Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

Data in Brief

journal homepage: www.elsevier.com/locate/dib

Data Article

Macrolitter dataset from a highly frequented roadway in Nantes, France



Romain Tramoy^{a,b,*}, Lauriane Ledieu^{c,d}, Sophie Ricordel^{c,d}, Daniel Astrié^{c,d}, Bruno Tassin^{a,b}, Johnny Gasperi^{c,d}

^a Univ Paris Est Créteil, LEESU, F-94010 Créteil, France

^b Ecole des Ponts, LEESU, F-77455 Champs-sur-Marne, France

^c GERS-LEE, Univ Gustave Eiffel, IFSTTAR, F-44344 Bouguenais, France

^d Institut de Recherche en Sciences et Techniques de la Ville IRSTV, CNRS, 1 rue de la Noë, 44321 Nantes Cedex 3,

France

ARTICLE INFO

Article history: Received 8 April 2022 Revised 27 April 2022 Accepted 28 April 2022 Available online 4 May 2022

Dataset link: Macrolitter along a highly frequented roadway (Original data)

Keywords: Macroplastics Road runoff Road traffic Stormwater TOP10 items TSG-ML/OSPAR classification

ABSTRACT

Land-based sources of riverine macrolitter are now recognized as a major concern, but few field data on litter amount, composition and sources are available. This is especially the case for macrolitter hotspots like high frequented roadways that could generate large amount of macrolitter potentially reaching rivers. This dataset provides macrolitter amount and composition over one year from a retention pond collecting stormwater and carried macrolitter from a 800 m portion of a highly frequented roadway (around 90,000 vehicles per day). The typology of macrolitter was defined using the TSG-ML/OSPAR classifications. A total of 36,439 items in which 84% of plastics were individually counted, classified and weighted by category for a total mass of 88.5 kg (60% of plastics). Raw data are available in Mendeley Data (DOI:10.17632/t6ryv6crjd.4). Top 10 items represent 92% by count of the total with plastic fragments (31%), cigarette butts (18%), EPS fragments (17%) or foam packaging (11%) as most common items. Top 10 items represent 72% by mass of the total with plastic fragments (24%) and Cardboard (13%) as most common items, followed by foam packaging (6%), wood

DOI of original article: 10.1016/j.envpol.2022.119145

* Corresponding author.

E-mail address: romain.tramoy@enpc.fr (R. Tramoy).

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dib.2022.108237

2352-3409/© 2022 The Author(s). Published by Elsevier Inc. This is an open access article under the CC BY license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/)

fragments (6%), industrial plastic sheets (5%), rubber fragments (4%) and EPS fragments (4%). More than 94% of plastic items are below 1.9 g/item. This dataset is related to the research paper Amount, composition and sources of macrolitter from a highly frequented roadway.

> © 2022 The Author(s). Published by Elsevier Inc. This is an open access article under the CC BY license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/)

Specifications Table

Subject	Environmental Sciences, Pollution
Specific subject area	Plastic leakage into the environment: sources and pathways.
Type of data	Table
	Graph
	Figure
How the data were acquired	Hand collection of macrolitter in a retention pond
-	Air-dried at the lab
	Manual sorting and visual identification of items according to TSG-ML/OSPAR
	classifications [1].
	Each category of tiem was weighed.
	Computation into Microsoft Excel sheets.
	Graph and figures from Microsoft Excel and Adobe illustrator.
Data format	Analyzed
	Filtered
Description of data collection	Macrolitter were collected in a retention pond collecting stormwater from a
	800 m portion of the South part of the Cheviré Bridge, Nantes, France. A
	one-year survey (10 samples) was conducted on the macrolitter conveyed by
	stormwater runoff in the retention pond. For each campaing, all visible
	macrolitter above 1 cm were collected and brought to the lab for sorting and
	identification.
	Road traffic and precipitation were also recorded for each campaign.
Data source location	Institution: Gustave Eiffel University
	City: Nantes
	Country: France
	• Lat. 47.1849; Long. –1.6144
	 Raw data: Mendeley Data; DOI:10.17632/t6ryv6crjd.4
Data accessibility	Repository name: Mendeley Data
	Data identification number: DOI: 10.17632/t6ryv6crjd.4
	https://data.mendeley.com/datasets/t6ryv6crjd/4
Related research article	Related research paper:
	[2] L. Ledieu, R. Tramoy, S. Ricordel, D. Astrie, B. Tassin, et J. Gasperi, 2022.
	Amount, composition and sources of macrolitter from a highly frequented
	roadway. Environ. Pollut., vol. 303, p. 119145.
	https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envpol.2022.119145.

Value of the Data

 Identified Macrolitter items, especially plastic debris, are scarce along roadsides in the peerreviewed literature. This dataset participates to fill this knowledge gap with macrolitter collected on a highly frequented highway. Macrolitter amount were reported by count and by mass to facilitate emission estimates. In contrast to other data on macrolitter in the environment, macrolitter from the logistic sector (industrial sheeting, foam, and cardboard fragments) are commonly featuring in Top 10 items either by count or by mass.

- Macrolitter were characterized according to TSG-ML/OSPAR classifications to facilitate comparisons with other studies dealing with macrolitter leakage into the terrestrial and aquatic environment. Institutions, policy makers and researchers using this European classification and its future updates can benefit from those data.
- Exploring driving factors of the macrolitter accumulation over time was made possible thanks to road traffic data and other environmental data (wind, precipitation, temperature). Those data can be used on similar roads from which road traffic is known to estimate potential related litter and macroplastic emissions.

1. Data Description

Significant contributions from urban runoff to riverine macrolitter and plastic debris was already demonstrated [3–5]. Road runoff constitutes a potential non-point source of pollution as roadside ditches may connect land-based sources to waterway, but field data specifically dedicated to roadsides are scarce [6,7]. In this paper, an inventory of macrolitter from a portion of 800 m of a highly frequented highway in Nantes (France) is presented.

The dataset is made of 36,439 items >1 cm counted and classified according to TSG-ML/OSPAR, in which 84% of items were plastics (raw data in Mendeley Data; DOI:10.17632/t6ryv6crjd.4). Dry mass of each category was also reported for a total mass of 88.5 kg (60% of plastics), which is equivalent to 117.4 kg/yr/km or 42.8 kg/yr/ha.

Material types are reported in Table 1 by count and by mass together with precipitation amounts and road traffic for the 10 field campaigns. When focused on plastics, their mass distribution is shifted toward light weight specific items with a median value of 1.2 g/plastic and 94% < 1.9 g/plastic (n = 30,777; Fig. 1).

Top 10 specific items by count and by mass based on aggregated data of all field campaigns are illustrated in Figs. 2 and 3, respectively. Top 10 items represent 92% by count of the total items (n = 36,439) and Top 10 items by mass represent 72% of the total mass, i.e. 88,467 g. Variability of abundances and masses is extremely high between the 10 campaigns with values



Fig. 1. Mass distribution of plastic items only. The mass item per category corresponds to the average mass of items for a specific category, i.e. the number of items in a category divided by its mass, meaning the 30,777 plastic items were not individually weighed. Data are from Mendeley Data (DOI:10.17632/t6ryv6crjd.4).

Material types by count and mass of the ten field campaigns (C1 to C10) with associated precipitation (in mm) and cumulated road traffic. Mveh, Millions of vehicles.

Field campaigns	C1	C2	C3	C4	C5	C6	C7	C8	С9	C10	Ctot
Start End Period (d) Precipitation (mm) Road traffic (Mveh) Vehicles/d	10/08/2020 07/09/2020 28 84.6 2.89 103,205	08/09/2020 23/09/2020 15 35.8 1.67 111,433	24/09/2020 19/10/2020 25 82.6 2.62 104,615	20/10/2020 29/10/2020 9 42.9 1.04 115,850	30/10/2020 01/12/2020 32 48.3 2.10 65,484	02/12/2020 05/01/2021 34 138.4 2.85 81,369	06/01/2021 25/01/2021 19 49.1 1.69 84,505	26/01/2021 15/03/2021 48 111.4 4.17 85,157	16/03/2021 05/05/2021 50 32.6 4.18 82,017	06/05/2021 29/07/2021 84 199.8 8.77 103,169	- - 344 825.5 31.98 93,680.4
Macrolitter by count and material type											
Plastics	1,658	475	1,497	631	2,830	9,742	2,359	2,300	4,284	5,001	30,777
%	97.7	80.4	86.8	65.0	88.8	91.0	85.5	72.6	80.5	79.2	84.5
Rubber	5	9	16	3	11	16	35	31	42	66	234
%	0.3	1.5	0.9	0.3	0.3	0.1	1.3	1.0	0.8	1.0	0.6
Textile	0	17	22	6	11	25	18	20	37	76	232
%	0.0	2.9	1.3	0.6	0.3	0.2	0.7	0.6	0.7	1.2	0.6
Paper, cardboard	25	75	127	15	165	359	233	626	869	921	3,415
%	1.5	12.7	7.4	1.5	5.2	3.4	8.4	19.8	16.3	14.6	9.4
Wood	3	1	41	310	145	506	87	84	43	139	1,359
%	0.2	0.2	2.4	31.9	4.6	4.7	3.2	2.7	0.8	2.2	3.7
Metal	3	12	18	6	24	50	22	106	40	106	387
%	0.2	2.0	1.0	0.6	0.8	0.5	0.8	3.3	0.8	1.7	1.1
Glass, ceramic	2	1	4	0	0	1	5	0	8	9	30
%	0.1	0.2	0.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.0	0.2	0.1	0.1
Other	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	5
%	0.1	0.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0
Total	1,697	591	1,725	971	3,186	10,700	2,759	3,169	5,323	6,318	36,439

(continued on next page)

Field campaigns	C1	C2	C3	C4	C5	C6	C7	C8	C9	C10	Ctot
Macrolitter by mass (kg) and material type											
Plastics	5.093	1.897	3.724	1.295	4.746	9.926	2.985	5.921	5.858	11.786	53.231
%	80.0	67.5	67.0	63.1	72.1	61.8	61.3	55.0	51.6	53.5	60.2
Rubber	0.120	0.110	0.177	0.025	0.208	1.164	0.490	0.607	0.944	0.443	4.289
%	1.9	3.4	3.2	1.2	3.2	7.2	10.1	5.6	8.3	2.0	4.8
Textile	0.470	0.176	0.375	0.028	0.234	1.410	0.214	0.245	0.536	1.841	5.528
%	7.4	5.5	6.7	1.4	3.5	8.8	4.4	2.3	4.7	8.4	6.2
Paper, cardboard	0.145	0.147	0.604	0.150	0.902	1.888	0.456	2.550	3.659	5.253	15.753
%	2.3	4.6	10.9	7.3	13.7	11.8	9.4	23.7	32.2	23.8	17.7
Wood	0.004	0.003	0.360	0.448	0.433	1.571	0.523	0.573	0.179	0.891	4.983
%	0.1	0.1	6.5	21.8	6.6	9.8	10.7	5.3	1.6	4.0	5.6
Metal	0.404	0.468	0.305	0.106	0.064	0.085	0.143	0.870	0.164	1.730	4.338
%	6.3	14.6	5.5	5.2	1.0	0.5	2.9	8.1	1.4	7.9	4.9
Glass, ceramic	0.040	0.003	0.017	0.000	0.000	0.011	0.056	0.000	0.022	0.091	0.241
%	0.6	0.1	0.3	0.0	0.0	0.1	1.2	0.0	0.2	0.4	0.3
Other	0.088	0.006	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.003	0.000	0.007	0.000	0.000	0.105
%	1.4	0.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.1
Total	6 364	2 810	5 561	2 052	6 5 8 6	16 058	4 866	10 774	11 362	22 035	88 467

т



Fig. 2. Top 10 macrolitter items collected in the retention pond of a highly frequented highway in Nantes, France. A, cumulated Top 10 items by count. Blue for plastics, yellow for cardboard and paper, brown for other wood (manufactured) and orange for rubber. B, median values between the ten field campaigns. C, variability in % relative to the median values (red bars) between the ten field campaigns. Lower and upper hinges represent the first and the third quartile and whiskers represent minimum and maximum values. Data are from Mendeley dataset (DOI:10.17632/t6ryv6crjd.4).



Fig. 3. Top 10 macrolitter items collected in the retention pond of a highly frequented highway in Nantes, France. A, cumulated Top 10 items by mass. Blue for plastics, yellow for cardboard and paper, brown for wood, dark grey for clothing and textile and grey for metal. and orange for rubber. B, median values between the ten field campaigns. C, variability in % relative to the median values (red bars) between the ten field campaigns. Lower and upper hinges represent the first and the third quartile and whiskers represent minimum and maximum values. Data are from Mendeley dataset (DOI:10.17632/t6ryv6crjd.4).

Table 2

		Correlation coefficient (Spearman, R)								
		C	5 included		C6 excluded					
Items by count	Time	Traffic	HV vehicles	Rainfall	Time	Traffic	HV vehicles	Rainfall		
All macrolitter Plastics	0.84 0.79	0.67 0.64	0.81 0.76	0.48 0.46	0.90 0.85	0.78 0.73	0.90 0.86	0.3 0.27		

Spearman correlation (R) coefficient between main material types by count and time, traffic, Heavy (HV) vehicles (around 10% total traffic) and rainfall. Significant correlations (p-value < 0.05) are in bold.

Table 3

Spearman correlation (R) coefficient between main material types by mass and time, traffic, Heavy (HV) vehicles (around 10% total traffic) and rainfall. Significant correlations (p-value < 0.05) are in bold.

		Correlation coefficient (Spearman, R)							
		Ce	6 included		C6 excluded				
Items by mass	Time	Traffic	HV vehicles	Rainfall	Time	Traffic	HV vehicles	Rainfall	
All macrolitter Plastics	0.96 0.94	0.88 0.90	0.93 0.89	0.58 0.70	1.00 0.97	0.95 0.97	1.00 0.97	0.42 0.58	

spanning up to three orders of magnitude. Only the abundance distribution of cigarette butts and EPS fragments follows a normal distribution.

The most specific items featuring in both Top 10 are plastic fragments (31% by count and 24% by mass), EPS fragments (17% by count and 4% by count), foam packaging (11% by count and 6% by mass), Cardboards (6% by count and 13% by mass), wood fragments (4% by count and 6% by mass), industrial plastic sheets (1% by count and 5% by mass) and rubber fragments(1% by count and 4% by mass). Cigarette butts, paper fragments and sweet wrappers are only featuring in the Top 10 by count and represent respectively 18%, 3% and 2%. Other textiles, plastic bags and metal fragments are only featuring in the Top 10 by mass and represent respectively 4%, 4% and 3%.

Accumulation time, road traffic and rainfall are potential driving factors of the macrolitter accumulation in the retention pond. The 6th field campaign corresponds to the Bella stormwater with high rainfall and high wind gusts. When field campaign 6 (C6) is excluded, macrolitter accumulation by count significantly correlates with the accumulation time and heavy vehicles traffic (Table 2). Macrolitter accumulation by mass also significantly correlates with the accumulation time and heavy vehicles traffic (Table 3). There are no significant correlations between macrolitter by count and rainfall.

2. Experimental Design, Materials and Methods

Macrolitter were collected in a retention pond collecting stormwater from a 800 m portion of the South part of the Cheviré Bridge (See Figure in Ledieu et al. [2]). A one-year survey was conducted on the macrolitter conveyed by stormwater runoff in the retention pond (Table 1). The Cheviré Bridge is in the western part of "Nantes Métropole" and is a part of its ring-road. It therefore constitutes a highly frequented highway over a length of 1,531 m. No pedestrians nor bikes may use this bridge, motorists are therefore the only potential input source of debris. During the studied period, an average of $93,680 \pm 16,147$ vehicles crossed that bridge each day in both directions (personal communication from DIRO – Direction Interdépartementale des Routes Ouest). Among these traffic levels, rates of heavy vehicles were relatively constant (9.9 \pm 1.2%). The 800 m road portion investigated is divided into 2 \times 3 lanes of traffic for a total surface of 20,639 m². Lateral gutters collect stormwater to a retention pond, south of the bridge. This pond offers a good opportunity to easily collect macrolitter. Rain amounts and wind speeds were measured at the Nantes-Atlantique airport station, 3 km from the Cheviré Bridge (https://prevision-meteo.ch/).

Ten field campaigns (C1 to C10) were performed over one year from the 10th of August 2020 to the 29th of July 2021. For each campaign, all macrolitter above 1 cm in the retention pond were collected by hands, air-dried at ambient air for days (at least one week) in the lab, characterized according to TSG-ML/OSPAR classifications [1] and weighed by category. The abundance of items was expressed by count and by dry mass. Plastic debris were considered as all artificial polymer materials, from parent codes G1 to G124 according to the TSG-ML classification. Raw data are available in Mendeley Data (DOI:10.17632/t6ryv6crjd.4).

Accumulation periods of macrolitter in the retention pond ranged between 9 and 84 days before sampling and associated precipitation amount ranged between 32.6 mm and 199.8 mm (Table 1). Road traffic ranged between 65,484 and 115,850 vehicles/d. The sample C5 partially corresponds to the second national lockdown relative to the COVID-19 pandemic (from October 30th to December 15th, 2020), but levels of road traffic exhibited no significant differences with the other campaigns. The sample C6 integrates the Bella storm that occurred on December 27th and 28th, 2020. During this storm, 20 mm of rain fell in one day and winds gusted up to 90 km/h (https://www.infoclimat.fr/).

Ethics Statements

CRediT Author Statement

Tramoy Romain: Conceptualization, Writing – original draft preparation, Data curation, Methodology, Illustration; **Lauriane Ledieu:** Conceptualization, Writing – original draft preparation, Data curation, Writing – review & editing; **Sophie Ricordel:** Data acquisition, Data curation; **Daniel Astrié:** Data acquisition, Data curation; **Bruno Tassin:** Validation, Supervision, Writing – review & editing; **Johnny Gasperi:** Conceptualization, Methodology, Data curation, Writing – review & editing, Validation, Supervision.

Declaration of Competing Interest

The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

Data Availability

Macrolitter along a highly frequented roadway (Original data) (Mendeley Data).

Acknowledgments

We acknowledge the DIR Ouest for their collaboration and for providing the data on traffic levels.

Funding

This work, as part of the Plasti-nium Research project, was funded by the Région Pays de la Loire (France) and by Nantes Métropole. The University Gustave Eiffel also supported this work by funding the apprenticeship of D. Astrié.

References

- MSFD Technical Subgroup on Marine Litter, Guidance on Monitoring of Marine Litter in European Seas, 2013 https: //mcc.jrc.ec.europa.eu/documents/201702074014.pdf.
- [2] L. Ledieu, R. Tramoy, S. Ricordel, D. Astrie, B. Tassin, et J. Gasperi, Amount, composition and sources of macrolitter from a highly frequented roadway, Environ. Pollut. 303 (2022) 119145, doi:10.1016/j.envpol.2022.119145.
- [3] E.A. Weideman, V. Perold, G. Arnold, et P.G. Ryan, Quantifying changes in litter loads in urban stormwater runoff from Cape Town, South Africa, over the last two decades, Sci. Total Environ. 724 (2020) 138310, doi:10.1016/j. scitotenv.2020.138310.
- [4] P. Tasseron, H. Zinsmeister, L. Rambonnet, A.-F. Hiemstra, D. Siepman, et T. van Emmerik, 2020. Plastic Hotspot Mapping in Urban Water Systems. Geosciences, vol. 10, no. 9. https://doi.org/10.3390/geosciences10090342.
- [5] R. Treilles, J. Gasperi, M. Saad, R. Tramoy, J. Breton, A. Rabier, B. Tassin, Abundance, composition and fluxes of plastic debris and other macrolitter in urban runoff in a suburban catchment of Greater Paris, Water Res 192 (2021) 116847, doi:10.1016/j.watres.2021.116847.
- [6] A. Robertson, N. Armitage, et M.H.P. Zuidgeest, Stormwater runoff quality on an urban highway in South Africa, J. South Afr. Inst. Civ. Eng. 61 (2) (2019) 51–56, doi:10.17159/2309-8775/2019/v61n2a5.
- [7] O. Pietz, M. Augenstein, C.B. Georgakakos, K. Singh, M. McDonald, et M.T. Walter, Macroplastic accumulation in roadside ditches of New York State's Finger Lakes region (USA) across land uses and the COVID-19 pandemic, J. Environ. Manage. 298 (2021) 113524, doi:10.1016/j.jenvman.2021.113524.