

## MONITORING NITROGEN IN DRINKING WATER: GHANAIAN FARMING COMMUNITIES STUDY

<sup>1</sup>Kwaku Mensah Boateng and <sup>2</sup>Abena Osei Tutu

<sup>1</sup>Regional Programmes Division, Environmental Protection Agency, Sunyani, Ghana.

<sup>2</sup>Department of Chemistry, Kwame Nkrumah University of Science and Technology, Kumasi, Ghana.

**Abstract:** Nitrogen is a critical element in aquatic environments, existing in various forms including ammonia (NH<sub>3</sub>), nitrate (NO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup>), nitrite (NO<sub>2</sub><sup>-</sup>), and ammonium ion (NH<sub>4</sub><sup>+</sup>). Of these, ammonia is known to be the most toxic to aquatic biota such as fish and amphibians, followed by nitrite and nitrate. Nitrate, as the final oxidation product of the nitrogen cycle in natural waters, holds significance as the sole thermodynamically stable nitrogen compound in aerobic aquatic environments. This paper provides an overview of nitrogen forms in aquatic ecosystems, emphasizing their ecological implications and potential risks to aquatic life. Drawing on insights from Rouse et al. (1999), the paper elucidates the hierarchy of nitrogen toxicity to biota, with ammonia posing the greatest threat followed by nitrite and nitrate. Additionally, it discusses the role of nitrate as a stable nitrogen compound in aerobic waters, highlighting its importance in nitrogen cycling processes. Through a comprehensive examination of nitrogen dynamics in aquatic environments, this paper aims to enhance understanding of the ecological implications of nitrogen pollution and its impact on aquatic ecosystems. It underscores the importance of monitoring and managing nitrogen levels to mitigate adverse effects on aquatic biota and safeguard water quality.

**Keywords:** Nitrogen, Aquatic environment, Ammonia, Nitrate, Ecological implications.

### INTRODUCTION

Nitrogen in the aquatic environment occurs in four forms: ammonia (NH<sub>3</sub>), nitrate (NO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup>), nitrite (NO<sub>2</sub><sup>-</sup>) and ammonium ion (NH<sub>4</sub><sup>+</sup>). The most toxic nitrogen to biota such as fish and amphibians is ammonia, followed by nitrite and nitrate (Rouse et al., 1999). Nitrate is the final oxidation product of the nitrogen cycle in natural waters and is considered to be the only thermodynamically stable nitrogen compound in aerobic waters.

Following pesticides, nitrate is listed as the second greatest chemical threat to surface and groundwater in the world (Payal, 2000). Many water resources are faced with problems related to high concentrations of nitrate and nitrite. Increasing nitrate levels in water resources are a potential source of severe environmental stress to aquatic organisms, because nitrate is known to be toxic to crustaceans (Muir et al., 1990), insects (Camargo and Ward, 1992), amphibians (Baker and Waights, 1993, 1994) and fish (Tomasso and Carmichael, 1986). In humans, infants who drink water containing nitrate in excess could develop blue-baby syndrome (methemoglobinemia) (Spalding and Exner 1993; Hudak 1999; EPA 2002,). High levels of nitrate in drinking water can also cause cancer when it reacts with protein compounds in the body to form nitrosamine, a well-documented, cancercausing agent (Tricker and Preussmann, 1991). It causes algae to bloom resulting in eutrophication in surface water.

Recently concern has been raised over levels of nitrate in surface and ground water supplies. Significant sources of nitrate contamination of water include agricultural application of nitrogen based mineral fertilizers, manure and their subsequent runoff (Bogardi et al., 1991; Oldham et al., 1996). In some instances, high concentrations may be due to natural background levels or other causes such as on-site wastewater disposal systems (Jenkins

1999; Stoddard et al., 1999). With sufficient surface water infiltration, soluble nitrates can leach below the root zone to underground water (Hallberg and Keeney, 1993).

Occupying over 80% of the study area, agriculture (cocoa, maize, tobacco, tomatoes, yams and cassava) is the main economic activity in the Brong Ahafo Region of Ghana. While most farmers grow crops in the uplands, several others also grow their crops along rivers banks especially during the dry season. These streams pass through some towns and many villages. Communities along the streams use surface water mainly for domestic purposes like cooking, drinking, washing and bathing. Likewise, these water sources supply approximately 90% of the total drinking water needs.

Dry season vegetable farmers also prepare their nursery beds close to streams and use surface water for irrigation. The proximity of nurseries to streams results in clearing of stream bank vegetation to accommodate nurseries. Pollution of stream water and depletion of their resources can put the lives of many people in danger. Unfortunately, there is no information on effects of farming activities on stream water quality or of groundwater which serves as drinking water sources. Such information is vital for policy makers who should in turn give proper advice to farm owners and surrounding communities to alleviate potential health concerns. Water from these sources is not treated before it is consumed; therefore the type and levels of pollutants are unknown. The objective of this research was to assess the nitrogen pollution of the stream water whose banks are highly cultivated, in addition to boreholes within these highly cultivated areas.

## **MATERIALS AND METHODS**

### **Sampling**

Ten domestic surface water sources and five groundwater sources (four boreholes and one artesian well) were sampled. Selection of sample sites was based on their socio-economic importance as well as land use. Water samples were collected from these sites at three months intervals, from January to December 2005. A total of sixty samples were collected in the month of February (first quarter), May (second quarter), August (third quarter) and November (fourth quarter). Each sample site was visited four times.

Water samples were collected between 0900 and 1100 GMT directly into clean high-density polyethylene bottles and stored in an icebox at a temperature of about 4°C. The sample containers were earlier washed with detergent, rinsed with de-ionized water and soaked in 1.4M HNO<sub>3</sub> solution overnight. They were again rinsed with de-ionized water prior to collection. For surface water sampling, bottles and caps were rinsed three times with water to be sampled during sampling and for ground water each borehole was pumped for 3 min and each sample bottle and its cap were rinsed three times with well water during sampling. Samples were transported to the Environmental Protection Agency's laboratory in Sunyani and examined within 24 h.

### **Methodology**

Laboratory analyses were performed using procedures outlined in the Palintest Photometer Method. To a 10 ml of filtered water sample, a test tablet was added and ground. The solution was allowed to stand for the colour to develop. The test tube was then placed in photometer which has been standardized and the readings recorded. NO<sub>3</sub>-N was analyzed by hydrazine reduction and spectrophotometric determination at 520 nm; NO<sub>2</sub>-N by diazotization and spectrophotometric determination at 540 nm and NH<sub>3</sub>-N by reaction with alkaline salicylate in the presence of chlorine to form a blue-green indophenol complex and measured at 640 nm.

## **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

Nitrate (measured as NO<sub>3</sub>-N) distribution in the selected surface and ground water resources is provided in Table 1. The highest NO<sub>3</sub>-N concentration in samples from ground water was 0.48 mg/l recorded during the third quarter at K. Danso. Relatively higher concentrations were observed in samples from boreholes in agricultural areas, where potential sources of nitrate contamination are more prevalent. Borehole samples from

Atebubu and K. Danso recorded an annual mean of  $0.28 \pm 0.09$  mg/l and  $0.30 \pm 0.13$  mg/l respectively. There were significant variations in  $\text{NO}_3\text{-N}$  concentrations in groundwater throughout the period, the trend showed that higher levels were observed during the third and the fourth quarter analysis shortly after massive farming period. This may be the result of leaching from fertilizer use and human waste.

All surface water samples showed a low level of  $\text{NO}_3\text{-N}$  throughout the year when compared to limits set for drinking water standards by the WHO. The highest  $\text{NO}_3\text{-N}$  level of 2.60 mg/l was recorded from the Subin stream at Wenchi during the first quarter. This was much higher than the concentrations obtained in second and third quarter samples. This area is noted for intensive tomato farming during the dry season (December – March). Stream water is used to irrigate vegetable farms along the banks. The artesian well at Bonsu recorded the lowest  $\text{NO}_3\text{-N}$  concentration of 0.09 mg/l during the fourth quarter. An annual mean  $\text{NO}_3\text{-N}$  content of the water samples varied from  $0.16 \pm 0.10$  to  $1.06 \pm 1.07$  mg/l. Minimum

( $0.16 \pm 0.10$  mg/l) and maximum ( $1.06 \pm 1.07$  mg/l)  $\text{NO}_3\text{-N}$  content were observed from Bonsu and Wenchi communities respectively. Studies by Altman and Parizek (1995) on sloping agricultural land showed that while the concentration of  $\text{NO}_3$  was high in cropping areas, it was low or non-detectable in the adjacent stream, due to dilution as the water discharged into the stream, denitrification, and plant assimilation of  $\text{NO}_3$  before entering the river. On sloppy land, ground water could be forced to flow close to the ground, where denitrification and plant assimilation were most likely to remove  $\text{NO}_3$ , before discharging into the stream. This explanation may also apply to this study. Additionally, in warmer seasons,  $\text{NO}_3$  levels are likely to be reduced by biochemical processes and algal assimilation (Chimwanza et al., 2006). In Ghana, temperatures in the Brong Ahafo region typically reach  $37^\circ\text{C}$  in the dry season, which increases biochemical activities in water. Since there is no surface runoff into the river, the  $\text{NO}_3$  concentration is further reduced. In absolute terms,  $\text{NO}_3$  concentrations were higher in the rainy season than in the dry season.

Most surface water samples recorded considerable amount of  $\text{NO}_3\text{-N}$  between June and September (third quarter) during which fertilizer applications were high and when runoff from storm events was frequent. These samples were from streams draining watersheds with high levels of maize production at Fiaso and Biaso, as well as tomatoes and tobacco production at Wenchi and Tainso (Table 1).

The current situation of  $\text{NO}_3\text{-N}$  distribution in the region is such that no clear demarcation can be made of areas high in  $\text{NO}_3$ , since all the water resources studied in the area have  $\text{NO}_3\text{-N}$  concentrations lower than the recommended limit of 10 mg/l  $\text{NO}_3\text{-N}$  for drinking water (EPA, 2002).

All sixteen water sources contained  $\text{NH}_3\text{-N}$  (Table 2). Concentrations of  $\text{NH}_3\text{-N}$  were low in all samples. Values of  $\text{NH}_3\text{-N}$  ranged from an annual average of  $0.008 \pm 0.006$  mg/l (Tano stream at Tachiman) to  $0.179 \pm 0.31$  mg/l (borehole at Jinijini). Ammonia is usually present in aquatic systems as dissociates ammonium ion which is rapidly taken up by algae,  $\text{NH}_3$  is therefore present at very low quantities (Horne and Goldman, 1994). Furthermore, under oxygenated conditions,  $\text{NH}_3$  and  $\text{NO}_2$  are oxidized to  $\text{NO}_3$  by nitrification bacteria (Huey and Beitingner, 1998). Therefore  $\text{NH}_3$  in drinking-water is not of immediate health relevance, and therefore no health-based guideline value is proposed. However,  $\text{NH}_3$  can compromise disinfection efficiency, result in  $\text{NO}_2$  formation in distribution systems, cause the failure of filters for the removal of manganese and cause taste and odour problems (WHO, 2003).

$\text{NO}_2\text{-N}$  levels in samples are provided in Table 3. Mean  $\text{NO}_2\text{-N}$  concentrations varied between  $0.006 \pm 0.01$  mg/l (at both Tano and Gao streams at Tachiman and Goaso) to  $0.36 \pm 0.47$  mg/l (Wenchi from the Subin stream). The concentrations of  $\text{NO}_2\text{-N}$  in all samples throughout the year were lower than the maximum contaminant level (MCL) of 1.0 mg/l for public water systems established by the WHO (2003). Seasonal differences were not observed for  $\text{NO}_2\text{-N}$  in samples except those from Subin stream and ground water from Drobo.

Consequences of NO<sub>3</sub> pollution on amphibians and other aquatic organisms are hard to quantify. Research has shown that NO<sub>3</sub> is toxic enough to represent one of the most pervasive contaminants that threaten the survival of aquatic organisms (Hecnar 1995, Johansson et al., 2001). The lethal concentration of nitrate for a number of eggs and tadpole of some aquatic organisms are in the range of 1 - 10 mg/l, with chronic effect occurring at concentration of 2.3 mg/l (Kincheloe et al., 1979). Water quality data from agricultural areas sampled in the Brong Ahafo region showed nitrate concentrations in surface waters were below these critical toxicity levels for organisms for extended periods of time and during sensitive periods of their development such as egg and tadpole stage.

**Table 1.** Statistical analysis of nitrate content of surface and ground water samples in the Brong Ahafo region, Ghana.

| Sampling site         | Water type | Max. mg/l | Min. mg/l | Variance mg/l | Mean mg/l | S. D. |
|-----------------------|------------|-----------|-----------|---------------|-----------|-------|
| Subin (wenchi)        | surface    | 2.60      | 0.30      | 1.15          | 1.06      | 1.07  |
| Tain (Tainso)         | surface    | 0.66      | 0.48      | 0.007         | 0.60      | 0.085 |
| Bia (Biaso)           | surface    | 0.66      | 0.22      | 0.05          | 0.42      | 0.22  |
| Fia (Fiaso)           | surface    | 0.55      | 0.30      | 0.01          | 0.42      | 0.10  |
| Pru (Pruso)           | surface    | 0.92      | 0.10      | 0.13          | 0.37      | 0.36  |
| Tano (Ntotoroso)      | surface    | 0.92      | 0.19      | 0.12          | 0.39      | 0.35  |
| Goa (Goaso)           | surface    | 0.42      | 0.22      | 0.009         | 0.29      | 0.09  |
| Ankwasua (Afrisipa)   | surface    | 0.42      | 0.10      | 0.02          | 0.23      | 0.14  |
| Yokom (Kintampo)      | surface    | 0.31      | 0.12      | 0.01          | 0.22      | 0.08  |
| Tano (Tachiman)       | surface    | 0.35      | 0.20      | 0.01          | 0.25      | 0.07  |
| Borehole (Drobo)      | ground     | 0.25      | 0.14      | 0.002         | 0.19      | 0.05  |
| Borehole (Jinijini)   | ground     | 0.35      | 0.18      | 0.006         | 0.24      | 0.08  |
| Borehole (Atebubu)    | ground     | 0.40      | 0.18      | 0.008         | 0.28      | 0.09  |
| Borehole (K. Danso)   | ground     | 0.48      | 0.18      | 0.02          | 0.30      | 0.13  |
| Artesian well (Bonsu) | ground     | 0.31      | 0.09      | 0.01          | 0.16      | 0.10  |

§ Object in brackets indicates communities where water samples were collected

## Conclusion

Dissolves nitrogen as NO<sub>3</sub>-N, NH<sub>2</sub>-N and NH<sub>3</sub>-N in surface and ground water samples of selected communities in the Brong Ahafo region of Ghana was determined in this study. Concentrations of nitrogen forms were found to be below guidelines for drinking waters established by the WHO. Concentrations are non- toxic to humans who depend on these water resources for their domestic water needs. These low levels may not affect the health of the aquatic ecosystems of the investigated water bodies. However it is suggested that regular monitoring of these water resources should be encouraged. Results have also shown that there was an increase in the concentration of nitrates during the rainy season (second and third quarters).

**Table 2.** Statistical analysis of ammonia content in surface and ground water samples from the Brong Ahafo region, Ghana.

| Sampling site         | Water type | Max.mg/l | Min. mg/l | Variance mg/l        | Mean mg/l | S. D   |
|-----------------------|------------|----------|-----------|----------------------|-----------|--------|
| Subin (wenchi)        | surface    | 0.050    | 0.014     | $49 \times 10^{-5}$  | 0.025     | 0.022  |
| Tain (Tainso)         | surface    | 0.050    | 0.032     | $6 \times 10^{-5}$   | 0.043     | 0.008  |
| Bia (Biaso)           | surface    | 0.060    | 0.012     | $48 \times 10^{-5}$  | 0.031     | 0.022  |
| Fia (Fiaso)           | surface    | 0.33     | 0.012     | 0.02                 | 0.108     | 0.15   |
| Pru (Pruso)           | surface    | 0.048    | 0.024     | $13 \times 10^{-5}$  | 0.039     | 0.011  |
| Tano (Ntotoroso)      | surface    | 0.060    | 0.060     | 0.060                | 0.00      | 0.00   |
| Goa (Goaso)           | surface    | 0.060    | 0.00      | $69 \times 10^{-5}$  | 0.078     | 0.026  |
| Ankwasua (Afrisipa)   | surface    | 0.036    | 0.012     | $9.6 \times 10^{-5}$ | 0.025     | 0.01   |
| Yokom (Kintampo)      | surface    | 0.084    | 0.014     | $82 \times 10^{-5}$  | 0.048     | 0.028  |
| Tano (Tachiman)       | surface    | 0.642    | 0.00      | 0.096                | 0.179     | 0.31   |
| Borehole (Drobo)      | ground     | 0.048    | 0.024     | $9.9 \times 10^{-5}$ | 0.035     | 0.016  |
| Borehole (Jinijini)   | ground     | 0.012    | 0.00      | $3.2 \times 10^{-5}$ | 0.008     | 0.0057 |
| Borehole (Atebubu)    | ground     | 0.042    | 0.00      | $37 \times 10^{-5}$  | 0.029     | 0.019  |
| Borehole (K. Danso)   | ground     | 0.048    | 0.012     | $22 \times 10^{-5}$  | 0.032     | 0.015  |
| Artesian well (Bonsu) | ground     | 0.036    | 0.012     | $9.6 \times 10^{-5}$ | 0.024     | 0.010  |

**Table 3.** Statistical analysis of nitrite content in surface and ground water samples from the Brong Ahafo region, Ghana.

| Sampling site       | Water type | Max.mg/l | Min. mg/l | Variance mg/l        | Mean mg/l | S. D  |
|---------------------|------------|----------|-----------|----------------------|-----------|-------|
| Subin (wenchi)      | surface    | 0.950    | 0.004     | 0.220                | 0.249     | 0.470 |
| Tain (Tainso)       | surface    | 0.050    | 0.003     | $37 \times 10^{-5}$  | 0.025     | 0.02  |
| Bia (Biaso)         | surface    | 0.030    | 0.009     | $7.9 \times 10^{-5}$ | 0.020     | 0.09  |
| Fia (Fiaso)         | surface    | 0.014    | 0.009     | $5.6 \times 10^{-5}$ | 0.011     | 0.002 |
| Pru (Pruso)         | surface    | 0.018    | 0.009     | $1.5 \times 10^{-5}$ | 0.013     | 0.004 |
| Tano (Ntotoroso)    | surface    | 0.32     | 0.00      | $2.6 \times 10^{-5}$ | 0.006     | 0.005 |
| Goa (Goaso)         | surface    | 0.014    | 0.001     | $3.1 \times 10^{-5}$ | 0.006     | 0.006 |
| Ankwasua (Afrisipa) | surface    | 0.031    | 0.00      | $2.8 \times 10^{-5}$ | 0.007     | 0.005 |
| Yokom (Kintampo)    | surface    | 0.023    | 0.001     | $8.9 \times 10^{-5}$ | 0.013     | 0.009 |
| Tano (Tachiman)     | surface    | 0.007    | 0.004     | $2 \times 10^{-6}$   | 0.006     | 0.001 |
| Borehole (Drobo)    | ground     | 0.300    | 0.014     | 0.020                | 0.089     | 0.14  |
| Borehole (Jinijini) | ground     | 0.013    | 0.001     | $2.4 \times 10^{-5}$ | 0.007     | 0.007 |
| Borehole (Atebubu)  | ground     | 0.023    | 0.007     | $4.6 \times 10^{-5}$ | 0.017     | 0.007 |

|                       |        |       |       |                      |       |       |
|-----------------------|--------|-------|-------|----------------------|-------|-------|
| Borehole (K. Danso)   | ground | 0.023 | 0.003 | $7.9 \times 10^{-5}$ | 0.015 | 0.009 |
| Artesian well (Bonsu) | ground | 0.023 | 0.001 | $8.4 \times 10^{-5}$ | 0.013 | 0.008 |

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The authors are grateful for the financial support from the Ghana Government through the Environmental Protection Agency, Ghana, and the Head, Brong Ahafo Regional EPA for providing the necessary facilities.

## REFERENCES

- Altman SJ, Parizek RR (1995). Dilution of non-point source nitrate in ground water. J.Environ. Qual., 24: 707-718.
- Baker JM, Waights V (1993). The effects of sodium nitrate on the growth and survival of toad tadpoles (*Bufo bufo*) in laboratory. Herpetol. 3:147-148. .
- Baker JM, Waights V (1994). The effects of nitrate on tadpoles of the tree frog (*Litoria caerulea*). Herpetol. 4:106-108.
- Bogardi I, Kuzelka RD, Ennenga WG (1991). Nitrate contamination: Exposure, consequence, and control. NATO ASI Series G: Ecological Sciences, Vol. 30. Springer-Verlag, New York.
- Camargo JA, Ward JV (1992). Short-term toxicity of sodium nitrate ( $\text{NaNO}_3$ ) to non-target freshwater invertebrates. Chemosphere 24:2328.
- Chimwanza B, Mumba, PP, Moyo BHZ, Kadewa W (2006). The impact of farming on river banks on water quality of the rivers. Int. J. Environ. Sci. Tech. 2 (4): 353-358.
- EPA (2002). List of Drinking Water Contaminants & MCLs. Health and Aesthetic Aspects of Water Quality. 816-F-02-013;

- Hallberg LW, Keeney DR (1993). Nitrate, Regional groundwater quality, J. W. Alley, Ed., Van Nostrand Reinhold, New York.
- Hecnar SJ (1995). Acute and chronic toxicity of ammonium nitrate fertilizer to amphibians from southern Ontario. Environ. Toxicol. Chem. 14: 2131-2137.
- Horne AJ, Goldman CR (1994). Limnology, 2nd. McGraw-Hill Inc, Singapore.
- Hudak, P. F. (1999). Regional trends in nitrate content of Texas groundwater. J. Hydro., Amsterdam, 228; 37-47.
- Jenkins A (1999). End of the acid rain. Nature 401: 537–538.
- Johansson M, Räsänen K, Merilä J (2001). Comparison of nitrate tolerance between different populations of the common frog, *Rana temporaria*. Aquatic Toxicol. 54: 1–14.
- Kincheloe JW, Wedemeyer GA, Koch DL (1979). Tolerance of developing salmonid eggs and fry to nitrate exposure. Bull. Environ. Contam. Toxicol. 23: 575-578.
- Muir, P. R., Sutton, D. C., Owens, L., (1990). Nitrate toxicity to *Penaeus monodon* protozoa. Mar. Biol. 108: 67–71.
- Oldham RS, Latham DM, Hilton-Brown D, Towns M, Cooke AS, Burn A (1996). The effect of ammonium nitrate fertiliser on frog (*Rana temporaria*) survival. Agric. Ecosyst. Environ. 61: 69–74.
- Rouse JD, Bishop CA, Struger J (1999). Nitrogen pollution: An assessment of its threat to amphibian survival. Environ. Health Perspect. 107: 799–803.
- Spalding, R.F., and Exner, M.E., 1993, Occurrence of nitrate in groundwater—a review. J. Environ. Qual. 22 (3): 392-402.
- Stoddard JL, Jeffries DS, Lukewille A, Clair TA, Dillon PJ, Driscoll CT, Forsius M, Johannessen M, Kahl, J.S., Kellogg, J.H., Kemp, A., Mannio, J., Monteith, D.T., Murdoch, P.S., Patrick, S., Rebsdorf, A., Skjelkvale BL, Stainton MP, Traaen T, van Dam H, Webster KE, Wieting J, Wilander A (1999). Regional trends in aquatic recovery from acidification in North America and Europe. Nature 401: 575– 578.
- Tomasso JR, Carmichael GL (1986). Acute toxicity of ammonia, nitrite, and nitrate to the Guadalupe bass, *Micropterus treculi*. Bull. Environ. Contam. Toxicol. 36: 866-870.
- Tricker AR, Preussmann R (1991). Carcinogenic N-nitrosamines in the diet: Occurrence, mechanisms and carcinogenic potential. Mutat. Res. 259: 277-289.
- WHO (2003). Ammonia in drinking-water. Background document for preparation of WHO Guidelines for drinking-water quality. Geneva, World Health Organization (WHO/SDE/WSH/03.04/1).

