.1 $\pm$ (1.4)	6	2000	150	2.5 <sup>b</sup>	2.5 <sup>b</sup>	22	85
Mn	26	2	14	20 $\pm$ (16)	58	200	14.3	4.5	18	6700	140
Ni	20	0.3	4.3	4.4 $\pm$ (2.2)	10	200	28	1 <sup>b</sup>	1 <sup>b</sup>		16
Ag	19	0.03	0.12	0.12 $\pm$ (0.03)	0.29	-					
Sr	19	10	40	70 $\pm$ (0.02)	170	-	60 <sup>a</sup>				260
V	19	0.94	1.5	1.7 $\pm$ (0.7)	3.5	100					10
Zn	26	17	52	65 $\pm$ (62)	310	2000	13,000	63	113	15,800	26,000

<sup>a</sup> Result is based on mean only.

<sup>b</sup> Half practical quantitation limit

<sup>c</sup> A Grubbs test was performed on the B results as apparent outlier was present. The test identified that the control population of samples contained one outlier with B concentrations of 81,000  $\mu\text{g L}^{-1}$  with a Z-score of 7.1, larger than the critical Z-score of 3.2. The result was thus excluded as an outlier.

Sigma ( $\sigma$ ) = standard deviation

### 3.2 Soil

All the soils were classified as a sandy clay loam. The carbon content at the surface was 3% and decreased down the soil profile. The average pH range of the transpiration zone soils was pH 5.8 to  $6.1 \pm (0.6)$  and the soil conductivity average range was  $0.006$  to  $0.017 \pm (0.06) \text{ S m}^{-1}$  (see supplementary information - general soil characteristics, based on Turner et al. (2013)). Turner et al. (2013) reported that the control and irrigated transpiration zone soils from this study had similar characteristics in terms of total carbon, soil texture and general pH and EC characteristics. From this, an assumption was made that before the greywater irrigation began, the control and irrigated transpiration zone soils had similar metal concentrations and any subsequent measured differences were due to greywater irrigation.

When compared to control sites, the metals concentrations in the transpiration zone soils of at least one lot had significantly ( $p \leq 0.05$ ) larger concentrations of As, B, Cr, Pb, Ni and Zn than the control soils (Table 2), most likely due to metals adsorbing onto the soil from the greywater. EILs were only available for As, Cr and Pb. Metal concentrations in the transpiration zone soils were also compared to the CCLs (ANZECC and ARMCANZ 2000) and CEQGs if CCLs were not available. Despite these significant increases of metal concentrations in the irrigated soils, only the concentration of As exceeded its EIL and cumulative contaminant loading limits (CCL) (ANZECC and ARMCANZ, 2000) and only B exceeded the corresponding Canadian Environmental Quality Guidelines (CEQGs) (CCME, 1999) for park and residential soils (Table 3).

**Table 2 Non-parametric Kruskal-Wallis p values results of the transpiration zone soils of lots A, B, C and D. Bold values indicate that the irrigated soils had significantly ( $p \leq 0.05$ ) different concentrations to the control soils. An upward arrow ( $\uparrow$ ) indicates a significant increase in concentration, while a downward arrow ( $\downarrow$ ) indicates a significant decrease in concentration.**

Soil metals	Lot A	Lot B	Lot C	Lot D
Al	<b>0.012</b> $\downarrow$	<b>0.001</b> $\downarrow$	<b>0.014</b> $\downarrow$	0.222
As	0.999	0.199	1	<b>&lt;0.001</b> $\uparrow$
B	0.414	0.175	<b>&lt;0.001</b> $\uparrow$	<b>&lt;0.001</b> $\uparrow$
Cd	0.421	0.955	0.197	0.999
Cr	0.74	<b>&lt;0.001</b> $\uparrow$	<b>&lt;0.001</b> $\uparrow$	<b>0.009</b> $\uparrow$
Co	0.755	0.995	0.755	0.699
Cu	0.271	1	0.085	<b>&lt;0.001</b> $\downarrow$
Fe	0.354	0.65	0.796	<b>&lt;0.001</b> $\downarrow$
Pb	<b>0.047</b> $\downarrow$	0.972	<b>0.019</b> $\uparrow$	<b>0.025</b> $\uparrow$
Mn	0.77	0.65	0.945	0.928
Ni	0.689	<b>0.009</b> $\uparrow$	0.093	0.128
Ag	<b>&lt;0.001</b> $\downarrow$	0.991	0.984	0.987
Zn	0.242	<b>&lt;0.001</b> $\uparrow$	<b>&lt;0.001</b> $\uparrow$	0.992

**Table 3 Summary statistics and comparisons of metal concentrations in the transpiration zone (TZ) soils for all irrigated and control lots. The TZ soil results were assessed and compared with the Ecological Investigation Levels (EILs) in the National Environment Protection (Assessment of Site Contamination) Measure (NEPC, 2013) and the Australian and New Zealand long-term irrigation trigger values (ANZECC and ARMCANZ, 2000) and Canadian Environmental Quality Guidelines (CCME, 1999). Bolded purple lots and values indicate where a trigger value was exceeded.**

Soil metals <sup>a</sup>	Soil metal concentration (mg kg <sup>-1</sup> )		Location	n	Soil metal concentration (mg kg <sup>-1</sup> ) except Fe (%)			
	EILs <sup>b</sup>	Soil Quality Guidelines <sup>c</sup>			Minimum	Median	Mean $\pm$ ( $\sigma$ )	Maximum
As	50	20 <sup>f</sup>	<b>Lot A</b>	12	8	14	14 $\pm$ (6.2)	<b>27</b>
			<b>Lot B</b>	15	14	17	18 $\pm$ (2.9)	<b>23</b>
			Lot C	12	12	14	14 $\pm$ (2.0)	18
			<b>Lot D</b>	14	17	<b>36</b>	<b>42 <math>\pm</math> (23)</b>	<b>95</b>
			<b>Controls</b>	36	8	14	16 $\pm$ (9.5)	<b>53</b>
B	NG	2 <sup>g</sup>	Lot A	12	0.13	0.13	0.17 $\pm$ (0.18)	0.76
			Lot B	15	0.13	0.13	0.15 $\pm$ (0.07)	0.33
			<b>Lot C</b>	12	0.13	0.58	0.93 $\pm$ (0.92)	<b>3.01</b>
			Lot D	14	0.13	0.20	0.36 $\pm$ (0.31)	1.00
			Controls	36	0.13	0.13	0.12 $\pm$ (0.01)	0.13
Cr	240 <sup>d</sup>	64 <sup>g</sup>	Lot A	12	8	24	23 $\pm$ (8.7)	37
			Lot B	15	27	35	37 $\pm$ (7.5)	56
			<b>Lot C</b>	12	23	39	41 $\pm$ (13)	<b>73</b>
			Lot D	14	17	26	26 $\pm$ (7.7)	48
			Controls	36	12	19	20 $\pm$ (5.9)	42
Cu	150 <sup>e</sup>	140 <sup>f</sup>	Lot A	12	20	50	48 $\pm$ (15)	75
			Lot B	15	47	61	64 $\pm$ (19)	129
			<b>Lot C</b>	12	61	82	86 $\pm$ (28)	<b>151</b>
			Lot D	14	28	37	39 $\pm$ (12)	71
			Controls	36	40	62	64 $\pm$ (19)	106

<sup>a</sup> Box plots for metal concentrations in the soil of the transpiration zones (TZ) of lots A, B, C and D and the non-irrigated controls as well as the probability values of each lot compared to the control samples using the Kruskal-Wallis test, are provided in the supplementary information.

<sup>b</sup> Values are Ecological Investigation Levels (EILs - Fresh) based on National Environment Protection (Assessment of Site Contamination) Measure (NEPC, 2013); NG = no guideline. d = Cr value adjusted for average study site soil characteristics, average soil clay content (25%) average background concentration (20 mg kg<sup>-1</sup>), average Fe content (2.3 %). e = Cu value adjusted for average study site soil characteristics, cation exchange capacity (95 meq 100 g<sup>-1</sup>), average soil pH (5.8) average carbon content (2.4%) average background concentration (64 mg kg<sup>-1</sup>), average Fe content (2.3 %).

<sup>c</sup> f = cumulative contaminant loading limits (CCLs) (ANZECC and ARMCANZ, 2000). g = Canadian Environmental Quality Guidelines (CEQGs) (CCME, 1999) for park and residential soils. These were only used when no CCL was available. NG = no guideline (either CCL or CEQG).

Sigma ( $\sigma$ ) = standard deviation



Closer examination revealed that As concentrations in the irrigated soils were similar to the controls, except for Lot D (Table 3), where greater than 75% of the soil samples were above the CCL ( $20 \text{ mg kg}^{-1}$ ). This anthropogenic loading of As in Lot D soil occurred after only 4 years of greywater irrigation. When the greywater of Lot D is assessed separately, the As average and maximum concentrations were 4.0-times ( $2.5 \mu\text{g L}^{-1}$ ) and 9.5-times ( $12 \mu\text{g L}^{-1}$ ) greater, respectively, than the other lots. Potentially exacerbating the As loadings of Lot D soil is the fact that soils that receive added phosphorus (P) will leach As (Feng et al., 2013 and Bolan et al., 2014). Irrigated greywater contains elevated P concentrations (Turner et al., 2013) and consequent leaching of As has the potential to contaminate the ground and surface waters. Boron was measured at elevated concentrations in the transpiration zone soils in all lots, with lots C and D being significantly ( $p \leq 0.05$ ) larger than the control soils. The elevation of B is consistent with the elevated P concentrations observed previously (Turner et al., 2013), with the likely source being detergents. There are no Australian environmental soil guidelines for B; however, the CEQG (CCME, 1999) is  $2 \text{ mg kg}^{-1}$  and only 2 samples, from lot D, exceeded this value. Chromium concentrations in the transpiration zone soils of lots B, C and D were significantly ( $p \leq 0.05$ ) larger than the controls (Table 2). This result is surprising given the Cr concentrations in the greywater were only slightly larger than the rain tank water measured on site. No CCL guidelines exist for Cr so the CEQG of  $64 \text{ mg kg}^{-1}$  was used (CCME, 1999). Only the soil Cr concentration of Lot C exceeded the CEQG (Table 3).

Lead concentrations in transpiration zone soils of lots C and D were significantly ( $p \leq 0.05$ ) larger than the controls and other lots (Table 2); however, none of the soil Pb concentrations exceeded the EIL or CCL for Pb (supplementary information – soils). Lead was not detected in the rainwater tanks, and was only measured at low concentrations in greywater (Table 1). There were elevated Ni concentrations in the transpiration zone soils of lots B and C compared to the controls (supplementary information – soils) but only Ni concentrations in Lot B were significantly ( $p \leq 0.05$ ) larger than the control (Table 2). None of the soil results were above the EIL or CCL for Ni (supplementary information – soils). Concentrations of Zn in the transpiration zone soils of all lots were larger than the controls (supplementary information – soils), with significant ( $p \leq 0.05$ ) increases in lots B and C (Table 2). No exceedances of either the EIL or the CCL for Zn occurred.

Statistical comparisons also identified significant ( $p \leq 0.05$ ) decreases in Al, Cu, Fe, Pb and Ag concentrations in some transpiration zone soils, presumably due to leaching. It was expected that

Al concentrations in transpiration zone soils would be larger than in control soils as Al concentrations in the greywater were elevated (Section 3.1). However, in all lots the soil Al concentrations were smaller than the controls, with the Al concentrations in the transpiration zone soils of lots A, B and C significantly ( $p \leq 0.05$ ) smaller than the control soils (Tables 2 and 3). As greywater has elevated concentrations of Ca, Na and N (Turner et al., 2013) a pseudo-podsolization process is likely to be occurring as a result of the greywater irrigation. Increasing soil pH by the addition of base cations (e.g. Ca and Na) can displace Al from binding sites on clay minerals (Reuss, 1983) resulting in leaching. In addition, an increase in nitrate and ammonium concentrations via irrigation can increase Al leaching (Emmett et al., 1995). The greywater has elevated Al concentrations and provides a continual supply of base cations, nitrate and ammonium, displacing Al from the soil into pore-water and then potentially into groundwater. There are no CCL or CEQG values for Al, so it is not possible to determine if the soil Al concentrations pose a risk to soil ecosystems and plants; however, this is unlikely as Al is a key constituent of aluminosilicates (clays).

Copper exceeded the irrigation guidelines and this resulted in Lot C exhibiting transpiration zone soils concentrations above the EIL and CCL. However, concentrations in Lot C transpiration zone soils were not statistically different ( $p > 0.05$ ) to the control soils. Furthermore, Lot D had a significant ( $p \leq 0.05$ ) decrease in concentrations of Cu. Irrigated greywater is a direct and indirect mechanism for Cu adsorption and leaching. The mobility of Cu is highly variable and is influenced by soil pH and P concentrations. Larger soil P concentrations will reduce Cu mobility, thereby reducing leachability; whereas decreasing soil pH will cause an increase in Cu mobility (Kumpiene et al., 2008) and leaching to groundwater. Of the four studied lots, Lot C had the largest average greywater P concentrations ( $25 \text{ mg L}^{-1}$ ), the largest soil Colwell extractable P concentrations ( $> 350 \text{ mg kg}^{-1}$ ) (Turner et al., 2013) and the highest average pH (pH 6.4) causing Cu to adsorb to soil; resulting in Cu increases in the transpiration zone soils. In contrast, Lot D had a smaller average greywater P concentration ( $16 \text{ mg L}^{-1}$ ), a similar soil Colwell extractable P concentration ( $\sim 175 \text{ mg kg}^{-1}$ ) compared to the control soils (Turner et al., 2013) and the lowest average pH levels (pH 5.8) causing Cu to be mobile and leach; resulting in less Cu in the transpiration zone soils. This Cu leaching is also compounded by the additional large concentration of Cu from irrigated greywater.

There was a significant ( $p \leq 0.05$ ) decrease in concentrations of Ag in Lot A and of Fe in Lot D, which was unusual. Uptake by plants could cause or contribute to some of the observed

decreases in transpiration zone soil metal concentrations; however, two factors mitigate the potential role of plants. Firstly, the transpiration zones only contain grass which has a typical root depth of 8.3 mm (Connellan 2002) and the greywater was released into the transpiration zones at 5 to 18 mm depth. Secondly, the soil transpiration metal concentration values were based on three depth segments taken at 100 mm intervals between the surface and 300 mm depth. Thus the most likely cause of metals decreasing at this site is due to leaching. This is consistent with the view of Mohamed et al. (2014), that soil metal concentration losses (due to grass uptake) would in general be minimal compared to leaching.

There were no differences in the concentration in the transpiration zone and control soils for Cd, Co and Mn and there were no exceedances of guidelines (see supplementary information – soils).

### 3.3 Groundwater

The 95<sup>th</sup> percentile concentrations of all the metals that were elevated in greywater (i.e., Al, As, B, Cu, Fe and Mn) decreased from P1 to P2 to P3 (Table 4) with the exception of Al, for which the concentration decreased from P1 to P3 to P2. This general trend confirms the experimental design that assumed that P1 would be most affected by greywater irrigation, P2 to a lesser extent and P3 the least (or as a control). Given the location of the piezometers and the flow of groundwater, the piezometers will mainly be affected by the irrigated greywater from Lot D. Greywater inputs to lots A to C should also affect the composition of groundwater down-flow of their location, but in a manner reflecting their greywater composition.

The concentrations of Al, As, B, Cd, Co, Cu, Fe, Pb, Mn, Ni and Zn at P1 were larger than those in the control (P3) but only As, B, Cd, Co, Fe, Mn, Ni and Zn (Table 4) were significantly ( $p \leq 0.05$ ) different. The elevated concentrations of As and B in groundwater can be linked back to the elevated concentrations in the transpiration zone soil and then to the greywater (Table 3 and Table 4). The elevated concentrations of Al, Cu and Fe in groundwater can be attributed directly to the greywater and to leaching of these metals from the transpiration zone soils (Table 3, Table 4 and supplementary information – soils). Logically, the elevated concentrations of Ni, Pb and Zn in groundwater must have originated from greywater, as the concentrations in the transpiration zone soil are elevated, even though the greywater concentrations were not highly elevated compared to the source water. The elevated concentrations of Mn in groundwater could be a result of the Mn in greywater not binding to soil (supplementary information – soils) and passing directly to the groundwater. This hypothesis is supported by Khattak and Jarrell (1989) who demonstrated increasing salinity in irrigation waters lead to increased mobility of Mn. The

greywater chemistry of the households demonstrated high salinity with maximums of; 2511  $\mu\text{S cm}^{-1}$  for electrical conductivity, 14  $\text{mg L}^{-1}$  Ca, 6.3  $\text{mg L}^{-1}$  Mg, 630  $\text{mg L}^{-1}$  Na and 50  $\text{mg L}^{-1}$  K (Turner et al., 2013).

The elevated groundwater concentrations of Cd and Co cannot be directly or indirectly attributed to greywater irrigation. The concentrations of Co in the groundwater were much larger (>10-times) than in the greywater, indicating that there was another source of Co apart from the greywater. A potential source of the elevated Co is fertilisers, where Co is present as a micro-nutrient (Singh, 1993). Similarly, greywater is unlikely to be the main source of Cd and is most likely to be phosphatic fertilisers (Lambert et al., 2007). Mineral fertilizers can also contain trace amounts of various metals as additives or as contaminants (Singh, 1993 and Lambert et al., 2007) and may, therefore, have also contributed to the measured groundwater metal concentrations. However, the concentrations of all metals that were elevated in groundwater, apart from Co and Cd, can be explained by the composition of the greywater. Therefore, it can be ascertained that fertilisers are a relatively minor contributor to the observed groundwater metal concentrations. The 95<sup>th</sup> percentile values of some piezometers for Al, As, Cd, Cr, Co, Cu, Fe, Mn, Ni, and Zn were larger than their corresponding GILS (Table 4), indicating that they pose a moderate to high risk to aquatic ecosystems (NEPM, 2013). There were no exceedances for B, Fe, Pb and Ag, and therefore, pose a low risk to aquatic ecosystems. In summary, the concentrations of As, Cd, Co, Fe, Mn, Ni and Zn were significantly elevated in the groundwater and exceeded GILS but only the exceedances of As, Fe, Mn, Ni and Zn could be attributed to greywater irrigation.



**Table 4 Groundwater 95<sup>th</sup> percentile metal concentrations ( $\mu\text{g L}^{-1}$ ) for piezometers one, two and three (P1, P2 and P3) including the significant differences between piezometers one, and piezometers three. Results were assessed and compared with the Australian and New Zealand water quality guidelines using 95% level of protection (ANZECC and ARMCANZ, 2000) and Canadian Environmental Quality Guidelines (CCME, 1999). Bolded purple values indicate where a trigger value was exceeded.**

Groundwater metals <sup>a</sup>	95th percentile ( $\mu\text{g L}^{-1}$ )			Trigger Values <sup>b</sup> PC95 ( $\mu\text{g L}^{-1}$ )	Probability of comparison of P1 and P3
	P1 (n= 23)	P2 (n= 22)	P3 (n= 23)		
Al	<b>1780</b>	<b>880</b>	<b>1080</b>	55	0.967
As	<b>41</b>	11	2.7	24	0.006
B	73	46	30	370	<0.001
Cd	<b>0.7</b>	<b>0.2</b>	0.1	0.2	<0.001
Cr	<b>2.3</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3.4</b>	1.0	0.925
Co	<b>61</b>	<b>11</b>	0.5	1.4 <sup>c</sup>	<0.001
Cu	<b>18</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>7.6</b>	1.4	0.647
Fe	<b>9500</b>	<b>2990</b>	10	300 <sup>d</sup>	<0.001
Pb	0.5	0.3	0.3	3.8	0.942
Mn	<b>4400</b>	<b>5000</b>	200	1900	<0.001
Ni	<b>31</b>	8.4	3.8	11	<0.001
Ag <sup>e</sup>	<0.05	<0.05	<0.05	0.05	-
Zn	<b>521</b>	<b>114</b>	<b>35</b>	8	<0.001

<sup>a</sup> Groundwater temporal figures for metal each concentrations and the Australian and New Zealand freshwater quality guideline trigger value for ecosystem protection (ANZECC and ARMCANZ, 2000) are provided in the supplementary information.

<sup>b</sup> Trigger values were obtained from Australian and New Zealand Guidelines for Fresh and Marine Water Quality water quality guidelines using 95% level of protection (ANZECC and ARMCANZ, 2000).

<sup>c</sup> A low reliability Australian guideline was available for Cobalt which was checked against the Canadian Environmental Quality Guidelines (CCME, 1999) Federal Water Quality Guideline of  $2.5 \mu\text{g L}^{-1}$ .

<sup>d</sup> The current Canadian Environmental Quality Guidelines (CCME, 1999) Federal Water Quality Guideline is  $300 \mu\text{g L}^{-1}$  which could be used as an interim indicative working level (ANZECC and ARMCANZ, 2000).

<sup>e</sup> All concentration for silver were below practical quantitation levels.

### 3.4 Surface water

Surface water concentrations of Al, B, Co, Cu, Fe, Pb, Mn and Zn were larger at the impact site than at the control site (Table 5) but only those for Co ( $p < 0.001$ ), Fe ( $p = 0.002$ ), Mn ( $p = 0.001$ ) and Zn ( $p = 0.007$ ) at the impact sites were significantly different than control sites. These surface water concentration increases indicate that there is at least one source of these metals up-gradient of the impact sites, which were not similarly influencing the control site. When comparing metal concentrations in surface water and groundwater, only Co, Fe, Mn and Zn were similarly elevated in the groundwater, and of these, only Fe, Mn and Zn can be linked directly back to the greywater irrigation (Table 4). The 95<sup>th</sup> percentile Fe concentration value at the Enoggera reservoir reference site was  $481 \mu\text{g L}^{-1}$  and  $178 \mu\text{g L}^{-1}$  at the control site immediately below the discharge point. This decrease between the reference and control site may reflect changes in the oxidation state of the water. At depth, water in reservoirs is often anoxic or has a low oxidation state, which once released, is aerated resulting in the Fe being converted from  $\text{Fe}^{2+}$  to  $\text{Fe}^{3+}$  and resulting in precipitation and a lowering of the dissolved Fe concentration. The subsequent significant increase at the impact site ( $369 \mu\text{g L}^{-1}$ ) is thus presumed to be linked to groundwater discharge into Enoggera Creek, and therefore, linked to greywater irrigation. Unexpectedly, the As concentrations at the impact site were significantly smaller than the control ( $p = 0.014$ ) site. This may be a result of co-precipitation of As with Fe (Feng et al., 2013). The concentrations of As and Fe in surface water at the impact site were highly and significantly correlated (Spearman correlation coefficient = 0.72,  $p < 0.001$ ), whereas the concentrations at the control site were not correlated (Spearman correlation coefficient = 0.042,  $p = 0.86$ ). Furthermore, the observation of iron flock in the creek during sampling at the impact site, is consistent with this explanation for low concentrations of As at the impact site.

The 95<sup>th</sup> percentile concentrations of Cu, Fe and Zn at the impact site and Cu at the control site exceeded the corresponding Australian and New Zealand trigger values (ANZECC and ARMCANZ, 2000), indicating they pose a moderate to high risk to aquatic ecosystems. In summary, the metals that were elevated at the impact site compared to the control site (Co, Fe, Mn and Zn) and that exceeded their trigger values (Cu, Fe and Zn) can each be attributed to greywater irrigation.

**Table 5 Surface water (SW) 95<sup>th</sup> percentile metal concentrations ( $\mu\text{g L}^{-1}$ ) for the control (C), impact (I) and reference (R) sites of Enoggera Creek. Results were assessed and compared with the Australian and New Zealand water quality guidelines (ANZECC and ARMCANZ, 2000) using 95% level of protection and Canadian Environmental Quality Guidelines (CCME, 1999). Bolded purple values indicate where a trigger value was exceeded.**

Surface water metals	Enoggera Creek 95 <sup>th</sup> percentiles			Trigger Values PC95 <sup>a</sup> ( $\mu\text{g L}^{-1}$ )
	( $\mu\text{g L}^{-1}$ )			
	Reference n= 7	Control n= 21	Impact n= 21	
Al	12	26	44	55
As	1.8	21.0	6.6	24
B	32	33	34	370
Cd	<0.04	<0.04	<0.04	0.2
Cr	0.13	0.40	0.40	1.0
Co	0.09	0.14	1.13	1.4 <sup>b</sup>
Cu	0.30	<b>2.76</b>	<b>2.80</b>	1.4
Fe	<b>481</b>	178	<b>369</b>	300 <sup>c</sup>
Pb	0.20	0.33	0.43	3.8
Mn	85	214	1130	1900
Ni	<1.0	1.2	<1.0	11
Ag	<0.05	<0.05	<0.05	0.05
Zn	2.6	6.3	<b>11</b>	8

<sup>a</sup> Trigger values were obtained from Australian and New Zealand Guidelines for Fresh and Marine Water Quality water quality guidelines using 95% level of protection (PC95) (ANZECC and ARMCANZ, 2000).

<sup>b</sup> A low reliability Australian guideline was available for Cobalt (ANZECC and ARMCANZ, 2000) which was checked against the Canadian Environmental Quality Guidelines (CCME, 1999) Federal Water Quality Guideline of  $2.5 \mu\text{g L}^{-1}$ .

<sup>c</sup> The current Canadian Environmental Quality Guidelines (CCME, 1999) Federal Water Quality Guideline is  $300 \mu\text{g L}^{-1}$  which could be used as an interim indicative working level (ANZECC and ARMCANZ, 2000).

### 3.3 Guideline comparison summary

The concentrations of metals in greywater, transpiration zone soil, groundwater and surface water were compared to relevant guidelines and trigger values (Table 6). Copper consistently exceeded trigger values/guidelines in all the environmental compartments as a result of greywater irrigation (Table 1). A number of metals accumulated in the transpiration zone soils, but only As, B, Cu and Cr exceeded trigger values/guidelines (Table 3). The concentrations of Al, As, Cd, Cr, Co, Cu, Fe, Mn, Ni and Zn in groundwater exceeded their trigger values, whereas the concentrations of only Cu, Fe and Zn exceeded their trigger values in the surface water. All exceedances indicate a moderate to high risk of environmental harm occurring. The inconsistencies in the metals that exceeded the corresponding trigger values/guidelines indicates the inherent limitation of deriving trigger values/guidelines that only consider effects within a single environmental compartment (e.g. soil, surface water or groundwater) or environmental value (e.g. ecosystem protection or irrigation). In order to use greywater responsibly, specific greywater guidelines should be developed that consider the effects of metals in all environmental compartments that might be directly and/or indirectly impacted. Greywater will also contain a variety of other inorganic (Turner et al., 2013) and organic chemicals (from household products that enter the greywater) and the potential transport and effects of these must also be considered.



**Table 6 Comparison of the maximum concentration of each element measured in different media from the greywater irrigated lots compared with the corresponding Australian and New Zealand water quality guideline trigger values (ANZECC and ARMCANZ, 2000). Measured concentrations are less than (<) or greater than (>) the ANZECC and ARMCANZ (2000) guidelines, greater than the CCME (1999) guidelines (>C), or neither guideline was available (-).**

Analyte	Greywater <sup>1</sup>	Soil CCL <sup>2</sup>	Groundwater <sup>3</sup>	Surface water <sup>4</sup>
Al	<	-	>	<
As	<	>	>	<
B	>	> C <sup>5</sup>	<	<
Cd	<	<	>	<
Cr	<	> C <sup>6</sup>	>	<
Co	<	<	<	<
Cu	>	>	>	>
Fe	>	-	>	>
Pb	<	<	<	<
Mn	<	<	>	<
Ni	<	<	>	<
Ag	-	-	<PQL	<PQL
Zn	<	<	>	>

<sup>a</sup> Greywater has been assessed with the ANZECC and ARMCANZ (2000) irrigation guidelines in table 9.2.17 using the long-term trigger value

<sup>b</sup> The transpiration zones has been assessed with the ANZECC and ARMCANZ (2000) guidelines in table 9.2.17 using the soil cumulative contaminant loading limit (CCL)

<sup>c</sup> Groundwater has been assessed with the ANZECC and ARMCANZ (2000) water quality trigger value in table 3.4.1 using 95% level of protection

<sup>d</sup> Surface water at the impact site has been assessed with the ANZECC and ARMCANZ (2000) water quality guidelines in table 3.4.1 using 95% level of protection

<sup>e</sup> No Australian guideline was available for Boron therefore the Canadian Environmental Quality Guideline for residential/parkland was used (2 mg kg<sup>-1</sup>) (CCME, 1999)

<sup>f</sup> No Australian guideline was available for Cadmium therefore the Canadian Environmental Quality Guideline for residential/parkland was used (64 mg kg<sup>-1</sup>) (CCME, 1999)

### 3.4 Implications of the study

Greywater irrigation at this site has, within four years, increased concentrations of several metals such that they exceed appropriate environmental quality guidelines and thus pose a moderate to high risk to ecosystems in transpiration zone soils, groundwater and an adjacent creek. However, it is likely that the effects of greywater will vary at different sites due to variations in greywater composition and site-specific characteristics. For example, the chemical composition of greywater is likely to differ from site to site reflecting the quantity and types of products used in households, and from region to region due to changes in product formulation to maintain product efficacy. Also, the extent of metal adsorption to soils is likely to vary spatially due to the composition of the soil and the aquifer (e.g. clay content, cation exchange capacity and pH). The ability to detect increased metal concentrations will also depend on the existing concentrations of the metals in the various environmental compartments and the distance to the nearest surface water. Nonetheless, this study clearly indicates the need to carefully consider the metals present in greywater (as a component or a contaminant) and manage the irrigation of water (by controlling the inputs to greywater or the amount and frequency of irrigation permitted) in order to obtain the potential water savings but minimizing environmental harm.

It is recommended that studies similar to the present (e.g. on a larger scale, using different soil and climatic types) are conducted at sites with different characteristics to determine if quantitative relationships similar to those of Broos et al. (2007) and Warne et al. (2008) can be developed and thus generate guidelines for greywater irrigation that account for site-specific characteristics. For example, it would be expected that sandy acidic soils (i.e. with a low clay content (and low CEC) and low pH) and aquifers would not bind metals and essentially all would move into the groundwater.

Further analysis of this data can determine soil enrichment factors and irrigation soil metal loadings. Although greywater irrigation is not always the direct source of the metals observed in the aquatic environment, greywater irrigation is influencing leaching. With this in mind irrigation assessment models such as MEDLI (Gardner et al., 2002) should be enhanced (for sub-surface irrigation) to assess the irrigation site's soil suitability for receiving metals from greywater irrigation and the greywater irrigations impact on soil leaching. This will help ensure future greywater irrigation approvals are designed to be environmentally sustainable. Additional work can also estimate loads of metals delivered to Enoggera Creek assessing the total amount of metal leached to the aquatic environment. Future work should also examine the potential

environmental impacts associated with organic contaminants such as pharmaceuticals and personal care products (PPCPs) in greywater.

As more greywater data and scientific understanding is published, government regulation and policy on greywater reuse should use specific science and move away from gap filling science from a similar field (i.e. onsite sewerage guidelines). With further research, robust government environment regulation and policy will be underpinned by sound science (a strong science — policy interface). It is inevitable that Australia or other countries will be affected by periods of drought, during which water conservation policies (greywater reuse) will be needed. With ongoing research good science can be expected to underpin greywater reuse policy and the impacts on the environment can be minimised. Furthermore, updating greywater irrigation guidelines with a greater emphasis on metals will ensure that responsible reuse of greywater does not result in environmental harm.

#### **4 Conclusions**

Greywater irrigation can help reduce demand on freshwater for external uses such as watering gardens. However, this study provides evidence that greywater irrigation could potentially cause environmental harm due to metal accumulation in soils and the presence of metal contaminants in the aquatic environment.

After four years of commencing greywater irrigation, it has led to an increase in the average concentrations of As, B, Cr, Cu, Pb, Ni and Zn and decreased the concentrations of Al, Cu, Fe, and Ag from soil; increased the concentrations of Al, As, B, Cu, Fe, Pb, Mn, Ni and Zn in groundwater and increased the concentrations of Al, B, Cu, Fe, Pb, Mn, and Zn in an adjacent creek.

The concentrations of As, B, Cr and Cu in soil and Al, As, Cr, Cu, Fe, Mn, Ni, and Zn in groundwater and Cu, Fe, and Zn in the surface water also exceeded the corresponding environmental quality guidelines and thus pose a moderate to high risk to the exposed ecosystems. Although the composition of greywater and site-specific characteristics will modify the effects at each site, it is clear that the existing greywater reuse guidelines do not provide adequate environmental protection and they should be revised taking into account the concentrations of metals, and other contaminants, in greywater.

## 5 Acknowledgments

The authors would like to thank all reviewers who provided useful comment on this manuscript. The authors would also like to acknowledge the Queensland Government for providing R.D.R. Turner with study time and funding for this research project. We particularly would like to thank the staff at the Chemistry Centre of the Department of Science, Information Technology and Innovation for their time and assistance. Thanks to colleagues at the Queensland Government who provided valuable advice and support, particular Belinda Thomson for the conceptual diagram and Ben Ferguson for the site map and the internal reviewers. This research would not have been possible without the support of the residents at Payne Road, The Gap, Queensland, Australia.

## 6 References

ACT Health 2007, "Greywater use : guidelines for residential properties in Canberra "ACT Health - Health Protection Service, October 2007, Weston Creek, Australian Capital Territory, Canberra, Australia.

ANZECC (Australian and New Zealand Environment and Conservation Council) and ARMCANZ (Agriculture and Resource Management Council of Australia and New Zealand) 2000, Australian Guidelines for Water Quality Monitoring and Reporting. National Water Quality Management Strategy, Canberra.

Apgar, M.A. 2000, "Sustainability of ground-water resources" USGS Circular #1186", *Ground Water*, vol. 38, no. 3, pp. 330.

Ayenimo, J.G., Yusuf, A.M., Adekunle, A.S. & Makinde, O.W. 2010, "heavy metal exposure from personal care products", *Bulletin of Environmental Contamination and Toxicology*, vol. 84, no. 1, pp. 8–14.

Biolytix. 2005, "Global winner, Biolytix, is taking on effluent society", *Ecos*, no. 127, pp. 5

Bradl, H.B. 2004, "Adsorption of heavy metal ions on soils and soils constituents", *Journal of Colloid and Interface Science*, vol. 277, no. 1, pp. 1–18.

Broos, K., Warne, M.St.J., Heemsbergen, D.A., Stevens, D., Barnes, M.B., Correll, R.L. and McLaughlin, M.J. 2007, "Soil factors controlling the toxicity of Cu and Zn to microbial processes in Australian soils". *Environmental Toxicology and Chemistry*, vol. 26, no. 4, pp. 583–590.

Bryan, G.W. & Langston, W.J. 1992, "Bioavailability, accumulation and effects of heavy metals in sediments with special reference to United Kingdom estuaries: a review", *Environmental Pollution*, vol. 76, no. 2, pp. 89–131.

CCME (Canadian Council of Ministers of the Environment). 1999, *Canadian Environmental Quality Guidelines*, Environmental Quality Guidelines edn, Canadian Council of Ministers of the Environment, 1999, Hull, QC, Canada.

Chartres, C. 2006, "A Strategic Science Framework for the National Water Commission", National Water Commission, 95 Northbourne Ave, Canberra, ACT 2600.

Christova-Boal D., Eden R.E. and McFarlane S., An investigation into greywater reuse for urban residential properties, *Desalination* 106 (1–3), 1996, 391–397.

Connellan. G. 2002, "Efficient Irrigation: A Reference Manual for Turf and Landscape", School of Resource Management and Geography, University of Melbourne.

DIP (Department of State Development, Infrastructure and Planning). 2007, "The Queensland Plumbing and Wastewater Code (QPW code)", Department of State Development, Infrastructure and Planning (DIP), Compliance edn, Queensland, Australia, Brisbane.

Diaper C, Tjandraatmadja G, Pollard C, Tusseau AC, Price G, Burch L, Gozukara Y, Sheedy C and Moglia M. 2008, "Sources of critical contaminants in domestic wastewater: contaminant loads from household appliances". CSIRO: Water for a Healthy Country National Research Flagship.

DoEUS NSW 2008, "NSW guidelines for greywater reuse in sewerred, single household residential premises", Sydney: Department of Energy, Utilities and Sustainability, 2008, Sydney, New South Wales, Australia. ISBN number 978 0 7347 5940 5.



Donner, E., Eriksson, E., Revitt, D., Scholes, L., Lützhøft, H.H. & Ledin, A. 2010, "Presence and fate of priority substances in domestic greywater treatment and reuse systems", *Science of The Total Environment*, vol. 408, no. 12, pp. 2444–2451.

Eaton, A.D., Clesceri, L.S., Rice, E.F., Greenberg, A.E. & Franson, M.A.H. 2005, *Standard methods for the examination of water & wastewater 21st edn*, American Public Health Association, Washington, D.C.

EHP (Queensland Department of Environment and Heritage Protection). 2010, *Environmental Protection (Water) Policy 2009 South-east Queensland Map Series PLAN WQ1431*, Projection: Map Grid of Australia (MGA) Zone 56 Horizontal Datum: Geocentric Datum of Australia 1994 (GDA94) [Online]. Available: <http://www.ehp.qld.gov.au/water/policy/pdf/plans/brisbane-est-ev-plan-2010.pdf> [23/1/2015].

Emmett, B.A., Brittain, S.A., Hughes, S., Görres, J., Kennedy, V., Norris, D., Rafarel, R., Reynolds, B. & Stevens, P.A. 1995, "Nitrogen additions (NaNO<sub>3</sub> and NH<sub>4</sub>NO<sub>3</sub>) at Aber forest, Wales: I. Response of throughfall and soil water chemistry", *Forest Ecology and Management*, vol. 71, no. 1–2, pp. 45–59.

EPHC (Environment Protection and Heritage Council). 2006, "National guidelines for water recycling. Managing health and environmental risks (phase 1)". Canberra, Australia.

Eriksson, E. & Donner, E. 2009, "Metals in greywater: Sources, presence and removal efficiencies", *Desalination*, vol. 248, no. 1–3, pp. 271–278.

Eriksson, E., Auffarth, K., Henze, M. & Ledin, A. 2002, "Characteristics of grey wastewater", *Urban Water*, vol. 4, no. 1, pp. 85–104.

Eriksson, E., Baun, A., Henze, M., Ledin A. 2006, "Phytotoxicity of grey wastewater evaluated by toxicity tests", *Urban Water Journal*, Vol. 3, no. 1, 2006

Etchepare, R. & van der Hoek, J.P. 2015, "Health risk assessment of organic micropollutants in greywater for potable reuse", *Water research*, vol. 72, no. 0, pp. 186–198.

Facchinelli, A., Sacchi, E. & Mallen, L. 2001, "Multivariate statistical and GIS-based approach to identify heavy metal sources in soils", *Environmental Pollution*, vol. 114, no. 3, pp. 313–324.

Förstner, Ulrich, and Gottfried TW Wittmann. 2012, "Metal pollution in the aquatic environment", Springer Science & Business Media, 2012.

Feng, Q., Zhang, Z., Chen, Y., Liu, L., Zhang, Z. & Chen, C. 2013, "Adsorption and Desorption Characteristics of Arsenic on Soils: Kinetics, Equilibrium, and Effect of Fe(OH)<sub>3</sub> Colloid, H<sub>2</sub>SiO<sub>3</sub> Colloid and Phosphate", *Procedia Environmental Sciences*, vol. 18, pp. 26–36.

Friedler, E. 2004, "Quality of individual domestic greywater streams and its implication for on-site treatment and reuse possibilities", *Environmental technology*, vol. 25, no. 9, pp. 997-1008.

Gardner T, Vieritz A, Atzeni M. 2002, "Model for effluent disposal using land irrigation (MEDLI)." Version 2.0 ed. Brisbane: Queensland Department of Primary Industries and the Queensland Department of Natural Resources; 2002.

Gilbert, R.O. 1987, *Statistical methods for environmental pollution monitoring*, Van Nostrand Reinhold Co, New York.

Godfrey, S., Labhasetwar, P. & Wate, S. 2009, "Greywater reuse in residential schools in Madhya Pradesh, India—A case study of cost–benefit analysis", *Resources, Conservation and Recycling*, vol. 53, no. 5, pp. 287–293.

Gray, S.R. & Becker, N.S.C. 2002, "Contaminant flows in urban residential water systems", *Urban Water*, vol. 4, no. 4, pp. 331–346.

Hollander, M. and Wolfe, D.A. 1999, "Nonparametric Statistical Methods", 2nd edn. New York: John Wiley & Sons. ISBN: 978-0-471-19045-5.

Howard, E., Misra, R., Loch, R. & Le, M.N. 2007, "Laundry grey water potential impact on Toowoomba soils - final report", University of Southern Queensland, National Centre for Engineering in Agriculture, Toowoomba, Australia. [Online]. Available: <http://eprints.usq.edu.au/641/> [01/04/2016].

Huston, R., Chan, Y.C., Chapman, H., Gardner, T. & Shaw, G. 2012, "Source apportionment of heavy metals and ionic contaminants in rainwater tanks in a subtropical urban area in Australia", *Water research*, vol. 46, no. 4, pp. 1121–1132.

Huston, R. 2010, "Chemical contaminants in urban rainwater tanks". Thesis (PhD Doctorate), Griffith University, Brisbane. [Online]. Available: <https://www120.secure.griffith.edu.au/rch/items/823120a1-60af-a2bd-6511-115608f5c7c2/1/> [01/04/2016].

Jeppesen, B. 1996, "Domestic greywater re-use: Australia's challenge for the future", *Desalination*, vol. 106, no. 1-3, pp. 311-315.

Jury, W.A. & Vaux, H.J. 2007, "Advances in Agronomy Volume 95; The Emerging Global Water Crisis: Managing Scarcity and Conflict Between Water Users ", vol. 95, pp. 1 - 76.

Khattak, R.A. & Jarrell, W.M. 1989, "Effect of Saline Irrigation Waters on Soil Manganese Leaching and Bioavailability to Sugar Beet", vol. 53, no. 1, pp. 142-146.

Kumpiene, J., Lagerkvist, A. & Maurice, C. 2008, "Stabilization of As, Cr, Cu, Pb and Zn in soil using amendments - A review", *Waste Management*, vol. 28, no. 1, pp. 215-225.

Lambert, R., Grant, C. & Sauvé, S. 2007, "Cadmium and zinc in soil solution extracts following the application of phosphate fertilizers", *Science of The Total Environment*, vol. 378, no. 3, pp. 293-305.

Maimon, A., Tal, A., Friedler, E. & Gross, A. 2010, "Safe on-site reuse of greywater for irrigation - a critical review of current guidelines", *Environmental Science & Technology*, vol. 44, no. 9, pp. 3213-3220.

March, J.G. & Gual, M. 2009, "Studies on chlorination of greywater", *Desalination*, vol. 249, no. 1, pp. 317-322.

Mohamed, R., Kassim, A., Anda, M. & Dallas, S. 2014, "The Effects of Elements Mass Balance from Turf Grass Irrigated with Laundry and Bathtub Greywater", *International Journal of Applied Environmental Sciences* ISSN 0973-6077 Volume 9, Number 4 (2014), pp. 2033-2049

NEPM (2013), National Environment Protection (Assessment of Site Contamination) Measure 1999 as in force on 16 May 2013. Volume 2 (Schedule B1). Prepared by the Office of Parliamentary Counsel, Canberra. Federal Register of Legislative Instruments F2013C00288.

Available from: <http://www.comlaw.gov.au/Details/F2013L00768/Download>

Nolde, E. 2000, "Greywater reuse systems for toilet flushing in multi-storey buildings – over ten years experience in Berlin", *Urban Water*, vol. 1, no. 4, pp. 275-284

Peralta-Videa, J.R., Lopez, M.L., Narayan, M., Saupe, G. & Gardea-Torresdey, J. 2009, "The biochemistry of environmental heavy metal uptake by plants: Implications for the food chain", *The international journal of biochemistry & cell biology*, vol. 41, no. 8-9, pp. 1665-1677.

Peeverill, K.I., Reuter, D.J. & Sparrow, L.A. 1999, "Soil analysis: an interpretation manual", CSIRO Publishing, Collingwood, Victoria, Australia. ISBN 0 643 06376 5.

Queensland 2015, Water Act 2000, The State of Queensland, Brisbane, [Online]. Available <http://www.legislation.qld.gov.au/legisln/current/w/watera00.pdf> [01/12/2015].

Rattan, R.K., Datta, S.P., Chhonkar, P.K., Suribabu, K. & Singh, A.K. 2005, "Long-term impact of irrigation with sewage effluents on heavy metal content in soils, crops and groundwater—a case study", *Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment*, vol. 109, no. 3-4, pp. 310-322.

Rayment, G. & Lyons, D. 2010, "Soil Chemical Methods – Australasia", CSIRO Publishing, Melbourne, Australia. ISBN: 9780643067684.

Reichman, S.M. & Wightwick, A.M. 2013, "Impacts of standard and 'low environmental impact' greywater irrigation on soil and plant nutrients and ecology", *Applied Soil Ecology*, vol. 72, pp. 195-202.

Reuss, J.O. 1983, "Implications of the Calcium-Aluminum Exchange System for the Effect of Acid Precipitation on Soils", *Journal of Environmental Quality*, vol. 12, no. 4, pp. 591-595.  
<http://dx.doi.org/10.2134/jeq1983.00472425001200040032x>

Revitt, D.M., Eriksson, E. & Donner, E. 2011, "The implications of household greywater treatment and reuse for municipal wastewater flows and micropollutant loads", *Water Research*, vol. 45, no. 4, pp. 1549-1560.

Rodrigo, S., Leder, K. & Sinclair, M. 2009, "Quality of stored rainwater used for drinking in metropolitan South Australia", *Water Research Australia*, Adelaide SA 5000.

Schmidt, U. 2003, "Enhancing Phytoextraction: The effect of chemical soil manipulation on mobility, plant accumulation, and leaching of heavy metals ", PLOS ONE, vol. 32, no. 6, pp. 1939–1954. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0062941>

Sharma, V.K. & Sohn, M. 2009, "Aquatic arsenic: Toxicity, speciation, transformations, and remediation", Environment International, vol. 35, no. 4, pp. 743–759.

Singh, B. 1993, "Effect of Cobalt-Enriched NPK Fertilizer on Cobalt Concentration in Ryegrass and Its Leaching Losses at Different pH Levels" in , ed. N.J. Barrow, Springer Netherlands, , pp. 709–712.

Standards Australia1998a, AS/NZS 5667.1:1998, "Water quality - Sampling - Guidance on the design of sampling programs, sampling techniques and the preservation and handling of samples", Standards Australia edn, Homebush Australia.

Standards Australia1998b, AS/NZS 5667.10:1998 "Water quality: sampling. Part 10, Guidance on sampling of waste waters", Standards Australia edn, Homebush, Australia.

Stevens D, Dillon P, Page D, Warne M.St.J., Ying GG.2011, "Assessing environmental risks of laundry detergents in greywater used for irrigation ", Journal of Water Reuse and Desalination, vol. 1, no. 2, pp. 61–77.

Sundaram, B., 2009, "Groundwater Sampling and Analysis - A Field Guide". Record 2009/027. Geoscience Australia, Canberra. [Online]. Available [http://www.ga.gov.au/metadata-gateway/metadata/record/gcat\\_68901](http://www.ga.gov.au/metadata-gateway/metadata/record/gcat_68901) [01/04/2016].

Tjandraatmadja, G., Diaper, C., Gozukara, Y., Burch, L., Sheedy, C. & and Price, G. 2008, "Sources of critical contaminants in domestic wastewater: contaminant contribution from household products", CSIRO: Water for a Healthy Country National Research Flagship, Australia.

Thermo Electron Corporation, X-Series ICP-MS Getting Started Guide, Issue 1.3 : January 2004, Ref. No. : S419MA

Tölgyesi, C., Bátori, Z. & Erdős, L. 2014, "Using statistical tests on relative ecological indicator values to compare vegetation units – Different approaches and weighting methods", Ecological Indicators, vol. 36, no. 1, pp. 441–446.

Travis, M.J., Wiel-Shafran, A., Weisbrod, N., Adar, E. & Gross, A. 2010, "Greywater reuse for irrigation: Effect on soil properties", *Science of the Total Environment*, vol. 408, no. 12, pp. 2501–2508.

Turner, R.D.R., Will, G.D., Dawes, L.A., Gardner, E.A. & Lyons, D.J. 2013, "Phosphorus as a limiting factor on sustainable greywater irrigation", *Science of The Total Environment*, vol. 456–457, no. 1, pp. 287–298.

US EPA, Office of Water (OW) 2007, "Arsenic and Your Distribution System", United States Environmental Protection Agency, United States. [Online]. Available [https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2015-09/documents/fs\\_arsenic\\_dist\\_sys\\_factsheet\\_final.pdf](https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2015-09/documents/fs_arsenic_dist_sys_factsheet_final.pdf) [04/04/2016].

Varian, I. 2001, *Varian Vista Pro Operation Manual 2001*, 1st edn, Varian, Inc., Melbourne.

Warne, M.St.J., Heemsbergen, D.A., Stevens, D., McLaughlin, M.J., Cozens, G., Whatmuff, M., Broos, K., Barry, G., Bell, M., Nash, D., Pritchard, D. and Penney, N. 2008. "Modelling the toxicity of Cu and Zn salts to wheat in fourteen soils". *Environmental Toxicology and Chemistry*, vol. 27, pp 786–792.

Wiel-Shafran, A., Ronen, Z., Weisbrod, N., Adar, E. & Gross, A. 2006, "Potential changes in soil properties following irrigation with surfactant-rich greywater", *Ecological Engineering*, vol. 26, no. 4, pp. 348–354.

Winward, G.P., Avery, L.M., Frazer-Williams, R., Pidou, M., Jeffrey, P., Stephenson, T. & Jefferson, B. 2008, "A study of the microbial quality of grey water and an evaluation of treatment technologies for reuse", *Ecological Engineering*, vol. 32, no. 2, pp. 187–197.

Zhu, S.-, Wang, C., Yip, A.C.K. & Tsang, D.C.W. 2015, "Highly effective degradation of sodium dodecylbenzene sulphonate and synthetic greywater by Fenton-like reaction over zerovalent iron-based catalyst", *Environmental Technology (United Kingdom)*, vol. 36, no. 11, pp. 1423–1432.

Zhong, S., Geng, H., Zhang, F., Liu, Z., Wang, T. & Song, B. 2015, "Risk Assessment and Prediction of Heavy Metal Pollution in Groundwater and River Sediment: A Case Study of a Typical Agricultural



Irrigation Area in Northeast China". International Journal of Analytical Chemistry vol 2015,

Article ID 921539, 11 pages <http://dx.doi.org/10.1155/2015/921539>

## Supplementary information – Quality Assurance and Quality Control.

### Quality control sample summary

Table 1 Analytical results for field sampling quality assurance and quality control ( $\mu\text{g L}^{-1}$ )

Analyte	Field blank	Field sample	Duplicate field sample	% difference
Ag	<0.05	<0.05	<0.05	n.c
Al	<6	46	44	4%
As	<0.10	4.78	4.58	4%
B	<2	20	19	5%
Be	<0.2	<0.2	<0.2	n.c
Cd	<0.04	<0.04	<0.04	n.c
Co	<0.05	0.59	0.58	2%
Cr	<0.10	0.19	0.19	<1%
Cu	<0.2	2.8	2.5	11%
Fe	<1.0	368	369	<1%
La	<0.04	0.11	0.1	9%
Mn	<0.2	473	468	1%
Mo	<0.4	0.8	0.6	25%
Ni	<1.0	<1.0	<1.0	n.c
Pb	<0.05	0.16	0.16	<1%
Sn	<0.10	0.18	0.13	28%
Se	<0.4	<0.4	<0.4	n.c
Tl	<0.05	<0.05	<0.05	n.c
U	<0.03	<0.03	<0.03	n.c
V	<0.05	0.18	0.16	11%
Zn	<1.0	7.9	7.6	4%

n.c = not calculable

**Table 2 Analytical results for laboratory quality assurance and quality control ( $\mu\text{g L}^{-1}$ )**

Analyte	Analytical run						Average (n=6)	<sup>a</sup> TM27.3 CRM values	<sup>a</sup> TM27.3 CRM acceptable range ( $\pm$ )	difference
	1	2	3	4	5	6				
Al	49	45	46	48	46	48	47	44.4	5.1	2.60
Sb	1.58	1.49	1.51	1.46	1.44	1.51	1.50	1.51	0.19	-0.01
As	2.13	2.12	2.21	2.12	2.12	2.25	2.16	2.15	0.3	0.01
Be	1	1.2	1	1.1	1.1	1.3	1.12	1.16	0.15	-0.04
B	15	15	15	15	15	16	15	14.7	4.3	0.47
Cd	1.01	1.03	0.96	0.98	1.03	1.05	1.01	1.05	0.12	-0.04
Co	2	2.05	1.99	2.02	2.05	2.14	2.04	2.05	0.18	-0.01
Cr	1.7	1.72	1.71	1.75	1.66	1.72	1.71	1.73	0.33	-0.02
Cu	6.2	6.2	6.1	6.2	6.2	6.6	6.25	6.16	0.61	0.09
Fe	11	11	14.2	11.5	12.5	11.8	12	10.9	3	1.10
La	<0.04	<0.04	<0.04	<0.04	<0.04	<0.04	-	-	-	
Pb	3.08	2.86	2.89	2.84	2.91	2.94	2.92	2.86	0.32	0.06
Mn	2.3	2.4	2.4	2.4	2.5	2.4	2.40	2.27	0.35	0.13
Mo	2.2	2.3	1.9	2	2	2.2	2.10	2.28	0.34	-0.18
Ni	2.3	2.1	2.3	2.4	2.3	2.4	2.30	2.44	0.53	-0.14
Se	1.5	1.6	1.5	1.5	1.6	1.6	1.55	1.69	0.53	-0.14
Ag	0.84	0.79	0.81	0.82	0.8	0.83	0.82	0.78	0.1	0.03
Tl	1.55	1.5	1.5	1.46	1.49	1.54	1.51	1.49	0.2	0.02
U	2.1	2.09	2.04	2	2.1	2.14	2.08	2.03	0.19	0.05
V	2.19	2.21	2.14	2.15	2.14	2.21	2.17	2.18	0.25	-0.01
Zn	18.2	16.2	18.4	18.6	18.4	19.1	18	16.2	2.4	1.95
Ba	14.8	14.9	15.7	15	15	15.4	15	14.9	1.1	0.23
Li	<5	<5	<5	<5	<5	<5	-	3.57	0.68	-
Ti	1.99	1.92	1.91	1.95	1.9	1.96	1.94	2.02	0.33	-0.08
Sn	2.3	2.4	2.5	2.4	2.2	2.3	2.35	2.32	0.41	0.03

<sup>a</sup>National Research Council Canada - Trace Metals Certified Reference Material (TM 27.3)

**Table 3 Analytical meta-data for greywater, groundwater and surface water; including instrumentation of analysis, method of uncertainty and practical quantitation limits (PQL) for each analyte.**

Analyte	Instrumentation <sup>1</sup>	Uncertainty $\pm\%$	PQL	Unit <sup>2</sup>
Ag	ICP-MS	10	0.05	$\mu\text{g/L}$
Al	ICP-MS	12	6	$\mu\text{g/L}$
Al	ICP-OES <sup>3</sup>	8	0.14	$\text{mg/L}$
As	ICP-MS	10	0.1	$\mu\text{g/L}$
B	ICP-MS	16	2	$\mu\text{g/L}$
B	ICP-OES <sup>4</sup>	12	0.05	$\text{mg/L}$
Ba	ICP-MS	10	0.5	$\mu\text{g/L}$
Be	ICP-MS	10	0.2	$\mu\text{g/L}$
Cd	ICP-MS	10	0.04	$\mu\text{g/L}$
Co	ICP-MS	8	0.05	$\mu\text{g/L}$
Cr	ICP-MS	8	0.1	$\mu\text{g/L}$
Cu	ICP-MS	8	0.2	$\mu\text{g/L}$
Fe	ICP-MS	15	1	$\mu\text{g/L}$
Fe	ICP-OES <sup>5</sup>	10	0.04	$\text{mg/L}$
La	ICP-MS	10	0.04	$\mu\text{g/L}$
Li	ICP-MS	10	5	$\mu\text{g/L}$
Mn	ICP-MS	8	0.2	$\mu\text{g/L}$
Mn	ICP-OES <sup>6</sup>	10	0.01	$\text{mg/L}$
Mo	ICP-MS	8	0.4	$\mu\text{g/L}$
Ni	ICP-MS	8	1	$\mu\text{g/L}$
Pb	ICP-MS	8	0.05	$\mu\text{g/L}$
Sb	ICP-MS	8	0.1	$\mu\text{g/L}$
Se	ICP-MS	10	0.4	$\mu\text{g/L}$
Sn	ICP-MS	10	0.1	$\mu\text{g/L}$
Ti	ICP-MS	10	0.05	$\mu\text{g/L}$
Tl	ICP-MS	8	0.05	$\mu\text{g/L}$
U	ICP-MS	8	0.03	$\mu\text{g/L}$
V	ICP-MS	8	0.05	$\mu\text{g/L}$
Zn	ICP-MS	8	1	$\mu\text{g/L}$

<sup>1</sup> ICP-OES = inductively coupled plasma-optical emission spectrometer; ICP-MS = inductively coupled plasma-mass spectrometer

<sup>2</sup> All results in the manuscript have been standardised to  $\mu\text{g L}^{-1}$

<sup>3</sup> Aluminium data obtained from this instrument were for results  $>500 \mu\text{g L}^{-1}$  for greywater and groundwater

<sup>4</sup> Boron data obtained from this instrument were for results  $>500 \mu\text{g L}^{-1}$  for greywater

<sup>5</sup> Iron data obtained from this instrument were for results  $>500 \mu\text{g L}^{-1}$  for greywater, groundwater and surface water

<sup>6</sup> Manganese data obtained from this instrument were for results  $>500 \mu\text{g L}^{-1}$  for groundwater and surface water

**Elemental (dissolved low level) analysis of water by ICP-OES method from the Chemistry Centre laboratory of the Department of Science, Information Technology and Innovation. Extracted from analytical method Chemistry Centre W\_TD\_ICP.**

**Table 4 Varian Vista Pro ICP-OES operating wavelengths**

<b>Analyte</b>	Ag	Al	As	B	Be	Bi	Cd	Co	Cr	Cu	Fe
<b>Wavelength (nm)</b>	328.068	237.312	193.696	249.678	234.861	223.061	214.439	237.863	205.56	327.395	238.204
<b>Analyte</b>	Mn	Mo	Ni	Pb	Sb	Se	Sr	Ti	V	Zn	
<b>Wavelength (nm)</b>	257.61	202.032	231.604	220.353	217.582	196.026	407.771	334.941	292.401	213.857	

**Table 5 ICP-OES operating parameters**

Number of replicates	3
Stabilisation time (seconds)	15
Sample uptake time (seconds)	57 (Nominal but may vary depending on instrument and sample)
	10
Replicate time (seconds)	80
Rinse time max (seconds)	
Plasma Conditions	1300
RF power (Watts)	10 (Nominal but may vary depending on instrument and sample)
Viewing height (mm)	Sea spray, Glass Expansion
	15
Nebulizer type	1.5
Plasma flow (L/Min)	0.8
Auxiliary flow (L/Min)	
Nebulizer flow (L/Min)	15
Peristaltic pump	On
Pump rate (rpm)	
Fast pump	
	mg/L
Element Calibration	0.999
Units	Off
Correlation coefficient limit	Quadratic, through blank
Re-slopes	
Calibration type	

**Table 6 Peristaltic Pump Tubing Configuration**

Sample tubing	White/white (flow rated 0.6 mL/Min)
Internal standard tubing	Orange/white (flow rated 0.23 mL/Min)
Waste tubing	Yellow/Yellow (flow rated 1.2 mL/Min)

**Ultra Low Level Total Dissolved Metals Inductively Coupled Plasma Mass Spectrometry method from the Chemistry Centre laboratory of the Department of Science, Information Technology and Innovation. Extracted from analytical method Chemistry Centre W\_UTD\_IMS.**

**Table 7 ICP\_MS (Thermo X7) sample introduction system**

Sample pump tube	Orange/orange 0.42 ml/min
Internal standard pump tube	Orange/green 0.1 ml/min
Waste pump tube	White/white 0.6 ml/min
Torch	Quartz, 1.5 mm injector
Cones	HPI
Torch Shield	Not used
Pump speed	15 rpm

**Table 8 Survey scan setup**

Survey runs	1
Sweeps	5
Dwell Time	0.6 ms
Channels Per Mass	10

**Table 9 Main Run Setup**

Main Run mode	Peak Jumping
Main runs	3
<b>Sweeps</b>	100
Dwell Time	10 ms
Channels Per Mass	1
Acquisition Duration	58746
Channel Spacing	0.02 AMU
Resolution	standard
Calibration mode	Fully quantitative, linear, no weighting, forced through blank
Application of internal standards	Be, Zn, As, Se and Cd: reference to Te Sb and La: reference to In Other analytes: use interpolation
Interference correction equations	
As	-3.127(77ArCl-0.815*82Se)
Se	-1.00100*83Kr
Pb (abundance)	206Pb+207Pb+208Pb
V	-3.127(53CrO-0.113*52Cr)
Analytical Isotopes	9Be, 11B, 27Al, 51V, 52Cr, 55Mn, 59Co, 60Ni, 65Cu, 66Zn, 75As, 82Se, 98Mo, 107Ag, 114Cd, 123Sb, 139La, 205Tl, 206Pb, 207Pb, 208Pb, 209Bi, 238U

**Table 10 Analytical meta-data for soil; including instrumentation of analysis, method of uncertainty and practical quantitation limits (PQL) for each analyte.**

Analyte	Instrumentation <sup>7</sup>	Uncertainty ±%	PQL	Unit
Ag	ICP-MS	20	0.01	mg/kg
Al	ICP-OES	5	5	mg/kg
B	ICP-OES	10	0.25	mg/kg
As	ICP-OES	22	8	mg/kg
Cd	ICP-MS	20	0.01	mg/kg
Co	ICP-OES	22	8	mg/kg
Cr	ICP-OES	14	3	mg/kg
Cu	ICP-OES	15	5	mg/kg
Fe	ICP-OES	11	0.02	%
Mn	ICP-OES	12	1	mg/kg
Mo	ICP-OES	11	8	mg/kg
Ni	ICP-OES	36	10	mg/kg
Pb	ICP-OES	20	10	mg/kg
Zn	ICP-OES	12	5	mg/kg

**Microwave digestion procedure based on Standard Method No. 3051a (USEPA, 2007) using a Anton Paar 3000 microwave reaction system**

1. Weigh 0.5 g ± 0.1g of sample into tared, Microwave Vessel. Record weight either on the batch sheet or by data capture. (To the nearest 0.001g)
2. Add 9.0 ml HNO<sub>3</sub> from an acid dispenser, rinsing down sides during the addition.
3. Add 1.0 mL of MilliQ H<sub>2</sub>O
4. Swirl gently
5. Load samples into the Microwave Rotor
6. Run NRW EPA 3051a microwave digest method (See Appendix 2 and SOP for Anton Paar microwave.)
7. Remove samples from Microwave and allow to cool to room temperature
8. Transfer digests to a 50ml PPE Tube with graduations.
9. Rinse (X3) digest vessel and lid with RW(I).
10. Make volume up to 50 ml according to the graduation on the tubes and mix.
11. Centrifuge at 3000 rpm for 5 minutes to produce clear solution.
12. Pour into 10 mL tubes and send to ICP-OES for analysis.

<sup>7</sup> ICP-OES = inductively coupled plasma-optical emission spectrometer; ICP-MS = inductively coupled plasma-mass spectrometer



**Determination of Al, As, Ca, Co, Cr, Cu, Fe, K, Pb, Mg, Mn, Mo, Ni, P, Na, S & Zn in soil, sediment and sludge materials using USEPA 3051a microwave digestion (nitric acid) followed by ICP-OES method from the Chemistry Centre laboratory of the Department of Science, Information Technology and Innovation. Extracted from analytical method Chemistry Centre S\_RAM\_ICP.**

**Table 11 Varian Vista Pro ICP-OES operating parameters**

Number of replicates	3
Stabilisation time (seconds)	15
Sample uptake time (seconds)	57
Replicate time (seconds)	10
Rinse time max (seconds)	80
Plasma Conditions	
RF power (Watts)	1300
Viewing height (mm)	10
Nebulizer type	Sea spray, Glass Expansion
Plasma flow (L/Min)	15
Auxiliary flow (L/Min)	1.5
Nebulizer flow (L/Min)	0.8
Peristaltic pump	
Pump rate (rpm)	15
Fast pump	On
Sample tubing	White/white (flow rated 0.6 mL/Min)
LiCl tubing	Orange/white (flow rated 0.23 mL/Min)
Waste tubing	Yellow/yellow (flow rated 1.2 mL/Min)
Element Calibration	
Units	mg/L
Correlation coefficient limit	0.998
Reslopes	Off
Calibration type	Quadratic, through blank

**Table 12 Varian Vista Pro ICP-OES operating wavelengths and background corrections**

Analyte	Wavelength (nm)	Background correction mode
Al	394.401	Offpeak BC, Fe IEC
As	193.696	Offpeak BC, Al and Fe IEC
Ca	430.253	Offpeak BC, Al and Fe IEC
Co	231.16	Offpeak BC, 0.008 nm left, 0.015 nm right, Al and Fe IEC
Cr	267.716	Offpeak BC, 0.015 nm left, 0.015 nm right, Al and Fe IEC
Cu	219.959	Offpeak BC, Al and Fe IEC
Fe	240.489	Offpeak BC, Al IEC
K	766.491	Offpeak BC, Al and Fe IEC
Li	460.289	Offpeak BC, Al and Fe IEC
Mg	383.829	Offpeak BC, Al and Fe IEC
Mn	257.610	Offpeak BC, 0.024 nm left, 0.010 nm right, Al and Fe IEC
Mo	202.032	Offpeak BC, 0.027 nm left, 0.018 nm right, Al and Fe IEC
Na	588.995	Offpeak BC, Al and Fe IEC
Ni	227.877	Offpeak BC, 0.015 nm left, 0.015 nm right, Al and Fe IEC
P	177.434	Offpeak BC, Al and Fe IEC
Pb	220.353	Offpeak BC, 0.006 nm left, 0.006 nm right, Al and Fe IEC
S	181.972	Offpeak BC, Al and Fe IEC
Zn	213.857	Offpeak BC, Al and Fe IEC

**Mehlich-3 Extractable Elements by ICP-OES method from the Chemistry Centre laboratory of the Department of Science, Information Technology and Innovation. Extracted from analytical method Chemistry Centre S\_MEH3\_ICP**

**Table 13 ICP-OES Operating Parameters**

Analysis Preferences	
Number of replicates	3
Stabilisation time (seconds)	15
Sample uptake time (seconds)	57 (Nominal but may vary depending on instrument and sample)
Replicate time (seconds)	10
Rinse time max (seconds)	80
Plasma Conditions	
RF power (Watts)	1300
Viewing height (mm)	10 (Nominal but may vary depending on instrument and sample)
Nebulizer type	Sea spray, Glass Expansion
Plasma flow (L/Min)	15
Auxiliary flow (L/Min)	1.5
Nebulizer flow (L/Min)	0.8
Peristaltic pump	
Pump rate (rpm)	15
Fast pump	On
Element Calibration	
Units	mg/L
Correlation coefficient limit	0.999
Reslopes	Off
Calibration type	Quadratic, through blank

**Table 14 Peristaltic Pump Tubing Configuration**

Sample tubing	<b>White/white</b> (flow rated 0.6 mL/Min)
Internal standard tubing	<b>Orange/white</b> (flow rated 0.23 mL/Min)
Waste tubing	<b>Yellow/Yellow</b> (flow rated 1.2 mL/Min)

**Table 15 ICPOES Analytical Wavelengths**

Analyte	Al	B	Ca	Cu	Fe	K	Mg	Mn	Na	P	S	Zn
Wavelength (nm)	394.401	249.772	430.253	327.395	259.94	766.491	383.829	257.61	589.592	213.618	181.972	213.857

## Supplementary information – groundwater

### *Piezometers installation*

The piezometers were installed by a licensed drill operator using a Geoprobe® 6600 series drill rig following the procedures set out in the “Groundwater Sampling and Analysis – A Field Guide. Geoscience Australia” (Sundaram, 2009) and adhering to *Water Act 2000* (Queensland, 2015).

The below steps were followed:

- test soil cores were drilled to determine the water table depth;
- well holes (100 mm in diameter) were augured to the water table;
- PVC geofabric sock covered tubes (50 mm in diameter) with 1200 mm slotted base were installed;
- groundwater monitoring grade aggregate was added to stabilize each well;
- bentonite sealed the surface to a depth of 1.2 m to stop preferential water movement; and
- piezometers were flushed, cleaned, drained and allowed to stabilise for 4 weeks before sampling.




Figure 1 groundwater aluminium concentrations ( $\mu\text{g L}^{-1}$ ) and the Australian and New Zealand freshwater quality guideline default trigger value for ecosystem protection




Figure 2 groundwater Arsenic concentrations ( $\mu\text{g L}^{-1}$ ) and the Australian and New Zealand freshwater quality guideline default trigger value for ecosystem protection




Figure 3 groundwater Boron concentrations ( $\mu\text{g L}^{-1}$ ) and the Australian and New Zealand freshwater quality guideline default trigger value for ecosystem protection




Figure 4 groundwater Cadmium concentrations ( $\mu\text{g L}^{-1}$ ) and the Australian and New Zealand freshwater quality guideline default trigger value for ecosystem protection






Figure 5 groundwater Chromium concentrations ( $\mu\text{g L}^{-1}$ ) and the Australian and New Zealand freshwater quality guideline default trigger value for ecosystem protection




Figure 6 groundwater Cobalt concentrations ( $\mu\text{g L}^{-1}$ ) and the Australian and New Zealand freshwater quality guideline default trigger value for ecosystem protection




Figure 7 groundwater Copper concentrations ( $\mu\text{g L}^{-1}$ ) and the Australian and New Zealand freshwater quality guideline default trigger value for ecosystem protection




Figure 8 groundwater Iron concentrations ( $\mu\text{g L}^{-1}$ ) and the Australian and New Zealand freshwater quality guideline default trigger value for ecosystem protection




Figure 9 groundwater Lead concentrations ( $\mu\text{g L}^{-1}$ ) and the Australian and New Zealand freshwater quality guideline default trigger value for ecosystem protection




Figure 10 groundwater Manganese concentrations ( $\mu\text{g L}^{-1}$ ) and the Australian and New Zealand freshwater quality guideline default trigger value for ecosystem protection




Figure 11 groundwater Nickel concentrations ( $\mu\text{g L}^{-1}$ ) and the Australian and New Zealand freshwater quality guideline default trigger value for ecosystem protection






Figure 12 groundwater Zinc concentrations ( $\mu\text{g L}^{-1}$ ) and the Australian and New Zealand freshwater quality guideline default trigger value for ecosystem protection

## Supplementary information – soils

**Table 3 Summary statistics and comparisons of metal concentrations in the transpiration zone (TZ) soils for all irrigated and control lots. The TZ soil results were assessed and compared with the Ecological Investigation Levels (EILs) in the National Environment Protection (Assessment of Site Contamination) Measure (NEPC, 2013) and the Australian and New Zealand long-term irrigation trigger values (ANZECC and ARMCANZ, 2000) and Canadian Environmental Quality Guidelines (CCME, 1999). Bolded purple lots and values indicate where a trigger value was exceeded.**

Soil metals <sup>a</sup>	Soil metal concentration (mg kg <sup>-1</sup> ) <sup>1)</sup>		Location	n	Soil metal concentration (mg kg <sup>-1</sup> ) except Fe (%)			
	EILs <sup>b</sup>	Soil Quality Guidelines <sup>c</sup>			Minimum	Median	Mean ± (σ)	Maximum
aluminium	NG	NG	Lot A	12	587	688	756 ± (164)	1069
			Lot B	15	482	720	730 ± (171)	1116
			Lot C	12	259	817	765 ± (175)	905
			Lot D	14	451	836	798 ± (232)	1237
			Controls	36	637	933	953 ± (157)	1241
arsenic	50	20 <sup>j</sup>	<b>Lot A</b>	12	8	14	14 ± (6.2)	<b>27</b>
			<b>Lot B</b>	15	14	17	18 ± (2.9)	<b>23</b>
			Lot C	12	12	14	14 ± (2.0)	18
			<b>Lot D</b>	14	17	<b>36</b>	<b>42 ± (23)</b>	<b>95</b>
			<b>Control s</b>	36	8	14	16 ± (9.5)	<b>53</b>
boron	NG	2 <sup>k</sup>	Lot A	12	0.13	0.13	0.17 ± (0.18)	0.76
			Lot B	15	0.13	0.13	0.15 ± (0.07)	0.33
			<b>Lot C</b>	12	0.13	0.58	0.93 ± (0.92)	<b>3.01</b>
			Lot D	14	0.13	0.20	0.36 ± (0.31)	1.00
			Controls	36	0.13	0.13	0.12 ± (0.01)	0.13
cadmium	3	2 <sup>j</sup>	Lot A	12	0.05	0.05	0.06 ± (0.01)	0.10
			Lot B	15	0.05	0.08	0.08 ± (0.03)	0.14
			Lot C	12	0.08	0.12	0.13 ± (0.04)	0.24
			Lot D	14	0.04	0.09	0.10 ± (0.06)	0.22
			Controls <sup>d</sup>	35	0.04	0.06	0.12 ± (0.11)	0.40
chromium	240 <sup>f</sup>	64 <sup>k</sup>	Lot A	12	8	24	23 ± (8.7)	37
			Lot B	15	27	35	37 ± (7.5)	56
			<b>Lot C</b>	12	23	39	41 ± (13)	<b>73</b>
			Lot D	14	17	26	26 ± (7.7)	48
			Controls	36	12	19	20 ± (5.9)	42
cobalt	NG	50 <sup>j</sup>	Lot A	12	4.0	4.0	4 ± (0.01)	4.0
			Lot B	15	4.0	4.0	4.3 ± (1.3)	9.0
			Lot C	12	4.0	4.0	4 ± (0.1)	4.0
			Lot D	14	4.0	4.0	4 ± (0.1)	4.0
			Controls	36	4.0	4.0	4.4 ± (1.2)	8.0
copper	150 <sup>g</sup>	140 <sup>j</sup>	Lot A	12	20	50	48 ± (15)	75
			Lot B	15	47	61	64 ± (19)	129
			<b>Lot C</b>	12	61	82	86 ± (28)	<b>151</b>
			Lot D	14	28	37	39 ± (12)	71
			Controls	36	40	62	64 ± (19)	106
iron	NG	NG	Lot A	12	0.9	2.2	2.1 ± (0.73)	3.3
			Lot B	15	2.2	2.7	2.6 ± (0.24)	3.0
			Lot C	12	1.2	2.3	2.3 ± (0.59)	3.2
			Lot D	14	1.4	1.7	1.7 ± (0.196)	2.1
			Controls	36	2.0	2.5	2.5 ± (0.34)	3.6
lead	270	260 <sup>j</sup>	Lot A	12	10	11	14 ± (9.2)	43
			Lot B	15	12	16	16 ± (3.6)	22
			Lot C	12	13	26	28 ± (10)	43
			Lot D	14	10	29	33 ± (23)	103

manganese e	NG	NG	Controls	36	10	18	18 ± (4.9)	26
			Lot A	12	99	170	167 ± (33)	222
			Lot B	15	140	209	220 ± (48)	350
			Lot C	12	156	203	203 ± (33)	271
			Lot D	14	81	176	181 ± (75)	329
nickel	250 <sup>h</sup>	85 <sup>j</sup>	Controls	36	96	189	205 ± (87)	546
			Lot A	12	5	14	13 ± (5.3)	19
			Lot B	15	13	19	19 ± (3.9)	27
			Lot C	12	13	19	20 ± (6.8)	36
			Lot D	14	5	12	13 ± (5.4)	27
silver	NG	20 <sup>j</sup>	Controls	36	5	15	15 ± (3.5)	24
			Lot A	12	0.02	0.05	0.04 ± (0.01)	0.06
			Lot B	15	0.07	0.09	0.09 ± (0.01)	0.11
			Lot C	12	0.05	0.09	0.09 ± (0.04)	0.19
			Lot D	14	0.03	0.08	0.09 ± (0.05)	0.22
zinc	170 <sup>i</sup>	300	Controls	36	0.05	0.09	0.09 ± (0.02)	0.16
			Lot A	12	26	46	47 ± (11)	75
			Lot B	15	41	58	59 ± (12)	82
			Lot C	12	34	79	79 ± (35)	165
			Lot D	14	14	40	54 ± (36)	128
			Controls <sup>e</sup>	34	15	41	41 ± (12)	83

<sup>a</sup> Box plots for metal concentrations in the soil of the transpiration zones (TZ) of lots A, B, C and D and the non-irrigated controls as well as the probability values of each lot compared to the control samples using the Kruskal-Wallis test, are provided in the supplementary information.

<sup>b</sup> Values are Ecological Investigation Levels (EILs - Fresh) based on National Environment Protection (Assessment of Site Contamination) Measure (NEPC, 2013); NG = no guideline. f = Cr value adjusted for average study site soil characteristics, average soil clay content (25%) average background concentration (20 mg kg<sup>-1</sup>), average Fe content (2.3 %). g = Cu value adjusted for average study site soil characteristics, cation exchange capacity (95 meq 100 g<sup>-1</sup>), average soil pH (5.8) average carbon content (2.4%) average background concentration (64 mg kg<sup>-1</sup>), average Fe content (2.3 %). h = Ni value adjusted for average study site soil characteristics, cation exchange capacity (95 meq 100 g<sup>-1</sup>) average background concentration (15 mg kg<sup>-1</sup>), average Fe content (2.3 %). i = Zn value adjusted for average study site soil characteristics, cation exchange capacity (95 meq 100 g<sup>-1</sup>), average soil pH (5.8), average background concentration (41 mg kg<sup>-1</sup>), average Fe content (2.3 %).

<sup>c</sup> j=cumulative contaminant loading limits (CCLs) (ANZECC and ARMCANZ, 2000). k = Canadian Environmental Quality Guidelines (CEQGs) (CCME, 1999) for park and residential soils. These were only used when no CCL was available. NG = no guideline (either CCL or CEQG).

<sup>d</sup> A data point for the cadmium control soil samples seemed to be an outlier. A Grubbs test for outliers, based on a two-tailed test, where the p-value was set to < 0.0001 for a significance level alpha of 0.05 was performed. The test identified that a single control soil sample with a cadmium result of 1.3 mg kg<sup>-1</sup> had a Z-score 5.114 which was larger than the critical Z-score of 2.991, it was there for excluded from all analysis as an outlier.

<sup>e</sup> A Grubbs test was performed on the Zn soil control results as apparent outliers were present. The test identified that the control population of samples contained two outliers with Zn concentrations of 831 mg/kg and 153 mg/kg with respective Z-scores of 5.76 and 5.24, larger than the critical Z-score of 2.99. These results were thus excluded as outliers.




Figure 1 Box plots for aluminum concentrations in the soil of the transpiration zones (TZ) of lots A, B, C and D and the non-irrigated controls as well as the probability values of each lot compared to the control samples using the Kruskal-Wallis test. Bold p values indicate significant differences to the control samples. (The lower and upper ends of each box are the 1st quartile and 3rd quartile of the data. The line within each box is the median while the red cross is the mean. The whiskers displayed at both ends of the “box” represent values which are beyond first and third quartiles while the diamonds are the minimum and maximum values. All subsequent TZ and control box plot figures are represented the same way.). The dotted line represents the median of the control samples in relation to all lots.




Figure 2 Box plots for arsenic concentrations in the soil of the transpiration zones of lots A, B, C and D and the non-irrigated controls as well as the probability values of each lot compared to the control samples using the Kruskal-Wallis test. Bold p values indicate significant differences to the control samples. (See Figure 1 for box plot description). The dotted line represents the median of the control samples in relation to all lots. The dashed line represents the BG. The dashed and dotted line represents the CCL.




Figure 3 Box plots for boron concentrations in the soil of the transpiration zones of lots A, B, C and D and the non-irrigated controls as well as the probability values of each lot compared to the control samples using the Kruskal-Wallis test. Bold p values indicate significant differences to the control samples. (See Figure 1 for box plot description). The dotted line represents the median of the control samples in relation to all lots. The dashed line represents the BG. The solid line represents the CEQG - only used when there are no BG or CCL.




Figure 4 Box plots for cadmium concentrations in the soil of the transpiration zones of lots A, B, C and D and the non-irrigated controls as well as the probability values of each lot compared to the control samples using the Kruskal-Wallis test. Bold p values indicate significant differences to the control samples. (See Figure 1 for box plot description). The dotted line represents the median of the control samples in relation to all lots. The dashed line represents the BG. The dashed and dotted line is not represented as the CCL is 2 mg kg<sup>-1</sup>.




Figure 5 Box plots for chromium concentrations in the soil of the transpiration zones of lots A, B, C and D and the non-irrigated controls as well as the probability values of each lot compared to the control samples using the Kruskal-Wallis test. Bold p values indicate significant differences to the control samples. (See Figure 1 for box plot description). The dotted line represents the median of the control samples in relation to all lots. The solid line represents the CEQG - only used when there are no BG or CCL.






Figure 6 Box plots for cobalt concentrations in the soil of the transpiration zones of lots A, B, C and D and the non-irrigated controls as well as the probability values of each lot compared to the control samples using the Kruskal-Wallis test. Bold p values indicate significant differences to the control samples. (See Figure 1 for box plot description). The dotted line represents the median of the control samples in relation to all lots. The dashed line is not represents as the BG is 27 mg kg<sup>-1</sup>. The solid line is not represented as the CEQG is 50 mg kg<sup>-1</sup>.




Figure 7 Box plots for copper concentrations in the soil of the transpiration zones of lots A, B, C and D and the non-irrigated controls as well as the probability values of each lot compared to the control samples using the Kruskal-Wallis test. Bold p values indicate significant differences to the control samples. (See Figure 1 for box plot description). The dotted line represents the median of the control samples in relation to all lots. The dashed line represents the BG. The dashed and dotted line represents the CCL.






Figure 9 Box plots for lead concentrations in the soil of the transpiration zones of lots A, B, C and D and the non-irrigated controls as well as the probability values of each lot compared to the control samples using the Kruskal-Wallis test. Bold p values indicate significant differences to the control samples. (See Figure 1 for box plot description). The dotted line represents the median of the control samples in relation to all lots. The dashed line represents the BG. The dashed and dotted line is not represented as the CCL is 260 mg kg<sup>-1</sup>.




Figure 10 Box plots for manganese concentrations in the soil of the transpiration zones of lots A, B, C and D and the non-irrigated controls as well as the probability values of each lot compared to the control samples using the Kruskal-Wallis test. Bold p values indicate significant differences to the control samples. (See Figure 1 for box plot description). The dotted line represents the median of the control samples in relation to all lots. The dashed line represents the BG.




Figure 11 Box plots for nickel concentrations in the soil of the transpiration zones of lots A, B, C and D and the non-irrigated controls as well as the probability values of each lot compared to the control samples using the Kruskal-Wallis test. Bold p values indicate significant differences to the control samples. (See Figure 1 for box plot description). The dotted line represents the median of the control samples in relation to all lots. The dashed line represents the BG. The dashed and dotted line is not represented as the CCL is 85 mg kg<sup>-1</sup>.




Figure 12 Box plots for silver concentrations in the soil of the transpiration zones of lots A, B, C and D and the non-irrigated controls as well as the probability values of each lot compared to the control samples using the Kruskal-Wallis test. Bold p values indicate significant differences to the control samples. (See Figure 1 for box plot description). The dotted line represents the median of the control samples in relation to all lots. The soil line is not represented as the CEQG is 20 mg kg<sup>-1</sup>.




Figure 13 Box plots for zinc concentrations in the soil of the transpiration zones of lots A, B, C and D and the non-irrigated controls as well as the probability values of each lot compared to the control samples using the Kruskal-Wallis test. Bold p values indicate significant differences to the control samples. (See Figure 1 for box plot description). The dotted line represents the median of the control samples in relation to all lots. The dashed line represents the BG. The dashed and dotted line is not represented as the CCL is 300 mg kg<sup>-1</sup>.



## Highlights

- Greywater irrigation resulted in As, B, Cr and Cu exceeding soil guidelines.
- Movement of irrigated metals resulted in the pollution of ground and surface waters.
- Groundwater metals exceeded water guidelines for Al, As, Cr, Cu, Fe, Mn, Ni and Zn.
- Surface water metals exceeded water guidelines for Cu, Fe and Zn.