

1 Low plastic ingestion rate in Atlantic Cod (*Gadus morhua*) from 2 Newfoundland destined for human consumption collected 3 through citizen science methods

4
5 Max Liboiron*^{1,2,3,5}, France Liboiron^{4,5}, Emily Wells^{4,5}, Natalie Richárd^{2,5}, Alexander Zahara^{2,5}, Charles
6 Mather^{2,5}, Hillary Bradshaw^{2,5}, Judyannet Murichi^{1,5}

7
8 ¹ Department of Sociology, Memorial University of Newfoundland, St. John's, Newfoundland, A1C 5S7,
9 Canada

10 ² Department of Geography, Memorial University of Newfoundland, St. John's, Newfoundland, A1B
11 3X9, Canada

12 ³ Program in Environmental Sciences, Memorial University of Newfoundland, St. John's, Newfoundland,
13 A1C 5S7, Canada

14 ⁴ Department of Biology, Memorial University of Newfoundland, St. John's, Newfoundland, A1B 3X9,
15 Canada

16 ⁵ Civic Laboratory for Environmental Action Research (CLEAR), Memorial University of Newfoundland,
17 St. John's, Newfoundland, A1B 3X9, Canada

18
19
20 *Corresponding author.

21 E-mail: mliwoiron@mun.ca

22 Address: AA4057, Memorial University of Newfoundland, 230 Elizabeth Avenue, St. John's, NL, A1C
23 5S7

24 25 **Abstract**

26
27 Marine microplastics are a contaminant of concern because their small size allows ingestion by a
28 wide range of marine life. Using citizen science during the Newfoundland recreational cod
29 fishery, we sampled 205 Atlantic cod (*Gadus morhua*) destined for human consumption and
30 found that 5 had eaten plastic, an ingestion prevalence rate of 2.4%. This ingestion rate for
31 Atlantic cod is the second lowest recorded rate in the reviewed published literature (the lowest is
32 1.4%), and the lowest for any fish in the North Atlantic. This is the first report for plastic
33 ingestion in fish in Newfoundland, Canada, a province dependent on fish for sustenance and
34 livelihoods.

35 36 **Key words**

37 Atlantic Cod; marine debris; plastic; ingestion; human consumption; citizen science

38 39 **Highlights (3-5 points, 85 char max including spaces)**

- 40
41
- 42 • Plastic ingestion rate of 2.4% for Atlantic Cod (n=205)
 - 43 • First recorded baseline for fish in Newfoundland, Canada
 - 44 • This plastic ingestion prevalence rate is among the lowest recorded to date
 - Used citizen science to collect GI tracts from fish destined for human consumption

45

1 Introduction

2 There are plastics in every ocean around the world (Provencher et al. 2010, Zarfl & Matthies
3 2010, Eriksen et al. 2014) and more than 90% of marine plastics are microplastics (<5mm)
4 (Eriksen et al. 2014). Microplastics (<5mm) and mesoplastics (5-10 mm) are of concern because
5 they are viable for ingestion by a wide range of marine life (Foekema et al. 2013, Wright et al.
6 2013, Setälä et al. 2014, Kühn et al. 2015). Plastics have been found in marine species that are
7 commonly eaten by humans, including: shrimp (Setälä et al. 2014); bivalves, such as oysters and
8 mussels (Von Moos et al. 2012, Van Cauwenberghe and Janssen 2014); and fish from a variety
9 of trophic levels (Choy and Drazen 2013, Foekema et al. 2013, Jantz et al. 2013, Lusher et al.
10 2015a, Seltenrich 2015, Bråte et al. 2016). The majority of these studies assess marine life that
11 were raised in a laboratory or caught specifically for research purposes. Few studies have
12 targeted marine life that was caught specifically for human consumption (Van Cauwenberghe
13 and Janssen 2014, Rochman et al. 2015a), and to our knowledge, none sample fish that were
14 eaten by humans.

15
16 The study of plastics in food webs is an emerging area of study (Rochman 2016). Research
17 indicates that chemicals accumulate on plastics (Ogata et al. 2009, Mato et al. 2001, Holmes et
18 al. 2012), such as hexachlorinated hexanes (HCHs), polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs),
19 polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs), polybrominated diphenyl ethers (PBDEs), triclosan,
20 nonylphenols, and heavy metals, among others. The chemicals may then transfer to the animal's
21 tissues after ingestion (Endo et al. 2005, Browne et al. 2013, Gassel et al. 2013, Tanaka et al.
22 2013, Rochman et al. 2014, Wardrop et al. 2016). The toxic effects of these synthetic chemicals
23 are varied. For example, they may cause cellular necrosis and tissue lacerations in the
24 gastrointestinal tract (Rochman et al. 2015b), make animals more susceptible to stress (Browne
25 et al. 2013, Rochman et al. 2013), and can result in liver toxicity and pathology (Rochman et al.
26 2013). While these studies on the harm caused by plastic ingestion are conducted in a laboratory
27 rather than the field, and laboratory contexts reduce the complexity of chemical exposures by
28 studying a single chemical at specific endpoints rather than the "cocktail" of chemicals and wide
29 range of endpoints they may effect (Koelmans et al. 2013, Koelmans et al. 2014), they do
30 provide cause for concern because of the potential human health effects for people who eat fish.

31
32 The accumulation of microplastics and their associated toxicants within marine food webs is of
33 special concern in Newfoundland, Canada, where people rely extensively on marine life for food
34 sustenance. In Newfoundland, Atlantic cod (*Gadus morhua*) is an important species to consider
35 because of its cultural and culinary significance. Up to 82% of households along the west coast
36 of Newfoundland report consuming local seafood more than once a week, of which cod is the
37 preferred food choice (Lowitt 2013). Yet, there are no previous studies on plastics ingested by
38 food fish in the region. While commercial harvesting of Atlantic cod is strictly controlled
39 (Bavington 2011) people in Newfoundland and Labrador are able to fish for Atlantic cod during
40 the seasonal recreational cod fishery. Individuals are permitted to catch five fish per person per
41 day, with a maximum of fifteen fish per boat outing (Fisheries and Oceans Canada 2015).

42
43 In 2015, the Newfoundland food fishery took place during two one-week periods in the summer
44 and early fall (Schrank and Roy 2013; Fisheries and Oceans Canada 2015). During the
45 September 2015 food fishery, we were present on public fishing wharves near St. John's, the
46 only major city in the province and thus the area with the greatest population, to obtain the

1 gastrointestinal (GI) tracts from citizen scientists (both commercial and recreational fish
 2 harvesters) to monitor the rate of plastic ingestion in fish destined for human consumption. This
 3 study joins an emerging trend in microplastic pollution research that evaluates ingestion rates by
 4 marine life that is destined for human consumption. All fish were Atlantic cod (*Gadus morhua*).
 5 These fish were analyzed in the lab according to standardized methods (van Franeker et al.,
 6 2011). Data were used to determine the rate of ingestion between recreational and commercially
 7 caught fish, geographical locations where fish had been caught, and types and characteristics of
 8 ingested plastics. While there are other dangers associated with marine plastics to fishing
 9 communities, such as entanglement and ghost fishing reducing available fish stock (Hall 2000),
 10 the purview of this study is on plastic ingestion in fish caught for human consumption.

11
 12 To contextualize this study, we conducted a literature review of nearly 100 previous studies of
 13 marine plastic ingestion by fish from around the world. The following table illustrates published
 14 ingestion rates of various fish species using an array of methods. The majority of the studies
 15 assessed plastic ingestion rates regionally and as a result the samples included multiple species of
 16 fish. For the table we disaggregate the published data and sort the results by fish species where
 17 possible. This has resulted in some species appearing to have very small sample sizes, which is
 18 an artefact of our disaggregation. We do not provide details on sampling protocols, which may
 19 be found in the original cited articles. Species with an ingestion rate of 0% have been excluded
 20 from the table.

21

22 **Table 1: Published plastic ingestion rates of fish, disaggregated by species and body of**
 23 **water.**

Region	Location	Fish Species	Ingestion Rate (%)	Sample Size	Reference
North Atlantic	Baltic Sea	Atlantic cod (<i>Gadus Morhua</i>)	1.4%	74	Rummel et al. (2015)
	Baltic Sea	European flounder (<i>Platichthys flesus</i>)	10.0%	20	Rummel et al. (2015)
	Baltic Sea	Atlantic mackerel (<i>Scomber scombrus</i>)	30.8%	13	Rummel et al. (2015)
	Eastern Mediterranean	Blackspot seabream (<i>Pagellus bogaraveo</i>)	1.7%	6	Anastasopoulou et al. (2013)
	Eastern Mediterranean	Pelagic stringray (<i>Pteroplatytrygon violacea</i>)	50%	2	Anastasopoulou et al. (2013)
	Eastern Mediterranean	Velvet belly lanternshark (<i>Etmopterus spinax</i>)	6.3%	16	Anastasopoulou et al. (2013)
	Eastern Mediterranean	Blackmouth catshark (<i>Galeus melastomus</i>)	3.2%	741	Anastasopoulou et al. (2013)
	Eastern Mediterranean	Longnose spurdog (<i>Squalus blainville</i>)	1.3%	75	Anastasopoulou et al. (2013)
	English Channel	Whiting (<i>Merlangius merlangus</i>)	32%	50	Lusher et al. (2013)

	Blue Whiting (<i>Micromesistius poutassou</i>)	51.9%	27	Lusher et al. (2013)	
English Channel	Atlantic horse mackerel (<i>Trachurus trachurus</i>)	28.6%	56	Lusher et al. (2013)	
English Channel	Poor cod (<i>Trisopterus minutus</i>)	40%	50	Lusher et al. (2013)	
English Channel	John Dory (<i>Zeus faber</i>)	46.7%	42	Lusher et al. (2013))	
English Channel	Red gurnard (<i>Aspitrigla cuculus</i>)	51.5%	66	Lusher et al. (2013)	
English Channel	Dragonet (<i>Callionymus lyra</i>)	38%	50	Lusher et al. (2013)	
English Channel	Redband fish (<i>Cepola macrophthalma</i>)	32.3%	62	Lusher et al. (2013)	
North Atlantic continued...	Solenette (<i>Buglossisium luteum</i>)	26%	50	Lusher et al. (2013)	
	English Channel	Thickback sole (<i>Microchirus variegates</i>)	23.5%	51	Lusher et al. (2013)
	Gulf of Mexico	Marine: 8 species	10% *	116	Phillips & Bonner (2015)
	Gulf of Mexico	Freshwater: 44 species	8% *	419	Phillips & Bonner (2015)
	Mediterranean Sea	Swordfish (<i>Xiphias gladius</i>)	12.5%	9	Romeo et al. (2015)
	Mediterranean Sea	Albacore (<i>Thunnus alalunga</i>)	12.9%	4	Romeo et al. (2015)
	Mediterranean Sea	Atlantic bluefin tuna (<i>Thunnus thynnus</i>)	32.4%	16	Romeo et al. (2015)
	North Atlantic	Slender snipe eel (<i>Nemichthys scolopaceus</i>)	100%	1	Lusher et al. (2015a)
	North Atlantic	Spotted barracudina (<i>Arctozenus risso</i>)	21%	14	Lusher et al. (2015a)
	North Atlantic	Bluntnout smoothhead (<i>Xenodermichthys copei</i>)	60%	5	Lusher et al. (2015a)
	North Atlantic	Glacier lantern fish (<i>Benthoosema glaciale</i>)	22%	27	Lusher et al. (2015a)
	North Atlantic	Lancet fish (<i>Notoscopelus kroyeri</i>)	15%	417	Lusher et al. (2015a)
	North Atlantic	Mueller's pearlside (<i>Maurolicus muelleri</i>)	3%	282	Lusher et al. (2015a)
	North Atlantic	Scaly Dragonfish (<i>Stomias boa boa</i>)	40%	5	Lusher et al. (2015a)
	Norwegian Sea	Atlantic cod (<i>Gadus Morhua</i>)	3%	302	Bråte et al. (2016)
	North Sea	Common dab (<i>Limanda limanda</i>)	5.4%	74	Rummel et al. (2015)

	North Sea	Atlantic mackerel (<i>Scomber scombrus</i>)	13.2%	38	Rummel et al. (2015)	
	North Sea	Atlantic herring (<i>Clupea harengus</i>)	1.4%	566	Foekema et al. (2013)	
	North Sea	Gray gurnard (<i>Eutrigla gurnardus</i>)	<1%	171	Foekema et al. (2013)	
	North Sea	Whiting (<i>Merlangius merlangus</i>)	5.7%	105	Foekema et al. (2013)	
	North Sea	Atlantic horse mackerel (<i>Trachurus trachurus</i>)	1.0%	100	Foekema et al. (2013)	
	North Sea	Haddock (<i>Melanogrammus aeglefinus</i>)	6.2%	97	Foekema et al. (2013)	
	North Sea	Atlantic mackerel (<i>Scomber scombrus</i>)	<1%	84	Foekema et al. (2013)	
	North Sea	Atlantic cod (<i>Gadus Morhua</i>)	13%	80	Foekema et al. (2013)	
North Atlantic continued...	Portuguese Coast	Twait shade (<i>Alosa fallax</i>)	100%	1	Neves et al. (2015)	
	Portuguese Coast	Meagre (<i>Argyrosomus regius</i>)	60% ‡	5	Neves et al. (2015)	
	Portuguese Coast	Bogue (<i>Boops boops</i>)	9.0%	32	Neves et al. (2015)	
	Portuguese Coast	Atlantic pomfret (<i>Brama brama</i>)	33% ‡	3	Neves et al. (2015)	
	Portuguese Coast	Large-eyed dentex (<i>Dentex macrophthalmus</i>)	100% ‡	1	Neves et al. (2015)	
	Portuguese Coast	Four-spot megrim (<i>Lepidorhombus boscii</i>)	50%	2	Neves et al. (2015)	
	Portuguese Coast	Angler (<i>Lophius piscatorius</i>)	50% ‡	2	Neves et al. (2015)	
	Portuguese Coast	European Hake (<i>Merluccius merluccius</i>)	29%	7	Neves et al. (2015)	
	Portuguese Coast	European Hake (<i>Merluccius merluccius</i>)	20% ‡	5	Neves et al. (2015)	
	Portuguese Coast	Striped red mullet (<i>Mullus surmuletus</i>)	100%	1	Neves et al. (2015)	
	Portuguese Coast	Striped red mullet (<i>Mullus surmuletus</i>)	100% ‡	3	Neves et al. (2015)	
	Portuguese Coast	Axillary seabream (<i>Pagellus acarne</i>)	100%	1	Neves et al. (2015)	
	Portuguese Coast	Mediterranean starry ray (<i>Raja asterias</i>)	43% ‡	7	Neves et al. (2015)	
	Portuguese Coast	Chub mackerel (<i>Scomber japonicus</i>)	31%	35	Neves et al. (2015)	
	Portuguese Coast	Atlantic mackerel (<i>Scomber scombrus</i>)	31%	13	Neves et al. (2015)	
		Portuguese	Small spotted catshark	12%	17	Neves et al. (2015)

	Coast	<i>(Scyliorhinus canicula)</i>				
	Portuguese Coast	Small spotted catshark <i>(Scyliorhinus canicula)</i>	67% ‡	3	Neves et al. (2015)	
	Portuguese Coast	Blue jack mackerel <i>(Trachurus picturatus)</i>	3%	29	Neves et al. (2015)	
	Portuguese Coast	Atlantic horse mackerel <i>(Trachurus trachurus)</i>	7%	44	Neves et al. (2015)	
	Portuguese Coast	Piper gurnard (<i>Trigla lyra</i>)	19.0%	31	Neves et al. (2015)	
	Portuguese Coast	John Dory (<i>Zeus faber</i>)	100%	1	Neves et al. (2015)	
North Pacific	California, USA	Pacific oyster (<i>Crassostrea gigas</i>)	33% ‡	12	Rochman et al. (2015a)	
	California, USA	Jacksmelt (<i>Atherinopsis californiensis</i>)	29% ‡	7	Rochman et al. (2015a)	
	California, USA	Pacific anchovy (<i>Engraulis mordax</i>)	30% ‡	10	Rochman et al. (2015a)	
	California, USA	Yellowtail Rockfish <i>(Sebastes flavidus)</i>	33% ‡	3	Rochman et al. (2015a)	
	California, USA	Striped bass (<i>Morone saxatilis</i>)	29% ‡	7	Rochman et al. (2015a)	
	California, USA	Chinook salmon <i>(Oncorhynchus tshawytscha)</i>	25% ‡	4	Rochman et al. (2015a)	
	California, USA	Blue rockfish (<i>Sebastes mystinus</i>)	20% ‡	10	Rochman et al. (2015a)	
	California, USA	Pacific sanddab <i>(Citharichthys sordidus)</i>	60% ‡	5	Rochman et al. (2015a)	
	California, USA	Lingcod (<i>Ophiodon elongatus</i>)	9% ‡	11	Rochman et al. (2015a)	
			Six species: Indo-Pacific snaggletooth (<i>Astronesthes indopacifica</i>), pacific saury (<i>Cololabis saira</i>), Reinhardt's lantern fish (<i>Hygophum reinhardtii</i>), <i>Loweina interrupta</i> , Golden lanternfish (<i>Myctophum aurolaternatum</i>), bigfin lanternfish			Boerger et al. (2010)
	North Pacific Central Gyre	<i>(Symbolophorus californiensis)</i>	35% *	670		
	North Pacific Hawaii	Longnose lancetfish <i>(Iepisaurus ferox)</i>	30%	144	Choy & Drazen (2013)	
North Pacific	Common dolphinfish	2%	42	Choy & Drazen (2013)		

	Hawaii	<i>(Coryphaena hippurus)</i>			
	North Pacific	Snake mackerel (<i>Gempylus</i>			
	Hawaii	<i>serpens)</i>	<1%	104	Choy & Drazen (2013)
	North Pacific	Bigeye tuna (<i>Thunnus</i>			
	Hawaii	<i>obesus)</i>	9%	35	Choy & Drazen (2013)
	North Pacific	Big-eye moonfish/opah			
	Hawaii	(<i>Lampris</i> sp.)	43%	115	Choy & Drazen (2013)
	North Pacific	Small-eye moonfish/opah			
	Hawaii	(<i>Lampris</i> sp.)	58%	24	Choy & Drazen (2013)
	North Pacific	Broadbill swordfish			
	Hawaii	(<i>Xiphias gladius)</i>	3%	31	Choy & Drazen (2013)
	North Pacific	Longnose lancetfish			
	Hawaii	(<i>Alepisaurus ferox)</i>	24.5%	192	Jantz et al. (2013)
South Atlantic	Eastern Brazil	Little croaker (<i>Stellifer</i>	9.2%	22	Dantas et al. (2011)
	Eastern Brazil	<i>stellifer)</i>	6.9%	23	Dantas et al. (2011)
		Southern opah (<i>Lampis</i>			
	Falkland Islands	<i>immaculatus)</i>	14%	69	Jackson et al. (2000)
	Northeastern	Brazilian sharpnose shark			Miranda & de
	Brazil	(<i>Rhizoprionodon</i>	33.0%	8	Carvalho-Souza (2016)
	Northeastern	Kingmackerel			Miranda & de
	Brazil	(<i>Scomberomorus cavalla)</i>	62.5%	6	Carvalho-Souza (2016)
	Northeastern	Brazilian mojarra (<i>Eugerres</i>	21%	240	Ramos et al. (2012)
	Brazil	<i>brasilianus)</i>			
	Northeastern	Flagfin mojarra	9%	141	Ramos et al. (2012)
	Brazil	(<i>Eucinostomus</i>			
	Northeastern	Capitola mojarra	8.8%	44	Ramos et al. (2012)
	Brazil	(<i>Diapterus rhombeus)</i>			
Northeastern	Madamango sea catfish	18%	60	Possatto et al. (2011)	
Brazil	(<i>Cathorops spixii)</i>				
Northeastern	Bagre gaivota (<i>Cathorops</i>	33%	60	Possatto et al. (2011)	
Brazil	<i>agassizii)</i>				
Northeastern	Pemoucou sea catfish				
Brazil	(<i>Sciades</i>	17%	62	Possatto et al. (2011)	
Southeastern	Largehead hairtail	0.7%	149	Di Benedetto &	
Brazil	(<i>Trichiurus lepturus)</i>			Awabdi (2014)	
South Pacific	Eastern	Indian Mackerel	56% ‡	9	Rochman et al.
	Indonesia	(<i>Rastrelliger kanagurta)</i>			(2015a)
	Eastern	Shortfin scad (<i>Decapterus</i>	29% ‡	17	Rochman et al.
	Indonesia	<i>macrosoma)</i>			(2015a)
	Eastern	Silver-stripe round herring	40% ‡	10	Rochman et al.
Indonesia	(<i>Spratelloides gracilis)</i>			(2015a)	
Eastern	Family Carangidae (species	71% ‡	7	Rochman et al.	

Indonesia	not specified)			(2015a)
Eastern Indonesia	Streamlined spinefoot (species of rabbitfish) (<i>Siganus argenteus</i>)	50% ‡	2	Rochman et al. (2015a)
Eastern Indonesia	Whitespotted spinefoot (species of rabbitfish) (<i>Siganus canaliculatus</i>)	33% ‡	3	Rochman et al. (2015a)

‡ These samples were bought from food stores

* These studies did not disaggregate their data in terms of species, so ingestion rates is for all species listed

The 97 reviewed publications on ingestion rates in various fish species in a wide range of geographical locations used different methodologies to assess ingestion rates, which makes the rates not directly comparable, but they do serve as a base to understand and compare ingestion rates in general terms. Studies found that between 0.7-100% (mean 31%) of individual fish within a species had ingested plastics. Of these, Atlantic cod were found to ingest at a rate between 1.4-13% (n=3, mean 5.8%) (Foekema et al 2013, Rummel et al 2015, Brate et al. 2016), and fish species in northern waters fed directly by the Arctic (such as the North Sea) had ingestion rates of <1-13.2% (n=9, mean 5.3%) (Foekema et al 2013, Rummel et al 2015). We expected, then, that we would find a relatively low rate of plastic ingestion in our cod from northern waters (likely less than the mean of 31% for all fish, and closer to the 5.3-6% rate for fish in northern waters or 1.4-15% rate for Atlantic cod).

Methods

Collection of Samples

We collected cod fish gastrointestinal (GI) tracts from local fish harvesters as they gutted their fish during the fall food fishery (September 19th, 20th, and 27th, 2015). The provincial Department of Fisheries requires that all fish caught are filleted on land (DFO 2015), making wharves an ideal location for gathering samples. Field station sites were located on wharves with high fishing activity on the eastern coast of Newfoundland, Canada at Petty Harbour and St. Phillip's Harbour, both of which are within an hour's drive of the province's capital, St. John's, the area of highest population in the province.

Both team members and local fish harvesters were well acquainted with what Atlantic cod look like, and all fish sampled were Atlantic cod. We solicited fish GI tracts from local people gutting their fish on public wharves as well as from a commercial fishery in a private dock in Petty Harbour, where we also collected information about the location fish were harvested. We then extracted the GI tract from the esophagus to the anus after fishermen had filleted their fish, and bagged the GI tract contents for laboratory analysis. Each sample was given a unique identifier which was recorded on a master data sheet and on a slip of paper in the sample bag; the identifier consisted of an abbreviation of the location the fish was caught and a number respective the order in which they had been caught as well as the date. For example, the 8th fish caught in Petty Harbour on October 11th, 2015: PH8, Oct. 11/15. GI tracts that were cut open or nicked during the filleting process were discarded. Because the project was designed around public engagement, each fish harvester was asked to provide a name for their donated fish so they could easily locate the results of the data for their specific catch on an online database of results (CLEAR 2015). After bagging the fish intestines, they were placed into a cooler and taken to a

1 laboratory at Memorial University where they were placed in a freezer until further examination.
2 In total, 205 GI tracts were gathered, 188 from the recreational food fishery and 17 from one
3 commercial vessel.

4 *Laboratory Procedures*

5
6 Methods follow and adapted standardized protocol for biomonitoring of microplastics in animal
7 GI tracts developed by van Franeker et al. (2011) for birds. We choose this method over others
8 that use KOH (such as Rochman et al. 2015) because, as a laboratory that works with and within
9 local communities, we opt for the most robust methods that use as little specialized chemicals
10 and equipment as possible so citizen scientists can compare their findings to our results. We
11 thawed the GI tracts in cold water for approximately 2 hours prior to dissection. We used a
12 double sieve method, stacking a 4.75mm (#4) mesh stainless steel sieve above a 1mm (#18)
13 mesh stainless steel sieve. These sieves were selected as 1mm is considered the cut off point of
14 'large' microplastics (1.0-5.0mm) (Wagner et al. 2014), and is the size that has been suggested
15 for cod ingestion studies (European Commission 2014). Large microplastics of a 1.0-5.0 mm size
16 range are considered to be the lower limit of what the naked eye and microscope are able to
17 reliably detect, without the use of a spectrometer (Song et al. 2015). The GI tract was placed in
18 the top 5mm sieve and was cut along the stomach and intestines to the anus using fine scissors.
19 We used a wash bottle to gently rinse out the contents into the sieve to remove all mucus and
20 food. Tissues were closely examined for embedded microplastics. We then visually sorted and
21 separated all plastics; the GI tract was placed aside, and we examined the contents of the sieves;
22 microplastics and other anthropogenic materials were removed with tweezers, rinsed, and placed
23 in a Petri dish for closer examination under a microscope. Ingested animals that were intact
24 enough for dissection were given a sub code and then processed separately using the same
25 method as above.

26
27 Suspected anthropogenic debris was examined under a dissecting microscope with both reflected
28 oblique and transmitted light (Olympus SZ61, model SZ2-ILST, with a magnification range of
29 0.5-12x), where we visually sorted microplastics from organic and other anthropogenic debris
30 based on colour, absence or presence of cellular structure, erosion characteristics of plastics
31 (Cocharine et al. 2009), and, if necessary, breaking the objects open to inspect internal structures
32 after they were weighed and measured. All items requiring further inspection for accurate
33 identification were examined under a compound microscope (magnification 10x, 40x). Samples
34 were placed into folded filter paper to dry for a minimum two days or until the weight had
35 stabilized. Once dry, we transferred the plastics, over a Pyrex dish, into pre-labeled scintillation
36 jars.

37
38 All plastics recovered were above the size threshold for reliable visual identification (Song et al.
39 2015) and where simple to identify as plastics with the naked eye and compound microscope
40 (see image below), and secondary methods such as hot wire tests, and Fourier Transform
41 Infrared Spectroscopy (FTIR) analysis, which are usually reserved for fibres or plastics smaller
42 than 1mm, were not necessary. While this is a limitation of the methodology because we do not
43 gain data on the type of polymers recovered, it is also a strength for our region--by using
44 methods that citizen scientists can also employ, we facilitate comparability between future
45 studies in the area. Moreover, a lack of fibres found reduces issues of air contamination of
46 samples, since none of the recovered samples were light enough for air deposition. As such, a
47 standardized protocol (van Franeker et al. 2011) with reliably consistent low resolution data and

1 low threat of contamination is more valuable than a variety of studies with varying degrees of
2 resolution that cannot be compared. As there is no baseline data for Newfoundland and Labrador
3 and there is a push in the province for citizen science in the area, this is important
4 methodologically (Liboiron, 2016).

5
6 Prevalence rate is reported as the proportion of sampled cod found to have ingested plastic, and
7 arithmetic means (+/- SE) for number of ingested plastic and mass were reported. Following van
8 Franeker (2004), individual items were categorized as industrial plastic (small symmetrical
9 virgin plastic pellets, or ‘nurdles’) or user plastic (categories of: fragments, sheets, threads,
10 foam). Though van Franeker et al. (2011) does not include fibres in their categories, we included
11 them in our analysis, though none were found. The dimensions of each piece were measured
12 using digital callipers (accurate to 0.01 mm). We documented the opacity (transparent or opaque-
13 the ability to see light through the sample when backlit by the microscope), color, and type of
14 erosion. Characteristics of erosion are based on Cochrane et al. 2009, a study of degradation and
15 erosion patterns on beached marine plastics (categories: pitting, adhering particles, grooves,
16 linear fractures, irregular surface). Opacity was determined based on our ability to see through
17 the plastic from light transmitted from the microscope. If there was no light, we considered the
18 plastic to be opaque. Opacity and color were analyzed in the event that cod are attracted to
19 specific visual characteristics, and type and degree of erosion were analyzed to aid in
20 determining whether plastics were potentially local or from other landmasses. Air dried plastics
21 were measured in terms of count and mass (in grams) using a Sartorius electronic weighing scale
22 (accurate to 0.0001 g).

23
24 We undertook precautions to avoid cross-contamination. All tools were rinsed or wiped down
25 with water and paper cloths, including the microscope lens and plate, Petri dishes, and sieves.
26 Hands were washed, lab coats worn, and hair was tied back. After each dissection, we closely
27 examined our hands and tools for any microplastics that may have adhered.

28 **Results**

29 Of the 205 of cod collected, 5 had ingested 7 pieces of plastic between them (range 0 – 2
30 plastics/fish), an ingestion prevalence rate of 2.4%. However, because our collection method
31 involved local fishermen and women, 27 samples contained only part of the GI tract (usually just
32 the stomach). Because other studies have found that some plastics are excreted by animals that
33 ingest them (Ryan 2015), the protocol we used called for investigating the entire GI tract of fish.
34 If we omit the samples that were missing the lower GI tract from our analysis, we had 177 of
35 fish, 4 of which ingested plastics, an ingestion prevalence rate of 2.3%. Omitting fish whose
36 entire GI tract was not sampled led to a very small underestimation of plastics and a slightly
37 lower rate of prevalence. Given the small difference in results, we have decided to include fish
38 with only part of the GI tract, a 2.4% baseline ingestion rate.

1

Table 2: Description of ingested plastics


Fish ID	Type	Mass (g)	Size (longest side) mm	Opacity	Pigmentation	Erosion pattern
PH67	Fragment	0.001	4.2	Opaque	White	pitting, particles, grooves, linear fractures
Ph67	Fragment	0.0002	2	Opaque	White	pitting, particles, grooves, linear fractures
PH92	Fragment	0.0018	2.8	Opaque	White	grooves, linear fractures
SP141	Thread	0.0028	9	Opaque	Green	irregular surface
SP31	Sheet	0.0017	6.5	Opaque	White	none
SP31	Sheet	0.0011	9.7	Opaque	White	none
SP9	Thread		8.2	Opaque	Green	none

2

3

4 Plastics found in the stomachs were of a variety of types: 2 were film/sheet plastic, 2 were
5 threads, and 3 were fragments. None were industrial pellets (“nurdles”) or fibres. Mean length,
6 width, and height were 6.06 ± 1.17 mm, 0.772 ± 0.398 mm, and 2.23 ± 0.594 mm, respectively
7 (range in the longest dimension was 9.7 mm - 2 mm and the shortest dimension 0.001 mm - 2.5
8 mm). All samples are above 1mm in size, under which human vision is no longer reliable for
9 identification of plastics, even with the aid of a microscope (Song et al 2015). The mean (+/- SE)
10 mass of ingested plastic, which was based on 6 rather than 7 samples because one sample was
11 lost after size measurement but before weight measurement, was 0.00143 ± 0.00036 g per fish
12 (range 0.0002 g - 0.0028 g). Three of the samples were completely unweathered, while four of
13 the seven (including all fragments) were weathered and showed pitting, grooves, and irregular
14 surfaces (n=4). All were opaque. The two threads were green (the same colour as fishing nets
15 and lines common in the area) and the remaining five items were white.

16



1
2 Figure 1: Examples of four plastics found in four Atlantic Cod caught during the Newfoundland recreational cod
3 fishery. The green thread is a typical colour and type found in local fishing gear. The thread (far left) and film (far
4 right) show very little erosion or discolouration, indicating that they have not been in the water long and are likely
5 local plastics. Grid is 1cm x 1cm.

6
7 Fish that had ingested plastics came from a variety of locations within an hour's drive to the
8 capital city of Newfoundland, St. John's. Two were from Petty Harbour, three from Portugal
9 Cove, one from Quidi Vidi, and one from Belle Island. This distribution is wide given that the
10 vast majority of fish sampled were from Petty Harbour (32.2%) and Portugal Cove (40.5%), with
11 only 11 (5.4%) fish from Belle Island and 3 (1.5%) from Quidi Vidi. Other locations account for
12 the remaining 20.4% of catch. As all samples were collected on wharves at Petty Harbour and St.
13 Phillips, the higher prevalence in samples are from those locations.

14



1
2 Figure 2: Map of areas in the Avalon Peninsula of Newfoundland where cod fish GI tracts were collected. The
3 number in white indicates the quantity of fish collected from the area, and the number in black indicates how many
4 of those fish had ingested plastic, regardless of the amount of plastics ingested. All fish GI tracts were recovered
5 from the wharves of Petty Harbour or St. Phillips through citizen science methods. All sites are within an hour drive
6 of the province's capital city, St. John's.

7 Most fish sampled (n=188) were from the recreational cod fishery, while 17 were from the
8 commercial fishery, all of which were destined for human consumption. All plastics were found
9 in fish from the recreational fishery. The recreational fishery uses rods and lines to catch fish and
10 stays close to shore (Protected Areas Association of Newfoundland and Labrador 1996). The
11 commercial fishery, which contained no fish that ingested plastic, used bottom trawls further
12 offshore (this is not true of all commercial fisheries in Petty Harbour, but was the case for the
13 fishery we received samples from). All fish that had ingested plastics also had organic food in
14 their stomachs, suggesting a plastic gut clearance rates similar to ingested food (see Brate et al.
15 2016 for similar findings in Atlantic cod in Norwegian waters).

16
17 While the methods for studying ingestion rates in the extensive literature review we conducted
18 were variable, and so direct comparison is not possible, it does help us situate our study
19 compared to other locations and species. Our ingestion rate for Atlantic cod of 2.4% is the

1 second lowest recorded rate in the reviewed literature for cod, below average for fish species in
2 general and fish in northern waters, the lowest for any fish in the North Atlantic.

3

4 **Discussion**

5

6 Since this is the first indication of plastic ingestion rates for a remote province dependant on fish
7 for sustenance and commercial enterprises, we will begin with a discussion of why the ingestion
8 rate may be so low. We hypothesize that Atlantic cod caught for food in Newfoundland have
9 amongst the lowest recorded plastic ingestion rates (2.4%, Table 1) due to three major factors.
10 These factors are: (1) fish consumption behaviour; (2) the prevalence of ocean plastics in
11 Newfoundland waters; (3) the relatively small population of the island of Newfoundland. We
12 then discuss these hypotheses to characterise potential sources of, and susceptibility to, plastic
13 pollution, and to point to future directions for marine plastic research in Newfoundland.

14

15 First, we speculate that cod behaviour and feeding patterns make them less likely to encounter
16 ocean plastics than other fish. Understanding ingestion rates within the context of a species life
17 history is important given calls by marine plastics researchers to consider animal behaviour
18 within their study design and analysis (Carson 2013). While research has not determined the
19 abundance of microplastics throughout the water column in the North Atlantic, characteristics of
20 microplastics correspond with their abundance in certain locations: namely, low-density plastics
21 are commonly found near surface or subsurface waters (Andrady 2015), while others, such as
22 fouled or high-density plastics, accumulate in high concentrations in sediments on the ocean
23 floor (Derraik 2002; Van Cauwenberghe et al. 2013). By contrast, cod is a benthopelagic
24 demersal fish (known as ‘groundfish’ in the Newfoundland fishing industry), meaning their main
25 habitat is below pelagic waters but above the ocean floor (approx 150-200m below the surface)
26 (Johansen et al. 2009). The diet of adult cod is primarily small or medium sized fish from
27 benthopelagic waters (Cohen et al. 1990). During spawning season (early spring), cod increase
28 their intake of benthic organisms and plant material though by late summer, which coincides
29 with our study’s sampling season, and food intake is primarily benthopelagic fish (Cohen et al.
30 1990). In turn, it is possible that cod are less likely to consume plastics, given where they feed
31 and where plastics are commonly found within the water column. Life history traits may explain
32 the low rates of cod ingestion compared to other fish sampled in similar locations (Table 1).
33 Further research examining the movement and location of microplastics within the water
34 column, including the amount that is suspended from sediment into benthopelagic waters, may
35 help to identify how and which species are most susceptible to plastic ingestion in North Atlantic
36 waters.

37

38 Secondly, water near the coast of Newfoundland and Labrador may contain fewer microplastics
39 than other ocean waters. Like all major bodies of water, plastics have been shown to accumulate
40 in the North Atlantic Ocean (Eriksen et al. 2014). Newfoundland, including its coastal waters,
41 however, is located beyond the region’s major plastic accumulation zone, the North Atlantic
42 Subtropical gyre (Law et al. 2010). Furthermore, the waters surrounding Newfoundland receive
43 their input from Arctic waters flowing southerly via the Labrador Current (Loder et al. 1998).
44 While plastic ingestion has been recorded in multiple seabird species that migrate between the
45 Arctic and North Atlantic oceans (Mallory et al. 2006; Mallory 2008; Provencher et al. 2009;
46 Provencher et al. 2010; Provencher et al. 2014) thus indicating the presence of marine plastics
47 within the general area of our study site, the actual plastic concentration in waters along the

1 Newfoundland and Labrador coastline has not yet been quantified. Recent studies have
2 suggested that Arctic sea ice may act as a sink for microplastics, as low-density plastics tend to
3 accumulate in higher density seawater as ice freezes (Obbard et al. 2014; Lusher et al. 2015b).
4 Microplastics are found in sea ice at six times the concentration of surrounding waters, much of
5 which accumulates in permanent sea ice and is not released during annual sea ice events (Obbard
6 et al. 2014). Waters flowing from the Arctic may therefore contain less microplastics than other
7 ocean waters because of these additional sinks. This may be particularly relevant to the
8 Newfoundland cod fishery, as larger cod are often associated with colder temperatures (Cohen et
9 al. 1990; Björnsson and Steinarsson 2002)—something that was confirmed in the Newfoundland
10 context through observations by local fishermen. Furthermore, the Labrador current receives
11 inputs from Greenlandic glaciers (with icebergs regularly appearing in the spring and summer
12 months along the Newfoundland coast) that, upon melting, further dilute microplastic
13 concentrations with unpolluted freshwater. A similar phenomenon was suggested by Lusher et al.
14 (2015b), who found lower than expected concentrations of microplastics in the Barents Sea,
15 possibly due to freshwater inputs of Arctic water. However, we caution that this finding may not
16 apply to all Newfoundland waters where cod is caught as part of the commercial and recreational
17 cod fishery. Compared to northerly and north-easterly waters where this study took place, waters
18 along the southern coast of Newfoundland may have higher concentrations of plastic pollution,
19 as they receive additional inputs from the Gulf of St. Lawrence (Han et al. 1999) and wind may
20 push pollutants from the Gulf Stream into southern waters. Future research should examine
21 plastic ingestion in this southern area.

22
23 Third, Canada's Northern Atlantic and Arctic regions have small and dispersed populations that
24 contribute to relatively less onshore litter compared to other sites where cod has been sampled.
25 Newfoundland and Labrador has a relatively low population of 530,000 people spread over
26 400,000km², which may account for some of the difference between our results and Foekema et
27 al. (2013) who examined cod in the much more populated North Sea. In their case, of 67 cod
28 caught near coastal waters, 14.9% had ingested plastics, whereas none of their 13 cod caught
29 offshore had ingested plastics—a finding that is similar to that of the present study where 0% of
30 17 offshore cod contained plastics. Foekema et al. (2013) attributed the greater number of
31 plastics found near inshore waters to higher levels of local plastic pollution due to coastal
32 proximity. Similar results were obtained by Bråte et al. (2016) in Norwegian waters, where their
33 302 Atlantic cod from six sampling sites around the country had a 3% ingestion rate, but cod
34 from the Bergen City Harbour, their most populated test site, had a 27% ingestion rate.

35
36 While it is difficult to trace plastics to the original point source of pollution, we are confident that
37 most of the plastics in the present study (n= 3, 60%) originate from the province of
38 Newfoundland as evidenced by low levels of erosion and lack of discolouring. Newfoundland is
39 a remote province, and plastics traveling from afar would have to endure significant time at sea.
40 Plastics that have spent significant time at sea or on beaches show signs of wear, erosion, or
41 fouling (Corcoran et al. 2009), which were absent from these plastics. The two plastic threads
42 found in cod (see Image 1) are the same type and colour of plastic that is commonly found on
43 local shorelines and coastal sea floors (Claerebout 2004; Zhou et al. 2011), and is associated
44 with the bottom trawls used in the area. Local waste and sewage management practices,
45 geographical features, and proximity to the main urban area of the province likely impacts the
46 type and incidences of plastics found in our study. Most of this study's cod were caught at Petty
47 Harbour and Portugal Cove, which have relatively large and open bays compared to other

1 sampling locations, such as Belle Island and Quidi Vidi—both of which are located in small
2 inshore bays and whose cod were found to contain plastics. Further sampling of cod in these and
3 other inshore locations might yield larger plastic incidence rates.

4
5 A potential issue associated with comparing plastic ingestion rates among studies is the use of
6 different lower detection limits. As has been discussed, the lower detection limit used in this
7 study was 1mm for ‘large microplastics’, as this has been shown to be the largest size that can
8 reliably detected visually through a compound microscope, and is the limit most commonly used
9 in plastic ingestion studies (Song et al. 2015). However, other detection limits have been used in
10 fish ingestion papers, where plastics of less than 1mm are included in study results (for example,
11 Lusher et al. 2013; Phillips and Bonne 2015). This in turn might lead to an overestimation of
12 plastics in certain species, where a greater number of small and medium sized microplastics are
13 detected, or underestimation of others, including the present study where smaller microplastics
14 are not investigated. We found no fibers, for example, while in studies such as Rochman et al.
15 (2015) fibres were plentiful. This may have implications, where researchers are assessing what
16 species are most vulnerable to plastic ingestion, and indicates the importance of using
17 comparable methods in both accredited and citizen science. The development of reliable citizen
18 science methods is particularly important in Newfoundland and Labrador due to the importance
19 of fish in the local economy, community concerns regarding plastic pollution and the wellbeing
20 of marine life, low research infrastructure, and a wealth of local knowledge by fishermen in the
21 area. The present study contributes to ongoing efforts by marine plastic researchers to use and
22 standardize citizen science methods.

23
24 Other studies in marine plastic pollution have used volunteer participation of citizens (citizen
25 scientists) to contribute information, data, and samples to scientific studies (Tudor & Williams
26 2001, Bonney et al. 2009, Bravo et al. 2009, Ogata et al. 2009, Ribic et al. 2010, Hidalgo-Ruz &
27 Thiel 2013, Eastman et al. 2014, Smith & Edgar 2014, Hidalgo-Ruz & Thiel 2015). In an
28 overview of citizen science projects involving marine debris, Hidalgo-Ruz and Thiel (2015)
29 found that 68% of studies examined the spatial distribution and composition of marine litter
30 through beach clean ups and shoreline studies. They found that only 18% of citizen science
31 studies addressed interaction of plastics with biota, and only one dealt with ingestion of plastics
32 by fish, where plastics were gathered from shorelines and appraised for bite marks (Carson
33 2013). To our knowledge, ours is the first study that uses citizen scientists to gather GI tracts for
34 biomonitoring and analysis. Citizen scientists, and fish harvesters in particular, are an important
35 population for collaboration in ingestion studies because their participation allows us to sample
36 human food webs directly. All fish in our sample were eaten by humans. Also, compared to
37 studies where whole fish are bought from market and analyzed (such as Rochman et al. 2015a),
38 we are able to obtain more fish with additional data, including where they were caught and under
39 what conditions (hand line versus trawl, and nearshore versus offshore, for example). Finally, in
40 addition to gains in sampling, citizen science also allows for input from the community. We
41 hosted a public meeting of our results in Petty Harbour, where many of our samples were
42 collected, before submission for publication. Citizen scientists and members of the public gave
43 us feedback as to whether our results aligned with their own understandings of plastics and fish
44 in the area, and they advised that we look at mackerel and capelin, two pelagic fish species also
45 consumed in the area. They also invited us back for the following year to continue our study. For
46 remote areas with large coastlines, in fishing communities, and on topics of public concern such
47 as marine plastics, citizen science is an ideal methodology.

1
2 Based on this study, we will continue to monitor the food fishery in Newfoundland's east shore
3 in coming years to establish a more robust monitoring system, and we will look to sample the
4 south shore of the island where plastics from the Gulf Stream are likely to occur. We will also
5 add additional protocols to our citizen science collection to ensure entire GI tracts, rather than
6 just stomachs, are gathered in future studies.
7

8 **Contributions**

9 Max Liboiron is the principle investigator for this project and coordinated the study, wrote field
10 and laboratory protocols, trained students and participated in all field and laboratory protocols,
11 analyzed plastic samples, wrote, edited and revised the final article, and facilitated the public
12 meeting at Petty Harbour. Liboiron is the PI on all grants that supported this study.

13 France Liboiron conducted the majority of laboratory wet lab work, including the analysis of
14 plastics, wrote, edited, and revised the final article, and attended the public meeting at Petty
15 Harbour.

16 Emily Wells conducted wet laboratory work, including the analysis of plastics, prepared the
17 majority of the literature review on ingestion rates, wrote, edited, and revised the final article,
18 and attended the public meeting at Petty Harbour.

19 Natalie Richárd conducted field collection and laboratory wet lab work, including the analysis of
20 plastics, wrote and edited the final article, and attended the public meeting at Petty Harbour.

21 Alex Zahara wrote, edited, and revised the final article, with an emphasis on the discussion, and
22 attended the public meeting at Petty Harbour.

23 Charles Mather conducted field collection, analyzed plastics in the laboratory, edited the final
24 article, and co-facilitated the public meeting at Petty Harbour.

25 Hillary Bradshaw conducted field collection and attended the public meeting at Petty Harbour.

26 Judyannet Murichi conducted field collection and attended the public meeting at Petty Harbour.
27

28 **Acknowledgements**

29 This research was made possible through a Social Science and Humanities Research Council
30 (SSHRC) Insight Development Grant (#430-2015-00413) and Marine Environmental
31 Observation Prediction and Response Network (MEOPAR) grant, and the generosity of Dr.
32 Yolanda Wiersma, Department of Biology, Memorial University of Newfoundland for dedicated
33 laboratory space. Alicia Poole and Louis Charron provided assistance in the field and for fact-
34 checking. We wish a special acknowledgement to all citizen participants who helped us gather
35 samples, especially Emily Pretty, who attends Frank Roberts Junior High School in Conception
36 Bay South and spent many hours helping us collect data. Finally, thank you to the anonymous
37 reviewer whose comments strengthened this paper.
38

39 **Bibliography**

- 40
41 Anastasopoulou, A., Mytilineou, C., Smith, C. J., & Papadopoulou, K. N. (2013). Plastic debris ingested
42 by deep-water fish of the Ionian Sea (Eastern Mediterranean). *Deep Sea Research Part I:
43 Oceanographic Research Papers*, 74, 11-13. doi:10.1016/j.dsr.2012.12.008
44 Andradý, A. L. (2015). Persistence of plastic litter in the oceans. In *Marine Anthropogenic Litter*, eds
45 Bergmann, M., Gutow, L., Klages, M. Heidelberg: Springer, 57–72. DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-


- 1 16510-3_3
- 2 Bavington, D. (2011). *Managed annihilation: an unnatural history of the Newfoundland cod collapse*.
3 Vancouver, BC: UBC Press.
- 4 Björnsson, B. & A. Steinarsson. (2002). The food-unlimited growth rate of Atlantic cod (*Gadus morhua*).
5 *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences*, 59, 494-502. doi: 10.1139/f02-028
- 6 Boerger, C. M., Lattin, G. L., Moore, S. L., & Moore, C. J. (2010). Plastic ingestion by planktivorous
7 fishes in the North Pacific Central Gyre. *Marine Pollution Bulletin*, 60, 2275-2278.
8 [doi:10.1016/j.marpolbul.2010.08.007](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpolbul.2010.08.007)
- 9 Bonney, R., Cooper, C. B., Dickinson, J., Kelling, S., Phillips, T., Rosenberg, K. V., Shirk, J. (2009).
10 Citizen science: A developing tool for expanding science knowledge and scientific literacy.
11 *BioScience*, 59, 977–984. doi: 10.1525/bio.2009.59.11.9
- 12 Bråte, I. L. N., Eidsvoll, D. P., Steindal, C. C., & Thomas, K. V. (2016). Plastic ingestion by
13 Atlantic cod (*Gadus morhua*) from the Norwegian coast. *Marine Pollution Bulletin*. In
14 press. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.marpolbul.2016.08.034>
- 15 Bravo, M., Gallardo, M., Luna-
16 Jorquera, G., Núñez, P., Vásquez, N., & Thiel, M. (2009). Anthropogenic debris on beaches in
17 the SE Pacific (Chile): Results from a national survey supported by volunteers. *Marine Pollution
18 Bulletin*, 58, 1718–1726. doi:10.1016/j.marpolbul.2009.06.017
- 19 Browne, M. A., Niven, S. J., Galloway, T. S., Rowland, S. J. & Thompson, R. C. (2013). Microplastic
20 moves pollutants and additives to worms, reducing functions linked to health and biodiversity.
21 *Current Biology*, 23, 2388– 2392. doi:10.1016/j.cub.2013.10.012
- 22 Carson, H. S. (2013). The incidence of plastic ingestion by fishes: From the prey’s perspective. *Marine
23 Pollution Bulletin*, 74, 170–174. doi:10.1016/j.marpolbul.2013.07.008
- 24 Civic Laboratory for Environmental Action Research (CLEAR). (2015). “Fish Guts!”
25 <http://civiclaboratory.nl/2015/09/18/fish-guts/>. Website. (accessed March 10, 2016).
- 26 Choy, C. A. & Drazen, J. C. (2013). Plastic for dinner? Observations of frequent debris ingestion by
27 pelagic predatory fishes from the central North Pacific. *Marine Ecology Progress Series*, 485,
28 155– 163. doi: 10.3354/meps10342
- 29 Claereboudt, M. R. (2004). Shore litter along sandy beaches of the Gulf of Oman. *Marine Pollution
30 Bulletin*, 49, 770-777. doi:10.1016/j.marpolbul.2004.06.004
- 31 Corcoran, P. L., Biesinger, M. C., & Griff, M. (2009). Plastics and beaches: A degrading relationship.
32 *Marine Pollution Bulletin*, 58(1), 80-84. doi:10.1016/j.marpolbul.2008.08.022
- 33 Cohen, D. M., Inada, T., Wiamoto, T., & Scialabba, N. (1990). *FAO Species Catalogue: Vol 10 Gadiform
34 Fishes of the World (Order Gadiformes)*. Rome, IT: Food and Agriculture Organization of the
35 United Nations.
- 36 Dantas, D. V., Barletta, M., & Da Costa, M. F. (2012). The seasonal and spatial patterns of ingestion of
37 polyfilament nylon fragments by estuarine drums (Sciaenidae). *Environmental Science and
38 Pollution Research*, 19, 600-606. doi: 10.1007/s11356-011-0579-0
- 39 Derraik, J. G. B. (2002). The pollution of the marine environment by plastic debris: A review. *Marine
40 Pollution Bulletin*, 842-852. [doi:10.1016/S0025-326X\(02\)00220-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0025-326X(02)00220-5)
- 41 Department of Fisheries and Aquaculture. (2016). *Seafood Industry: Year in Review 2015*. St. John’s, NL:
42 Newfoundland and Labrador Planning and Services Division, Government of Newfoundland.
- 43 Di Benedetto, A. P. M., & Awabdi, D. R. (2014). How marine debris ingestion differs among megafauna
44 species in a tropical coastal area. *Marine Pollution Bulletin*, 88, 86-90.
45 [doi:10.1016/j.marpolbul.2014.09.020](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpolbul.2014.09.020)
- 46 Eastman, L., Hidalgo-Ruz, V., Macaya-Caquilpán, V., Nuñez, P., & Thiel, M. (2014). The potential for
47 young citizen scientist projects: A case study of Chilean schoolchildren collecting data on marine
48 litter. *Coastal and Marine Management in Latin America*, 14, 569–579. doi:10.5894/rcgi507
- 49 Endo, S., Takizawa, R., Okuda, K., Takada, H., Chiba, K., Kanehiro, H., Ogi, H., Yamashita, R., Takeshi,
D. (2005). "Concentration of polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs) in beached resin pellets:


- 1 variability among individual particles and regional differences." *Marine Pollution Bulletin* 50, no.
2 10 (2005): 1103-1114. doi.org/10.1016/j.marpolbul.2005.04.030
- 3 Eriksen, M., Lebreton, L. C. M., Carson, H. S., Thiel, M., Moore, C.J., Borerro, J.C., Galgani, F., Ryan,
4 P.G., & Reisser, J. (2014). Plastic pollution in the world's oceans: More than 5 trillion plastic
5 pieces weighing over 250,000 tons afloat at sea. *PLoS ONE*, 9, doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0111913
- 6 Eriksen, M., Mason, S., Wilson, S., Box, C., Zellers, A., Edwards, W., Farley, H., Amato, S. (2013).
7 Microplastic pollution in the surface waters of the Laurentian Great Lakes. *Marine Pollution*
8 *Bulletin*, 77, 177-182. doi:10.1016/j.marpolbul.2013.10.007
- 9 European Commission (2014). *Guidance on monitoring of marine litter in European Seas*. Luxembourg,
10 EU: Publications Office of the European Union. doi:10.2788/99475
- 11 Fisheries and Oceans Canada. (2015). "Newfoundland and Labrador Recreational Groundfish Fishery."
12 <http://www.dfo-mpo.gc.ca/decisions/fm-2013-gp/atl-015-eng.htm#>. Website. (accessed March
13 10, 2016).
- 14 Foekema, E. M., De Gruijter, C., Mergia, M. T., van Franeker, J. A., Murk, A. J., & Koelmans, A. A.
15 (2013). Plastic in North Sea fish. *Environmental Science & Technology*, 47, 8818-8824.
16 doi: 10.1021/es400931b
- 17 Gassel, M., Harwani, S., Park, J. S. & Jahn, A. (2013). Detection of nonylphenol and persistent organic
18 pollutants in fish from the North Pacific Central Gyre. *Marine Pollution Bulletin*, 73, 231– 242.
19 doi:10.1016/j.marpolbul.2013.05.014
- 20 Hall, K., 2000. *Impacts of Marine Debris and Oil: Economic and Social Costs to Coastal Communities*.
21 KIMO, c/o Shetland Islands Council, Lerwick.
- 22 Han, G., Loder, J.W., & Smith, P.C. (1999). Seasonal-mean hydrography and circulation in the Gulf of
23 St. Lawrence and on the Eastern Scotian and southern Newfoundland Shelves. *Journal of*
24 *Physical Oceanography*, 29, 1279-1301. doi:10.1175/1520-
25 0485(1999)029<1279:SMHACI>2.0.CO;2
- 26 Hidalgo-Ruz, V., & Thiel, M. (2015). The contribution of citizen scientists to the monitoring of marine
27 litter. In *Marine Anthropogenic Litter*, eds Bergmann, M., Gutow, L., Klages, M. Heidelberg:
28 Springer, 429-447. doi:10.1007/978-3-319-16510-3_16
- 29 Hidalgo-Ruz, V., & Thiel, M. (2013). Distribution and abundance of small plastic debris on beaches in
30 the SE Pacific (Chile): a study supported by a citizen science project. *Marine Environmental*
31 *Research*, 87-88, 12-18. doi:10.1016/j.marenvres.2013.02.015
- 32 Holmes, L. A., Turner, A. & Thompson, R. C. (2012). Adsorption of trace metals to plastic resin pellets
33 in the marine environment. *Environmental Pollution*, 160, 42– 48.
34 doi:10.1016/j.envpol.2011.08.052
- 35 Jackson, G. D., Buxton, N. G., & George, M. J. (2000). Diet of the southern opah *Lampris immaculatus*
36 on the Patagonian Shelf; the significance of the squid *Moroteuthis ingens* and anthropogenic
37 plastic. *Marine Ecology Progress Series*, 206, 261-271. doi:10.3354/meps206261
- 38 Jantz, L. A., Morishige, C. L., Bruland, G. L., & Lepczyk, C. A. (2013). Ingestion of plastic marine debris
39 by longnose lancetfish (*Alepisaurus ferox*) in the North Pacific Ocean. *Marine pollution*
40 *bulletin*, 69, 97-104. [doi:10.1016/j.marpolbul.2013.01.019](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpolbul.2013.01.019)
- 41 Johansen, S. D., Coucheron, D. H., Andreassen, M., Karlsen, B. O., Furmanek, T., Jørgensen, T. E.,
42 Emblem, A., Breines, R., Nordeide, J. T., Moum, T., Nederbragt, A. J., Stenseth, N. C., &
43 Jakobsen, K. S. (2009). Large-scale sequence analyses of Atlantic cod. *New Biotechnology*, 25,
44 263-271. doi: 10.1016/j.nbt.2009.03.014.
- 45 Koelmans, A. A., Bakir, A., Burton, G. A., & Janssen, C. R. (2016). Microplastic as a vector for
46 chemicals in the aquatic environment: Critical review and model-supported re-interpretation of
47 empirical studies. *Environmental Science & Technology*, 50, 3315-3326.
48 doi:10.1021/acs.est.5b06069
- 49 Koelmans, A. A., Besseling, E., & Foekema, E. M. (2014). Leaching of plastic additives to marine
50 organisms. *Environmental Pollution*, 187, 49-54. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.envpol.2013.12.013>

- 1 Koelmans, A. A., Besseling, E., Wegner, A., & Foekema, E. M. (2013). Plastic as a carrier of POPs to
2 aquatic organisms: a model analysis. *Environmental science & technology*, 47(14), 7812-7820.
3 [dx.doi.org/10.1021/es401169n](https://doi.org/10.1021/es401169n)
- 4 Kühn, S., Rebolledo, E. L. B., & van Franeker, J. A. (2015). Deleterious effects of litter on marine life.
5 In *Marine anthropogenic litter* (pp. 75-116). Springer International Publishing.
- 6 Law, K. L., Morét-Ferguson, S., Maximenko, N. A., Proskurowski, G., Peacock, E. E., Hafner, J., Reddy,
7 C. M. (2010). *Science*, 329, 1185- 1188. DOI: 10.1126/science.1192321
- 8 Liboiron, M. (2016). Leveraging Civic, Citizen, and Open Science to Make Science Matter. Plenary
9 presentation at International Marine Conservation Congress, St. John's, Newfoundland, July 30.
- 10 Loder, J.W., Petrie, B., Gawarkiewicz, G. (1998) The coastal ocean off northeastern North America: A
11 large-scale view. In *The Global Coastal Ocean: Regional Studies and Synthesis vol. 11*, eds K. H.
12 Brink and A. R. Robinson. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley, 105-133.
- 13 Lowitt, K. (2013). Examining fisheries contributions to community food security: Findings from a
14 household seafood consumption survey on the west coast of Newfoundland. *Journal of Hunger &*
15 *Environmental Nutrition*, 8, 221-242. doi:10.1080/19320248.2013.786668
- 16 Lusher, A.L., O'Donnell, C., Officer, R., & O'Connor, I. (2015a). Microplastic interactions with North
17 Atlantic mesopelagic fish. *ICES Journal of Marine Science*, doi:10.1093/icesjms/fsv241
- 18 Lusher, A. L., Tirelli, V., O'Connor, I., & Officer, R. (2015b). Microplastics in Arctic polar waters: the
19 first reported values of particles in surface and subsurface samples. *Scientific Reports*, 5. doi:
20 10.1038/srep14947
- 21 Lusher, A. L., McHugh, M., & Thompson, R. C. (2013). Occurrence of microplastics in the
22 gastrointestinal tract of pelagic and demersal fish from the English Channel. *Marine Pollution*
23 *Bulletin*, 67, 94-99. [doi:10.1016/j.marpolbul.2012.11.028](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpolbul.2012.11.028)
- 24 Mallory, M.L., Roberston, G.J., Moenting, A. (2006). Marine plastic debris in northern fulmars from
25 Davis Strait, Nunavut, Canada. *Marine Pollution Bulletin*, 52, 800-815.
26 doi:10.1016/j.marpolbul.2006.04.005
- 27 Mallory, M.L. (2008). Plastic debris in northern fulmars from the Canadian high Arctic. *Marine Pollution*
28 *Bulletin*, 56, 1486-1512. doi:10.1016/j.marpolbul.2008.04.017
- 29 Mato, Y., Isobe, T., Takada, H., Kanehiro, H., Ohtake, C. & Kaminuma, T. (2001). Plastic resin pellets as
30 a transport medium for toxic chemicals in the marine environment. *Environmental Science and*
31 *Technology*, 35, 318-324. doi:10.1021/es0010498
- 32 Miranda, D. D. A., & de Carvalho-Souza, G. F. (2016). Are we eating plastic-ingesting fish? *Marine*
33 *Pollution Bulletin*, 103, 109-114. [doi:10.1016/j.marpolbul.2015.12.035](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpolbul.2015.12.035)
- 34 Neves, D., Sobral, P., Ferreira, J. L., & Pereira, T. (2015). Ingestion of microplastics by commercial fish
35 off the Portuguese coast. *Marine Pollution Bulletin*, 101, 119-126.
36 [doi:10.1016/j.marpolbul.2015.11.008](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpolbul.2015.11.008)
- 37 Obbard, R.W., Sadri, S., Wong, Y.Q., Khitun, A.A., Baker, I., & Thompson, R.C. (2014). Global
38 warming releases microplastic legacy frozen in Arctic sea ice. *Earth's Future*, 2.
39 doi:10.1002/2014EF000240.
- 40 Ogata, Y., Takada, H., Mizukawa, K., Hirai, H., Iwasa, S., Endo, S., Mato, Y., Saha, M., Okuda, K.,
41 Nakashima, A., Murakami, M., Zurcher, N., Booyatumanondo, R., Zakaria, M., Dung, L.,
42 Gordon, M., Miguez, C., Suzuki, S., Moore, C., Karapanagioti, H., Weerts, S., McClurg, T.,
43 Burrell, E., Smith, W., Van Velkenburg, M., Lang, J., Lang, R., Laursen, D., Danner, B.,
44 Stewardson, N. & Thompson, R. (2009). International pellet watch: global monitoring of
45 persistent organic pollutants (POPs) in coastal waters. 1. Initial phase data on PCBs, DDTs, and
46 HCHs. *Marine Pollution Bulletin*, 58, 1437-1446. doi:10.1016/j.marpolbul.2009.06.014
- 47 Phillips, M. B., & Bonner, T. H. (2015). Occurrence and amount of microplastic ingested by fishes in
48 watersheds of the Gulf of Mexico. *Marine Pollution Bulletin*, 100, 264-269.
49 [doi:10.1016/j.marpolbul.2015.08.041](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpolbul.2015.08.041)

- 1 Possatto, F. E., Barletta, M., Costa, M. F., do Sul, J. A. I., & Dantas, D. V. (2011). Plastic debris ingestion
2 by marine catfish: an unexpected fisheries impact. *Marine Pollution Bulletin*, 62, 1098-1102.
3 [doi:10.1016/j.marpolbul.2011.01.036](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpolbul.2011.01.036)
- 4 Protected Areas Association of Newfoundland and Labrador. (1996). "Ancient Rights: The Protected
5 Fishing Area of Petty Harbour-Maddox Cove." [http://lib-](http://lib-lespaul.library.mun.ca/cdm/ref/collection/ich_avalon/id/5516)
6 [lespaul.library.mun.ca/cdm/ref/collection/ich_avalon/id/5516](http://lib-lespaul.library.mun.ca/cdm/ref/collection/ich_avalon/id/5516) Website. (Accessed March 10,
7 2016).
- 8 Provencher, J. F., Gaston, A. J., Mallory, M. (2009). Evidence for increased ingestion of plastics by
9 northern fulmars (*Fulmarus glacialis*) in the Canadian Arctic. *Marine Pollution Bulletin*, 58,
10 1092-1094. doi:10.1016/j.marpolbul.2009.04.002
- 11 Provencher, J. F., Gaston, A. J., Mallory, M. L., O'hara, P. D., & Gilchrist, H. G. (2010). Ingested plastic
12 in a diving seabird, the thick-billed murre (*Uria lomvia*), in the eastern Canadian Arctic. *Marine*
13 *Pollution Bulletin*, 60, 1406-1411. doi:10.1016/j.marpolbul.2010.05.017.
- 14 Provencher, J. F., Bond, A. L., Hedd, A., Montevecchi, W. A., Bin Muzaffar, S. B., Courchesne, S. J.,
15 Gilchrist, G., Jamieson, S. E., Merkel, F. R., Falk, K., Durinck, J., Mallory, M. L. (2014).
16 Prevalence of marine debris in marine birds from the North Atlantic. *Marine Pollution Bulletin*,
17 84, 411-417. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.marpolbul.2014.04.044>
- 18 Ramos, J. A., Barletta, M., & Costa, M. F. (2012). Ingestion of nylon threads by Gerreidae while using a
19 tropical estuary as foraging grounds. *Aquatic Biology*, 17, 29-34. doi: 10.3354/ab00461
- 20 Ribic, C. A., Sheavly, S. B., Rugg, D. J., & Erdmann, E. S. (2010). Trends and drivers of marine debris
21 on the Atlantic coast of the United States 1997–2007. *Marine Pollution Bulletin*, 60, 1231–
22 1242. doi:10.1016/j.marpolbul.2010.03.021
- 23 Rochman, C. M. (2016). "The Role of Plastic Debris as Another Source of Hazardous Chemicals in
24 Lower-Trophic Level Organisms." In *The Handbook of Environmental Chemistry*. Springer, 1-15.
- 25 Rochman, C. M., Tahir, A., Williams, S. L., Baxa, D. V., Lam, R., Miller, J. T., The, F., Werorilangi, S.,
26 & Teh, S. J. (2015a). Anthropogenic debris in seafood: Plastic debris and fibers from textiles in
27 fish and bivalves sold for human consumption. *Scientific Reports*, 5 doi:10.1038/srep14340
- 28 Rochman, C. M., Browne, M. A., Underwood, A. J., van Franeker, J. A., Thompson, R. C., & Amaral-
29 Zettler, L. A. (2015b). The ecological impacts of marine debris: unraveling the demonstrated
30 evidence from what is perceived. *Ecology*, 9, 302-312. doi: 10.1890/14-2070.1
- 31 Rochman, C.M., Lewison, R.L., Eriksen, M., Allen, H., Cook, A.-M. and Teh, S.J. (2014).
32 Polybrominated diphenyl ethers (PBDEs) in fish tissue may be an indicator of plastic
33 contamination in marine habitats. *Science of the Total Environment*, 476, 622–633.
34 doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2014.01.058
- 35 Rochman, C. M., Hoh, E., Kurobe, T., & Teh, S. J. (2013). Ingested plastic transfers hazardous chemicals
36 to fish and induces hepatic stress. *Scientific Reports*, 3. doi:10.1038/srep03263
- 37 Romeo, T., Pietro, B., Pedà, C., Consoli, P., Andaloro, F., & Fossi, M. C. (2015). First evidence of
38 presence of plastic debris in stomach of large pelagic fish in the Mediterranean Sea. *Marine*
39 *Pollution Bulletin*, 95, 358-361. [doi:10.1016/j.marpolbul.2015.04.048](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpolbul.2015.04.048)
- 40 Rummel, C. D., Löder, M. G., Fricke, N. F., Lang, T., Griebeler, E. M., Janke, M., & Gerdts, G. (2015).
41 Plastic ingestion by pelagic and demersal fish from the North Sea and Baltic Sea. *Marine*
42 *Pollution Bulletin*, 102, 134-141. doi: [10.1016/j.marpolbul.2015.11.043](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpolbul.2015.11.043)
- 43 Ryan, P. G. (2015). How quickly do albatrosses and petrels digest plastic particles? *Environmental*
44 *Pollution*, 207, 438-440. doi:10.1016/j.envpol.2015.08.005
- 45 Schrank, W. E., & Roy, N. (2013). The Newfoundland fishery and economy twenty years after the
46 Northern cod moratorium. *Marine Resource Economics*, 28, 397-413. doi:10.5950/0738-1360-
47 28.4.397
- 48 Seltenrich, N. (2015). New link in the food chain? Marine plastic pollution and seafood safety.
49 *Environmental Health Perspectives*. 123, A34. doi:10.1289/ehp.123-A34
- 50 Setälä, O., Fleming-Lehtinen, V., & Lehtiniemi, M. (2014). Ingestion and transfer of microplastics in the
51 planktonic food web. *Environmental Pollution*, 185, 77-83. doi:10.1016/j.envpol.2013.10.013

- 1 Smith, S. D., & Edgar, R. J. (2014). Documenting the density of subtidal marine debris across multiple
2 marine and coastal habitats. *PLoS ONE*, 9, e94593. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0094593
- 3 Song, Y. K., Hong, S. H., Jang, M., Han, G. M., Rani, M., Lee, J., Shim, W. J. (2015). Comparison of
4 microscopic and spectroscopic identification methods for analysis of microplastics in
5 environmental samples. *Marine Pollution Bulletin*, 93, 202-209.
6 doi:10.1016/j.marpolbul.2015.01.015
- 7 Tanaka, K., Takada, H., Yamashita, R., Mizukawa, K., Fukuwaka, M. and Watanuki, Y. (2013).
8 Accumulation of plastic-derived chemicals in tissues of seabirds ingesting marine plastics.
9 *Marine Pollution Bulletin*, 69, 219–222. doi:10.1016/j.marpolbul.2012.12.010
- 10 Tudor, D.T. & Williams, A.T. (2001) *Investigation of Litter Problems in the Severn Estuary/Bristol*
11 *Channel Area*. Bristol: Environment Agency.
- 12 Van Cauwenberghe, L., Vanreusel, A., Mees, J., & Janssen, C. (2013). Microplastic pollution in deep-sea
13 sediments. *Environmental Pollution*, 182, 495-499. doi:10.1016/j.envpol.2013.08.013
- 14 Van Cauwenberghe, L. & Janssen, C. R. (2014). Microplastics in bivalves cultured for human
15 consumption. *Environmental Pollution*, 193, 65– 70. doi:10.1016/j.envpol.2014.06.010
- 16 Van Franeker, J. A. (2004). *Save the North Sea Fulmar-Litter-EcoQO Manual Part 1: Collection and*
17 *Dissection Procedures*. Wageningen, Netherlands: Alterra.
- 18 van Franeker, J.A., Blaize, C., Danielsen, J., Fairclough, K., Gollan, J., Guse, N., Hansen, P.-L., Heubeck,
19 M., Jensen, J.-K., Le Guillou, G., Olsen, B., Olsen, K.-O., Pedersen, J., Stienen, E.W.M., Turner,
20 D.M. (2011). Monitoring plastic ingestion by the northern fulmar *Fulmarus glacialis* in the North
21 *Sea. Environ. Pollut.* 159, 2609–2615. doi:10.1016/j.envpol.2011.06.008
- 22 Von Moos, N., Burkhardt-Holm, P. & Köhler, A. (2012) Uptake and effects of microplastics on cells and
23 tissue of the blue mussel *Mytilus edulis* L. after an experimental exposure. *Environmental Science*
24 *& Technology*, 46, 11327– 11335. doi:10.1021/es302332w
- 25 Wagner, M., Scherer, C., Alvarez-Muñoz, D., Brennholt, N., Bourrain, X., Buchinger, S., Fries, E.,
26 Grosbois, C., Klasmeier, J., Marti, T., Rodriguez-Mozaz, S., Urbatzka, R., Vethaak, A. D.,
27 Winter-Nielsen, M., & Reifferscheid, G. (2014). Microplastics in freshwater ecosystems: what
28 we know and what we need to know. *Environmental Sciences Europe*, 26, 12.
29 doi:10.1186/s12302-014-0012-7
- 30 Wardrop, P., Shimeta, J., Nugegoda, D., Morrison, P. D., Miranda, A., Tang, M., & Clarke, B. O. (2016).
31 Chemical pollutants sorbed to ingested microbeads from personal care products accumulate in
32 fish. *Environmental Science & Technology*, 50, 4037-4044. doi:10.1021/acs.est.5b06280
- 33 Wright, S. L., Thompson, R. C., & Galloway, T. S. (2013). The physical impacts of microplastics on
34 marine organisms: a review. *Environmental Pollution*, 178, 483-492.
- 35 Zarfl, C., & Matthies, M. (2010). Are marine plastic particles transport vectors for organic pollutants to
36 the Arctic? *Marine Pollution Bulletin*, 60, 1810-1814. doi:10.1016/j.marpolbul.2010.05.026
- 37 Zhou, P., Huang, C., Fang, H., Cai, W., Li, D., Li, X., Yu, H. (2011) The abundance, composition and
38 sources of marine debris in coastal seawaters or beaches around the northern South China Sea
39 (China). *Marine Pollution Bulletin*, 62, 1998-2007. doi:10.1016/j.marpolbul.2011.06.018





ATLANTIC OCEAN



Conception Bay

Bauline • 3
(0)

Flatrock • 7
(0)

Bell Island • 11
(1)

1 • (0) (to the right of) Portugal Cove

St. Phillips 1 • (0)

82 • (1) Portugal Cove

3 • (1) Quidi Vidi

St. John's ★

16 • (0) Tinkers

6 • (0) North Head
Cape Spear

Petty Harbour 66 • (2)

5 • (0) Black Hole Top

Northeast Avalon Peninsula

- sample site
- 16** fish in sample size
- (0)** fish with plastic
- ★ provincial capital

