SCCWRP Annual Report 2013

Comparison of PCR and quantitative realtime PCR methods for the characterization of ruminant and cattle fecal pollution sources

Meredith R. Raith², Catherine A. Kelty¹, John F. Griffith², Alexander Schriewer³, Stefan Wuertz³, Sophie Mieszkin⁴, Michele Gourmelon⁴, Georg H. Reischer⁵, Andreas H. Farnleitner⁵, Jared S. Ervin⁶, Patricia A. Holden⁶, Darcy.L. Ebentier⁷, Jennifer A. Jay⁷, Dan Wang⁸, Alexandria B. Boehm⁸, Tiong Gim Aw⁹, Joan B. Rose⁹, E. Balleste¹⁰, W.G. Meijer¹⁰, Mano Sivaganesan¹ and Orin C. Shanks¹

ABSTRACT

The State of California has mandated the preparation of a guidance document on the application of fecal source identification methods for recreational water quality management. California contains the fifth highest population of cattle in the United States, making the inclusion of cow-associated methods a logical choice. Because the performance of these methods has been shown to change based on geography and/or local animal feeding practices, laboratory comparisons are needed to determine which assays are best suited for implementation. We describe the performance characterization of two end-point PCR assays (CF128 and CF193) and five real-time quantitative PCR (qPCR) assays (Rum2Bac, BacR, BacCow, CowM2, and CowM3) reported to be associated with either ruminant or cattle feces. Each assay was tested against a blinded set of 38 reference challenge filters (19 duplicate samples) containing fecal pollution from 12 different sources suspected to impact water quality. The abundance of each hostassociated genetic marker was measured for qPCRbased assays in both target and non-target animals and compared to quantities of total DNA mass, wet mass of fecal material, as well as Bacteroidales, and enterococci determined by 16S rRNA qPCR and culture-based approaches (enterococci only). Ruminantand cow-associated genetic markers were detected in all filters containing a cattle fecal source. However, some assays cross reacted with non-target pollution sources. A large amount of variability was evident across laboratories when protocols were not fixed suggesting that protocol standardization will be necessary for widespread implementation. Finally, performance metrics indicate that the cattleassociated CowM2q PCR method combined with either the BacR or Rum2Bac ruminant-associated methods are most suitable for implementation.

Full Text

http://ftp.sccwrp.org/pub/download/DOCUMENTS/AnnualReports/2013AnnualReport/ar13 491 500.pdf

¹US Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Research and Development, National Risk Management Research Laboratory, Cincinnati, OH

²Southern California Coastal Water Research Project, Costa Mesa, CA

³University of California, Department of Civil & Environmental Engineering, Davis, CA

⁴IFREMER, Laboratoire de Microbiologie e EMP/MIC, Plouzané, France

⁵Vienna University of Technology, Institute of Chemical Engineering, Research Group Environmental Microbiology and Molecular Ecology, and Interuniversity Cooperation Center Water and Health, Vienna, Austria

⁶University of California, Earth Research Institute and Bren School of Environmental Science & Management, Santa Barbara, CA

⁷University of California, Civil and Environmental Engineering Department, Los Angeles, CA

⁸Stanford University, Department of Civil & Environmental Engineering, Stanford, CA

⁹Michigan State University, Department of Fisheries and Wildlife, East Lansing, MI

¹⁰University College Dublin, School of Biomolecular and Biomedical Science, Dublin, Ireland