

# Persisting impact of historical mining activity to metal (Pb, Zn, Cd, Tl, Hg) and metalloid (As, Sb) enrichment in sediments of the Gardon River, Southern France

Eleonore Resongles, Corinne Casiot, Remi Freydier, Laurent Dezileau, Jerome Viers, Francoise Elbaz-Poulichet

## ► To cite this version:

Eleonore Resongles, Corinne Casiot, Remi Freydier, Laurent Dezileau, Jerome Viers, et al.. Persisting impact of historical mining activity to metal (Pb, Zn, Cd, Tl, Hg) and metalloid (As, Sb) enrichment in sediments of the Gardon River, Southern France. Science of the Total Environment, 2014, 481, pp.509-521. 10.1016/j.scitotenv.2014.02.078 . hal-01054163

# HAL Id: hal-01054163 https://hal.science/hal-01054163

Submitted on 31 May 2021  $\,$ 

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers. L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Persisting impact of historical mining activity to metal (Pb, Zn, Cd, 1 Tl, Hg) and metalloid (As, Sb) enrichment in sediments of the Gardon 2 **River, Southern France** 3 4 Eléonore Resongles<sup>a</sup>\*, Corinne Casiot<sup>a</sup>, Rémi Freydier<sup>a</sup>, Laurent Dezileau<sup>b</sup>, Jérôme Viers<sup>c</sup> and 5 Françoise Elbaz-Poulichet<sup>a</sup> 6 7 8 <sup>a</sup> HydroSciences UMR 5569, CNRS, Universités Montpellier I & II, IRD, Place Eugène 9 Bataillon, CC MSE, 34095 Montpellier Cedex 5, France 10 <sup>b</sup> Géosciences UMR 5243, CNRS, Universités Montpellier II, Place Eugène Bataillon, CC 60, 11 34095 Montpellier Cedex 5, France 12 <sup>c</sup> Géosciences Environnement Toulouse UMR 5563, Université Paul Sabatier, CNRS, IRD, 14 13 Avenue Edouard Belin, 31400 Toulouse, France

14

## 1 Abstract

2 In this study, we assessed past and present influence of ancient mining activity on metal(loid) 3 enrichment in sediments of a former mining watershed (Gardon River, SE France), that is now industrialized and urbanized. A sedimentary archive and current sediments were 4 characterized combining geochemical analyses, zinc isotopic analyses and sequential 5 6 extractions. The archive was used to establish local geochemical background and recorded (i) 7 increasing enrichment factors (EF) for Pb, Zn, Cd, Tl, Hg, As and Sb throughout the industrial 8 era, (ii) a contamination peak in 1976 attributed to a tailings dam failure, and (iii) current 9 levels in 2002 and 2011 similar to those of 1969, except for Sb and Hg, reflecting a persisting 10 contamination pattern. Inter-element relationships and spatial distribution of EF values of 11 current sediments throughout the watershed suggested that both ancient and current 12 contamination had a common origin for Pb, Zn, Cd, Tl and As related to the exploitation of 13 Pb/Zn mineralization while old Sb mines and coal extraction area were the main sources for 14 Sb and Hg respectively. This prevailing mining origin was reflected for Zn by a relatively uniform isotopic composition at  $\delta^{66}$ Zn = 0.23±0.03‰, although slight decrease from 0.23‰ 15 16 to 0.18‰ was recorded from upstream to downstream sites along the river course in relation with the contribution of the lighter  $\delta^{66}$ Zn signature (~0.08‰) of acid mine drainage impacted 17 18 tributaries. Results from sequential extractions revealed that the potential mobility of the 19 studied metal(loid)s varied in the order Sb<Tl≈As<Zn<Pb<Cd, with an increase of the mobile 20 pool for Cd, Pb, Zn and to a lesser extent for As and Tl associated to increased enrichment. 21 Altogether, these results tend to demonstrate that ancient mining activity still contributes to metal enrichment in the sediments of the Gardon River and that some of these metals may be 22 23 mobilized toward the water compartment.

## 24 Keywords

Mining-affected river; Metal and metalloid; Sedimentary archive; Zinc isotopes; Sequential
 extraction

## 1 **1 Introduction**

2 Mining activity is one of the most important sources of harmful metals (Pb, Zn, Cd, Tl, Hg) 3 and metalloids (As, Sb) to rivers (Byrne et al., 2012; Hudson-Edwards, 2003; Johnson and 4 Hallberg, 2005; Nriagu and Pacyna, 1988; Schwarzenbach et al., 2010). Damage to surface 5 water ecosystems has been recognized in many areas in the United States (Caruso et al., 2008; Cherry et al., 2001; Peplow and Edmonds, 2005), the United Kingdom (Gray, 1997; Jarvis 6 7 and Younger, 1997), France (Audry et al., 2004a; Monna et al., 2011), Spain (Bonilla-8 Valverde et al., 2004), with dramatic accidents such as those of Aznalcollar in Spain (Grimalt 9 et al., 1999) or Maramures County in Romania (Macklin et al., 2003). A peculiarity of mining 10 related pollution is that tailings, waste piles, ochre sediments and contaminated floodplains 11 continue acting as secondary sources for pollutants to downstream watershed throughout 12 hundreds of years after the mine closure (Byrne et al., 2012; Johnson and Hallberg, 2005; 13 MacKenzie and Pulford, 2002; Macklin et al., 1997; Younger and Wolkersdorfer, 2004). 14 Furthermore, the extent of contamination is not strictly limited to the vicinity of mines; 15 contaminated material (i.e. tailings, contaminated river bed and floodplain sediments) may be physically remobilized in high flow conditions (Hudson-Edwards, 2003; Hudson-Edwards et 16 17 al., 1997; Miller, 1997; Moore and Langner, 2012), thus dispersing pollutants over hundreds 18 of kilometers away from historical mining sites (Grosbois et al., 2012; Moore and Luoma, 19 1990; Salomons, 1995).

20 In Europe, the Water Framework Directive (2000/60/EC) aimed to achieve good ecological 21 status of water bodies by 2015 and has reinforced the need for management of streams and 22 rivers at the catchment scale (Kimball and Runkel, 2009; Mayes et al., 2009; Mighanetara et 23 al., 2009). While metal discharges from industrial activities have decreased as a result of more 24 stringent controls, pollution from historical mining persists and its relative contribution to 25 anthropogenic emissions of metals and metalloids to downstream watersheds has become 26 more important over recent years (Macklin et al., 2006). In the perspective of optimizing 27 remediation strategies at the river basin scale, achieving maximum improvements of 28 downstream water quality, it is essential to develop approaches allowing evaluation of the 29 impact of abandoned mining sites on metal enrichment to downstream river systems and to 30 distinguish metals from such sources from natural geochemical background and other 31 anthropogenic (industrial, urban) point sources. In environmental studies, metal isotope 32 geochemistry may be useful to complement traditional geochemical data to track metal 33 sources and elucidate processes affecting their transport and fate in rivers (Cloquet et al.,

2008; Weiss et al., 2008). Zn has five stable isotopes, <sup>64</sup>Zn, <sup>66</sup>Zn, <sup>67</sup>Zn, <sup>68</sup>Zn, and <sup>70</sup>Zn, with 1 average natural abundances of 48.63%, 27.90%, 4.10%, 18.75% and 0.62% respectively 2 3 (Rosman and Taylor, 1998). Previous studies have reported Zn isotope variations (expressed as  $\delta^{66}$ Zn unit) of 2.5% in terrestrial samples (Cloquet et al., 2006). In mining environments 4 5 related studies, Zn isotopic composition of the main Zn-ore (sphalerite, ZnS) was shown to 6 cover a large range of  $\delta^{66}$ Zn from -0.17‰ to 0.64‰ with an average of +0.16±0.20‰ (Sonke et al., 2008). Borrok et al., (2008) reported  $\delta^{66}$ Zn values between 0.02‰ and 0.46‰ for 7 8 dissolved Zn in streams draining historic mining districts in the United States and Europe. 9 Several physical and biogeochemical reactions including evaporation, inorganic and organic 10 adsorption, diffusion and biological uptake can induce Zn isotope fractionation (Cloquet et al., 11 2008). Largest Zn isotopic variations are observed associated with smelting industry; 12 atmospheric emissions are enriched in the lighter Zn isotopes while slag are enriched in the 13 heavier Zn isotopes (Mattielli et al., 2009; Sivry et al., 2008; Sonke et al., 2008). The potential 14 of Zn isotopes to track pollution sources has already been demonstrated in urban, mining and 15 smelting impacted environments (Borrok et al., 2009; Chen et al., 2008, 2009; Dolgopolova et 16 al., 2006; Mattielli et al., 2009; Sivry et al., 2008; Sonke et al., 2008; Thapalia et al., 2010).

17 In the present study, we investigated the impact of abandoned mines localized in the 18 Cevennes Mountains to metal (Pb, Zn, Cd, Tl, Hg) and metalloid (As, Sb) enrichment in the 19 sediments of the Gardon River watershed, which is a tributary of the Rhône River. The River Gardon catchment is around 2,000 km<sup>2</sup> with 180,000 people. Multiple mining sites are 20 21 referenced on this catchment (BRGM, SIG Mines website; Vincent, 2006), including 22 scattered metal mines (Pb, Zn, Ag, Sb) and a coal production district (La Grand-Combe). 23 Besides, one mid-size town (Ales, 40,000 inhabitants) and a chemical and industrial center 24 (Salindres) constitute other possible point sources of metals and metalloids to the watershed. 25 The impact of ancient mining activity on global contamination of the watershed by metals and 26 metalloids has never been evaluated (SMAGE des Gardons, 2011), although severe local 27 pollution was evidenced in the vicinity of some of these mining sites (Casiot et al., 2009).

In this study, we propose a methodological framework allowing catchment-scale assessment of in-stream mining-related pollution. For this, a sedimentary archive was used to establish the natural geochemical background levels of metals and metalloids of the watershed and reconstruct a historical record of metal and metalloid enrichment. Enrichment factors were determined for current sediments of the Gardon River and for those of its main tributaries. Inter-element correlations and zinc isotope ratios were used to track the contribution of disused mining sites to sediment contamination. Geochemical associations of Pb, Zn, Cd, Tl, As and Sb, evaluated using the BCR sequential extraction procedure, allowed assessment of
 the potential mobility of these contaminants in the sediments.

## 3 2 Material and methods

#### 4 2.1 Study area

5 The Gardon River watershed is located at the southeast of the Massif Central Mountains in 6 France. This tributary of the Rhône River is 144 km long and drains an area of 2,014 km<sup>2</sup>. The 7 watershed includes three main geological areas (1) Primary metamorphic (schists and 8 micaschists) and igneous (granite) rocks in the upstream part of the watershed (Cevennes 9 Mountains region), (2) Jurassic carbonate formations (limestone and dolomite) along the 10 Cevennes Mountains boundary, (3) Cretaceous limestone formation (Gardon River gorges) and Quaternary alluvium deposits of the Rhône River in the downstream watershed (Figure 11 12 1a, BRGM, Info Terre website). In the area of Ales-La Grand-Combe, a graben filled with 13 Tertiary detrital sediments represents the most important coalfield of the Cevennes 14 Mountains. Hydrologically, the Gardon River is characterized by high seasonal variability 15 including severe low water during summer and extreme floods with peak reaching 100 times 16 the average discharge mainly in autumn.

17 The upstream watershed drains many disused mining sites (Figure 1b, Table 1). Mining 18 activity began on the Gardon River watershed during Roman Times for Ag and Middle Ages 19 for Ag, Pb and coal (Rolley website; Vincent, 2006). The large-scale production started from the middle of the 19th century and declined after 1960. During this period, we estimated that 20 21 about 4Mt of pyrite, 85,000t of Zn, 50,000t of Pb and 2,570t of Sb were produced on the 22 Gardon River watershed leaving several millions of tons of wastes close to ore extraction and 23 processing sites (BRGM, SIG Mines website). Exploited ores were in the form of sulfide 24 minerals (galena and argentiferous galena for Pb and Ag, sphalerite for Zn and stibnite for 25 Sb). These minerals were associated to other unexploited sulfide minerals such as pyrite and 26 marcasite (FeS<sub>2</sub>), tetraedrite ( $Cu_{12}Sb_4S_{13}$ ), pyrargyrite ( $Ag_3SbS_3$ ) and proustite ( $Ag_3AsS_3$ ) 27 described for the Carnoulès mine drained by the Amous River (AF9) (Alkaaby, 1986). On the 28 Gardon of Anduze River subwatershed, the most important Pb/Zn mining districts were those 29 of Carnoulès and Pallières, drained respectively by the Amous River (AF9) and the Ourne and 30 Aiguesmortes Rivers (AF8 and AF10). Antimony mines are localized on the upstream 31 subwatershed of the Gardon of Ales River and they are drained by the Ravin des Bernes and

1 the Richaldon Rivers (AF1 and AF2). Downstream, in the area of Ales-La Grand-Combe, 2 coal has been exploited intensively. Finally, the Grabieux River (AF4), the Alzon River (AF5) 3 and the Avène River (AF6), on the Gardon of Ales River subwatershed, drain old 4 Pb/Zn/pyrite mining sites. Most of these tributaries are impacted by metal and metalloid 5 contamination downstream from these mining sites (SMAGE des Gardons, 2011). Pollution 6 from the abandoned Pb/Zn mine of Carnoulès was already mentioned in 1970 (Michard and 7 Faucherre, 1970) and to date, the Amous River remains highly impacted (Casiot et al., 2009). 8 In addition to the extractive activity, three smelters have been in activity on the watershed; a 9 Zn smelter at La Grand-Combe town with a period of activity from 1846 to 1899 (Ministère 10 de la Culture) and two small Sb smelters located on the upstream Gardon of Ales River near 11 Sb mining sites which had worked from 1822 to 1858 and from 1896 to 1951 (BRGM, 12 BASIAS website). 13 Nowadays, the chemical industrial center of Salindres and the urban area of Ales (40,000 14 inhabitants) can also contribute to metals and metalloids enrichment of the Gardon River. The

Avene River (AF 6) is both impacted by industrial and mining discharges. According to the French Water Agency, 27kg d<sup>-1</sup> of metals and metalloids were released in 2007 in the Gardon River by industrial activities and urban wastewater treatment plants (SMAGE des Gardons,

18 2011).

#### 19 2.2 Sampling

#### 20 2.2.1 Sedimentary archive

21 The sedimentary archive (GE) was sampled in March 2010 in the downstream part of the watershed (Figure 1b), in a zone of canyon. This flooding terrace, situated between 6.20 and 22 23 9.50 m above the riverbed level, was formed by the accumulation of extreme flood deposits 24 (Dezileau et al., 2013; Dezileau et al., in review). These flood events have resulted in one 25 sedimentary layer each. The terrace was composed of 20 layers corresponding to 20 extreme 26 flood events; these layers were identified in the field through a close inspection of deposition 27 breaks and/or indicators of surficial exposure (e.g. presence of a paleosol, clay layers at the 28 top of a unit, detection of erosional surfaces, bioturbation features, angular clast layers 29 deposits in local alcove or slope materials accumulation between flood events, fireplaces and 30 anthropogenic occupation layers between flood events). Sedimentary layers were numbered 31 from the bottom to the top of the terrace and named GE1 to GE20. Samples were excavated 32 directly from the terrace using a Teflon spatula and collected in PP-jars. Sieving was not

1 necessary because all particles were finer than 2mm. Then, samples were air-dried, crushed in 2 an agate mortar and homogenized before further processing. Dating of sedimentary layers was 3 based on an original method using a multi-dating approach described in Dezileau et al. (in review). Radionuclide analyses (<sup>210</sup>Pb, <sup>137</sup>Cs) and geochemical analyses (total Pb) were used 4 to determine age controls. Maximum <sup>137</sup>Cs activity in layers GE17 and GE18 was associated 5 to the maximum atmospheric emission in the mid-1960s. <sup>210</sup>Pb activity results indicated that 6 7 layers GE15 to GE20 were deposited after the end-1930s. Pb concentration was constant in 8 layers GE1 to GE9 and increased from the layer GE10 showing that layers GE1 to GE9 dated 9 back the beginning of large-scale mining activity on the watershed around 1870. These age 10 controls were combined with the continuous record of Gardon River flow since 1890, the 11 combined records allow to assign ages to the most recent layers, from GE9 to GE20 (Dezileau 12 et al., 2013; Dezileau et al., in review).

#### 13 2.2.2 Current stream sediments

14 Active stream sediments in contact with stream water were studied; this sampling medium 15 integrates both natural geochemical characteristics and recent anthropogenic contamination of 16 the whole watershed upstream from the sampling station over time (Ettler et al., 2006; Gosar 17 and Miler, 2011). Six surveys were carried out from 2010 to 2012 in low flow and high flow 18 conditions; stream sediments were sampled on the upper part of the watershed, along the 19 Gardon River and on the tributaries of interest i.e. main tributaries and tributaries impacted by 20 mining, industrial or urban activities. The location of the sampling stations is shown in Figure 21 1b. Stream sediments were collected in PP-jars using a Teflon spatula, in the first centimeter 22 of the riverbed surface, as far as possible from the riverbank. Back in the laboratory, the 23 sediment samples were sieved <2 mm, freeze-dried and powdered in an agate mortar.

24 **2.3 Sample preparation** 

#### 25 2.3.1 Bulk mineralization

Total digestion of sediment samples was carried out in a clean room. All material was acidcleaned before use; reagents were Merck Suprapur quality. For each set of samples, method blanks and international certified reference materials digestion (Stream sediments LGC6189 from United Kingdom Accreditation Service and NCS DC70317 from LGC Standards) were performed. About 100 mg of sediment samples were digested in closed Teflon reactors on hot-plates at 95 °C for 24 h successively with (1) H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub> 35% (2) a 4:3:0.13 mL concentrated HNO<sub>3</sub>-HF-HClO<sub>4</sub> mixture and (3) a 1:3 mL concentrated HNO<sub>3</sub>-HCl mixture (aqua regia).
Samples were cooled and evaporated to dryness between each step and at the end of the
procedure. Samples were brought to 30mL using 3mL HNO<sub>3</sub> and double deionized water
(Milli-Q®). Finally samples were filtered to remove possible residues.

#### 5 2.3.2 Chemical purification for zinc isotopic analyses

6 Zn isotopic analyses were carried out on the sedimentary archive samples and on the current 7 sediments samples of the November 2011 sampling campaign. Digested solution aliquots 8 containing approximately 1000ng of Zn were used for Zn separation and isotopic 9 measurement. Zn was separated from the matrix elements by ion chromatography using AG1-MP1 anion-exchange resin (Biorad) and the elution sequence from Maréchal et al. (1999). 10 11 The protocol was repeated twice to ensure Zn purity. The total procedural blank of  $\approx 15$  ng was 12 negligible compared to the amount of Zn in samples (1000ng). Column yields were checked 13 for each sample by ICP-MS, X Series II (Thermo Fisher Scientific) and found to be >96%. 14 After the purification, samples were evaporated to dryness at 60°C. Then samples were taken 15 up in 3.3mL of HNO<sub>3</sub> 0.05N and doped with a Cu standard (Cu NIST-SRM 976); final Zn and Cu concentrations were 300ng.g<sup>-1</sup>. 16

#### 17 2.3.3 Selective sequential extraction procedure

18 Total metal and metalloid concentrations are insufficient to evaluate the potential mobility of 19 these contaminants in stream sediments. Therefore, selective sequential extractions were 20 performed to characterize the distribution of Pb, Zn, Cd, Tl, As and Sb in sediment samples. 21 Selected samples from the sedimentary archive and current sediments were subjected to a 22 four-step sequential extraction procedure using the standardized method of the European 23 Community Bureau of Reference (BCR) described by Rauret et al. (1999). Metals and 24 metalloids were extracted into the following four operationally defined fractions: 25 exchangeable and carbonate fraction (F1), reducible fraction (bound to Fe and Mn 26 oxides/hydroxydes) (F2), oxidisable fraction (bound to organic matter and sulfides) (F3) and 27 residual fraction (F4). The fraction F4 was determined using a procedure of mineralization 28 assisted by microwaves; 100mg of the residual solid was digested by a 2:4 mL concentrated 29 HF:HNO<sub>3</sub> mixture. Then samples were cooled, evaporated to dryness and brought to 30mL 30 using 3mL HNO3 and double deionized water (Milli-Q®).

#### 1 2.4 Analyses

2 Metal (Pb, Zn, Cd, Tl), metalloid (As, Sb) and Al concentrations in sediments (total and 3 selective extractions) were determined after an adequate dilution using an ICP-MS, X Series II (Thermo Fisher Scientific) equipped with a CCT (Collision Cell Technology) chamber. The 4 5 quality of analytical methods was checked by analyzing international certified reference 6 waters (SLRS-5, NIST1643e) and was generally better than 5% relative to the certified 7 values. Analytical error (relative standard deviation) was better than 5% for concentrations ten 8 times higher than the detection limits. Accuracy was within 10% of the certified values for 9 method standards (Stream sediments LGC6189 from United Kingdom Accreditation Service 10 and NCS DC70317 from LGC Standards, n=7) with recoveries of 95±7% for As, 100±4% for 11 Cd, 95±7% for Pb, 101±4% for Sb, 95±4% for Tl and 100±10% for Zn except for Al for 12 which recovery was 86±6%.

For total Hg determination, about 0.1g of crushed air-dried sediments was analyzed using a Direct Mercury Analyzer (DMA-80 Milestone) following the 7473 EPA standard method. To ensure analytical results precision, a certified reference material (Stream Sediment NCS DC70317 from LGC Standards) was analyzed every ten samples, accuracy was better than 10% for certified Hg concentration (34.4±3.3 ng.g<sup>-1</sup>, n=12). The procedural blank represents at most 2.7% of Hg measured in samples.

19 Zn isotopic analyses were performed on a multiple-collector inductively coupled plasma mass spectrometer (MC-ICP-MS) during several sessions at GET (Toulouse, France) on a Neptune 20 21 (Thermo-Scientific) and at ENS Lyon (Lyon, France) on a Nu Plasma 500 HR. Each sample was analyzed three times and was bracketed with the Lyon reference solution JMC 3-0749-L. 22 Zn isotopes (<sup>64</sup>Zn, <sup>66</sup>Zn, <sup>67</sup>Zn, <sup>68</sup>Zn), Cu isotopes (<sup>63</sup>Cu, <sup>65</sup>Cu) and Ni isotope (<sup>62</sup>Ni) were 23 monitored simultaneously. Measurements of <sup>62</sup>Ni signal allowed correcting the possible 24 isobaric interference of <sup>64</sup>Ni on <sup>64</sup>Zn. Instrumental mass bias was corrected using Cu internal 25 26 standard NIST-SRM 976 and the exponential law coupled with the method of sample-27 standard bracketing (Maréchal et al., 1999). Zn isotopic results are given as  $\delta^{66}$ Zn notation (in units of ‰),  $\delta^{66}$ Zn is the deviation relative to a standard, the Lyon reference solution JMC 3-28 29 0749-L:

30 
$$\delta^{66}Zn = \left(\frac{\left({}^{66}Zn/{}^{64}Zn\right)_{sample}}{\left({}^{66}Zn/{}^{64}Zn\right)_{reference}} - 1\right) \times 1000$$

31

Results are also given normalized to the standard IRMM-3702 calibrated by Moeller et al.
 (2012) in supplementary information (SI Table 2 and 3).

3 The external analytical reproducibility (standard deviation) calculated from replicate 4 measurements of the certified stream sediments LGC6189 from United Kingdom 5 Accreditation Service (including column duplicate, n=6) over multiple analytical sessions was 6 0.02% and  $\delta^{66}$ Zn was determined at 0.18‰.

#### 7 2.5 Data treatment

8 Metal (Pb, Zn, Cd, Tl, Hg) and metalloid (As, Sb) concentration in the sediment was 9 normalized to Al concentration. Indeed, Al is a conservative element and a major constituent 10 of the fine fraction (clay and fine silt) of sediments, which includes the particles most enriched in metals and metalloids (Owens et al., 2005). Al was used as a grain-size proxy and 11 12 thus the normalization allowed taking into account the dilution effect by silica or calcite and compensating for the effect of grain size distribution (Bouchez et al., 2011). The Enrichment 13 14 Factor (EF) was then calculated to assess the level of contamination relatively to a reference 15 level:

16  $EF = (Me/Al)_{sample} / (Me/Al)_{reference}$ 

17 where (Me/Al)<sub>sample</sub> is the concentration ratio of a metal to Al in the sediment sample and 18 (Me/Al)<sub>reference</sub> is the same ratio in the reference. To detect possible anthropogenic 19 contamination, the reference should be representative of the local geochemical background 20 (Meybeck, 2013). In this study, the selected reference was the average Me/Al ratio in the 21 samples from the bottom of the sedimentary archive (layer GE1 to layer GE6) which 22 represented the pre-industrial metal and metalloid content (Dezileau et al., 2013; Dezileau et 23 al., in review). This approach allows to integrate the geological variability of the whole 24 upstream watershed and to avoid local anomalies.

Concentrations (µg.g<sup>-1</sup>) and enrichment factors (EF) are given for the sedimentary archive and
the whole dataset of current stream sediments in supplementary information (SI Table 4 and
5).

Data analysis R software was used for all statistical analyses. Correlation factors (R<sup>2</sup>) were
 calculated with Spearman method.

### 1 **3 Results**

# 2 3.1 Enrichment factors for the sedimentary archive and current stream 3 sediments

In order to distinguish metals and metalloids of anthropogenic origin from natural sources, it 4 5 is necessary to assess the local geochemical background, especially in a mining watershed where the concentrations in soils and sediments can be naturally high. The bottom of the 6 7 sedimentary archive was considered as the geochemical background for the Gardon River 8 watershed and used for further EF determination. This local geochemical background value 9 was higher than the Upper Continental Crust average (Taylor and McLennan, 1995 for As, 10 Sb, Cd, Pb, Zn and Tl; Wedepohl, 1995 for Hg) used in some studies as the reference level, by 11 ~23-times for As, ~21-times for Sb, ~3-times for Cd, ~2.5-times for Pb, ~1.7-times for Zn and 12 Tl and lower by ~2.3 times for Hg (Table 2).

#### 13 **3.1.1 Sedimentary archive**

14 Enrichment factors (EF) of Pb, Zn, Cd, Tl, Hg, As and Sb in sediments of the archive are 15 presented in Figure 2. For all these elements, EF values increased from the layer GE10 to 16 upper layers, showing metal enrichment throughout time. For As and Pb, EF reached a plateau 17 at 1.4 (As) and 1.8 (Pb) in the layers GE10 to GE17, and then increased substantially up to 1.9 18 (As) and 3.5 (Pb) in the layer GE18, assigned to 1969-dated flood event (Dezileau et al., 19 2013; Dezileau et al., in review). For Hg, EF value continuously increased from GE10 to 20 GE17, the latter layer matching the 1963-dated flood event (Dezileau et al., 2013; Dezileau et 21 al., in review), and then increased drastically in the layer GE18. For other elements (Zn, Cd, 22 Tl and Sb), a general increase of EF value was observed from GE10 to GE18, reaching 2.1 for 23 Zn, 3.5 for Cd, 1.9 for Tl, and 2.5 for Sb, although important variations were recorded from 24 one layer to another and even within a single layer. For Sb, a peak was recorded in the layer 25 GE7 whose deposition date was anterior to the beginning of large-scale mining activity on the 26 catchment (Dezileau et al., 2013; Dezileau et al., in review).

The GE19 layer was particularly remarkable; a peak was recorded for all studied metals and metalloids and most markedly for As, Pb and Hg with EF value reaching respectively 9.9, 10.5 and 18. This layer was ascribed to an exceptional flood event in 1976 that caused important damage on tailings impoundment at the Pb/Zn Carnoulès mine (BRGM, BASOL website). The most recent layer GE20, which corresponded to the latest exceptional flood
event in 2002 (Delrieu et al., 2005), presented drastically lower EF values compared to those
recorded in the 1976-dated layer; these values were similar to those recorded in 1969 for Pb,
Zn, Cd, Tl and As. The order of metal and metalloid enrichment in the sedimentary archive
was Hg>Cd>Sb>Pb>As>Zn≥Tl except for the layer GE19 for which As and Pb were more
enriched than Cd, Sb, Tl and Zn.

#### 7 **3.1.2** Current stream sediments

8 EF values for current stream sediment sample collected at station 25, close to the location of 9 the sedimentary archive are labeled in Figure 2, for comparison to historical record. For this sample, EF values were similar or slightly lower (for Cd) than the 2002 flood event layer 10 11 values (Figures 2 and 3), thus reflecting comparable contamination level. In order to have an 12 overview of spatial distribution of the contamination, EF values of sediments sampled in 13 December 2012 (the most complete campaign) are mapped on the figure 4 using bar charts for 14 sediments of the main stream and a dot with EF value for sediments of the tributaries. 15 However, the whole dataset which is used for interpretation is presented in supplementary 16 information (SI Table 5). Similar EF values were obtained at the station 25 and at the next 17 upstream station 24, located downstream from the junction between the rivers Gardon of Ales 18 and Gardon of Anduze (Figure 4). Upstream from this junction, at the station 11 in the 19 Gardon of Ales River and station 23 in the Gardon of Anduze River, EF values were 20 drastically higher for Hg (EF=6.6) and Sb (EF=5.7) and to a lesser extent for Zn (EF=4.9) and 21 Cd (EF=4.6) in the Gardon of Ales River than in the Gardon of Anduze River (EF≈1.5, 1.5, 22 1.9 and 2.3 respectively). For other studied elements (Pb, As, Tl), EF values were similar at 23 both stations, with average values EF of 3.7±0.7 for Pb, 2.3±0.1 for As, 1.7±0.3 for Tl. This 24 indicated a significantly higher enrichment of Sb, Hg, Zn and Cd on the Gardon of Ales 25 subwatershed compared to the Gardon of Anduze subwatershed while Pb, As, and Tl were 26 slightly enriched on both subwatersheds.

For Sb and Hg, EF values for the main stream of the Gardon of Ales River increased from background level up to 7 (Sb) and 11.6 (Hg) from upstream to downstream stations below the Sb mine-impacted tributaries (AF1 and AF2) and the coal extraction area of La Grand-Combe respectively and then decreased downflow. This reflected a contribution of these sites to Sb and Hg enrichment in the main stream sediments of the Gardon of Ales River. Conversely, EF values for Sb and Hg in the main stream sediments of the Gardon of Anduze River was lower

1 than 2, which did not denote a significant contribution of the following Sb- and Hg-affected 2 tributaries AF8 (EF = 57 for Sb, EF = 174 for Hg), AF9 (EF = 16 for Sb, EF = 35 for Hg) and 3 AF10 (EF = 9.6 for Sb and EF = 24 for Hg). For other elements (Pb, Zn, As, Cd and Tl), a 4 two-fold increase of EF values was observed for As, Zn, Cd, Tl and three-fold increase for Pb 5 in the main stream sediments of the Gardon of Anduze downstream the tributaries AF8, AF9 6 and AF10 draining old Pb/Zn mines. Moreover, a two-fold increase was observed for As, Pb 7 and Tl, a three-fold increase for Zn and five-fold increase for Cd in main stream sediments of 8 the Gardon of Ales River downstream the town of Ales and the Grabieux River (AF4) which 9 drained both Pb/Zn mines and urban area. An additional increase was also evidenced at 10 downstream site (station 10) for Cd, reflecting the contribution of diffuse or unidentified point 11 source.

#### 12 **3.2 Inter-element metal/aluminum ratio correlations**

13 Inter-element Me/Al correlations may be used to characterize different groups of chemical 14 elements with similar geochemical patterns. In the sedimentary archive, Me/Al values for Pb, Zn, Cd, Tl and As were highly correlated with each other  $(0.71 < R^2 < 0.87)$  from GE1 to GE18 15 16 and in GE20 (Table 3); furthermore three groups of points representing (i) pre-industrial era 17 (GE1 to GE9) (ii) industrial era until 1963 (GE10 to GE17) and (iii) industrial era in 1969 and 18 2002 (GE18 and GE20), were distributed along a dilution line in relation with the 19 contamination level (Figure 3). This suggested a common origin for these elements over time. 20 The correlation was slightly lower between these elements and Sb ( $0.60 < R^2 < 0.75$ ) or Hg 21 (0.56<R<0.77). In the layer GE19 corresponding to the extreme 1976 flood event, the data did 22 not follow the same dilution line as the other layers (Figure 3); showing a different 23 geochemical signature.

24 In current main stream sediments, correlations were generally lower than in the sedimentary 25 archive (Table 4). On the Gardon of Anduze River, positive correlations were observed between Pb, Zn, Cd, Tl, As and Hg (0.23<R<sup>2</sup><0.93). On the Gardon of Ales River, Pb, Zn, Cd, 26 Tl and As were also correlated ( $0.42 < R^2 < 0.90$ ), while Hg was correlated only with As, Tl and 27 28 Pb (0.49<R<sup>2</sup><0.69). Among these elements, Zn and Cd were highly correlated on both the Gardon of Anduze and the Gardon of Ales Rivers subwatersheds (R<sup>2</sup>=0.93 and 0.91 29 30 respectively). No correlation was observed between Sb and the 6 other elements 31  $(0.00 < R^2 < 0.17)$  on any of the subwatersheds indicating a different predominant source for Sb.

#### 1 **3.3 Zinc isotopes**

2 Zinc isotopic composition was determined in the sedimentary archive (Figure 5a) and in 3 current sediments from the Gardon River including some of its tributaries (Figure 5b). In the 4 sedimentary archive, the range of variation of  $\delta^{66}$ Zn was quite narrow, from 0.20 to 0.26‰ 5 (Figure 5a). Extremely homogeneous values ( $\delta^{66}$ Zn=0.26 ± 0.02‰) were obtained in the 6 bottom of the sedimentary archive, from GE1 to GE7, whereas significant variations occurred 7 in upper layers.

8 Current stream sediments from the main stream of the Gardon River exhibited  $\delta^{66}$ Zn values 9 from 0.18 to 0.25‰, thus matching the range of the sedimentary archive (Figure 5b). The 10 values tended to decrease from upstream to downstream sites along the main stream of the 11 Gardon River. Zn-contaminated tributaries exhibited significantly lower ( $\delta^{66}$ Zn = 0.07‰ for 12 AF9 and 0.08‰ for AF10) or higher ( $\delta^{66}$ Zn = 0.31‰ for AF6)  $\delta^{66}$ Zn values.

#### 13 **3.4 Chemical partitioning of metals and metalloids**

14 The chemical partitioning of Cd, Zn, Pb, Tl, As and Sb in the sedimentary archive is 15 presented in Figure 6. The proportion of Cd, Zn, Pb, Tl and As contained in the most reactive 16 fractions (F1+F2+F3) increased from the bottom to the top of the archive, following the 17 increase of EF value. However, these metals and metalloids showed different distribution 18 pattern. Cd was largely associated with the most reactive fractions (48%<F1+F2+F3<86%) 19 and exhibited the highest proportion in exchangeable/carbonates fraction (F1), from 18±3% 20 on average in the bottom layers (GE1 to GE9) up to 36.5% in the most contaminated layer 21 (GE19). For Zn, the sum of the most reactive fractions (F1+F2+F3) increased gradually from 22  $11\pm 2\%$  on average in the bottom layers (GE1 to GE9) to  $49\pm 5\%$  on average in upper layers 23 (GE19 to GE20), the distribution among fraction F1, F2 and F3 remaining homogeneous. The 24 partitioning of Pb was dominated by Fe/Mn oxyhydroxides fraction (26%<F2<59%) with low 25 exchangeable/carbonates and organic matter/sulfides fractions (F1<6% and F3<17%). Tl, As 26 and Sb were mainly associated with the residual fraction (F4≥65.5%). For Tl and As, the 27 Fe/Mn oxyhydroxides fraction (F2) represented up to 19% (Tl) and 25% (As).

28 Chemical partioning of Cd, Zn, Pb, Tl, As and Sb in current stream sediments from the 29 Gardon River was similar to that of the sedimentary archive (Table 5). Cd and Zn exhibited 30 the highest proportion in exchangeable/carbonates fraction F1, ranging from 25% to 62% for 31 Cd and from 6% to 37% for Zn, with the most reactive fractions (F1+F2+F3) accounting 1 respectively for  $71\pm12\%$  and  $40\pm16\%$  (Table 5). For Pb, the reactive fractions represented 2  $44\pm12\%$  and were dominated by the Fe/Mn oxyhydroxides fraction (F2=30±8%). Tl and As 3 were largely bound to the residual fraction (F4>56% and 75% respectively) with Fe/Mn 4 oxyhydroxides fraction accounting for the majority of the remaining content. Sb was 5 essentially contained in the residual fraction (F4>94%).

6 For Cd, Zn, Pb and to a lesser extent for Tl and As, the proportion of the most reactive 7 fractions (F1+F2+F3) in main stream sediments tended to increase from upstream to 8 downstream sites along the watershed in relation with increased EF value. F1+F2+F3 9 represented on average 62% for Cd, 27% for Zn, 40% for Pb, 6% for Tl and 12% for As in 10 sediments of the upstream Gardon River (station 1, 3, 13 and 15) and reached 84% for Cd, 11 54% for Zn, 45% for Pb, 21% for Tl and 22% for As in sediments of downstream watershed 12 at station 24 downstream from the junction between the Gardon of Anduze and the Gardon of 13 Ales Rivers.

## 14 **4 Discussion**

# 4.1 Historical record of metal (Pb, Zn, Cd, Tl, Hg) and metalloid (As, Sb) contamination

17 The Gardon River watershed is a typical example of an ancient mining basin with multiple 18 sources of metal contamination. The assessment of anthropogenic metal levels in this 19 watershed and the deciphering of the origin of these contaminants is complex for several 20 reasons: (1) the geology of the watershed, which includes several metal-mineralized areas, 21 contributes to high metal levels in the transported sediments, thus confounding metals from 22 anthropogenic origin, (2) the temporal variability of the hydrological regime, typical of the 23 Mediterranean climate, with flash flood events responsible for most of the transport and 24 deposition of polluted sediments in the riverbed and floodplain away from their contamination 25 sources, making it difficult to acquire representative samples. Therefore, the use of a 26 sedimentary archive, which integrates both anthropogenic metal emissions and geochemical 27 background related to local geology of the whole upstream watershed, combined with current 28 stream sediment analysis, can make sense for a rigorous estimation of the contamination 29 status of the watershed. Sedimentary archives have recently been used to reconstruct 30 watershed contamination histories in several European river basins (Audry et al., 2004b;

1 Ayrault et al., 2012; Ferrand et al., 2012; Gocht et al., 2001; Grosbois et al., 2012; Grousset et 2 al., 1999; Le Cloarec et al., 2011; Monna et al., 2000; Müller et al., 2000; Winkels et al., 3 1998); these archives are generally floodplain cores (Ayrault et al., 2012; Gocht et al., 2001; 4 Grosbois et al., 2012; Le Cloarec et al., 2011) or reservoir cores (Audry et al., 2004b; Müller 5 et al., 2000). On the Gardon River watershed, there is no reservoir downstream from mining 6 sites and it is very difficult to find intact continuous record in the floodplain mainly due to 7 possible remobilization of sediments during flash floods which affect the watershed (Dezileau 8 et al. in review; Delrieu et al. 2005). For these reasons, the sedimentary archive used was a 9 high-standing flooding terrace which recorded only extreme flood events with a minimum 10 discharge of 2100m<sup>3</sup>/s (Dezileau et al., 2013; Dezileau et al., in review); the recording is thus 11 discontinuous and provides a low temporal resolution. Nevertheless, the archive has recorded 12 (i) pre-industrial floods allowing to determine the geochemical background of the watershed and (ii) 12 floods from the late 19th century to 2002 allowing to study the evolution of 13 14 contamination level throughout the industrial era. Pre-industrial levels of Pb, Zn, Cd, Tl, Hg, 15 As, and Sb in the archive allowed to characterize the local geochemical background of the 16 Gardon River watershed, which was highly enriched for As, Sb and to a lesser extent for Cd, 17 Pb, Zn and Tl relatively to the Upper Continental Crust, while being slightly depleted in Hg. 18 These results point out the importance to assess the local reference level in mine-impacted 19 watersheds for estimation of anthropogenic status as also highlighted elsewhere (Audry et al., 20 2004b; Dolgopolova et al., 2006; Lapworth et al., 2012). This high geochemical background 21 for As, Sb, Cd, Pb, Zn and Tl in the Gardon watershed was related to the presence of several 22 mineralized areas containing pyrite, galena, sphalerite and stibnite (BRGM, SIG Mines 23 website; Alkaaby, 1986; European Comission 1988) on the Gardon of Ales and the Gardon of 24 Anduze subwatersheds.

25 Since the late 19th century, 12 floods have been recorded by the sedimentary archive (layer 26 GE9 to layer GE20), revealing a global enrichment of metals (Pb, Zn, Cd, Tl, Hg) and 27 metalloids (As, Sb) in sediments of the Gardon River over time, until 1969, together with a 28 contamination peak related to tailing dam failure in 1976 and a latest record in 2002 that 29 presented levels similar to those of 1969 except for enrichment in Hg and Sb which was lower 30 in 2002 than in 1969. This latest sedimentary record in 2002 might reflect remobilization of 31 ancient floodplain sediments, acting as secondary contamination source during exceptional 32 flooding events (Hudson-Edwards, 2003). However, the similarity of EF values in the 2002 33 sedimentary record and in current stream sediments (station 25), characterized by respectively

high (maximum discharge of 7200 m<sup>3</sup>/s in 2002 (Dezileau et al., 2013; Dezileau et al., in 1 review)) and moderate (1140 m<sup>3</sup>/s in 2011, Banque Hydro website) intensity floods rather 2 3 points out limited improvement of sediment quality over recent years. This historical pattern 4 contrasted with that of large French Rivers such as the Loire River (Grosbois et al., 2012), the 5 Seine River (Le Cloarec et al., 2011) or the Rhône River (Ferrand et al., 2012) where a 6 gradual decrease was observed for most contaminants in sediments after 1980. This general 7 decontamination has been explained by improvement of waste water treatment, de-8 industrialization and industrial processes changes and generally by more stringent 9 environmental regulations (Ferrand et al., 2012; Grosbois et al., 2012; Le Cloarec et al., 2011; 10 Meybeck, 2013).

#### 11 **4.2 Current sediment contamination**

According to the classification of pollution level based on the enrichment factor method proposed by Sutherland (2000), current stream sediments were extremely polluted (EF>40), very highly polluted (20<EF<40) or significantly polluted (5<EF<20) for all studied elements (Pb, Zn, As, Cd, Tl, Sb and Hg) in sediments of mining/urban impacted tributary (AF4), mining/industrial impacted tributary (AF6) and Pb/Zn mines impacted tributaries (AF8, AF9 and AF10). Tributaries which drain old Sb mines (AF1 and AF2) were extremely polluted (AF1) and very highly polluted (AF2) with Sb.

19 In the sediments of the Gardon of Ales River, Hg and Sb were significantly (5<EF<20) to 20 moderately (2<EF<5) enriched. In both the Gardon of Anduze and the Gardon of Ales Rivers, 21 Pb, Zn, As and Cd were moderately enriched (2<EF<5) downstream from polluted tributaries 22 (AF4, AF6, AF8, AF9, AF10) while EF values for Tl reflected no or minimal pollution signal 23 in sediments. Variation of EF values along the Gardon of Ales and the Gardon of Anduze 24 Rivers downstream from the uppermost affected tributaries differed for the following two 25 groups of elements. For Pb, Zn, Cd, As and Tl, EF values remained almost constant, 26 suggesting a continuous input of these elements by several polluted tributaries along the main 27 stream (AF8, AF9 and AF10 on the Gardon of Anduze River and AF4, AF6 on the Gardon of 28 Ales River). For Sb and Hg, the decrease of EF values along the flowpath may reflect the 29 prevailing contribution of sources located on the upstream watershed and then the dilution by 30 less contaminated sediments, hydraulic sorting or storage in reservoir and floodplain (Byrne et 31 al., 2012; Hudson-Edwards, 2003).

# 4.3 Sources of metals and metalloids in the sedimentary archive and current stream sediments

3 Metal/aluminum ratios Pb, As, Zn, Cd and Tl in the sedimentary archive were found to be 4 correlated, suggesting a common origin for these elements from the pre-industrial era until the 5 present day. Such correlation could be ascribed to the association of these elements within the 6 Pb/Zn mineralization that has been exploited in several mines on the Gardon of Ales and the 7 Gardon of Anduze subwatersheds. This mineralization contained traces of cadmium in 8 sphalerite (ZnS), arsenic in Fe-sulfides (pyrite, marcasite FeS<sub>2</sub>), in sulfosalts (proustite 9 Ag<sub>3</sub>AsS<sub>3</sub>) and in galena (PbS), antimony in sulfosalts (pyrargyrite Ag<sub>3</sub>SbS<sub>3</sub>) and in galena, 10 mercury in Fe-sulfides and in sphalerite and thallium in Fe-sulfides (Alkaaby, 1986; Casiot et 11 al., 2011; European Comission, 1988). In particular, the strong relationship between Zn and 12 Cd both in the archive and in current stream sediments might reflect a homogeneous Cd 13 content in Zn-ore in the area. The 1976 layer exhibited a different geochemical signature, with 14 enrichment of As and Pb compared to previous layers; this was a local characteristic of 15 flotation residues stored behind a dam at the abandoned Carnoulès site located 60 km 16 upstream from the archive location (Leblanc et al., 1996); the impoundment contained As-rich 17 pyrite and galena, the wastes having exceptionally high As ( $\sim 0.2\%$ ) and Pb ( $\sim 0.7\%$ ) content. 18 Correlations of metal/aluminum ratios for Sb and Hg with other studied metal or metalloid 19 were lower than for the other elements, suggesting a contribution of multiple sources 20 including the Pb/Zn mineralization (Alkaaby, 1986) and Pb/Zn mine-impacted tributaries 21 (AF4, AF6, AF8, AF9 and AF10). However, the spatial distribution of EF values for Sb in 22 current stream sediments suggested that extraction of Sb ore and smelting works on the 23 upstream subwatershed of the Gardon of Ales River were responsible for the Sb enrichment in 24 main stream sediments of the Gardon River. The contamination peak at the bottom of the 25 sedimentary archive probably reflected ancient mining works dating back to the early 19th 26 century; first extraction (1810-1858) and smelting activities (1833-1858) were operating near 27 the tributary AF2. Then the largest Sb mine was active between 1906 and 1948 resulting in 28 38,000T of tailings drained by the tributary AF1 and an associated smelter that worked 29 between 1896 and 1951 (BRGM, BASIAS website). For Hg, important enrichment evidenced 30 in current main stream sediments of the Gardon of Ales River downstream from the coal 31 production area of La Grand-Combe suggests the predominance of this source over Pb-Zn 32 mineralization.

1 The potential of Zn isotopes to track the sources of zinc have been investigated in the present 2 study because Zn enrichment in current main stream sediments was evidenced downstream 3 various sources (Pb/Zn mine-impacted tributaries AF8, AF9 and AF10; both urban and mine-4 impacted tributary AF4, both industrial and mine-impacted tributary AF6; Ales town). 5 However, considering the prevailing Pb/Zn mining origin for Zn in sediments of the Gardon 6 River watershed, the relatively uniform isotopic composition of the sedimentary archive and current main stream sediments ( $\delta^{66}$ Zn=0.23±0.03‰) was consistent. Nevertheless, significant 7 8 differences were evidenced between the relatively homogeneous values at the bottom of the 9 sedimentary archive and upper layers, also between current main stream sediments and 10 tributaries.  $\delta^{66}$ Zn value of the natural geochemical background of the Gardon River watershed was 0.26‰±0.02‰, lying within background values determined at 0.31±0.06‰ for the Lot 11 12 River watershed (Sivry et al., 2008), also located in the Massif Central Mountains in France. Local Zn-ore was found at 0.18% (unpublished data) which is close to the  $\delta^{66}$ Zn average of 13 0.16% proposed by Sonke et al. (2008) for sphalerite.  $\delta^{66}$ Zn values in upper layers (from GE8 14 15 to GE20) of the sedimentary archive and in current main stream sediments impacted by 16 anthropogenic activities deviated slightly from the background value, with an average of 17 0.20% in the sedimentary archive and 0.18% in current main stream sediments. This was consistent with the contribution of Pb/Zn mine-impacted tributaries (AF9, AF10), 18 characterized by lower  $\delta^{66}$ Zn value (~0.07‰), to Zn enrichment in main stream sediments. 19

Conversely, the higher  $\delta^{66}$ Zn value of tributary AF4 ( $\delta^{66}$ Zn = 0.31‰), both influenced by 20 industrial and mining sites, did not significantly increase the  $\delta^{66}$ Zn value of the main stream, 21 showing little impact of industrial Zn source on Zn load.  $\delta^{66}$ Zn values of polluted sediments 22 23 from this study were drastically lower than in reservoir sediments of the Lot River downstream from the mining and smelting area of Decazeville ( $\delta^{66}$ Zn=0.75 to 1.35‰), where 24 25 the smelting process favored enrichment in the heavier isotopes in the remaining waste (Sivry et al., 2008). In the present study, ancient smelting activities on the Gardon of Ales 26 27 subwatershed, at La Grand-Combe (Ministère de la Culture) did not appear to significantly influence  $\delta^{66}$ Zn value in the sediments from this watershed. 28

To our knowledge, the  $\delta^{66}$ Zn data presented in this study are the first for riverbed sediments from AMD-impacted streams. They showed an isotopic composition at  $\delta^{66}$ Zn~0.07‰, thus within the range of 0.02 to 0.46‰ measured for the water compartment in a variety of streams draining historical mining district in United States and Europe (Borrok et al., 2008). This

lower value for AMD-impacted sediments compared to the local Zn-ore ( $\delta^{66}$ Zn=0.18‰) was 1 2 unexpected considering the low isotopic fractionation during Zn sulfide dissolution 3 (Fernandez and Borrok, 2009) and the preferential uptake of heavier Zn isotopes during 4 adsorption on ferrihydrite, which precipitates in AMD-impacted rivers (Aranda et al., 2012; 5 Balistrieri et al., 2008; Borrok et al., 2008). However, it probably reflects the complex 6 processes leading to enrichment either in the heavier or in the lighter isotopes depending on 7 the mineral phase onto which Zn is sorbed (Pokrovsky et al., 2005). Moreover, Borrok et al. 8 (2008) highlighted that lighter isotopes are enriched in the solid reservoir during important 9 diel fluctuations of dissolved Zn concentrations. Considering the variety of processes 10 involved in the cycle of Zn in AMD-impacted streams, further research would be required to 11 elucidate those controlling Zn isotopic composition in our mine-impacted streambed 12 sediments.

### 13 **4.4 Environmental significance of metal partitioning in sediments**

14 Considering the relatively high enrichment factors for the studied metals and metalloids in the 15 sediments of the Gardon River watershed, it is important to evaluate the potential mobility of 16 these elements in the sediments that can act as a chemical sink or a potential source of 17 pollutants to the overlying water. The three first fractions (F1, F2 and F3) define as 18 exchangeable, reducible and oxidisable fractions are supposed to contain metals that may be 19 mobilized toward the aqueous phase by changing redox conditions i.e. from reducing to 20 oxidizing (floods, dredging), and conversely from oxidizing to reducing (early diagenesis) or 21 pH conditions (Byrne et al., 2012). Subsequently to their release, metals may be transported 22 downstream in the dissolved phase or they might re-distribute to another solid phase in the 23 sediment (Audry et al., 2010; Byrne et al., 2012). Considering the percentage of metals and 24 metalloids extracted in the fractions F1+F2+F3, the order of potential mobility in the 25 sedimentary archive and in current stream sediments was Sb (1-7%) < Tl (3-34%) = As (4-26 35%) < Zn (9-65%) < Pb (25-77%) < Cd (48-88%). Comparison with other studies is limited 27 due to the diversity of the extraction protocols used (Byrne et al., 2012; Filgueiras et al., 28 2002). Nevertheless, other authors using BCR procedure or a similar one also reported an 29 important potential mobility for Cd, Zn and Pb in mine affected rivers. For As and Sb, 30 geochemical associations and subsequent estimation of their potential mobility in mine-31 affected stream sediments differed widely through studies. Galán et al. (2003) showed that As 32 was mainly bound to the relatively mobile pool in poorly cristallized Fe and Mn oxyhydroxides (fraction F2) in acidic Odiel and Tinto Rivers (Spain) affected by AMD while
other studies reported low mobility for As in other mining impacted environments (Bird et al.,
2003; Grosbois et al., 2001; Rapant et al., 2006). Association of Sb to the residual fraction
evidenced in other mine-impacted watersheds (Grosbois et al., 2001; Kraus and Wiegand,
2006; Rapant et al., 2006) was ascribed to its presence in stibnite which is an insoluble sulfide
phase (Kraus and Wiegand, 2006).

An increase of the proportion of the most reactive fractions (F1+F2+F3) was observed in relation with EF increase for Cd, Zn, Pb and to a lesser extent for As and Tl both in the sedimentary archive and in current main stream sediments of the Gardon River. Such an increase of metal mobility associated to anthropogenic contamination was already observed in other mining environments (Byrne et al., 2012) and industrial or urban affected rivers (Gagnon et al., 2009; Kim et al., 2009) showing that sediments may not act as a permanent sink for these metals.

## 14 **5** Conclusion

This study provided evidence of the gradual enrichment of Pb, Zn, Cd, Tl, Hg, As and Sb in the sediments of the Gardon watershed since the late 19th century related to the beginning of the industrial era and a remaining contamination pattern in recent decades, in contrast to the general decontamination observed for large French Rivers.

19 The combination of inter-element relationships and spatial distribution of EF values allowed 20 to point out the main sources of metals and metalloids in sediments, i.e. Pb/Zn ore 21 exploitation (Pb, Zn, As, Tl, Cd), antimony mining (Sb) and coal extraction (Hg). Zinc 22 isotopic composition provided modestly useful complement to the traditional geochemistry 23 results, in this particular context. The contribution of lighter  $\delta^{66}$ Zn value of AMD-impacted 24 streams decreases only slightly the isotopic composition of the Gardon River sediments. 25 Anthropogenic enrichment of metals and metalloids from mining origin in sediments of the 26 Gardon River was associated to increased potential mobility, as estimated by sequential 27 extraction, for Cd, Pb, Zn and to a lesser extent for As and Tl.

Altogether, these results showed that about fifty years after the closure of mines, the former mining sites remained the prevailing sources of Pb, Zn, Cd, Tl, Hg, As and Sb in sediments of the Gardon River, some of these contaminants initially trapped in the sediment being potentially mobilizable toward the aqueous medium by changing environmental conditions.
Further studies are necessary to quantify the contribution of specific mining sites to global
metal and metalloid enrichment in sediments of the Gardon River and to determine if these
sediments may actually become a source of contaminant to the overlying water.

5

## 6 6 Acknowlegments

The authors would like to thank Sophie Delpoux for fieldwork and analysis and Daniel Cossa
for mercury analysis. Jérôme Chmeleff and Philippe Télouk are gratefully acknowledged for
zinc isotopic analysis at Toulouse and Lyon. This study was supported by the EC2CO-INSU
program and OSU OREME (http://www.oreme.univ-montp2.fr).

11

## 1 **References**

- Alkaaby, A. (1986). Conglomérats minéralisés (Pb-Ba-Fe) du Trias basal sur la bordure sudest des Cévennes : exemple du système fluvial en tresse de Carnoulès (Gard). Thesis.
  Université des Sciences et Techniques du Languedoc. p.154.
- Aranda, S., Borrok, D. M., Wanty, R. B., & Balistrieri, L. S. (2012). Zinc isotope
  investigation of surface and pore waters in a mountain watershed impacted by acid rock
  drainage. The Science of the Total Environment, 420, 202–213.
- Audry, S., Schäfer, J., Blanc, G., Bossy, C., & Lavaux, G. (2004a). Anthropogenic
  components of heavy metal (Cd, Zn, Cu, Pb) budgets in the Lot-Garonne fluvial system
  (France). Applied Geochemistry, 19(5), 769–786. doi:10.1016/j.apgeochem.2003.10.002
- Audry, S., Schäfer, J., Blanc, G., & Jouanneau, J.-M. (2004b). Fifty-year sedimentary record
   of heavy metal pollution (Cd, Zn, Cu, Pb) in the Lot River reservoirs (France).
   Environmental Pollution, 132(3), 413–426. doi:10.1016/j.envpol.2004.05.025
- Audry, S., Grosbois, C., Bril, H., Schäfer, J., Kierczak, J., & Blanc, G. (2010). Postdepositional redistribution of trace metals in reservoir sediments of a mining/smeltingimpacted watershed (the Lot River, SW France). Applied Geochemistry, 25(6), 778–794.
  doi:10.1016/j.apgeochem.2010.02.009
- Ayrault, S., Roy-Barman, M., Le Cloarec, M.-F., Priadi, C. R., Bonté, P., & Göpel, C. (2012).
   Lead contamination of the Seine River, France: geochemical implications of a historical perspective. Chemosphere, 87(8), 902–910. doi:10.1016/j.chemosphere.2012.01.043
- Balistrieri, L. S., Borrok, D. M., Wanty, R. B., & Ridley, W. I. (2008). Fractionation of Cu
  and Zn isotopes during adsorption onto amorphous Fe(III) oxyhydroxide: Experimental
  mixing of acid rock drainage and ambient river water. Geochimica et Cosmochimica
  Acta, 72(2), 311–328.
- 25 Banque Hydro, Eaufrance. Last accessed on 11/26/2013. http://www.hydro.eaufrance.fr/
- Bird, G., Brewer, P. A., Macklin, M. G., Balteanu, D., Driga, B., Serban, M., & Zaharia, S.
  (2003). The solid state partitioning of contaminant metals and As in river channel
  sediments of the mining affected Tisa drainage basin, northwestern Romania and eastern
  Hungary. Applied Geochemistry, 18(10), 1583–1595. doi:10.1016/S08832927(03)00078-7
- Bonilla-Valverde, D., Ruiz-Laguna, J., Muñoz, A., Ballesteros, J., Lorenzo, F., Gómez-Ariza,
  J. L., & López-Barea, J. (2004). Evolution of biological effects of Aznalcóllar mining
  spill in the Algerian mouse (Mus spretus) using biochemical biomarkers. Toxicology,
  197(2), 123–138. doi:10.1016/j.tox.2003.12.010
- Borrok, D. M., Nimick, D. A., Wanty, R. B., & Ridley, W. I. (2008). Isotopic variations of
   dissolved copper and zinc in stream waters affected by historical mining. Geochimica et
   Cosmochimica Acta, 72(2), 329–344. doi:10.1016/j.gca.2007.11.014

- Borrok, D. M., Wanty, R. B., Ridley, W. I., Lamothe, P. J., Kimball, B. A., Verplanck, P. L.,
   & Runkel, R. L. (2009). Application of iron and zinc isotopes to track the sources and
   mechanisms of metal loading in a mountain watershed. Applied Geochemistry, 24(7),
   1270–1277. doi:10.1016/j.apgeochem.2009.03.010
- Bouchez, J., Lupker, M., Gaillardet, J., France-Lanord, C., & Maurice, L. (2011). How
  important is it to integrate riverine suspended sediment chemical composition with
  depth? Clues from Amazon River depth-profiles. Geochimica et Cosmochimica Acta,
  75(22), 6955–6970.
- 9 BRGM, SIG Mines. Last accessed on 11/26/2013. http://sigminesfrancebrgmfr/
- 10 BRGM, InfoTerre. Last accessed on 11/26/2013. http://infoterre.brgm.fr/
- BRGM, BASIAS. Inventaire historique de sites industriels et activités de service. Last
   accessed on 11/26/2013. http://basias.brgm.fr/
- 13 BRGM, BASOL. Last accessed on 11/26/2013. http://basol.developpement-durable.gouv.fr/
- Byrne, P., Wood, P. J., & Reid, I. (2012). The Impairment of River Systems by Metal Mine
  Contamination: A Review Including Remediation Options. Critical Reviews in
  Environmental Science and Technology, 42(19), 2017–2077.
  doi:10.1080/10643389.2011.574103
- Caruso, B., Cox, T., Runkel, R., Velleux, M., Bencala, K., Nordstrom, D., Julien, PY., Butler,
  BA., Alpers, CN., Marion, A., & Smith, K. (2008). Metals fate and transport modelling in
  streams and watersheds: state of the science and USEPA workshop review. Hydrological
  Processes, 22, 4011–4021. doi:10.1002/hyp
- Casiot, C., Egal, M., Bruneel, O., Verma, N., Parmentier, M., & Elbaz-Poulichet, F. (2011).
   Predominance of aqueous Tl (I) species in the river system downstream from the
   abandoned Carnoules Mine (Southern France). Environmental Science & Technology,
   45(I), 2056–2064.
- Casiot, C., Egal, M., Elbaz-Poulichet, F., Bruneel, O., Bancon-Montigny, C., Cordier, M.-A.,
  Gomez, E., & Aliaume, C. (2009). Hydrological and geochemical control of metals and
  arsenic in a Mediterranean river contaminated by acid mine drainage (the Amous River,
  France); preliminary assessment of impacts on fish (Leuciscus cephalus). Applied
  Geochemistry, 24(5), 787–799. doi:10.1016/j.apgeochem.2009.01.006
- Chen, J., Gaillardet, J., & Louvat, P. (2008). Zinc Isotopes in the Seine River Waters, France:
   A Probe of Anthropogenic Contamination. Environmental Science & Technology,
   42(17), 6494–6501. doi:10.1021/es800725z
- Chen, J., Gaillardet, J., Louvat, P., & Huon, S. (2009). Zn isotopes in the suspended load of
  the Seine River, France: Isotopic variations and source determination. Geochimica et
  Cosmochimica Acta, 73(14), 4060–4076. doi:10.1016/j.gca.2009.04.017

- Cloquet, C., Carignan, J., & Libourel, G. (2006). Isotopic composition of Zn and Pb
   atmospheric depositions in an urban/Periurban area of northeastern France.
   Environmental Science & Technology, 40(21), 6594–600.
- Cloquet, C., Carignan, J., Lehmann, M. F., & Vanhaecke, F. (2008). Variation in the isotopic
  composition of zinc in the natural environment and the use of zinc isotopes in
  biogeosciences: a review. Analytical and bioanalytical chemistry, 390(2), 451–63.
  doi:10.1007/s00216-007-1635-y
- 8 Cherry, D. S., Currie, R. J., Soucek, D. J., Latimer, H. A., & Trent, G. C. (2001). An
  9 integrative assessment of a watershed impacted by abandoned mined land discharges.
  10 Environmental Pollution, 111(3), 377–88.
- Delrieu, G., Ducrocq, V., Gaume, E., Nicol, J., Payrastre, O., Yates, E., Kirstetter, PE.,
  Andrieu, H., Ayral, PA., Bouvier, C., Creutin, JD., Livet, M., Anquetin, S., Lang, M.,
  Neppel, L., Obled, C., Parent-Du-Chatelet, J., Saulier, GM., Walpersdorf, A., &
  Wobrock, W. (2005). The catastrophic flash-flood event of 8-9 September 2002 in the
  Gard region, France: a first case study for the Cévennes-Vivarais Mediterranean
  Hydrometeorological. Journal of Hydrometeorology, 6, 34–52.
- Dezileau, L., Terrier, B., Berger, J. F., Blanchemanche, P., Freydier, R., Bremond, L.,
  Latapie, A., Paquier, A., Lang, M., & Delgado, J. (in review). A multi-dating approach
  applied to historical slackwater flood deposits of the Gardon River, SE France.
  Geomorphology.
- Dezileau, L., Terrier, B., Berger, J. F., Blanchemanche, P., Freydier, R., Latapie, A., Paquier,
   A., Lang, M., & Delgado, J. (2013). Reconstitution des crues extrêmes du Gardon à
   partir d'une analyse paléohydrologique. In Société Hydrotechnique de France (pp. 1–12).
- 24 Dolgopolova, A., Weiss, D. J., Seltmann, R., Kober, B., Mason, T. F. D., Coles, B., & 25 Stanley, C. J. (2006). Use of isotope ratios to assess sources of Pb and Zn dispersed in the environment during mining and ore processing within the Orlovka-Spokoinoe 26 27 mining (Russia). Applied Geochemistry, 21(4), 563-579. site 28 doi:10.1016/j.apgeochem.2005.12.014
- Ettler, V., Mihaljevic, M., Sebek, O., Molek, M., Grygar, T., & Zeman, J. (2006).
  Geochemical and Pb isotopic evidence for sources and dispersal of metal contamination
  in stream sediments from the mining and smelting district of Príbram, Czech Republic.
  Environmental Pollution, 142(3), 409–417. doi:10.1016/j.envpol.2005.10.024
- European Comission. (1988). Summary reports of the subprogramme: metals and mineral
  substances (1982-85): Volume 1. (M. Donato & L. Van Wambeke, Eds.) (Commission.,
  Vol. 1, p. 552).
- Fernandez, A., & Borrok, D. M. (2009). Fractionation of Cu, Fe, and Zn isotopes during the
  oxidative weathering of sulfide-rich rocks. Chemical Geology, 264, 1–12.
  doi:10.1016/j.chemgeo.2009.01.024
- Ferrand, E., Eyrolle, F., Radakovitch, O., Provansal, M., Dufour, S., Vella, C., Raccasi, G., &
   Gurriaran, R. (2012). Historical levels of heavy metals and artificial radionuclides

- reconstructed from overbank sediment records in lower Rhône River (South-East
   France). Geochimica et Cosmochimica Acta, 82, 163–182.
   doi:10.1016/j.gca.2011.11.023
- Filgueiras, A. V., Lavilla, I., & Bendicho, C. (2002). Chemical sequential extraction for metal
  partitioning in environmental solid samples. Journal of Environmental Monitoring, 4(6),
  823–857. doi:10.1039/b207574c
- Gagnon, C., Turcotte, P., & Vigneault, B. (2009). Comparative study of the fate and mobility
  of metals discharged in mining and urban effluents using sequential extractions on
  suspended solids. Environmental Geochemistry and Health, 31(6), 657–671.
  doi:10.1007/s10653-008-9223-4
- Galán, E., Gómez-Ariza, J., Gonzales, I., Fernandez-Caliani, J., Morales, E., & Giraldez, I.
   (2003). Heavy metal partitioning in river sediments severely polluted by acid mine
   drainage in the Iberian Pyrite Belt. Applied Geochemistry, 18, 409–421.
- Gocht, T., Moldenhauer, K., & Püttmann, W. (2001). Historical record of polycyclic aromatic
   hydrocarbons (PAH) and heavy metals in floodplain sediments from the Rhine River
   (Hessisches Ried, Germany). Applied Geochemistry, 16, 1707–1721.
- Gosar, M., & Miler, M. (2011). Anthropogenic metal loads and their sources in stream
  sediments of the Meža River catchment area (NE Slovenia). Applied Geochemistry,
  26(11), 1855–1866. doi:10.1016/j.apgeochem.2011.06.009
- Gray, N. (1997). Environmental impact and remediation of acid mine drainage: a management
   problem. Environmental Geology, 30, 62–71.
- Grimalt, J. O., Ferrer, M., & Macpherson, E. (1999). The mine tailing accident in Aznalcollar.
  The Science of the Total Environment, 242, 3–11.
- Grosbois, C, Meybeck, M., Lestel, L., Lefèvre, I., & Moatar, F. (2012). Severe and contrasted
  polymetallic contamination patterns (1900-2009) in the Loire River sediments (France).
  The Science of the Total Environment, 435-436, 290–305.
  doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2012.06.056
- Grosbois, Cecile, Horowitz, A. J., Smith, J. J., & Elrick, K. A. (2001). The effect of mining
  and related activities on the sediment-trace element geochemistry of Lake Coeur
  d'Alene, Idaho, USA. Part III. Downstream effects: the Spokane River Basin.
  Hydrological Processes, 15(5), 855–875.
- Grousset, F. E., Jouanneau, J. M., Castaing, P., Lavaux, G., & Latouche, C. (1999). A 70 year
  Record of Contamination from Industrial Activity Along the Garonne River and its
  Tributaries (SW France). Estuarine, Coastal and Shelf Science, 48(3), 401–414.
  doi:10.1006/ecss.1998.0435
- Hudson-Edwards, K. (2003). Sources, mineralogy, chemistry and fate of heavy metal-bearing
   particles in mining-affected river systems. Mineralogical Magazine, 67(2), 205–217.
   doi:10.1180/0026461036720095

- Hudson-Edwards, K., Macklin, M., & Taylor, M. (1997). Historic metal mining inputs to Tees
   river sediment. The Science of the Total Environment, 194/195, 437–445.
- Jarvis, A., & Younger, P. (1997). Dominating chemical factors in mine water induced
   impoverishment of the invertebrate fauna of two streams in the Durham Coalfield, UK.
   Chemistry and Ecology, 13(4), 249–270.
- Johnson, D. B., & Hallberg, K. B. (2005). Acid mine drainage remediation options: a review.
  The Science of the Total Environment, 338, 3–14. doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2004.09.002
- Kim, Y., Kim, B.-K., & Kim, K. (2009). Distribution and speciation of heavy metals and their
  sources in Kumho River sediment, Korea. Environmental Earth Sciences, 60(5), 943–
  952. doi:10.1007/s12665-009-0230-2
- Kimball, B. A., & Runkel, R. L. (2009). Spatially Detailed Quantification of Metal Loading
  for Decision Making: Metal Mass Loading to American Fork and Mary Ellen Gulch,
  Utah. Mine Water and the Environment, 28(4), 274–290. doi:10.1007/s10230-009-00855
- Kraus, U., & Wiegand, J. (2006). Long-term effects of the Aznalcóllar mine spill-heavy metal
  content and mobility in soils and sediments of the Guadiamar river valley (SW Spain).
  The Science of the Total Environment, 367, 855–71. doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2005.12.027
- Lapworth, D., Knights, K., Key, R., Johnson, C., Ayoade, E., Adekanmi, M., Arisekola, T.,
  Okunlola, O., Backman, B., Eklund, M., Everett, P., Lister, R., Ridgway, J., Watts, M.,
  Kemp, SJ., & Pitfield, P. (2012). Geochemical mapping using stream sediments in westcentral Nigeria: Implications for environmental studies and mineral exploration in West
  Africa. Applied Geochemistry, 27(6), 1035–1052. doi:10.1016/j.apgeochem.2012.02.023
- Le Cloarec, M.-F., Bonte, P. H., Lestel, L., Lefèvre, I., & Ayrault, S. (2011). Sedimentary
   record of metal contamination in the Seine River during the last century. Physics and
   Chemistry of the Earth, Parts A/B/C, 36(12), 515–529. doi:10.1016/j.pce.2009.02.003
- Leblanc, M., Achard, B., Othman, D. Ben, & Luck, J. (1996). Accumulation of arsenic from
  acidic mine waters by ferruginous bacterial accretions (stromatolites). Applied
  Geochemistry, 11(96), 541–554.
- MacKenzie, A., & Pulford, I. (2002). Investigation of contaminant metal dispersal from a
   disused mine site at Tyndrum, Scotland, using concentration gradients and stable Pb
   isotope ratios. Applied Geochemistry, 17(8), 1093–1103. doi:10.1016/S0883 2927(02)00007-0
- Macklin, M., Brewer, P., & Balteanu, D. (2003). The long term fate and environmental
   significance of contaminant metals released by the January and March 2000 mining
   tailings dam failures in Maramureş County, upper Tisa Basin, Romania. Applied
   Geochemistry, 18, 241–257.
- Macklin, M. G., Brewer, P. A., Hudson-Edwards, K. A., Bird, G., Coulthard, T. J., Dennis, I.
   A., Lechler, P.J., Miller, J.R., & Turner, J. N. (2006). A geomorphological approach to

- the management of rivers contaminated by metal mining. Geomorphology, 79, 423–447.
   doi:10.1016/j.geomorph.2006.06.024
- Macklin, M. G., Hudson-Edwards, K. A., & Dawson, E. J. (1997). The significance of
  pollution from historic metal mining in the Pennine orefields on river sediment
  contaminant fluxes to the North Sea. The Science of The Total Environment, 194195(96), 391–397. doi:10.1016/S0048-9697(96)05378-8
- Maréchal, C., Télouk, P., & Albarède, F. (1999). Precise analysis of copper and zinc isotopic
   compositions by plasma-source mass spectrometry. Chemical Geology, 156, 251–273.
- Mattielli, N., Petit, J. C. J., Deboudt, K., Flament, P., Perdrix, E., Taillez, A., RimetzPlanchon J. & Weiss, D. (2009). Zn isotope study of atmospheric emissions and dry
  depositions within a 5 km radius of a Pb–Zn refinery. Atmospheric Environment, 43(6),
  1265–1272. doi:10.1016/j.atmosenv.2008.11.030
- Mayes, W. M., Johnston, D., Potter, H. A. B., & Jarvis, A. P. (2009). A national strategy for
  identification, prioritisation and management of pollution from abandoned non-coal mine
  sites in England and Wales. I. Methodology development and initial results. The Science
  of the Total Environment, 407(21), 5435–47. doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2009.06.019
- Meybeck, M. (2013). Heavy metal contamination in rivers across the globe : an indicator of
   complex interactions between societies and catchments. In Proceedings f H04
   Understanding Freshwater Quality Problems in a Changing World (Vol. 361, pp. 3–16).
- Michard, G., & Faucherre, J. (1970). Étude géochimique de l'altération des minerais sulfurés
  de St. Sébastien d'Aigrefeuille. Chemical Geology, 6, 63–84.
- Mighanetara, K., Braungardt, C. B., Rieuwerts, J. S., & Azizi, F. (2009). Contaminant fluxes
  from point and diffuse sources from abandoned mines in the River Tamar catchment,
  UK. Journal of Geochemical Exploration, 100, 116–124.
  doi:10.1016/j.gexplo.2008.03.003
- Miller, J. (1997). The role of fluvial geomorphic processes in the dispersal of heavy metals
   from mine sites. Journal of Geochemical Exploration, 58, 101–118.
- Ministère de la Culture, Inventaire général du patrimoine culturel, base de donnée Mérimée.
   Last accessed on 11/26/2013. http://www.inventaire.culture.gouv.fr/
- Moeller, K., Schoenberg, R., Pedersen, R.-B., Weiss, D., & Dong, S. (2012). Calibration of
   the New Certified Reference Materials ERM-AE633 and ERM-AE647 for Copper and
   IRMM-3702 for Zinc Isotope Amount Ratio Determinations. Geostandards and
   Geoanalytical Research, 36(2), 177–199. doi:10.1111/j.1751-908X.2011.00153.x
- Monna, F., Camizuli, E., Revelli, P., Biville, C., Thomas, C., Losno, R., Scheifler, R.,
  Bruguier, O., Baron, S., Chateau, C., Ploquin, A., & Alibert, P. (2011). Wild brown trout
  affected by historical mining in the Cévennes National Park, France. Environmental
  science & technology, 45(16), 6823–30. doi:10.1021/es200755n

- Monna, F., Hamer, K., Lévêque, J., & Sauer, M. (2000). Pb isotopes as a reliable marker of
   early mining and smelting in the Northern Harz province (Lower Saxony, Germany).
   Journal of Geochemical Exploration, 68, 201–210.
- Moore, J., & Luoma, S. (1990). Hazardous wastes from large-scale metal extraction. A case
   study. Environmental Science & Technology, 24(9), 1278–1285.
- Moore, J. N., & Langner, H. W. (2012). Can a river heal itself? Natural attenuation of metal
  contamination in river sediment. Environmental Science & Technology, 46(5), 2616–
  2623. doi:10.1021/es203810j
- Müller, J., Ruppert, H., Muramatsu, Y., & Schneider, J. (2000). Reservoir sediments-a
  witness of mining and industrial development (Malter Reservoir, eastern Erzgebirge,
  Germany). Environmental Geology, 39(12), 1341–1351.
- Nriagu, J., & Pacyna, J. (1988). Quantitative assessment of worldwide contamination of air,
  water and soils by trace metals. Nature, 333, 134–139.
- Owens, P. N., Batalla, R. J., Collins, A. J., Gomez, B., Hicks, D. M., Horowitz, A. J.,
  Kondolf, G., Marden, M., Page, M., Peacock, D., Petticrew, E., Salomons, W., &
  Trustrum, N. (2005). Fine-grained sediment in river systems: environmental significance
  and management issues. River Research and Applications, 21(7), 693–717.
  doi:10.1002/rra.878
- Peplow, D., & Edmonds, R. (2005). The effects of mine waste contamination at multiple
  levels of biological organization. Ecological Engineering, 24, 101–119.
  doi:10.1016/j.ecoleng.2004.12.011
- Pokrovsky, O. S., Viers, J., & Freydier, R. (2005). Zinc stable isotope fractionation during its
   adsorption on oxides and hydroxides. Journal of colloid and interface science, 291(1),
   192–200. doi:10.1016/j.jcis.2005.04.079
- Rapant, S., Dietzová, Z., & Cicmanová, S. (2006). Environmental and health risk assessment
  in abandoned mining area, Zlata Idka, Slovakia. Environmental Geology, 51(3), 387–
  397. doi:10.1007/s00254-006-0334-x
- Rauret, G., López-Sánchez, J. F., Sahuquillo, A., Rubio, R., Davidson, C., Ure, A., &
  Quevauviller, P. (1999). Improvement of the BCR three step sequential extraction
  procedure prior to the certification of new sediment and soil reference materials. Journal
  of Environmental Monitoring, 1(1), 57–61.
- Rolley, J., La petite histoire du plomb et du zinc en Cévennes. Last accessed on 11/26/2013.
   http://www.rolley.fr/Geologie.html
- Rosman, K.J.R., & Taylor, P.D.P. (1998). Isotopic compositions of the elements 1997 (
   Technical Report ). Pure and Applied Chemistry, 70(1), 217–235.
- Salomons, W. (1995). Environmental impact of metals derived from mining activities:
   processes, predictions, prevention. Journal of Geochemical Exploration, 52, 5–23.

 Schwarzenbach, R. P., Egli, T., Hofstetter, T. B., von Gunten, U., & Wehrli, B. (2010).
 Global Water Pollution and Human Health. Annual Review of Environment and Resources, 35(1), 109–136. doi:10.1146/annurev-environ-100809-125342

4 Sivry, Y., Riotte, J., Sonke, J., Audry, S., Schafer, J., Viers, J., Blanc, G., Freydier, R., & 5 Dupre, B. (2008). Zn isotopes as tracers of anthropogenic pollution from Zn-ore smelters system. Chemical 6 The Riou Mort-Lot River Geology. 255, 295-304. 7 doi:10.1016/j.chemgeo.2008.06.038

- 8 SMAGE des Gardons (2011). Etude de la qualité des eaux du bassin des Gardons (p. 380).
- 9 Sonke, J., Sivry, Y., Viers, J., Freydier, R., Dejonghe, L., Andre, L., Aggarwal, J., Fontan, F., 10 & Dupre, B. (2008). Historical variations in the isotopic composition of atmospheric zinc 11 deposition from zinc smelter. Chemical Geology, 252. 145-157. a doi:10.1016/j.chemgeo.2008.02.006 12
- Sutherland, R. (2000). Bed sediment-associated trace metals in an urban stream, Oahu,
   Hawaii. Environmental Geology, 39(6), 611–627.
- Taylor, S. R., & McLennan, S. M. (1995). The geochemical evolution of the continental crust.
   Reviews of Geophysics, 33(2), 241–265.
- Thapalia, A., Borrok, D., Van Metre, P., Musgrove, M., & Landa, E. (2010). Zn and Cu
  isotopes as tracers of anthropogenic contamination in a sediment core from an urban
  lake. Environmental Science & Technology, 44(5), 1544–50. doi:10.1021/es902933y
- 20 Vincent, M. (2006). Les Mines des Cevennes. (Terre Cevenole, Ed.) (p. 320).
- Wedepohl, K. H. (1995). The composition of the continental crust. Geochimica et
   Cosmochimica Acta, 59(7), 1217–1232.
- Weiss, D., Rehkdmper, M., Schoenberg, R., McLaughlin, M., Kirby, J., Campbell, P., Arnold
  T., Chapman J., Peel K. & Gioia, S. (2008). Application of nontraditional stable-isotope
  systems to the study of sources and fate of metals in the environment. Environmental
  Science & Technology, 42(3), 655–664.
- Winkels, H. J., Kroonenberg, S. B., Lychagin, M. Y., Marin, G., Rusakov, G. V., & Kasimov,
  N. S. (1998). Geochronology of priority pollutants in sedimentation zones of the Volga
  and Danube delta in comparison with the Rhine delta. Applied Geochemistry, 13(5),
  581–591. doi:10.1016/S0883-2927(98)00002-X
- Younger, P., & Wolkersdorfer, C. (2004). Mining impacts on the fresh water environment:
   technical and managerial guidelines for catchment scale management. Mine water and
   the environment, 23, 2–80.

## **7** Figure and table captions

Figure 1 a) Simplified geological map (simplified from BRGM, Info Terre website); b) Map of the study area showing the main mining sites and the sampling stations (current stream sediments sampling stations : numbers represent stations on the main stream and AFx represents stations on the tributaries (AF1 Ravin des Bernes River, AF2 Richaldon River, AF3 Galeizon River, AF4 Grabieux River, AF5 Alzon River, AF6 Avène River, AF7 Salindrenque River, AF8 Aiguesmortes River, AF9 Amous River, AF10 Ourne River); Locations of sampling stations are available in supplementary information, SI Table 1

9 Figure 2 Enrichment Factors (EF) of As, Pb, Hg, Cd, Zn, Tl and Sb in sediments of the
10 archive (\*) and in current stream sediments (•) sampled on November 2011 at the station 25.

11 Datation from Dezileau et al., 2013 and Dezileau et al., in review

Figure 3 Temporal evolution of a) EF Tl vs. EF As and b) EF Pb vs. EF Zn in the sedimentary archive and in the current stream sediment sampled at the station 25 in 2011

Figure 4 Enrichment Factors (EF) of As, Cd, Hg, Pb, Sb, Tl and Zn in sediments sampled during the most complete campaign (December 6-7, 2012). EF are represented using bar charts for sediments of the main stream and a dot with EF value for sediments of the tributaries

Figure 5 a)  $\delta^{66}$ Zn (‰) variations in the sedimentary archive and b)  $\delta^{66}$ Zn (‰) in current stream sediments of the campaign of November 2011

Figure 6 Chemical partitioning of Cd, Zn, Pb, Tl, As and Sb in sediments of the archive between operationally defined fractions F1, F2, F3 and F4, expressed as percentage of total metal content and enrichment factor EF values. F1: exchangeable and bound to carbonates, F2: bound to Fe/Mn oxyhydroxides, F3: bound to organic matter (OM) and sulfides and F4: residual fraction

Table 1 Gardon River tributaries characteristics. Station number AFx indicate the sampling
 station location on the tributaries

Table 2 Metal/aluminum ratios in samples examined for geochemical background
 determination

Table 3 Spearman's correlation matrix for the metal(loid)/aluminum ratios in the sedimentary
 archive

3 Table 4 Spearman's correlation matrix for the metal(loid)/aluminum ratios in current stream 4 sediments : the left lower part is correlation coefficient (R<sup>2</sup>) for the Gardon of Ales River; the 5 right upper part is for the Gardon of Anduze River

**Table 5** Chemical partitioning of Cd, Zn, Pb, Tl, As and Sb in current stream sediments
between operationally defined fractions F1, F2, F3 and F4, expressed as percentage of total
metal content and enrichment factor EF values. F1: exchangeable and bound to carbonates,
F2: bound to Fe/Mn oxyhydroxides, F3: bound to organic matter (OM) and sulfides and F4:
residual fraction

11

12

## 1 8 Supplementary information

- 2 SI Table 1 Sampling station locations
- 3 SI Table 2  $\delta^{66}$ Zn values in the sedimentary archive relative to the standards "JMC Lyon 3-
- 4 0749-L" and "IRMM 3702"
- 5 **SI Table 3**  $\delta^{66}$ Zn values in current stream sediments of the campaign of November 2011 6 relative to the standards "JMC Lyon 3-0749-L" and "IRMM 3702"
- SI Table 4 As, Cd, Hg, Pb, Sb, Tl and Zn concentrations (in µg.g<sup>-1</sup>) and enrichment factors in
  the sedimentary archive
- 9 SI Table 5 As, Cd, Hg, Pb, Sb, Tl and Zn concentrations (in µg.g<sup>-1</sup>) and enrichment factors of
- 10 the whole dataset of current stream sediments
- 11
- 12

Tributaries	Station number	Characteristics
Ravin des Bernes River	AF1	Former Sb mining site drainage
Richaldon River	AF2	Former Sb, Pb, Zn mining site drainage
Galeizon River	AF3	Unimpacted
Grabieux River	AF4	Urban tributary with former coal, pyrite, Pb and Zn mining sites drainage
Alzon River	AF5	Former pyrite, Pb and Zn mining sites drainage
Avene River	AF6	Former pyrite, Pb and Zn mining sites drainage and industrial activity discharge
Salindrenque River	AF7	Unimpacted
Aiguesmortes River	AF8	Former Pb and Zn mining sites drainage
Amous River	AF9	Former Pb and Zn mining sites drainage
Ourne River	AF10	Former Pb and Zn mining sites drainage

		As/Al $10^3$	Cd/Al 10 <sup>3</sup>	Hg/Al 10 <sup>3</sup>	Pb/Al 10 <sup>3</sup>	Sb/Al 10 <sup>3</sup>	Tl/Al 10 <sup>3</sup>	Zn/Al 10 <sup>3</sup>
Sedimentary archive : Bottom	Mean	0.42	0.0036	0.0003	0.61	0.052	0.016	1.45
layers GE1 to GE6 (n=7)	Standard error	0.04	0.0005	0.0001	0.04	0.005	0.001	0.08
Upper Continental Crust		$0.02^{a}$	0.0012 <sup>a</sup>	$0.0007^{b}$	$0.25^{a}$	$0.002^{a}$	$0.009^{a}$	$0.88^{a}$

<sup>a</sup> Taylor and Mc Lennan 1995 ; <sup>b</sup> Wedepohl 1995

	Zn/Al	As/Al	Cd/Al	Sb/Al	Tl/Al	Pb/Al	Hg/Al
Zn/Al							
As/Al	0.71***						
Cd/Al	0.87***	0.71***					
Sb/Al	0.69***	0.62***	0.75***				
Tl/Al	0.85***	0.72***	0.73***	0.60***			
Pb/Al	0.87***	0.77***	0.81***	0.63***	0.85***		
Hg/Al	0.69***	0.56***	0.77***	0.66***	0.70***	0.61***	

\*\*\*p-value <0.0001

	Zn/Al	As/Al	Cd/Al	Sb/Al	Tl/Al	Pb/Al	Hg/Al
Zn/Al		0.51**	0.93**	0.17	0.23*	0.65**	0.54**
As/Al	0.47*		0.48**	0.07	0.33*	0.65**	0.31*
Cd/Al	0.90**	0.44*		0.15	0.25*	0.67**	0.54**
Sb/Al	0.00	0.04	0.00		0.00	0.04	0.02
Tl/Al	0.56**	0.42*	0.49*	0.08		0.57**	0.39*
Pb/Al	0.70**	0.58**	0.58**	0.00	0.58**		0.77**
Hg/Al	0.11	0.57*	0.10	0.15	0.49*	0.69*	

\*p-value<0.05

\*\*p-value <0.001

	Gard	lon of	Ales	River	Gara	lon of	`Andu	ze River	Gardon River
Station number	1	3	9	11	13	15	22	23	24
Cadmium									
F1	32	40	48	38	25	27	44	62	53
F2	20	16	31	10	16	17	7	11	21
F3	16	11	9	10	17	13	25	11	10
F4	33	33	12	41	42	43	24	16	16
F1+F2+F3	67	67	88	59	58	57	76	84	84
EF	1.4	1.3	5.3	4.6	1.2	1.2	1.8	2.3	4.0
Zinc									
F1	9	11	37	12	6	8	21	22	23
F2	6	6	15	7	5	6	10	12	17
F3	13	12	13	6	13	13	20	22	14
F4	72	71	35	75	75	74	49	44	46
F1+F2+F3	28	29	65	25	25	26	51	56	54
EF	1.6	1.3	3.4	4.9	1.1	1.2	1.5	1.9	2.5
Lead									
F1	13	7	8	3	4	9	14	20	5
F2	28	33	43	19	18	30	34	31	35
F3	5	5	8	4	3	4	6	4	5
F4	54	54	41	74	75	56	46	45	55
F1+F2+F3	46	46	59	26	25	44	54	55	45
EF	1.0	1.0	1.7	4.2	1.0	0.9	2.0	3.2	3.6
Thallium									
F1	1	1	9	4	1	1	1	1	2
F2	6	3	29	17	5	2	7	6	14
F3	1	1	5	4	2	1	4	4	4
F4	92	96	56	75	92	97	89	89	79
F1+F2+F3	8	4	44	25	8	3	11	11	21
EF	0.7	0.6	1.8	1.9	1.0	0.7	1.2	1.5	2.1
Arsenic									
F1	1	2	10	1	1	2	2	2	2
F2	3	8	8	2	8	10	18	13	16
F3	2	4	3	1	3	3	4	3	4
F4	93	86	79	96	87	85	75	82	78
F1+F2+F3	7	14	21	4	13	15	25	18	22
EF	1.0	0.7	1.1	2.4	1.3	1.9	2.0	2.3	2.2
Antimony									
F1	0	0	2	0	1	0	1	1	1
F2	1	2	1	1	2	1	2	2	3
F3	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	1
F4	98	97	96	98	97	99	97	97	95
F1+F2+F3	2	3	4	2	3	1	3	3	5
EF	1.6	7.4	3.6	5.7	0.9	0.7	1.0	1.5	1.4





















	Station	Longitude	Latitude
	1	3.9015	44.2477
	2	3.9138	44.2474
	3	3.9724	44.2478
	3	3.9148	44.1236
	4	4.0137	44.2208
	5	4.0493	44.1736
	6	4.0783	44.1403
	7	4.0754	44.1322
	8	4.0795	44.1202
	9	4.0956	44.1066
	10	4.1026	44.0863
Main straam	11	4.1180	44.0374
	12	3.8429	44.1763
seuments	14	3.9661	44.0794
	15	3.7626	44.1267
	16	3.8844	44.1034
	17	3.9221	44.0822
	18	3.9333	44.0771
	19	3.9429	44.0743
	20	3.9554	44.0731
	21	3.9735	44.0726
	22	3.9886	44.0521
	23	4.1101	44.0302
	24	4.1585	44.0182
	25	4.3221	43.9309
	AF1	3.9054	44.2439
	AF2	3.9241	44.2381
	AF3	4.0493	44.1531
	AF4	4.0874	44.1394
Tributary	AF5	4.0892	44.0907
sediments	AF6	4.1166	44.0829
	AF7	3.9348	44.0663
	AF8	3.9451	44.0669
	AF9	3.9854	44.0790
	AF10	4.0062	44.0226
Sedimentary archive	GE	4.4285	43.9369

Sampling depth <sup>a</sup> (cm)	$\delta^{66}Zn_{\rm JMC3-0749-L}$	$\delta^{66} Zn_{\rm IRMM~3702}$
12	0.21	-0.08
20	0.21	-0.08
36	0.25	-0.04
40	0.24	-0.05
44	0.21	-0.08
52	0.21	-0.08
60	0.24	-0.05
68	0.22	-0.07
76	0.22	-0.07
88	0.25	-0.04
96	0.22	-0.07
108	0.20	-0.09
116	0.23	-0.06
124	0.26	-0.03
132	0.25	-0.04
136	0.23	-0.06
148	0.24	-0.05
160	0.20	-0.09
172	0.21	-0.08
180	0.21	-0.08
188	0.27	-0.02
192	0.26	-0.03
200	0.24	-0.05
228	0.25	-0.04
236	0.25	-0.04
252	0.25	-0.04
260	0.26	-0.03
272	0.27	-0.02
280	0.25	-0.04
304	0.25	-0.04

<sup>a</sup>mesured from the top of the terrace

Station number	$\delta^{66}Zn_{JMC3\text{-}0749\text{-}L}$	$\delta^{66}Zn_{IRMM3702}$
3	0.25	-0.04
5	0.22	-0.07
8	0.18	-0.11
13	0.23	-0.06
16	0.20	-0.09
22	0.18	-0.11
24	0.18	-0.11
AF6	0.31	0.02
AF9	0.08	-0.21
AF10	0.07	-0.22

Sampling	As	:	Cd	l	Hg	5	Pb	)	Sb	)	T	l	Zn	ı	Layer	Doting
depth <sup>a</sup> (cm)	μg.g <sup>-1</sup>	EF	μg.g <sup>-1</sup>	EF	μg.g <sup>-1</sup>	EF	μg.g <sup>-1</sup>	EF	μg.g <sup>-1</sup>	EF	µg.g <sup>-1</sup>	EF	μg.g <sup>-1</sup>	EF	number	Dating
12	33.2	1.8	0.53	3.3	0.053	3.7	84.8	3.2	4.78	2.1	1.26	1.8	130.7	2.0	GE20	2002
20	46.4	2.1	0.63	3.4	0.043	2.7	106.0	3.4	5.16	1.9	1.59	1.9	159.4	2.1		
36	84.7	3.1	0.95	4.0	0.225	10.9	253.7	3.8	9.14	2.7	2.09	2.0	212.8	2.3	GE19	1976
40	165.2	5.7	0.97	4.0	0.223	10.4	471.3	6.7	10.82	3.0	2.74	2.5	246.2	2.5		
44	275.8	9.8	1.04	4.3	0.376	17.9	720.0	10.5	12.60	3.6	3.45	3.2	247.9	2.6		
52	59.2	2.0	0.86	3.5	0.301	13.8	153.2	3.7	9.15	2.5	2.07	1.9	214.0	2.1	GE18	1969
60	53.1	1.8	0.80	3.1	0.155	6.8	142.6	3.3	10.05	2.7	2.09	1.8	187.2	1.8		
68	39.3	1.3	0.59	2.3	0.101	4.5	78.1	1.8	10.32	2.8	1.67	1.5	143.7	1.4	GE17	1963
76	30.7	1.4	0.52	2.7	0.071	4.2	55.1	1.7	4.84	1.7	1.33	1.6	123.8	1.6	GE16	1958
88	34.9	1.4	0.72	3.4	0.069	3.8	68.5	1.9	6.97	2.3	1.54	1.7	147.5	1.8		
96	47.0	1.5	0.67	2.5	0.075	3.2	74.7	1.6	6.69	1.7	1.76	1.5	155.4	1.4	GE15	1951?
108	38.4	1.5	0.58	2.8	0.044	2.4	65.3	1.8	5.91	1.9	1.46	1.5	124.8	1.5	GE14	1943?
116	38.4	1.3	0.53	2.2	0.058	2.7	73.5	1.8	6.35	1.8	1.60	1.5	118.8	1.2	GE13	1933?
124	31.9	1.2	0.44	2.0	0.043	2.2	66.7	1.8	4.03	1.3	1.15	1.2	98.2	1.1	GE12	1915?
132	43.5	1.3	0.56	2.0	0.036	1.5	91.8	2.0	5.32	1.3	1.46	1.2	137.5	1.2		
136	37.2	1.5	0.45	2.1	0.028	1.5	66.3	1.8	5.99	1.9	1.24	1.3	109.5	1.3	GE11	1907?
140	34.3	1.4	0.28	1.3	0.039	2.0	55.0	1.5	4.37	1.4	1.10	1.1	94.5	1.1	GE10	1900?
148	27.6	1.1	0.26	1.2	0.025	1.3	39.3	1.1	3.46	1.1	0.99	1.0	83.8	0.9		
160	30.4	1.0	0.23	0.9	0.025	1.2	38.3	0.9	3.68	1.0	1.07	1.0	85.8	0.9	GE9	1890?
172	31.5	0.9	0.31	1.1	0.035	1.4	44.7	0.9	4.68	1.1	1.19	0.9	103.3	0.9	GE8	n.d.
180	31.8	1.0	0.40	1.4	0.047	1.9	46.9	1.0	4.22	1.0	1.15	0.9	114.7	1.0		
188	35.5	1.0	0.33	1.1	0.048	1.8	57.3	1.1	5.96	1.4	1.77	1.3	139.6	1.1	GE7	n.d.
192	37.8	1.1	0.33	1.1	0.043	1.6	58.1	1.1	5.97	1.4	1.73	1.3	131.7	1.1		
200	29.0	1.1	0.35	1.5	0.021	1.0	40.3	1.0	7.16	2.1	1.02	1.0	102.3	1.1		
208	36.7	1.0	0.27	0.9	0.034	1.3	49.5	1.0	4.27	1.0	1.30	1.0	114.8	1.0		
228	32.7	1.0	0.28	1.0	0.024	1.0	44.3	1.0	3.99	1.0	1.18	1.0	110.2	1.0	GE6	n.d.
236	32.0	1.0	0.25	0.9	0.023	1.0	41.8	0.9	4.22	1.1	1.12	0.9	104.6	0.9	GE5	n.d.
252	22.5	0.9	0.24	1.1	0.019	1.0	40.6	1.1	2.75	0.9	1.08	1.1	93.5	1.1	GE4	n.d.
260	29.4	1.1	0.30	1.3	0.034	1.7	41.7	1.1	3.87	1.1	1.15	1.1	98.9	1.1	GE3	n.d.
272	33.8	1.1	0.25	0.9	0.017	0.7	45.0	1.0	3.97	1.0	1.13	1.0	102.2	1.0	GE2	n.d.
280	28.9	1.0	0.20	0.8	0.018	0.8	41.0	1.0	3.32	0.9	1.12	1.0	92.2	1.0	GE1	n.d.
304	25.2	0.9	0.24	1.0	0.018	0.9	38.9	0.9	3.30	0.9	1.01	0.9	100.1	1.0		

<sup>a</sup>mesured from the top of the terrace

n.d. not determined

under         prod.*         FF	Station	As	5	C	d	H	5	Pł	)	Sb	)	Т	1	Zı	1	Hydrological	Sompling data	Divor
I         27.         10         0.54         1.4         0.09         0.4         0.4         0.72         0.7         0.6         0.60         0.60         12.2         14.6         10.6         10.8         11.2	number	μg.g <sup>-1</sup>	EF	μg.g <sup>-1</sup>	EF	μg.g <sup>-1</sup>	EF	μg.g <sup>-1</sup>	EF	μg.g <sup>-1</sup>	EF	μg.g <sup>-1</sup>	EF	μg.g <sup>-1</sup>	EF	conditions	Samping uate	Kivei
2         24.6         0.8         0.85         2.8         n.4         n.4         1.5         1.9         1.9         1.0         Mode March 10, 2011           24.8         0.8         0.27         0.6         0.20         0.6         1.0         1.0         1.0         Mode March 10, 2011           24.8         0.0         0.03         1.1         1.4         1.0         1.0         1.0         1.0         Mode March 10, 2011           24.8         0.0         0.03         1.3         n.d.         1.4         1.0         1.0         Mode March 10, 2011           21.8         0.0         0.04         1.3         n.d.         n.d.         1.1         1.0         1.0         1.0         Mode March 10, 2011           21.8         0.0         0.04         1.5         1.1         1.0         2.1         1.0         Mode March 10, 2011           21.8         1.1         1.0         7.2         1.4         1.4         1.0         1.0         1.0         1.0         1.0         1.0         1.0         1.0         1.0         1.0         1.0         1.0         1.0         1.0         1.0         1.0         1.0         1.0         1.0	1	27.5	1.0	0.34	1.4	0.009	0.4	40.1	1.0	5.58	1.6	0.72	0.7	153.5	1.6	Low flow	December 6-7, 2012	
3         56.0         0.8         0.97         1.4         a.4         4.51         0.2         2.5         0.87         0.66         1.24         1.36         1.08         1.16 <td>2</td> <td>24.6</td> <td>0.9</td> <td>0.63</td> <td>2.8</td> <td>n.d.</td> <td>n.d.</td> <td>48.3</td> <td>1.3</td> <td>19.97</td> <td>6.1</td> <td>0.62</td> <td>0.6</td> <td>172.9</td> <td>1.9</td> <td>High flow</td> <td>March 17, 2011</td> <td></td>	2	24.6	0.9	0.63	2.8	n.d.	n.d.	48.3	1.3	19.97	6.1	0.62	0.6	172.9	1.9	High flow	March 17, 2011	
24.8         0.6         0.39         0.80         0.11         0.57         0.57         0.67         0.68         12.1         1.11         Low How         Nearther 2, 2011           4         20.5         0.7         0.24         1.3         0.04         0.	3	26.0	0.8	0.37	1.4	n.d.	n.d.	45.1	1.0	51.72	13.4	0.72	0.6	142.6	1.3	Low flow	March 10, 2011	
21.9         0.7         0.33         1.3         0.01         0.5         41.0         1.0         2722         7.4         0.67         0.67         0.16         1.10         1.10         1.10         1.10         1.10         1.10         1.10         1.10         1.10         1.10         1.10         1.11         1.13         1.11		24.8	0.6	0.29	0.8	0.033	1.1	54.7	0.9	29.42	5.7	0.97	0.6	152.4	1.1	High flow	November 7, 2011	
4         20.5         0.8         0.2         1.3         d.d.         A.d.         20.6         0.7         0.8         1.2         0.4         0.0         1.0 </td <td></td> <td>21.9</td> <td>0.7</td> <td>0.33</td> <td>1.3</td> <td>0.011</td> <td>0.5</td> <td>41.0</td> <td>1.0</td> <td>27.22</td> <td>7.4</td> <td>0.67</td> <td>0.6</td> <td>127.1</td> <td>1.3</td> <td>Low flow</td> <td>December 6-7, 2012</td> <td></td>		21.9	0.7	0.33	1.3	0.011	0.5	41.0	1.0	27.22	7.4	0.67	0.6	127.1	1.3	Low flow	December 6-7, 2012	
5         20.6         0.7         21.2         1.4         0.4         3.6         0.00         0.7         82.2         0.9         1.00         Markhove	4	20.5	0.8	0.26	1.3	n.d.	n.d.	26.0	0.7	19.41	6.4	0.64	0.7	82.5	1.0	Low flow	March 10, 2011	
12.8         0.9         0.20         0.9         0.93         2.5         5.1         1.4         1.2         2.5         1.1         1.4         1.2         2.5         1.1         1.4         1.2         1.5         1.5         1.5         0.5         1.5         0.5         1.5         0.5         0.5         0.5         0.5         0.5         0.5         0.5         0.5         0.5         0.5         0.5         0.5         0.5         0.5         0.5         0.5         0.5         0.5         0.5         1.5         1.5         1.6         1.55         0.5         0.5         0.5         0.5         1.5         1.5         1.5         0.5         0.5         0.5         0.5         0.5         1.5         0.5         1.5         0.5         1.5         0.5         1.5         0.	5	20.6	0.7	0.28	1.2	n.d.	n.d.	36.0	0.9	7.85	2.3	0.70	0.7	82.2	0.9	Low flow	March 10, 2011	
42.3         1.6         0.22         1.1.6         7.62         2.0.         19.68         6.1         0.84         0.80         10.90         1.0         10.0         Pacempter 6-7, 2012         Gardon GAk           7         34.9         1.5         1.33         5.7         a.d.         0.4         7.81         2.7         1.84         1.6         2.23.0         4.1         High three         Numerhar 7, 2011           9         31.8         2.2         0.24         6.8         a.1         1.6         5.3         1.1         1.65         1.8         2.5         3.4         Low three         Numerhar 7, 2011           10         33.5         2.2         3.11         2.35         0.44         0.01         3.4         8.25         2.4         1.00         1.6         1.4         2.35.4         4.4         1.00         Numerhar 6, 2.012           11         1.33         1.8         0.35         1.4         0.010         3.5         1.2         1.00         Numerhar 6, 2.012           12         1.6         0.7         0.30         3.2         2.70         7.2         1.1         0.61         0.7         Numerhar 6, 2.012         1.00         1.00		21.8	0.9	0.20	0.9	0.048	2.5	51.1	1.4	12.38	3.9	0.71	0.7	85.3	1.0	High flow	November 7, 2011	
6         (7.4)         0.6         0.5         2.5         n.d.         a.d.         a.d.         8.14         4.7         100         10.5         12.8         16.6         12.8         16.7         12.8         16.7         12.8         16.7         12.8         16.7         12.8         16.7         12.8         16.6         12.8         16.7         12.8         16.7         12.8         16.7         12.8         16.7         12.8         16.7         12.8         16.7         12.8         16.7         12.8         16.7         12.8         16.7         12.8         16.7         12.8         16.7         12.8         16.7         12.8         16.7         12.8         16.7         12.8         16.7         12.8         16.7         12.8         12.7         12.7         12.8 </td <td></td> <td>42.3</td> <td>1.6</td> <td>0.28</td> <td>1.3</td> <td>0.227</td> <td>11.6</td> <td>76.2</td> <td>2.0</td> <td>19.68</td> <td>6.1</td> <td>0.84</td> <td>0.8</td> <td>105.0</td> <td>1.2</td> <td>Low flow</td> <td>December 6-7, 2012</td> <td>Gardon of Ale</td>		42.3	1.6	0.28	1.3	0.227	11.6	76.2	2.0	19.68	6.1	0.84	0.8	105.0	1.2	Low flow	December 6-7, 2012	Gardon of Ale
7         34.9         15         1.31         5.7         number 10         28         28         12         0.52         26         0.002         12         0.53         12         0.55         0.55         1.7         135         1.6         1.7         335.3         6.2         12         100         No	6	17.4	0.6	0.59	2.5	n.d.	n.d.	67.2	1.7	4.93	1.4	1.00	1.0	194.5	2.1	High flow	March 17, 2011	
8         203         12         205         26         807         1.7         8.18         2.7         1.73         8.16         1.92         2.3         High free         November 7. 2011           24.2         1.1         1.02         5.3         0.112         6.6         5.43         1.7         10.10         3.6         1.56         1.8         2.53.4         1.4         Low free         December 67, 2012           10         3.5.5         2.4         0.012         1.0         3.44         1.5         4.52         2.1         0.70         1.1         167.6         0.0         Low flow         Octuber 10, 2011           143         2.4         0.47         6.6         10.2         2.1         1.09         5.2         1.2         1.09         0.00         1.1         167.6         1.0         Low flow         Octuber 67, 2012           13         2.6.5         1.2         0.10         0.005         0.2         3.4         1.2         0.48         1.0         6.7.1         1.1         Low flow         Octuber 67, 2012           14         2.06         1.3         0.12         1.0         0.5         3.11         0.24         1.0         1.0	7	34.9	1.5	1.13	5.7	n.d.	n.d.	83.1	2.5	13.48	4.7	1.38	1.6	323.0	4.1	High flow	November 16, 2010	
9         51.8         3.3         0.92         6.8         nd         nds         9.8         7.3         14.90         7.5         10.06         1.7         338.3         6.25         3.4         Tare Daw         March 10, 2011           10         33.5         2.2         3.11         23.7         0.03         5.0         5.4.3         2.4         8.92         4.6         0.81         1.4         23.5         3.4         Law Daw         December 67, 2012           11         13.3         0.8         0.67         4.6         0.84         6.6         1.6         4.5         4.2         1.9         5.7         1.3         1.0         2.84.3         9.41         1.0         Law Taw         December 67, 2012           12         1.64         0.6         0.6         0.6         0.6         9.9         1.1         Law Taw         December 67, 2012           13         1.2         1.0         0.000         0.2         3.7         0.8         8.8         0.9         7.1         1.0         December 67, 2012           14         2.0         1.0         0.3         1.1         0.0         0.6         0.6         9.9         1.1         Law Taw Taw	8	29.8	1.2	0.55	2.6	0.092	5.0	58.7	17	8 1 5	2.7	1 53	1.6	192.6	2.3	High flow	November 7 2011	
2         2         1	9	51.8	3.2	0.92	2.0 6.8	n d	n d	168.3	73	14 90	75	1.06	1.0	338.3	<u> </u>	L ow flow	March 10, 2011	
10         13         22         13         14         14         15         14         14         15         14         15         14         15         15         15         16         16         16         16         15         16         16         16         16         16         16         16         16         16         16         16         17         16         16         16         16         17         16         16         16         16         17         16         16         16         16         16         17         16         16         16         16         17         16<		24.2	1.1	1.02	53	0.112	6.6	54.3	17	10.10	3.6	1.00	1.7	265.2	0.2 3 /	Low flow	December 6 7, 2012	
11       133       2.8       10.1       2.1.5       2.5.2       2.1.0       1.1       1.2.07       2.3.4       1.000 from the construction of the consthe construction of the consthe construction of the con	10	24.2	1.1 2.2	1.02	3.3 73 7	0.112	5.0	54.5	1.7	8.02	5.0 4.6	0.81	1.0	205.2	J.4 4 4	Low flow	December 6-7, 2012	
1         1.1.5         0.3.6         0.3.7         1.5.7         1.2.5         2.1         0.0.7         1.1         1.1.6         1.0.8         0.00         Dotation         Dotation <thdotation< th=""></thdotation<>	10	12.2	0.8	0.55	23.7	0.038	1.0	24.5	2.4	0.92 4 25	4.0	0.81	1.4	255.4	4.4	Low flow	October 10, 2011	
403         2.4         0.00         4.6         0.00.4         0.05         0.02         2.4         1.05         1.2         1.05         0.44         1.0         Low flow         December 67, 2012           13         26.6         1.2         0.16         0.7         83.3         1.1         Low flow         December 67, 2011           29.4         1.3         0.25         1.1         0.00         0.5         3.1.1         Low flow         December 67, 2011           29.4         1.3         0.25         1.1         0.05         0.4         8.6         8.2         1.1         Low flow         December 67, 2012           14         20.6         1.3         1.2         0.47         0.8         6.2         3.1         Low flow         December 67, 2012           15         57.5         1.9         0.31         1.2         0.47         0.3         0.87         1.0         Low flow         December 67, 2012           16         27.0         1.0         0.23         3.5         1.0         1.1         3.4         0.5         1.1         3.4         0.5         1.0         Low flow         December 67, 2012           17         7.1         0.6	11	15.5	0.8	0.55	4.0	0.012	1.0	54.4 102.2	1.5	4.23	2.1 5.7	0.70	1.1	107.0	5.0	Low flow	October 10, $2011$	
$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	10	40.5	2.4	0.67	4.6	0.084	0.0	102.2	4.2	11.99	5.7	1.25	1.9	284.2	4.9	Low flow	December 6-7, 2012	
15       26.5       1.2       0.19       1.01       0.08       0.2       2.87       1.1       0.01       0.7       83.4       1.1       Low flow       Centher 10, 2011         29.4       1.3       0.23       1.2       0.00       0.5       31.1       1.0       2.47       0.9       0.88       1.0       87.1       1.1       Low flow       December 6-7, 2012         14       20.6       1.3       0.1       2.4       0.0       0.8       0.0       1.0       0.1       Low flow       December 6-7, 2012         15       57.5       1.9       0.31       1.2       0.07       0.3       0.7       0.3       0.7       1.0       1.2       0.07       0.3       0.67       0.6       9.9       1.1       Low flow       December 6-7, 2011         16       27.0       1.0       0.23       1.1       1.34       0.51       1.7       1.3       1.3       3.67       1.0       Low flow       Octher 10, 2011         17       7.7       2.1       0.10       0.68       3.4       0.03       1.8       9.3       1.9       1.1       1.4       0.5       1.1       1.3       1.3       0.66       1.9	12	16.8	0.6	0.16	0.7	0.005	0.2	20.7	0.5	4.78	1.3	0.63	0.6	94.1	1.0	Low flow	December 6-7, 2012	
$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	13	26.5	1.2	0.19	1.0	0.005	0.3	23.0	0.7	2.87	1.1	0.61	0.7	83.3	1.1	Low flow	October 10, 2011	
$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$		31.9	1.2	0.21	1.0	0.005	0.2	28.7	0.8	2.88	0.9	0.60	0.6	99.9	1.1	High flow	November 7, 2011	
$  \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$		29.4	1.3	0.23	1.2	0.009	0.5	31.1	1.0	2.47	0.9	0.88	1.0	87.1	1.1	Low flow	December 6-7, 2012	
15       57.5       1.9       0.31       1.2       0.005       0.2       39.4       0.9       2.60       0.7       0.80       0.7       130.0       1.2       Low flow       December 67, 2012         16       27.0       1.0       0.28       1.2       0.007       0.3       24.0       0.6       11.42       3.0       0.67       0.6       9.7       1.0       Law flow       December 67, 2012         17       47.7       2.1       0.006       0.3       3.0       1.1       1.3       0.53       1.3       1.3       9.67       1.0       Low flow       Ocember 67, 2012         20       46.4       2.0       0.68       3.4       0.031       1.8       99.3       2.9       3.04       1.0       2.17       7.1       0.8       Low flow       December 67, 2012       2.1       2.3       1.5       0.27       1.6       Low flow       December 67, 2012       2.1       2.3       1.6       Low flow       December 67, 2012       2.1       2.3       1.6       Low flow       December 67, 2012       2.1       2.4       2.5       1.7       0.03       1.3       1.1       1.0       1.1       1.0       1.1       1.0       1.0	14	20.6	1.3	0.15	1.1	0.005	0.4	18.6	0.8	2.31	1.2	0.47	0.8	62.3	1.2	Low flow	December 6-7, 2012	
16         27.0         1.0         0.28         1.2         0.013         0.6         59.2         1.5         0.97         0.3         0.87         0.97         1.2         1.4         1.42         3.0         0.67         0.6         98.7         1.0         Low flow         December 67, 2011           17         47.7         2.1         0.11         0.6         0.008         0.4         31.1         0.77         0.5         31.3         3.96.7         1.0         Low flow         October 10, 2011           20         46.4         2.0         0.68         3.4         0.033         1.4         2.9         3.04         1.0         2.11         2.3         21.3         2.6         1.4         1.2         1.5         1.6         1.2         1.5         1.6         1.0         0.5         1.7.4         1.7         7.10         0.8         Low flow         October 10, 2011         1.5         1.4         2.2         2.4         1.0         0.4         1.0         1.1         1.5         1.6         Low flow         October 10, 2011         4.5         3.0         3.0         1.3         0.3         1.3         0.6         1.5         1.6         Low flow         October 1	15	57.5	1.9	0.31	1.2	0.005	0.2	39.4	0.9	2.60	0.7	0.80	0.7	130.0	1.2	Low flow	December 6-7, 2012	
19.3       0.6       0.19       0.7       0.007       0.3       24.0       0.6       11.43       0.5       11.7       1.3       58.4       0.7       Low flow       October 10, 2011       Gardon of Andt         18       30.3       1.1       0.23       1.0       0.008       0.4       39.1       1.0       1.77       1.3       58.4       0.7       Low flow       October 10, 2011       Gardon of Andt         19       29.7       1.1       0.11       0.5       0.011       0.6       55.3       1.5       1.70       0.5       1.33       10.6       1.8       Low flow       October 10, 2011       Gardon of Andt         20       46.4       2.0       0.68       3.4       0.033       1.8       1.2       2.3       13.7       2.6       Low flow       December 6.7, 2012       Corestrop 7.011       Gardon of Andt         21       25.3       1.5       0.27       1.4       0.053       1.5       9.04       3.6       2.2       2.66       1.0       1.41       1.2       15.5       2.0       Infigh flow       November 7, 2011       Gardon Gardon River do         22       3.5       1.2       0.34       1.8       0.063       5.1 </td <td>16</td> <td>27.0</td> <td>1.0</td> <td>0.28</td> <td>1.2</td> <td>0.013</td> <td>0.6</td> <td>59.2</td> <td>1.5</td> <td>0.97</td> <td>0.3</td> <td>0.87</td> <td>0.9</td> <td>121.6</td> <td>1.3</td> <td>High flow</td> <td>November 7, 2011</td> <td></td>	16	27.0	1.0	0.28	1.2	0.013	0.6	59.2	1.5	0.97	0.3	0.87	0.9	121.6	1.3	High flow	November 7, 2011	
17       47.7       2.1       0.11       0.6       0.008       0.4       39.1       1.0       1.77       0.5       1.33       1.3       96.7       1.0       Low flow       October 10, 2011       Gardon of Ande         19       29.7       1.1       0.11       0.5       0.01       0.6       55.3       1.5       1.70       0.5       1.74       1.7       71.0       0.8       Low flow       October 10, 2011         20       46.4       2.0       0.68       3.4       0.031       1.8       99.3       2.9       3.04       1.0       2.11       2.3       21.7       2.6       Low flow       October 10, 2011       7.6       1.00       1.00       1.11       1.4       1.01       1.6       Low flow       October 10, 2011       4.04       1.01       1.6       Low flow       October 10, 2011       4.04       1.01       1.1       1.11		19.3	0.6	0.19	0.7	0.007	0.3	24.0	0.6	11.42	3.0	0.67	0.6	98.7	1.0	Low flow	December 6-7, 2012	
18       30.3       1.1       0.23       1.0       0.11       0.5       0.11       0.5       1.5       1.70       0.5       1.31       1.71       0.6       Low flow       Ocaber 10, 2011       Order 0, 2010         20       46.4       2.0       0.68       3.4       0.033       1.8       99.3       2.9       3.04       1.0       2.11       2.3       213.7       2.6       Low flow       December 6-7, 2012         21       23.5       1.5       0.27       1.9       0.021       1.7       51.4       2.2       2.46       1.2       0.81       1.3       106.0       1.9       Low flow       December 6-7, 2012         22       35.2       1.7       0.39       2.3       0.044       2.9       6.8       4.4       1.00       1.2       1.55.6       2.0       High flow       November 7, 2011         45.8       2.0       0.34       1.8       0.03       2.1       6.5       9.4       4.6       2.3       1.3       1.8       1.01       1.2       1.4       1.5       1.2       1.4       1.5       1.2       1.4       1.5       1.2       1.4       1.5       1.2       1.4       1.5       1.2	17	47.7	2.1	0.11	0.6	0.005	0.3	35.0	1.1	1.34	0.5	1.17	1.3	58.4	0.7	Low flow	October 10, 2011	Condon of And
19       29.7       1.1       0.11       0.5       0.011       0.6       55.3       1.5       1.70       0.5       1.74       1.7       71.0       0.88       Low flow       Occoder 10, 2011         20       46.4       2.0       0.68       3.4       0.033       1.8       99.3       2.9       3.04       1.0       2.11       2.3       21.7       2.6       Low flow       December 6-7, 2012         21       35.2       1.7       0.39       2.3       0.044       2.9       68.9       2.4       2.09       0.8       1.05       1.4       109.1       1.6       Low flow       December 6-7, 2012         23       58.0       3.3       0.020       1.3       0.086       2.1       64.4       98       1.3       116.1       1.2       15.5       Low flow       December 6-7, 2012         23       58.0       3.3       0.021       1.3       0.66       1.9       1.2       1.15       1.2       Low flow       December 6-7, 2012         24       52.2       2.3       0.027       1.4       0.024       1.2       87.4       2.0       Low flow       December 6-7, 2012       Gardon River decclll       Min       Min       <	18	30.3	1.1	0.23	1.0	0.008	0.4	39.1	1.0	1.77	0.5	1.33	1.3	96.7	1.0	Low flow	October 10, 2011	Gardon of And
20         46.4         2.0         0.88         3.4         0.03         1.8         99.3         2.9         3.04         1.0         2.11         2.3         21.3         2.6         Low flow         December 6-7, 2012           21         25.3         1.5         0.27         1.9         0.021         1.7         51.4         2.2         2.46         1.2         0.85         1.3         106.0         1.9         Low flow         December 6-7, 2012           68.2         3.1         0.45         2.4         0.055         3.3         266.6         8.4         4.98         1.8         1.01         1.2         155.6         2.0         High flow         November 7, 2012           23         58.0         3.3         0.20         1.3         0.087         6.5         9.04         3.6         2.32         1.1         0.89         1.3         118.6         1.9         Low flow         December 6-7, 2012           24         52.9         2.3         0.23         1.2         1.4         1.2         3.7         1.5         1.14         1.5         1.2         1.6         1.00         December 6-7, 2012           24         52.9         2.3         0.21	19	29.7	1.1	0.11	0.5	0.011	0.6	55.3	1.5	1.70	0.5	1.74	1.7	71.0	0.8	Low flow	October 10, 2011	
21       25.3       1.5       0.27       1.9       0.021       1.7       51.4       2.2       2.46       1.2       0.83       1.3       106.0       1.9       Low flow       December 6-7, 2012         22       35.2       1.7       0.39       2.3       0.044       2.9       88       2.0       1.55       2.0       High how       November 7, 2011         45.8       2.0       0.44       1.8       0.036       2.1       65.4       2.0       2.66       8.4       4.88       1.01       1.2       115.1       1.5       Low flow       December 6-7, 2012         23       58.0       3.3       0.20       1.3       0.087       6.5       90.4       3.6       2.32       1.1       0.89       1.3       118.6       1.9       Low flow       December 6-7, 2012         24       52.9       2.3       0.27       1.4       0.024       1.4       120.4       3.7       3.76       1.3       1.23       1.4       147.9       1.7       High flow       November 7, 2011       Gardon River do         24       5.2       0.33       2.1       11.44       3.8       5.10       2.0       1.4       157.8       2.5       L	20	46.4	2.0	0.68	3.4	0.033	1.8	99.3	2.9	3.04	1.0	2.11	2.3	213.7	2.6	Low flow	December 6-7, 2012	
22         35.2         1.7         0.39         2.3         0.044         2.9         68.9         2.4         2.09         0.8         1.05         1.4         109.1         1.6         Low flow         October 10.2011           68.2         3.1         0.45         2.4         0.035         3.3         266.6         8.4         4.98         1.8         1.01         1.2         155.6         2.0         High flow         November 7, 2011           23         58.0         3.3         0.20         1.3         0.087         6.5         90.4         3.6         2.32         1.1         0.89         1.3         118.6         1.9         Low flow         October 10, 2011           45.5         2.3         0.27         1.4         0.024         1.2         87.6         1.3         1.23         1.4         159.7         2.0         Low flow         October 10, 2011         Gardon Aiver do           44.6         2.2         0.70         4.0         0.053         3.5         106.2         3.7         842.15         High flow         November 7, 2011         River do           51.1         44.6         2.2         0.70         4.0         0.053         3.5         106.2 <td>21</td> <td>25.3</td> <td>1.5</td> <td>0.27</td> <td>1.9</td> <td>0.021</td> <td>1.7</td> <td>51.4</td> <td>2.2</td> <td>2.46</td> <td>1.2</td> <td>0.83</td> <td>1.3</td> <td>106.0</td> <td>1.9</td> <td>Low flow</td> <td>December 6-7, 2012</td> <td></td>	21	25.3	1.5	0.27	1.9	0.021	1.7	51.4	2.2	2.46	1.2	0.83	1.3	106.0	1.9	Low flow	December 6-7, 2012	
68.2         3.1         0.45         2.4         0.055         3.3         266.6         8.4         4.98         1.8         1.01         1.2         155.6         2.0         High flow         November 7, 2011           23         58.0         3.3         0.02         1.3         0.087         6.5         90.4         3.6         2.2         1.1         0.89         1.3         118.6         1.9         Low flow         December 6-7, 2012           24         52.9         2.3         0.27         1.4         0.024         1.4         120.4         3.73         1.5         1.14         1.5         1.22         1.4         159.7         2.0         Dow flow         October 10, 2011         Gardon River dc           41.6         2.2         0.70         4.0         0.053         3.5         106.2         3.6         3.69         1.4         1.62         2.1         178.3         2.5         Low flow         December 6-7, 2012         Gardon River dc           25         43.9         2.1         0.45         2.5         0.033         3.5         106.2         3.6         0.62.15         Hift         1.51.3         2.1         High flow         November 7, 2011         Riadon of Adu	22	35.2	1.7	0.39	2.3	0.044	2.9	68.9	2.4	2.09	0.8	1.05	1.4	109.1	1.6	Low flow	October 10, 2011	
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		68.2	3.1	0.45	2.4	0.055	3.3	266.6	8.4	4.98	1.8	1.01	1.2	155.6	2.0	High flow	November 7. 2011	
23         58.0         3.3         0.021         1.3         0.087         6.5         90.4         3.6         2.32         1.1         0.89         1.3         118.6         1.9         Low flow         October 0, 2011           45.5         2.3         0.32         1.4         0.023         1.5         91.7         3.2         3.73         1.5         1.14         1.5         1.2         1.0         0.02         0.01         December 6-7, 2012           24         52.9         2.3         0.024         1.2         87.4         2.4         1.94         0.6         1.10         1.1         147.9         1.7         High flow         November 7, 2011         from the conflue           44.6         2.2         0.70         4.0         0.053         3.5         106.2         3.6         3.69         1.4         1.62         2.1         17.8         2.5         Low flow         November 7, 2011         from the conflue           44.6         2.2         0.70         1.4         0.83         1.5         Low flow         November 7, 2011         from the conflue           47.1         1.3         0.46         1.2         1.78         1.5         Low flow         November 7, 20		45.8	2.0	0.34	1.8	0.036	2.1	65.4	2.0	2.69	1.0	1.04	1.2	115.1	15	Low flow	December 6-7 2012	
24         36.3         1.3 <th1.3< th=""> <th1.3< th=""> <th1.3< th=""></th1.3<></th1.3<></th1.3<>	23	58.0	33	0.20	13	0.087	6.5	90.4	3.6	2 32	11	0.89	13	118.6	19	Low flow	October 10, 2011	
24         52.9         2.3         0.0.2         1.4         0.0.2         1.12         1.13         1.14         1.15         1.13         1.13         1.14         1.15         1.13         1.14         1.15         1	23	15 5	23	0.20	23	0.007	1.5	91. <del>7</del>	3.0	3 73	1.1	1.14	1.5	132.6	1.9	Low flow	December $6_{-7}$ 2012	
bit         bit <td>24</td> <td>52.9</td> <td>2.3</td> <td>0.37</td> <td>1.3</td> <td>0.023</td> <td>1.5</td> <td>120.4</td> <td>3.7</td> <td>3.75</td> <td>1.3</td> <td>1.14</td> <td>1.5</td> <td>152.0</td> <td>2.0</td> <td>Low flow</td> <td>October 10, 2011</td> <td>Gardon River do</td>	24	52.9	2.3	0.37	1.3	0.023	1.5	120.4	3.7	3.75	1.3	1.14	1.5	152.0	2.0	Low flow	October 10, 2011	Gardon River do
44.6       2.2       0.70       4.0       0.052       1.2       0.74       1.2       0.74       1.74       1.77       1.7	2-7	31.5	1.2	0.27	1.4	0.024	1.4	87 A	2.4	1.94	0.6	1.23	1.4	177 9	2.0	High flow	November 7, 2011	from the conflue
$\begin{array}{c} 14.6 & 2.2 & 0.70 & 4.0 & 0.053 & 2.1 & 104.2 & 3.0 & 5.3 & 100.2 & 3.0 & 5.3 & 100.2 & 3.0 & 5.3 & 100.2 & 3.0 & 5.3 & 100.2 & 3.0 & 5.3 & 100.2 & 3.0 & 5.3 & 100.2 & 5.1 & 100.1 & 100 & 100 & December 6-7, 2012 & 0.100 & 0.100 & 0.$		11.5	1.2	0.30	1.7	0.024	1.2	106.2	2.4	2.60	0.0	1.10	1.1	147.9	1.7	I ou flou	November $7, 2011$	Gardon of Anduz
AFI       1461.0       484       0.30       1.10       1.14       1.80       1.140       1.7       151.3       2.1       Figuration       November 67, 2012         AF2       155.3       3.8       0.61       1.7       n.d.       n.d.       312.1       5.3       132.50       25.8       1.01       0.6       198.4       1.4       High flow       March 17, 2011         AF2       155.3       3.8       0.61       1.7       n.d.       n.d.       312.1       5.3       132.50       25.8       1.01       0.6       198.4       1.4       High flow       March 17, 2011         AF3       6.5       0.4       0.16       1.0       n.d.       n.d.       12.7       0.5       1.02       0.5       0.38       0.6       65.0       1.1       High flow       November 16, 2010         25.2       1.0       0.16       0.8       0.014       0.8       29.7       0.8       4.22       1.4       0.60       6       9.6       1.2       Low flow       December 67, 2012       Gardon of Ale         240.6       26.0       6.88       83.5       0.143       20.6       23.8       33.3       0.90       1.8       85.5       1.9 </td <td>25</td> <td>44.0</td> <td>2.2</td> <td>0.70</td> <td>4.0</td> <td>0.033</td> <td>2.5</td> <td>114.4</td> <td>2.0</td> <td>5.09</td> <td>1.4</td> <td>1.02</td> <td>2.1</td> <td>170.3</td> <td>2.5</td> <td>Low now</td> <td>Nevember 7, 2012</td> <td>Pivers</td>	25	44.0	2.2	0.70	4.0	0.033	2.5	114.4	2.0	5.09	1.4	1.02	2.1	170.3	2.5	Low now	Nevember 7, 2012	Pivers
AF1       1461.0       48.4       0.30       1.2       0.120       5.3       160.6       5.7       132.50       25.8       1.01       0.6       198.4       1.4       High flow       March 17, 2011         47.7       1.3       0.46       1.5       0.099       0.3       124.0       2.4       133.99       30.5       0.93       0.7       167.5       1.4       Low flow       December 6-7, 2012         AF3       6.5       0.4       0.16       1.0       n.d.       n.d.       12.7       0.5       1.02       0.5       0.38       0.6       65.0       1.1       High flow       November 16, 2010         25.2       1.0       0.16       0.8       0.014       0.8       29.7       0.8       4.22       1.4       0.60       0.6       99.6       1.2       Low flow       December 6-7, 2012         AF4       278.2       29.3       5.06       62.5       n.d.       n.d.       315.8       23.2       31.49       26.6       8.25       22.8       1197.0       36.7       High flow       November 6-7, 2012       Tributari         AF5       34.4       2.7       0.31       2.8       0.39       4.5       6.27       4	<u> </u>	43.9	2.1	0.45	2.5	0.033	2.1	114.4	3.8	5.10	<u>ــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــ</u>	1.40	1./	151.5	2.1	High flow	November 7, 2011	Kiveis
AF2       153.3       5.8       0.01       1.7       1.0.       0.12       1.5.3       0.2.5       1.01       0.5       198.4       1.4       High flow       March 17, 201         47.7       1.3       0.46       1.5       0.009       0.3       124.0       2.4       133.99       30.5       0.93       0.7       167.5       1.4       Low flow       December 6-7, 2012         AF3       6.5       0.4       0.16       1.0       n.d.       n.d.       12.7       0.5       1.02       0.5       0.38       0.6       65.0       1.1       High flow       November 16, 2010         25.2       1.0       0.16       0.8       0.014       0.8       29.7       0.8       4.22       1.4       0.60       0.6       99.6       1.2       Low flow       December 6-7, 2012         AF4       278.2       29.3       5.06       62.5       n.d.       n.d.       315.8       33.7       29.4       7.05       20.0       855.0       26.9       Low flow       December 6-7, 2012         AF5       34.4       2.7       0.31       2.8       0.39       4.5       6.27       4.7       7.33       17.8       354.5       9.5		1401.0	40.4	0.50	1.2	0.120	J.J	212.1	5.1	122.50	##### <b>75</b> 9	1.30	1.4	137.8	1.3	LOW HOW	Marsh 17, 2011	
AF3       6.5       0.46       1.5       0.09       0.5       124.0       2.4       135.99       30.5       0.7       167.5       1.4       Low flow       December 6-7, 2012         AF3       6.5       0.4       0.16       1.0       n.d.       n.d.       12.7       0.5       1.02       0.5       0.38       0.6       65.0       1.1       High flow       November 16, 2010         25.2       1.0       0.16       0.8       0.014       0.8       23.2       31.49       26.6       8.25       22.8       1197.0       36.7       High flow       November 16, 2010         240.6       26.0       6.58       83.5       0.143       20.6       238.0       17.9       33.79       29.4       7.05       20.0       855.0       26.9       Low flow       December 6-7, 2012       Tributari         AF5       34.4       2.7       0.31       2.8       0.039       4.0       69.8       3.8       5.33       3.3       0.90       1.8       85.5       1.9       Low flow       December 6-7, 2012         AF5       34.4       2.7       0.31       2.8       0.034       4.5       6.27       4.7       7.33       17.8       3	ΑΓ2	155.5	5.8 1.2	0.01	1./	n.a.	n.a.	512.1 124.0	5.5 2.4	132.50	25.8	1.01	0.0	198.4	1.4	High flow	March 17, 2011 December $(.7, 2012)$	
AF3       6.5       0.4       0.16       1.0       n.d.       n.d.       12.7       0.5       1.02       0.5       0.38       0.6       65.0       1.1       High flow       November 16, 2010         25.2       1.0       0.16       0.8       0.014       0.8       29.7       0.8       4.22       1.4       0.60       99.6       99.6       1.2       Low flow       December 6-7, 2012       December 6-7, 2012         AF4       278.2       29.3       5.06       62.5       n.d.       n.d.       315.8       23.2       31.49       26.6       8.25       22.8       1197.0       36.7       High flow       November 16, 2010       Tributari         AF5       34.4       2.7       0.31       2.8       0.039       4.0       69.8       3.8       5.33       3.3       0.90       1.8       85.5       1.9       Low flow       December 6-7, 2012         AF6       50.1       6.6       1.21       18.9       n.d.       n.d.       7.0       7.97       10.1       4.91       20.4       28.0       13.3       Low flow       December 6-7, 2012         AF6       50.1       6.6       1.21       1.8       6.27       4.7		4/./	1.3	0.46	1.5	0.009	0.3	124.0	2.4	133.99	30.5	0.93	0.7	167.5	1.4	Low flow	December 6-7, 2012	
AF4       25.2       1.0       0.16       0.8       0.014       0.8       29.7       0.8       4.22       1.4       0.60       0.6       99.6       1.2       Low flow       December 6-7, 2012         AF4       278.2       29.3       5.06       62.5       n.d.       n.d.       315.8       23.2       31.49       26.6       8.25       22.8       1197.0       36.7       High flow       November 16, 2010       December 6-7, 2012         AF5       34.4       2.7       0.31       2.8       0.039       4.0       69.8       3.8       5.33       3.3       0.90       1.8       85.5       1.9       Low flow       December 6-7, 2012         AF6       50.1       6.6       1.21       18.9       n.d.       n.d.       70.8       6.5       9.01       9.6       3.89       13.5       314.0       12.1       High flow       November 16, 2010       Tibutari         45.9       4.2       1.48       16.0       0.191       23.5       69.4       4.5       6.27       4.7       7.33       17.8       354.5       9.5       High flow       November 16, 2010       Tibutari         45.7       5.4       0.2       0.08       0.3 </td <td>AF3</td> <td>6.5</td> <td>0.4</td> <td>0.16</td> <td>1.0</td> <td>n.d.</td> <td>n.d.</td> <td>12.7</td> <td>0.5</td> <td>1.02</td> <td>0.5</td> <td>0.38</td> <td>0.6</td> <td>65.0</td> <td>1.1</td> <td>High flow</td> <td>November 16, 2010</td> <td></td>	AF3	6.5	0.4	0.16	1.0	n.d.	n.d.	12.7	0.5	1.02	0.5	0.38	0.6	65.0	1.1	High flow	November 16, 2010	
AF4       278.2       29.3       5.06       62.5       n.d.       n.d.       315.8       23.2       31.49       26.6       8.25       22.8       1197.0       36.7       High flow       November 16, 2010       Tributari         AF5       34.4       2.7       0.31       2.8       0.039       4.0       69.8       3.8       5.33       3.3       0.90       1.8       85.5       1.9       Low flow       December 6-7, 2012         AF6       50.1       6.6       1.21       18.9       n.d.       n.d.       70.8       6.5       9.01       9.6       3.89       13.5       314.0       12.1       High flow       November 6-7, 2012         AF6       50.1       6.6       1.21       18.9       n.d.       n.d.       70.8       6.27       4.7       7.33       17.8       354.5       9.5       High flow       November 16, 2010       11         55.3       8.7       1.15       21.3       0.074       15.7       63.4       7.0       7.97       10.1       4.91       20.4       288.0       13.3       Low flow       December 6-7, 2012         AF7       5.4       0.2       0.08       0.3       0.013       0.6       <		25.2	1.0	0.16	0.8	0.014	0.8	29.7	0.8	4.22	1.4	0.60	0.6	99.6	1.2	Low flow	December 6-7, 2012	Gardon of Ale
240.6       26.0       6.58       83.5       0.143       20.6       238.0       17.9       33.79       29.4       7.05       20.0       855.0       26.9       Low flow       December 6-7, 2012         AF5       34.4       2.7       0.31       2.8       0.039       4.0       69.8       3.8       5.33       3.3       0.90       1.8       85.5       1.9       Low flow       December 6-7, 2012         AF6       50.1       6.6       1.21       18.9       n.d.       n.d.       70.8       6.5       9.01       9.6       3.89       13.5       314.0       12.1       High flow       November 6-7, 2012         45.9       4.2       1.48       16.0       0.191       23.5       69.4       4.5       6.27       4.7       7.33       17.8       354.5       9.5       High flow       November 7, 2011         55.3       8.7       1.15       21.3       0.074       15.7       63.4       7.0       7.97       10.1       4.91       20.4       288.0       13.3       Low flow       December 6-7, 2012         AF7       5.4       0.2       0.08       0.3       0.013       0.6       49.4       1.2       0.10       0.	AF4	278.2	29.3	5.06	62.5	n.d.	n.d.	315.8	23.2	31.49	26.6	8.25	22.8	1197.0	36.7	High flow	November 16, 2010	Tributari
AF5       34.4       2.7       0.31       2.8       0.039       4.0       69.8       3.8       5.33       3.3       0.90       1.8       85.5       1.9       Low flow       December 6-7, 2012         AF6       50.1       6.6       1.21       18.9       n.d.       n.d.       70.8       6.5       9.01       9.6       3.89       13.5       314.0       12.1       High flow       November 16, 2010         45.9       4.2       1.48       16.0       0.191       23.5       69.4       4.5       6.27       4.7       7.33       17.8       354.5       9.5       High flow       November 7, 2011         55.3       8.7       1.15       21.3       0.074       15.7       63.4       7.0       7.97       10.1       4.91       20.4       288.0       13.3       Low flow       December 6-7, 2012         AF7       5.4       0.2       0.08       0.3       0.013       0.6       49.4       1.2       0.10       0.0       1.90       1.8       69.0       0.7       Low flow       December 6-7, 2012         AF8       216.7       38.5       5.56       116.1       0.733       173.9       1295.4       160.5       39.91		240.6	26.0	6.58	83.5	0.143	20.6	238.0	17.9	33.79	29.4	7.05	20.0	855.0	26.9	Low flow	December 6-7, 2012	
AF6       50.1       6.6       1.21       18.9       n.d.       n.d.       70.8       6.5       9.01       9.6       3.89       13.5       314.0       12.1       High flow       November 16, 2010         45.9       4.2       1.48       16.0       0.191       23.5       69.4       4.5       6.27       4.7       7.33       17.8       354.5       9.5       High flow       November 7, 2011         55.3       8.7       1.15       21.3       0.074       15.7       63.4       7.0       7.97       10.1       4.91       20.4       288.0       13.3       Low flow       December 6-7, 2012         AF7       5.4       0.2       0.08       0.3       0.013       0.6       49.4       1.2       0.10       0.0       1.90       1.8       69.0       0.7       Low flow       December 6-7, 2012         AF8       216.7       38.5       5.56       116.1       0.733       173.9       1295.4       160.5       39.91       57.1       5.99       27.9       1148.1       59.5       Low flow       December 6-7, 2012         AF9       691.8       47.5       2.57       20.8       0.372       34.1       3957.7       189.5	AF5	34.4	2.7	0.31	2.8	0.039	4.0	69.8	3.8	5.33	3.3	0.90	1.8	85.5	1.9	Low flow	December 6-7, 2012	
45.9       4.2       1.48       16.0       0.191       23.5       69.4       4.5       6.27       4.7       7.33       17.8       354.5       9.5       High flow       November 7, 2011         55.3       8.7       1.15       21.3       0.074       15.7       63.4       7.0       7.97       10.1       4.91       20.4       288.0       13.3       Low flow       December 6-7, 2012         AF7       5.4       0.2       0.08       0.3       0.013       0.6       49.4       1.2       0.10       0.0       1.90       1.8       69.0       0.7       Low flow       October 10, 2011         15.9       0.7       0.14       0.7       0.009       0.5       40.3       1.2       0.86       0.3       1.68       1.9       42.7       0.5       Low flow       December 6-7, 2012         AF8       216.7       38.5       5.56       116.1       0.733       173.9       1295.4       160.5       39.91       57.1       5.99       27.9       1148.1       59.5       Low flow       December 6-7, 2012         AF9       691.8       47.5       2.57       20.8       0.372       34.1       3957.7       189.5       4.59	AF6	50.1	6.6	1.21	18.9	n.d.	n.d.	70.8	6.5	9.01	9.6	3.89	13.5	314.0	12.1	High flow	November 16, 2010	
55.3         8.7         1.15         21.3         0.074         15.7         63.4         7.0         7.97         10.1         4.91         20.4         288.0         13.3         Low flow         December 6-7, 2012           AF7         5.4         0.2         0.08         0.3         0.013         0.6         49.4         1.2         0.10         0.0         1.90         1.8         69.0         0.7         Low flow         October 10, 2011           15.9         0.7         0.14         0.7         0.009         0.5         40.3         1.2         0.86         0.3         1.68         1.9         42.7         0.5         Low flow         December 6-7, 2012           AF8         216.7         38.5         5.56         116.1         0.733         173.9         1295.4         160.5         39.91         57.1         5.99         27.9         1148.1         59.5         Low flow         December 6-7, 2012           AF9         691.8         47.5         2.57         20.8         0.372         34.1         3957.7         189.5         4.59         2.5         4.41         7.9         763.9         15.3         Low flow         December 6-7, 2012           AF9		45.9	4.2	1.48	16.0	0.191	23.5	69.4	4.5	6.27	4.7	7.33	17.8	354.5	9.5	High flow	November 7, 2011	
AF7       5.4       0.2       0.08       0.3       0.013       0.6       49.4       1.2       0.10       0.0       1.90       1.8       69.0       0.7       Low flow       October 10, 2011         15.9       0.7       0.14       0.7       0.009       0.5       40.3       1.2       0.86       0.3       1.68       1.9       42.7       0.5       Low flow       December 6-7, 2012         AF8       216.7       38.5       5.56       116.1       0.733       173.9       1295.4       160.5       39.91       57.1       5.99       27.9       1148.1       59.5       Low flow       December 6-7, 2012         AF9       691.8       47.5       2.57       20.8       0.372       34.1       3957.7       189.5       4.59       2.5       4.41       7.9       763.9       15.3       Low flow       October 10, 2011       Gardon of Andu         877.9       70.3       3.47       32.6       0.365       39.0       4475.5       249.8       30.59       19.7       4.61       9.7       926.5       21.6       High flow       November 7, 2011       Tributari         833.0       70.6       3.20       31.8       0.313       35.4		55.3	8.7	1.15	21.3	0.074	15.7	63.4	7.0	7.97	10.1	4.91	20.4	288.0	13.3	Low flow	December 6-7, 2012	
AF8       15.9       0.7       0.14       0.7       0.009       0.5       40.3       1.2       0.86       0.3       1.68       1.9       42.7       0.5       Low flow       December 6-7, 2012         AF8       216.7       38.5       5.56       116.1       0.733       173.9       1295.4       160.5       39.91       57.1       5.99       27.9       1148.1       59.5       Low flow       December 6-7, 2012         AF9       691.8       47.5       2.57       20.8       0.372       34.1       3957.7       189.5       4.59       2.5       4.41       7.9       763.9       15.3       Low flow       October 10, 2011       Gardon of Andu         877.9       70.3       3.47       32.6       0.365       39.0       4475.5       249.8       30.59       19.7       4.61       9.7       926.5       21.6       High flow       November 7, 2011       Tributari         833.0       70.6       3.20       31.8       0.313       35.4       2927.2       172.9       24.14       16.5       4.63       10.3       679.8       16.8       Low flow       December 6-7, 2012         AF10       125.4       20.2       2.83       53.7 <td< td=""><td>AF7</td><td>5.4</td><td>0.2</td><td>0.08</td><td>0.3</td><td>0.013</td><td>0.6</td><td>49.4</td><td>1.2</td><td>0.10</td><td>0.0</td><td>1.90</td><td>1.8</td><td>69.0</td><td>0.7</td><td>Low flow</td><td>October 10, 2011</td><td></td></td<>	AF7	5.4	0.2	0.08	0.3	0.013	0.6	49.4	1.2	0.10	0.0	1.90	1.8	69.0	0.7	Low flow	October 10, 2011	
AF8       216.7       38.5       5.56       116.1       0.733       173.9       1295.4       160.5       39.91       57.1       5.99       27.9       1148.1       59.5       Low flow       December 6-7, 2012         AF9       691.8       47.5       2.57       20.8       0.372       34.1       3957.7       189.5       4.59       2.5       4.41       7.9       763.9       15.3       Low flow       October 10, 2011       Gardon of Andu         877.9       70.3       3.47       32.6       0.365       39.0       4475.5       249.8       30.59       19.7       4.61       9.7       926.5       21.6       High flow       November 7, 2011       Tributari         833.0       70.6       3.20       31.8       0.313       35.4       2927.2       172.9       24.14       16.5       4.63       10.3       679.8       16.8       Low flow       December 6-7, 2012       Tributari         AF10       125.4       20.2       2.83       53.7       0.163       35.1       1021.9       115.0       14.66       19.1       5.25       22.2       576.6       27.1       High flow       November 7, 2011         70.7       7.9       2.68       35.		15.9	0.7	0.14	0.7	0.009	0.5	40.3	1.2	0.86	0.3	1.68	1.9	42.7	0.5	Low flow	December 6-7, 2012	
AF9       691.8       47.5       2.57       20.8       0.372       34.1       3957.7       189.5       4.59       2.5       4.41       7.9       763.9       15.3       Low flow       October 10, 2011       Gardon of Andu         877.9       70.3       3.47       32.6       0.365       39.0       4475.5       249.8       30.59       19.7       4.61       9.7       926.5       21.6       High flow       November 7, 2011       Tributari         833.0       70.6       3.20       31.8       0.313       35.4       2927.2       172.9       24.14       16.5       4.63       10.3       679.8       16.8       Low flow       December 6-7, 2012       Tributari         AF10       125.4       20.2       2.83       53.7       0.163       35.1       1021.9       115.0       14.66       19.1       5.25       22.2       576.6       27.1       High flow       November 7, 2011       Tributari         70.7       7.9       2.68       35.2       0.159       23.8       712.6       55.7       10.65       9.6       4.29       12.6       493.9       16.1       Low flow       December 6-7, 2012         n.d. not determined       7.9       2.68	AF8	216.7	38.5	5.56	116.1	0.733	173.9	1295.4	160.5	39.91	57.1	5.99	27.9	1148.1	59.5	Low flow	December 6-7, 2012	
877.9       70.3       3.47       32.6       0.365       39.0       4475.5       249.8       30.59       19.7       4.61       9.7       926.5       21.6       High flow       November 7, 2011       Tributari         833.0       70.6       3.20       31.8       0.313       35.4       2927.2       172.9       24.14       16.5       4.63       10.3       679.8       16.8       Low flow       December 6-7, 2012         AF10       125.4       20.2       2.83       53.7       0.163       35.1       1021.9       115.0       14.66       19.1       5.25       22.2       576.6       27.1       High flow       November 7, 2011       Tributari         70.7       7.9       2.68       35.2       0.159       23.8       712.6       55.7       10.65       9.6       4.29       12.6       493.9       16.1       Low flow       December 6-7, 2012         n.d. not determined       .d.       .d. <td>AF9</td> <td>691.8</td> <td>47.5</td> <td>2.57</td> <td>20.8</td> <td>0.372</td> <td>34.1</td> <td>3957.7</td> <td>189.5</td> <td>4.59</td> <td>2.5</td> <td>4.41</td> <td>7.9</td> <td>763.9</td> <td>15.3</td> <td>Low flow</td> <td>October 10. 2011</td> <td>Gardon of Andu</td>	AF9	691.8	47.5	2.57	20.8	0.372	34.1	3957.7	189.5	4.59	2.5	4.41	7.9	763.9	15.3	Low flow	October 10. 2011	Gardon of Andu
AF10       125.4       20.2       2.83       53.7       0.163       35.1       1021.9       115.0       14.66       19.1       5.25       22.2       576.6       27.1       High flow       December 6-7, 2012         AF10       125.4       20.2       2.83       53.7       0.163       35.1       1021.9       115.0       14.66       19.1       5.25       22.2       576.6       27.1       High flow       November 7, 2011         70.7       7.9       2.68       35.2       0.159       23.8       712.6       55.7       10.65       9.6       4.29       12.6       493.9       16.1       Low flow       December 6-7, 2012         n.d. not determined <t< td=""><td></td><td>877.9</td><td>70.3</td><td>3.47</td><td>32.6</td><td>0.365</td><td>39.0</td><td>4475.5</td><td>249.8</td><td>30.59</td><td>19.7</td><td>4.61</td><td>9.7</td><td>926.5</td><td>21.6</td><td>High flow</td><td>November 7. 2011</td><td>Tributari</td></t<>		877.9	70.3	3.47	32.6	0.365	39.0	4475.5	249.8	30.59	19.7	4.61	9.7	926.5	21.6	High flow	November 7. 2011	Tributari
AF10       125.4       20.2       2.83       53.7       0.163       35.1       1021.9       115.0       14.66       19.1       5.25       22.2       576.6       27.1       High flow       November 7, 2012         70.7       7.9       2.68       35.2       0.159       23.8       712.6       55.7       10.65       9.6       4.29       12.6       493.9       16.1       Low flow       December 6-7, 2012         n.d. not determined		833.0	70.6	3.20	31.8	0.313	35.4	2927.2	172.9	24 14	16.5	4.63	10.3	679.8	16.8	Low flow	December 6-7 2012	
70.7         7.9         2.68         35.2         0.159         23.8         712.6         55.7         10.65         9.6         4.29         12.6         493.9         16.1         Low flow         December 6-7, 2012           n.d. not determined	AF10	125.4	20.2	2.83	53.7	0.163	35.4	1021.9	115.0	14 66	19.1	5 25	22.2	576.6	27.1	High flow	November 7 2011	
n.d. not determined	· · · · · ·	70.7	20.2 7 Q	2.05	35.7	0.159	23.8	712.6	557	10.65	96	2.25 4 29	12.2	493.9	27.1 16.1	Low flow	December 6.7 2011	
	nd not deter	mined	1.)	2.00	55.4	0.137	23.0	/12.0	55.1	10.03	2.0	7.47	12.0	-773.7	10.1		December 0-7, 2012	

les River

luze River

ownstream ence of the ze and Ales

es River ries

luze River ries