You may use the information and images contained in this document for non-commercial, personal, or educational purposes only, provided that you (1) do not modify such information and (2) include proper citation. If material is used for other purposes, you must obtain written permission from the author(s) to use the copyrighted material prior to its use.

Evaluation of Microplastic Loading in Texas Diamondback Terrapin (*Malaclemys terrapin littoralis*) and their Associated Habitats

Gabrielle Hammerbach^{1,2*}, Mandi Gordon², Danielle DeChellis², Lydia Thurman^{1,2}, Cynthia Howard¹

¹University of Houston-Clear Lake, College of Science and Engineering, Houston, Texas ²University of Houston-Clear Lake, Environmental Institute of Houston, Houston, Texas *Corresponding and presenting author; hammerbach@uhcl.edu









Texas Plastic Pollution Symposium Houston, TX; April 3rd, 2025

Acknowledgements

Academic mentors Mandi Gordon and Cindy Howard

Field and lab assistants

A. Castillo, T. Goldstein, C. Gonzalez, K. Perkins, T. Pytlak, N. Reese, A. Sak, N. Santee, L. Soliz, B. Steward, E. Underwood

Other Contributors

K. Chau, S. McDaniel, M. Mokrech, J. Oakley, R. Puzdrowski, M. Rogers, D. Walker, C. Zhang

Permitting, Institutional Protocols, Access Permissions

TPWD Scientific Collection Permits SPR-0321-026; UHCL IACUC Protocol 0224.001.R0, special land access permits issued by TPWD

University of Houston Clear Lake



Environmental Institute of Houston



MATAGORDA BAY MITIGATION TRUST

Introduction

- $1-\mu m$ to 5-mm in dimension (Dong et al., 2023)
- Composed of synthetic polymers such as polyethylene (PE), polyvinyl chloride (PVC), polypropylene (PP), polystyrene (PS) (Hou and Rao, 2022)
- Classified by type (i.e., fragment, fiber, microbead, film, etc.) (Markley et al. 2024)



Microplastic Contaminant Pathway



Steps for Identifying Microplastics

- Lack of standardized protocols for extraction of microplastics from multiple media
- Extensive literature searching conducted to understand current protocols and best practices



Polymer

Identification

1. Quantify baseline microplastic loading in saltmarshes throughout Matagorda and San Antonio Bay.

- 2. Compare microplastic loading between spatially distinct sites in Matagorda and San Antonio Bay.
- 3. Compare site level microplastic loading to health factors in Texas Diamondback Terrapin.
- 4. Compare excreted microplastics in fecal samples to health factors in Texas Diamondback Terrapin.

Site Distribution



Table 1. Sources, sediment types, core sizes, and sieve sizes across a subset of microplastic literature.

		Number of		
Source	Sediment type	Core diameter	cores	Sample depth(s)
Alvarez-Zeferino et al. 2020	Beach shorelines	19-cm	10 per site	5-cm
Khan and Prezant 2018	Salt marsh (mussel bed)	7.62-cm	3 per plot	10-cm
Lloret et al. 2021	Estuarine marsh	9-cm	2 total	127.5-162.5-cm
Lourenco et al. 2017	Intertidal wetlands	3-cm square (PLOT)	1 per site	1-cm
Lo et al. 2018	Sandy beaches to mud flats (1:1)	50-cm x 50-cm PLOT	10 per transect	2-3-cm
Sartain et al. 2018	Beach shorelines	50-cm x 50-cm PLOT	Unknown	3-cm
Zhou et al. 2020	Sandy to Muddy	30-cm x 30-cm PLOT	5-7 per transect	2-cm

Sediment Sample Collection

Quadrat Distribution



Inner marsh samples (n = 3) per quadrat Shoreline samples (n = 3) per quadrat



0.5m

Sample Storage



aluminum wrapped lid

Table 2. Sources, sediment types, sieve size, density separation reagent, and digestion reagent across a subset of microplastic literature.

Source	Sediment type	Sieve Range	Density Separation Reagent	Organic Digestion Reagent
Alvarez-Zeferino et al. 2020	Beach shorelines	1.13–mm – 5-mm	CaCl ₂	HCl then 30% H ₂ O ₂
Beckwith and Fuentes 2018	Beach shorelines	63–µm – 125-µm	NaCl	None
Lloret et al. 2021	Estuarine salt marsh	$250-\mu m - 5-mm$	ZnCl ₂	Fenton's reagent
Lo et al. 2018	Sandy beaches to mud flats (1:1)	250–µm – 5-mm	ZnCl ₂	Fenton's reagent
Sartain et al. 2018	Beach shorelines	$55-\mu m - 5-mm$	NaCl	None
Vermeiren et al. 2020	Estuary (low to high)	50–µm – 0.5-mm	ZnCl ₂	30% H ₂ O ₂ ys Fenton's
Zhou et al. 2020	Sandy to Muddy	5–μm – 50 - μm	NaCl	Fenton's reagent

Laboratory Processing Flow Chart



Preliminary Results



Preliminary Results: Baseline Microplastics



Future Plans

- Objective 1: Additional sample collection and processing
- Objective 2: Comparison of microplastic loading between sites and sample types
- Objectives 3 and 4: Comparing microplastic loading at the site level and in fecal samples to health factors in Texas Diamondback Terrapin



Upcoming study in Galveston Bay funded by Galveston Bay and Estuary Program to incorporate staining techniques.

Thank you!



University of Houston Clear Lake



Funding



MATAGORDA BAY MITIGATION TRUST

Literature Cited

- Alvarez-Zeferino, J.C., S. Ojeda-Benítez, A.A. Cruz-Salas, C. Martínez-Salvador and A. Vázquez-Morillas. 2020. Microplastics in Mexican Beaches. Resources, Conservation and Recycling. 155:104633. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.resconrec.2019.104633
- Beckwith, V.K. and M.M.P.B. Fuentes. 2018. Microplastic at nesting grounds used by the northern Gulf of Mexico loggerhead recovery unit. Marine Pollution Bulletin. 131:32-27. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpolbul.2018.04.001
- Corbett, J. L., 2023. Microplastics Sources, Pathways, and Fate Conceptual Diagram. USGS. Microplastics Sources, Pathways and Fate Conceptual Diagram | U.S. Geological Survey
- Dong, X., X. Liu, Q. Hou, and Z. Wang. 2023. From natural environmental to animal tissues: A review of microplastics (nanoplastics) translocation and hazards studies. Science of the Total Environment, Science Direct. 855:158686. <u>http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2022.158686</u>
- Hou, D. and D.Q. Rao. 2022. Microplastics: Their Effects on Amphibians and Reptiles- A Review. Pakistan Journal of Zoology. 54(6):2931-2951. https://dx.doi.org/10.17582/journal.pjz/20210820080823
- Lloret, J., R. Pedrosa-Pamies, N. Vandal, R. Rorty, M. Ritchie, C. McGuire, K. Chenoweth and I. Valiela. 2021. Salt marsh sediments act as sinks for microplastics and reveal effects of current and historical land use changes. Environmental Advances. 4:100060. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envadv.2021.100060
- Lo, H.S., X. Xu, C.Y. Wong amd S.G. Cheung. 2018. Comparisons of microplastic pollution between mudflats and sandy beaches in Hong Kong. Environmental Pollution. 236:208-217. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envpol.2018.01.031
- Lourenço, P.M., C. Serra-Gonçalves, J.L. Ferreira, T. Catry and J.P. Granadeiro. 2017. Plastic and other microfibers in sediments, macroinvertebrates and shorebirds from three intertidal wetlands of southern Europe and west Africa. Environmental Pollution 123-133. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.envpol.2017.07.103
- Markley, L.A.T., C.T. Driscoll, B. Hartnett, N. Mark, A.M. Cárdenas and H. Hapich. 2024. Guide for the visual identification and classification of plastic particles. 10.13140/RG.2.2.27505.45927
- Sartain, M., C. Wessel and E. Sparks. 2018. Microplastics Sampling and Processing Guidebook. Mississippi State University, MS. extension.msstate.edu/sites/default/files/publications/publications/P3243.pdf.
- Vermeiren, P., C. Muñoz and K. Ikejima. Microplastic identification and quantification from organic rich sediments: A validated laboratory protocol. Environmental Pollution 262: 114298. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envpol.2020.114298
- Zhou, Q., C. Tu, C. Fu, Y. Li, H. Zhang, K. Xiong, X. Zhou, L. Li, J.J. Waniek and Y. Luo. 2020. Characteristics and distribution of microplastics in the coastal mangrove sediments of China. Science of the Total Environment. 703:134807. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2019.134807